Journal of Orthopaedic Experience & Innovation
Clinical, Economic, and Innovative Orthopaedic Experience

Bruning, Paul. 2026. "From My Perspective™...On the Challenge of Robots in Joint Arthroplasty." *Journal of Orthopaedic Experience & Innovation* 7 (2). https://doi.org/10.60118/001c.168135.

Editorial

From My Perspective™...On the Challenge of Robots in Joint Arthroplasty

Paul Bruning, DHA[a]

Keywords: Joint arthroplasty, robotic surgery, healthcare economics

https://doi.org/10.60118/001c.168135

Journal of Orthopaedic Experience & Innovation

Vol. 7, Issue 2, 2026

Robotic assistance has real potential, particularly in precision and reproducibility. The challenge is deciding what that precision means for patients—and whether the clinical, operational, and financial case is strong enough for a particular surgeon and institution.

I AM NOT AGAINST THE ROBOT

I see genuine potential in robotic joint arthroplasty. The technology has been used most heavily in hips and knees, and its reach continues to expand. A robot can help a surgeon execute a plan with impressive precision. It can improve the consistency of bone cuts, implant position, and alignment. Those are legitimate technical achievements, and they should not be dismissed.

My concern is that we sometimes move too quickly from technical precision to a claim of superior patient outcome. A more accurate cut is measurable. A better fit or a tighter alignment target is measurable. But the patient does not come to us asking for a radiographically precise cut. The patient wants less pain, better function, fewer complications, a durable implant, and a faster return to life. The central question is whether the measured technical advantage reliably produces those outcomes over the long term.

That distinction matters because much of the discussion around robotics treats the surrogate measure as though it were the final result. The robot may make a difference. It may even make an important difference. But we need to be honest about what has been demonstrated and what is still an assumption.

> *The robot may improve the precision of the operation. Precision, however, is not automatically the same thing as a better outcome for the patient.*

THE EVIDENCE QUESTION

The literature I have reviewed is encouraging in places, but it is still difficult to interpret. Many reports emphasize alignment, fit, bone preservation, or the accuracy of planned cuts. When patient-reported outcomes are included, the studies are often short-term, relatively small, limited to a single surgeon or organization, or based on only a few years of experience. That may tell us something about pain, activity, or early complications, but it does not yet settle questions about long-term function, implant survival, or revision risk.

Comparisons are further complicated by inconsistent outcome instruments and time points. If one study uses one questionnaire, another uses WOMAC, and a third measures a different endpoint at a different interval, it becomes difficult to combine the findings into a convincing answer. We need standardized measures, standardized follow-up, and multicenter studies that extend far enough to detect meaningful differences in failure and revision.

We have seen this problem before. Instrumentation in joint arthroplasty evolved from relatively simple guides to increasingly elaborate jigs, yet every improvement in instrumentation was not necessarily accompanied by proof of a better long-term patient result. Better tools can make the work more reproducible and may reduce outliers. That is valuable. But it still leaves us with the question: how much technical improvement is clinically meaningful?

a Paul Bruning, DHA, is Division Administrator for Sports Medicine, Hand, and the Sports Sciences Institute within Duke University's Department of Orthopaedic Surgery. With more than35 years of orthopedic healthcare leadership, he has led clinical and operational initiatives across academic and integrated health systems, previously serving as Director of the Neuromusculoskeletal Service Line at Sutter Health and Executive Director at the Orthopaedic Institute and Holy Cross Medical Group. Dr. Bruning is President-Elect of the American Alliance of Orthopaedic Executives (AAOE) and has served on the boards of AAOE, ATPPS and BONES of Florida, as well as chair of AAOE's Advocacy Council. His work focuses on strengthening clinical operations, developing high-performing teams, health care policy, and improving patient care. Paul is a member of the Minnesota Athletic Trainers' Association Hall of Fame.

Conflicts of Interest Statement for Dr. Paul Bruning

THE SURGEON IS PART OF THE TECHNOLOGY

Robotics cannot be evaluated independently of the surgeon who uses it. A high-volume arthroplasty surgeon who has performed the same procedure thousands of times may already work efficiently and reproducibly without a robot. A lower-volume surgeon may benefit more from planning support, guidance, or protection against an outlier—but that surgeon must also complete the learning curve for the platform.

The learning curve exists in both directions. Many residents and fellows now train in environments where robotic access is routine. Some finish training having performed few, if any, cases without robotic assistance. They naturally want the same system in their first practice. Conversely, an experienced surgeon who has never used the platform must learn new planning, registration, workflow, and instrumentation. During that transition, operating-room time may increase before it decreases.

Volume remains a powerful variable. Repetition improves efficiency. A surgeon doing many joint replacements every week is not comparable to one doing only a few. If the robot appears to improve the second surgeon's accuracy, is that a benefit of robotics, a compensation for lower volume, or both? If the high-volume surgeon achieves equivalent patient outcomes faster without the robot, how should an institution value the difference? Those are not criticisms of either surgeon; they are essential questions for a fair comparison.

THE ROBOT IS ONE COMPONENT IN A COMPLICATED SYSTEM

Joint replacement is not an audio system in which we can listen to one component in isolation. The result reflects the turntable, the needle, the receiver, the speakers—and the recording itself. In arthroplasty, robotics arrives alongside changes in implant design, kinematic alignment, medial-pivot concepts, cementless fixation, bearing materials, patellar management, anesthesia, prehabilitation, pain protocols, discharge planning, and patient selection.

