

Measuring Tibial Forces is More Useful than Varus-Valgus Laxities for Identifying and Correcting Overstuffing in Kinematically Aligned Total Knee Arthroplasty

Joshua D. Roth, PhD^{1,2,3}, Stephen M. Howell, MD⁴, Maury L. Hull, PhD^{4,5,6}

¹ Department of Orthopedics and Rehabilitation, University of Wisconsin-Madison

² Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison

³ Biomedical Engineering Graduate Group, University of California, Davis

⁴ Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of California, Davis

⁵ Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of California, Davis

⁶ Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of California, Davis

Corresponding Author:

Joshua D. Roth, PhD

telephone: +1 608-265-4086

fax: +1 608-262-2989

email: roth@ortho.wisc.edu

Running Title: Correcting Overstuffing in KA TKA

Author Contributions Statement: All authors made substantial contributions to research design, or the acquisition, analysis or interpretation of data. All authors made substantial contributions to drafting the paper or revising it critically All authors have read and approved the final submitted manuscript.

1 **Abstract**

2 Identifying and correcting varus-valgus (V-V) malalignment of the tibial component is important when
3 balancing a kinematically aligned total knee arthroplasty (TKA). Accordingly, the primary objective
4 was to determine whether the tibial forces or V-V laxities are more sensitive to, and thus more useful
5 for identifying and correcting, V-V malalignments of the tibial component that overstuff a
6 compartment. Calipered kinematically aligned TKA was performed on nine human cadaveric knees.
7 Medial and lateral tibial forces and V-V laxities were measured from 0° to 120° flexion with an
8 unmodified reference tibial component and modified tibial components that introduced $\pm 1^\circ$ and $\pm 2^\circ$ V-
9 V malalignments from the reference component to overstuff either the medial or lateral compartment.
10 Changes in the tibial forces were most sensitive to V-V malalignments at 0° flexion (medial = 118 ± 34
11 N/deg valgus malalignment and lateral = 79 ± 20 N/deg varus malalignment). The varus and valgus
12 laxities were most sensitive to V-V malalignments at 30° flexion (-0.6 ± 0.1 deg/deg varus
13 malalignment) and 120° flexion (-0.4 ± 0.2 deg/deg valgus malalignment), respectively. The maximum
14 average signal-to-noise ratios of the sensitivities to changes in tibial forces and V-V laxities were 8.4
15 deg^{-1} and 0.9 deg^{-1} , respectively, based on reported measurement errors (i.e., noise) using current
16 intraoperative technologies (14 N and 0.7°). Because of the greater signal-to-noise ratios, measuring
17 tibial forces is more useful than V-V laxities for identifying and correcting V-V malalignments of the
18 tibial component that overstuff a compartment. **Clinical Significance:** The sensitivities of tibial forces
19 provide objective guidance to surgeons performing V-V recuts of the tibia.

20

21 **Key Words:** Total knee replacement, contact force, component alignment, component malrotation,
22 soft tissue balance

23

24 **Introduction**

25 The surgical alignment goal of kinematically aligned total knee arthroplasty (TKA) is to restore
26 the native joint lines with the ultimate functional goal of restoring knee function to native. Restoration
27 of the joint lines, in turn, closely restores the native alignments of the limb and knee and eliminates the
28 need for ligament releases^{1, 2}. Kinematically aligning the femoral component is relatively straight
29 forward because the resection thicknesses can be measured using calipers (i.e., calipered kinematic
30 alignment³). However, kinematically aligning the tibial component is more challenging because the
31 resection plane must be correctly aligned in both the coronal and sagittal planes. The combination of
32 irregular geometry of the tibial articular surface⁴ and large amounts of cartilage and bone wear⁵ further
33 complicates the task of achieving correct alignment of the tibial resection plane.

34 In calipered kinematically aligned TKA, the varus-valgus (V-V) orientation of the tibial
35 resection is adjusted to balance medial and lateral soft tissues. The current intraoperative verification
36 check for proper V-V alignment of the tibial component is that the knee is stable in extension based on
37 a manual V-V laxity assessment by the surgeon⁶. However, because identifying an overly tight (i.e.,
38 overstuffed) knee by manually checking laxities is challenging⁷, it is important to consider more
39 accurate intraoperative technologies such as computer navigation for measuring laxities⁸ and sensors
40 for measuring tibial forces^{9, 10}. The utility of these two technologies can be compared based on their
41 signal-to-noise ratios. The ‘signal’ is the sensitivity of changes in the laxities/tibial forces due to V-V
42 malalignment of the tibial component that overstuffs a compartment of the tibiofemoral joint. The
43 ‘noise’ is the error in measuring the laxities/tibial forces using current intraoperative technologies.
44 Thus, the better of the two technologies for detecting V-V malalignments of the tibial component
45 would have a higher signal-to-noise ratio. Further, the sensitivities of changes in the better variable
46 would indicate to the surgeon the amount of adjustment necessary in the V-V orientation of the tibial

47 resection to realize a desired change in laxity or change in tibial force to achieve the desired soft tissue
48 balance.

49 Prior studies have indicated that changes in the tibial forces are sensitive to small V-V
50 malalignments of the tibial component in mechanically aligned TKA¹¹. However, because there are
51 fundamental differences between the surgical alignment goals and surgical techniques to achieve the
52 surgical alignment goals between mechanically and kinematically aligned TKA¹², it is important to
53 determine the sensitivity in changes in both the laxities and tibial forces to V-V malalignments of the
54 tibial component in kinematically aligned TKA. Additionally, because prior studies have shown wide
55 variability in both the tibial forces¹³ and laxities¹⁴ from knee to knee, it is important to determine how
56 much these sensitivities vary from knee to knee. If the sensitivities vary widely, then it might not be
57 feasible to determine the amount of correction for an individual patient based on a mean value.

58 Accordingly, there were three objectives. The first objective was to determine the sensitivities
59 of the tibial forces and V-V laxities to V-V malalignments of the tibial component that overstuff a
60 compartment. By comparing signal-to-noise ratios for V-V laxities and tibial forces based on
61 sensitivities and errors using currently available technologies^{15, 16}, the second objective was to
62 determine whether the changes in laxities or tibial forces are more useful for identifying and correcting
63 V-V malalignments of the tibial component that overstuff a compartment. The third objective was to
64 determine whether the variability in sensitivities from knee to knee was sufficiently low so that the
65 amount of correction for an individual could be based on the mean value of the sensitivity.

66 **Methods**

67 Nine fresh-frozen human cadaveric knees (average age = 74 years, range = 57 to 93 years, 6
68 males) were included. With nine knees, strong relationships between V-V malalignments of the tibial
69 component and tibial forces/laxities (i.e., $r^2 > 0.55$) could be detected with $\alpha = 0.05$ and $(1-\beta) = 0.8$ ¹⁷.
70 Each knee was free of radiographic signs of degenerative joint disease (i.e., marginal osteophytes, joint

71 space narrowing, chondrocalcinosis, and/or subchondral sclerosis) and evidence of previous surgery to
72 the knee.

73 After thawing overnight, each native knee specimen was dissected and aligned in a six degree-
74 of-freedom load application system¹⁸ in preparation for measuring the tibial forces and laxities using
75 previously described protocols^{14, 19-22}. Briefly, to enable the application of muscle forces, cloth loops
76 were sutured to the tendons of insertion of the quadriceps, the biceps femoris, and the
77 semimembranosus and semitendinosus (sutured together due to shared line of action²³). Subsequent to
78 a functional alignment procedure^{14, 19}, the shafts of the femur and tibia were cemented within square
79 aluminum tubes using methyl methacrylate (COE Tray Plastic, GC America Inc., Alsip, IL) to rigidly
80 fix the position and orientation of the knee specimen relative to the load application system and enable
81 removal and reinsertion of the knee specimen during subsequent testing in the load application
82 system¹⁸. Before determining the full extension position of each knee (i.e., 0° flexion), each knee
83 specimen was subjected to a preconditioning protocol consisting of first cycling five times between ±
84 2.5 Nm in flexion–extension (F–E) and then extending under 2.5 Nm to define 0° flexion²⁴.