When several of those variables change at once, improvements can be incorrectly attributed to whichever innovation is receiving the most attention. A healthier or more motivated patient population may recover differently. Bone quality may influence fracture risk. Prehabilitation and modern pain management may shorten recovery. Surgeon experience may outweigh a small difference in alignment. Implant philosophy may interact with the plan produced by the robot. The technology is part of the system, but it is not the whole system.

This is why vendor claims deserve careful reading. Companies understandably present their robot and their implant as the decisive variable. The evidence supporting those claims may be selected, short-term, or based on a narrow set of outcomes. Institutions should separate the measurable capability of the platform from the broader promise attached to it.

> *When multiple technologies, protocols, implants, and patient factors are changing together, it becomes very difficult to say that the robot alone produced the result.*

THE PATIENT HEARS SOMETHING DIFFERENT

The word robotic has enormous marketing power. Many patients hear it and imagine an autonomous machine performing a flawless operation. In reality, the system may function as navigation, planning support, or an assisted cutting tool under the surgeon's control. The distinction is obvious to surgeons and administrators, but it is not obvious to the public.

That gap in understanding can create a technology arms race. One hospital advertises a robot, patients begin asking for robotic surgery, and the hospital across town feels it must acquire one to remain competitive. The decision is no longer based only on clinical performance. It becomes a question of referral patterns, recruitment, market share, and public perception.

That does not make the investment illegitimate. Marketing value is still value, especially if the platform helps recruit a surgeon, retain cases, or strengthen a joint program. But we should call it what it is. If the primary case is competitive positioning, we should not disguise that case as definitive evidence of better long-term outcomes.

THE OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL REALITY

The financial calculation begins with a substantial capital purchase, service and disposable costs, staff training, and the operating-room time associated with setup and the learning curve. Robotic or navigation assistance may have billing codes, but the additional reimbursement generally does not transform the economics of an expensive platform. The return therefore depends heavily on volume.

Volume, however, cannot be considered separately from surgeon preference and platform design. Many robotic systems are closed or closely tied to a company's implant portfolio. A health system trying to standardize on one robot may have surgeons trained on different platforms and committed to different implants. Asking them to switch can mean changing not only the machine, but their operative workflow, instrumentation, implant philosophy, and supply chain.

I saw this challenge in a large multistate organization trying to consolidate to a single platform. The goal looked efficient at the system level. At the clinical level, surgeons arrived with different training, different experience, and different implant preferences. Standardization was not merely a purchasing decision; it was a change-management problem with direct consequences for surgeon confidence and productivity.

The setting also changes the calculation. A hospital with multiple dedicated joint rooms and enough volume to share one or more robots has a different opportunity than a small ambulatory surgery center performing a limited number of cases each day. Lower reimbursement, fewer rooms, lower throughput, and a longer path to high utilization can make

Table 1. A practical framework for evaluating a robotic joint-arthroplasty platform.

Decision area	Question to answer	Evidence to examine
Clinical purpose	Which patients or procedures should improve, and by what outcome?	Patient-reported outcomes, complications, revisions, and meaningful follow-up—not alignment alone
Surgeon fit	Who will use the platform, and what are their current skills and preferences?	Case volume, prior robotic training, implant familiarity, and learning-curve plan
Workflow	What happens to room time and throughput during adoption and at maturity?	Setup time, operative time, staffing, turnover, and scheduling capacity
Platform	Does the system constrain implant or vendor choice?	Closed-platform requirements, contracts, inventory, and switching costs
Market	Is demand clinical, recruitment-driven, or competitive?	Referral patterns, patient inquiries, surgeon recruitment, and realistic case growth
Economics	What utilization is required to justify the full cost?	Capital, service, disposables, reimbursement, contribution margin, and site-specific volume

the same platform financially reasonable in one environment and difficult to justify in another.

THE QUESTIONS I WOULD ASK BEFORE BUYING

Before an organization commits to a robot, I would make the decision explicit. The following questions force the clinical, workforce, market, and financial rationales into the same conversation.

MY PERSPECTIVE

Robotic joint arthroplasty is neither an empty gimmick nor a self-evident revolution. It is a sophisticated tool that can improve precision and may provide particular value for certain surgeons, patients, and organizations. Its benefits are likely to vary with experience, volume, implant strategy, workflow, and the population being treated.

The mistake is to ask only whether the robot works. It works. The better questions are what problem it solves, for whom, compared with what, at what cost, and with what evidence of benefit that matters to the patient. If the answer is improved consistency, surgeon recruitment, program growth, or market competitiveness, those may all be valid reasons. They are simply different reasons, and they should be evaluated honestly.

As the technology matures, I want to see multicenter comparisons, standardized patient-reported outcomes, meaningful long-term follow-up, and careful accounting for surgeon volume, implant design, alignment philosophy, patient selection, and perioperative care. Until then, organizations should avoid both reflexive resistance and reflexive adoption.

The robot belongs in the conversation. It should not be allowed to become the entire conversation.

Submitted: August 22, 2026 EST. Accepted: August 22, 2026 EST. Published: November 23, 2026 EST.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CCBY-NC-ND-4.0). View this license's legal deed at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0 and legal code at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode for more information.