85 Kinematically aligned TKA was performed using cruciate-retaining components (Persona CR,
86 Zimmer Biomet, Inc, Warsaw, IN, USA) and disposable manual instruments without ligament release
87 following a previously described technique^{3, 25}. Briefly, the knee was exposed through a mid-sagittal
88 osteotomy of the patella²⁶. The goal of maintaining the native the distal and posterior femoral joint
89 lines was accomplished by matching the thicknesses of the distal medial, distal lateral, posterior
90 medial, and posterior lateral femoral resections to within 0.5 mm as measured using calipers to the
91 corresponding condylar regions of the femoral component after correcting for the kerf of the saw
92 blade²⁵.

93 Next a conservative tibial resection was performed with the V-V orientation and posterior slope
94 set visually by the surgeon to match the those of the native tibial plateau. After inserting trial
95 components, the V-V orientation of the tibial resection was adjusted until there was negligible V–V

96 laxity at 0° flexion as judged visually by the surgeon^{19,25}. The posterior slope of the tibial resection
97 was also adjusted via re-cuts until the anterior-posterior (A–P) offset (i.e., distance between the distal
98 medial femoral condyle and the anterior cortex of the tibia) measured with a caliper at 90° flexion
99 matched that of the knee at the time of exposure²⁵. These checks have been shown to result in a V-V
100 orientation of the tibial component within $0.0^\circ \pm 1.8^\circ$ of that of the contralateral healthy knee² and a
101 posterior slope within $-0.2^\circ \pm 2.5^\circ$ of the pre-operative posterior slope¹. The internal-external (I–E)
102 rotation of the tibial component was set parallel to the F–E plane of the knee, which is the plane in
103 which the tibia flexes and extends, using templates that have been shown to align the A–P axis of the
104 tibial component with a root mean squared error of 4° from the F–E plane of the knee²⁷.

105 After the correctly sized trial components were determined and properly aligned based on the
106 previously described verification checks, the femoral component was coated with petroleum jelly and
107 cemented to the distal femur. The tibial baseplate was coated with petroleum jelly and cemented into
108 the proximal tibia after which the correctly sized tibial insert was attached. The petroleum jelly
109 allowed the components to be released from the cement mantles, which enabled accurate exchanges of
110 tibial components and the tibial force sensor described below. After the cement cured, the components
111 were removed. The patella was not resurfaced.

112 Varus–valgus malalignment of the tibial component was created by modifying both a
113 commercially available tibial baseplate (Persona CR, Zimmer Biomet, Inc.) for use while measuring
114 the laxities and the articular surface inserts of the custom tibial force sensor²¹ for use while measuring
115 the tibial forces (Figure 1). These modifications were performed using 3D modeling software
116 (SolidWorks 2014, Dassault Systèmes). To create malalignments that would be correctable by a V-V
117 re-cut, varus malalignments were made about the medial edge of the tibial baseplate, and valgus
118 malalignments were made about the lateral edge of the tibial baseplate. Thus, varus malalignments
119 primarily overstuffed the lateral compartment, and valgus malalignments primarily overstuffed the
120 medial compartment (Figure 1). Five tibial baseplates and five sets of articular surface inserts were 3D

121 printed (Gray60, Objet Eden260VS, Stratasys, Ltd.) for each tibial baseplate size (four with modified
122 geometry to create malalignments of 1° varus, 2° varus, 1° valgus, and 2° valgus and one 0° reference
123 baseplate/set of articular surface inserts with unmodified geometry). Values of 1° and 2° were selected
124 to span the malalignments correctable with 2° re-cut guides.
125




Figure 1. Renderings show the design of the modified tibial baseplates used when measuring the laxities (top row) and the design of the modified articular surface inserts used when measuring the tibial forces (bottom row). For the tibial baseplate, the modifications consisted of rotating the proximal features of the baseplate that secured the insert in place (solid black line) relative to the distal surface of the baseplate that interfaced with the cement mantle (dotted black line). Because the geometry of the distal surface was not changed, all baseplates could be implanted using the same cement mantle in each knee. The geometry of the proximal locking features of the tibial baseplate was also unchanged so the same standard UHMWPE (ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene) liner could be used in all knees. For the articular surface inserts, the modifications consisted of rotating the proximal articular surface (solid black line) relative to the distal surface that secured the inserts to the tibial force sensor (dotted black line)²¹. The modified tibial baseplate and articular surface inserts (left column) are an example of one of the four modified tibial baseplate and articular surface inserts created for each size tibial component. In the example case of a 2° valgus malalignment, the medial side of the tibial component is approximately 2 mm thicker than the lateral side.

126

127 Tibial forces in the medial and lateral compartments were measured with each of the five sets
128 of 3D-printed articular surface inserts attached to the custom tibial force sensor²¹. The tibial force
129 sensor had the same exterior size and shape as the correctly sized Persona tibial baseplate and insert.
130 The tibial force sensor measured force independently in the medial and lateral compartments and over
131 the full surface area of the liner with a maximum root mean squared error of 6 N^{21; 39}. Before testing,
132 each knee was passively flexed five times between 0° and 120° of flexion. The testing order of the five
133 sets of 3D-printed articular surface inserts was randomized. After inserting a randomly selected set of
134 3D-printed articular surface inserts, the patellar osteotomy was closed with two transverse screws. To
135 stabilize the TKA knee during flexion, constant forces of 26 N, 80 N, and 15 N were applied to the
136 tendons of insertion of the semimembranosus/semitendinosus, quadriceps, and biceps femoris,
137 respectively. These forces were proportional to the muscle cross-sectional areas²⁸ and smaller than
138 forces used to stabilize the TKA in other studies²⁹⁻³⁶. The tibial forces in the medial and lateral
139 compartments were measured at 30° increments as the TKA was flexed passively from 0° to 120° and
140 back to 0°. After a test was completed for a set of 3D-printed articular surface inserts, the patellar
141 osteotomy was opened, a different set of 3D-printed articular surface inserts was inserted, the patellar
142 osteotomy was closed, and the test was repeated.

143 Next the varus and valgus laxities were measured with each of the five 3D-printed tibial
144 baseplates using a six degree-of-freedom load application system^{14, 18, 22}. With the correctly sized
145 components implanted, each knee was subjected to a preconditioning protocol consisting of first
146 passively flexing and extending the knee five times from 0° to 120° flexion. Next, the knee was moved
147 to a flexion angle randomly selected from 0°, 60°, and 120° and then cycled five times between the
148 prescribed load limits for in four degrees of freedom in a random order³⁷. The prescribed load limits
149 were ± 3 Nm for I-E rotation³⁸, ± 5 Nm for V-V rotation³⁹, ± 45 N for A-P translation⁴⁰, and ± 100 N
150 for compression-distraction translation⁴¹. The limits of each load were selected to engage the soft
151 tissues sufficiently to load them beyond the initial toe region of the tibiofemoral joint's load–

152 deformation curve^{39,40}. The protocol was repeated for the remaining two flexion angles. After
153 completing preconditioning, the V-V laxities were measured at 30° increments from 0° to 120° in a
154 random order. The V-V laxities were computed as the difference between the V-V position of the tibia
155 under ± 5 Nm and that in the unloaded knee²².

156 Repeatability of laxities and tibial forces was determined by measuring each variable over five
157 trials in three additional knee specimens. The greatest standard deviations of the V-V laxities and tibial
158 forces were 0.1^{o22} and 12.9 N²⁰, respectively.

159 Following University of California policies, this study did not require institutional review board
160 (IRB) approval because de-identified cadaveric specimens were used.

161 *Statistical analysis*

162 To determine the sensitivities of the tibial forces and V-V laxities to V-V malalignment of the
163 tibial component, a simple linear regression with the intercept set to zero was performed for the
164 changes in the tibial forces and V-V laxities at each flexion angle. The changes were computed as the
165 difference between the tibial force/laxity with each modified component and that with the unmodified
166 reference component. The degree of either varus or valgus malalignment of the tibial component was
167 the independent variable, and the changes in each tibial force/laxity in all nine knees were the
168 dependent variables. The regressions were performed separately for varus malalignments and valgus
169 malalignments because each is likely to affect the medial and lateral structures differently due to the
170 differences in stiffness of the soft tissue restraints^{36,38,42}. The slope of each regression line determined
171 the sensitivity of each tibial force variable/laxity to each direction of V-V malalignment of the tibial
172 component at that flexion angle.

173 To compare the sensitivities of tibial forces and V-V laxities to V-V malalignments of the
174 tibial component, the signal-to-noise ratios (i.e., absolute values of the ratios of the sensitivities to
175 previously reported measurement errors of either optical motion capture systems or intraoperative
176 tibial force sensors) were computed. Measurement errors (i.e., noise levels) of 0.7° were used for the

177 laxities¹⁵. Measurement errors (i.e., noise level) of 14 N¹⁶ were used for the tibial forces. The signal-to-
178 noise ratios were computed for each sensitivity at each flexion angle.

179 To determine the variability of the sensitivities of the tibial forces and V-V laxities to V-V
180 malalignment of the tibial component, the 95% tolerance limits, which bound the predicted range of
181 95% of the sensitivities in the population with a 95% confidence level⁴³, were computed for the
182 sensitivity of each variable at each flexion angle (Equation 1). With nine knee specimens included in
183 the present study, the tolerance factor (k) was computed to be 3.55⁴³. Also, a simple linear regression
184 was performed for each knee independently with the degree of either varus or valgus malalignment of
185 the tibial component as the independent variable and the changes in each tibial force/laxity in each
186 knee as the dependent variable.

187 $Tolerance\ Limits = sensitivity \pm k \times standard\ error\ of\ sensitivity \times \sqrt{number\ of\ knees}$ (Equation 1)

188

189 **Results**

190 Sensitivities of tibial forces to V-V malalignment of the tibial component were greatest at 0°
 191 flexion (Table 1, Figure 2). Valgus malalignments caused changes in the tibial forces throughout
 192 flexion, but varus malalignments caused changes only at 0° flexion. Valgus malalignments primarily
 193 increased the medial tibial force. Varus malalignments primarily increased the lateral tibial force at 0°
 194 flexion.

Table 1. Mean sensitivity (i.e. slope), coefficient of determination (r^2), p-value, and 95% tolerance limits of the sensitivity for linear regressions between the change in the medial and lateral tibial forces and either the degree of varus or valgus malalignment of the tibial component (TC) (independent variables).

| | | 0° flexion | 30° flexion | 60° flexion | 90° flexion | 120° flexion |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Sensitivity of Lateral Tibial Force to Varus Malalignment | Slope | 78.6 N/deg | 7.2 N/deg | 4.9 N/deg | 5.5 N/deg | 4.4 N/deg |
| | r^2 | 0.68 | 0.39 | 0.52 | 0.48 | 0.43 |
| | p-value | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 |
| | 95% tolerance limits | 7.7 to 149.6 N/deg | -4.7 to 19.1 N/deg | -1.4 to 11.2 N/deg | -2.1 to 13.1 N/deg | -2.2 to 11.0 N/deg |
| Sensitivity of Medial Tibial Force to Valgus Malalignment | Slope | 118.3 N/deg | 35.9 N/deg | 39.5 N/deg | 30.4 N/deg | 18.2 N/deg |
| | r^2 | 0.63 | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.44 | 0.24 |
| | p-value | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 |
| | 95% tolerance limits | -1.4 to 238.0 N/deg | -12.9 to 84.7 N/deg | -10.1 to 89.1 N/deg | -15.0 to 75.7 N/deg | -25.0 to 61.5 N/deg |

195




Figure 2. Plots show means (points) and standard deviations (error bars) of the changes in the medial and lateral tibial forces caused by V-V malalignment of the tibial component. Dotted lines show the significant relationships ($p < 0.05$) between the changes in tibial force variables and V-V malalignments (Table 1). The shaded grey regions show the 95% tolerance intervals for the sensitivities.

196

197 Unlike the sensitivities of tibial forces, which were greatest at 0° flexion, the sensitivities of V-
 198 V laxities to V-V malalignment were greatest in mid to deep flexion (Table 2). Valgus malalignments
 199 decreased both varus and valgus laxities with the greatest sensitivity occurring at 120° flexion for
 200 valgus laxity. Varus malalignments primarily decreased the varus laxities with the greatest sensitivity
 201 occurring at 60° flexion.

202

Table 2. Mean sensitivity (i.e. slope), coefficient of determination (r^2), p-value, and 95% tolerance limits of the sensitivity for linear regressions between the changes in the laxities (dependent variables) and the degree of either varus or valgus malalignment of the tibial component (TC) (independent variables).

| | | 0° flexion | 30° flexion | 60° flexion | 90° flexion | 120° flexion |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Sensitivity of Varus Laxity to Varus Malalignment | Slope | -0.2 deg/deg | -0.6 deg/deg | -0.6 deg/deg | -0.6 deg/deg | -0.6 deg/deg |
| | r^2 | 0.39 | 0.88 | 0.80 | 0.68 | 0.63 |
| | p-value | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 |
| | 95% tolerance limits | -0.7 to 0.2 deg/deg | -0.9 to -0.3 deg/deg | -1.0 to -0.2 deg/deg | -1.2 to -0.1 deg/deg | -1.2 to 0.0 deg/deg |
| Sensitivity of Valgus Laxity to Valgus Malalignment | Slope | -0.1 deg/deg | -0.3 deg/deg | -0.1 deg/deg | -0.2 deg/deg | -0.4 deg/deg |
| | r^2 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.24 | 0.44 |
| | p-value | <0.0005 | <0.0005 | 0.09 | <0.0005 | <0.0005 |
| | 95% tolerance limits | -0.5 to 0.2 deg/deg | -0.8 to 0.3 deg/deg | -0.9 to 0.6 deg/deg | -0.7 to 0.3 deg/deg | -1.1 to 0.2 deg/deg |

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

The signal-to-noise ratios of the tibial forces were often greater than those of the V-V laxities (Figure 3). For the tibial forces, the greatest ratios occurred at 0° flexion. These were 5.6 deg⁻¹ of varus malalignment for the lateral tibial force and 8.5 deg⁻¹ of valgus malalignment for the medial tibial force. In comparison, for the V-V laxities, the greatest ratios were 0.9 deg⁻¹ of varus malalignment for the varus laxity at 90° of flexion and 0.6 deg⁻¹ of valgus malalignment for the valgus laxity at 120° of flexion (Figure 3).




Figure 3. Bar plots show the mean signal-to-noise ratios (i.e., ratios of the sensitivities to previously reported measurement errors of either optical motion capture systems or intraoperative tibial force sensors) for the medial and lateral forces, and the varus and valgus laxities from 0° to 120°.

210

211 The sensitivities of both tibial forces and laxities to V-V malalignment varied widely from knee
212 to knee (Tables 1 and 2). For the tibial forces, the 95% tolerance limits of the sensitivities were widest
213 at 0° flexion (medial tibial force = -1 to 238 N/deg of valgus malalignment; lateral tibial force = 8 to
214 150 N/deg of varus malalignment) (Table 1, Figure 2). For the varus laxities, the 95% tolerance limits
215 for the sensitivities were widest at 90° flexion (-1.2 to -0.1 deg/deg of varus malalignment) (Table 2).
216 For the valgus laxities, the 95% tolerance limits for the sensitivities were widest at 120° flexion (-1.1
217 to 0.2 deg/deg of valgus malalignment) (Table 2).

218

219 Although the sensitivities varied widely from knee to knee, the strength of the linear
220 relationships did not. The coefficients of determination (r^2) for the sensitivities of tibial forces across
221 the nine knees were most consistent at 0° flexion (range medial tibial force to valgus malalignment =
222 0.80 to 1.00 and range lateral tibial force to varus malalignment = 0.83 to 1.00) (Table 3). The r^2 -
values for the sensitivities were most consistent across the nine knees for the V-V laxities at 60°

223 flexion (range varus laxity to varus malalignment = 0.97 to 1.00, range valgus laxity to valgus
 224 malalignment = 0.58 to 1.00).

Table 3. Mean sensitivities and coefficients of determination (r^2) for linear regressions between the change in the medial and lateral tibial forces (dependent variables) and either the degree of varus or valgus malalignment of the tibial component (TC) (independent variables) for each of the nine knees at 0° flexion.

| Specimen | Mean slope, (r^2) | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| | Medial Tibial Force [N/deg] | | Lateral Tibial Force [N/deg] | |
| | TC Varus | TC Valgus | TC Varus | TC Valgus |
| 1 | 21.5 (0.65) | -212.9 (1.00) | 63.9 (1.00) | 3.8 (0.23) |
| 2 | -13.4 (0.91) | -87.9 (0.80) | 116.0 (0.97) | 26.6 (0.86) |
| 3 | 5.5 (0.97) | -86.3 (1.00) | 52.6 (0.97) | 15.2 (0.93) |
| 4 | 4.6 (0.08) | -179.6 (0.99) | 145.4 (0.95) | 17.8 (0.73) |
| 5 | 13.9 (0.96) | -142.1 (1.00) | 60.5 (0.97) | 17.1 (0.16) |
| 6 | 20.1 (0.79) | -147.8 (1.00) | 30.8 (0.83) | 24.3 (1.00) |
| 7 | -12.9 (0.84) | -35.3 (0.99) | 67.1 (1.00) | 0.3 (0.06) |
| 8 | -13.1 (1.00) | -128.4 (1.00) | 86.0 (1.00) | 24.8 (1.00) |
| 9 | 3.2 (0.93) | -44.5 (0.94) | 85.2 (0.99) | -8.9 (0.19) |

225

226 Discussion

227 There were three key findings in the present study. The first key finding was that in general the
 228 tibial forces were most sensitive to overstuffing near extension, and the laxities were most sensitive in
 229 mid to deep flexion. The second key finding was that tibial forces are better than laxities for
 230 identifying and correcting V-V malalignments of the tibial component that overstuff a compartment
 231 because the signal-to-noise ratios are greater by about an order of magnitude. The third key finding
 232 was that there was wide variability in the sensitivities of both the tibial forces and the laxities to V-V

233 malalignments between knees; however, each knee demonstrated strong linear relationships between
234 changes in tibial force/laxities and V-V malalignments.

235 The first key finding that tibial forces were most sensitive to overstuffing near extension and
236 the laxities were most sensitive in mid to deep flexion is consistent with the expected changes in the
237 tension of the soft tissue restraints. Overstuffing increases the length of the soft tissue restraints in the
238 overstuffing compartment, which in turn can increase the soft tissue tension or decrease the laxity
239 depending on the initial V-V laxity. If the initial V-V laxity is minimal, thus indicating some degree of
240 pretension in the soft tissue restraints, then overstuffing will further increase the tension and thus the
241 tibial force, which was observed at 0° flexion where V-V laxity is minimal²²; the V-V laxities will be
242 relatively unaffected because the soft tissue restraints are stiff. However, as the V-V laxity increases
243 with flexion²² indicating that the soft tissue restraints become more lax, the effect of overstuffing on
244 tibial forces is mitigated, but the effect on V-V laxities is amplified because overstuffing makes the
245 knee less lax in the particular compartment overstuffing.

246 Regarding the second key finding, the signal-to-noise ratio indicates how well actual changes in
247 force/laxity can be detected in the presence of measurement errors. Because all the signal-to-noise
248 ratios for the changes in the V-V laxities were less than 1 (Figure 3), surgeons would have a difficult
249 time detecting actual changes from measurement errors. However, many of the signal-to-noise ratios
250 for changes in tibial forces, especially those at 0° flexion where the tibial forces were greatest²⁰, are much
251 greater than 1. The relatively large signal-to-noise ratios indicate that actual changes in tibial forces
252 due to V-V malalignments of the tibial component should dominate over measurement errors (Figure
253 3). Therefore, tibial forces are better than V-V laxities for identifying and correcting V-V
254 malalignments of the tibial component that overstuff a compartment because guiding re-cuts based on
255 the sensitivities in tibial forces should lead to more accurate re-cuts.

256 The second key finding that the tibial forces are more useful than laxities for identifying and
257 correcting V-V malalignments of the tibial component that overstuff a compartment is supported by

258 prior clinical and biomechanical studies. A previous clinical study showed that it is challenging for
259 surgeons to detect high tibial forces using a standard gap-balancing approach for mechanically aligned
260 TKA⁷, which is based on the joint laxity. Without the use of an intraoperative tibial force sensor, TKAs
261 deemed to be correctly balanced exhibited mean compartment loads as high as 352 N, which are much
262 greater than those in the native knee that have been reported as 114 N on average¹³. Biomechanically,
263 because the soft tissues restraints are often already loaded into their linear high stiffness regions near
264 full extension^{39, 40}, additional deformation due to overstuffing does not change their stiffness. Thus, the
265 laxity, which is a cumulative measure of the deformations of many soft tissue restraints, would also not
266 change ([Table 2](#)). Therefore, intraoperative laxity assessments are likely better for detecting an under-
267 stuffed compartment where gaps between the components can be detected visually.

268 Regarding the third key finding, the large but variable sensitivities of tibial forces to
269 overstuffing caused by V-V malalignments of the tibial component have important clinical
270 implications for balancing a kinematically aligned TKA. The wide tolerance intervals on the
271 sensitivities are supported by both the wide variability in the mechanical properties of the primary soft
272 tissue restraints⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ and the wide variability in the tibial forces in the native knee¹³. As described
273 previously, balancing of the medial and lateral soft tissues in calipered kinematically aligned TKA is
274 performed by adjusting the V-V orientation of the tibial resection after confirming that the femoral
275 component is kinematically aligned^{19, 25}. Thus, the sensitivities determined in the present study provide
276 quantitative guidance for how large of an adjustment is necessary to achieve a desired reduction in the
277 tibial forces when an intraoperative tibial force sensor is used. However, the wide variability of these
278 sensitivities raises concern with using the mean values for all knees. An illustrative example about how
279 this variability might increase the time and complexity of the balancing procedure is presented in
280 [Supplement 1](#).

281 Because there was a strong linear relationship between changes in tibial forces and V-V
282 malalignments in all nine knees, a simple procedure might be useful to determine a patient-specific

283 sensitivity (Figure 4) to overcome the wide patient-to-patient variability. In this procedure, the surgeon
284 would first record the initial tibial force values. For example, assume that the initial medial and lateral
285 tibial forces are 300 and 65 N, respectively, and the surgeon desires to match the mean tibial forces of
286 the native knee (114 N in the medial compartment and 63 N in the lateral compartment¹³) by
287 performing a varus re-cut. Next, the surgeon would insert a trial that simulates a 1° varus re-cut and
288 again record the medial and lateral tibial forces. The difference between the medial tibial force before
289 and after inserting the 1° varus re-cut trial is the sensitivity of the medial tibial force to valgus tibial
290 malalignment. By determining this patient-specific sensitivity, the re-cut also would be patient-specific
291 (Figure 4). This approach would be useful in patients with OA because it is based on the current state
292 of the joint; thus, utilizing this simple patient-specific approach would overcome one methodological
293 issue with this study described below which is that the knees did not have OA.




Figure 4. Schematic shows representative examples of how patient-specific sensitivities can be determined using a small trial re-cut (e.g., 1° varus) and then how the correct re-cut for that patient can be determined based on the patient-specific sensitivity. Because the target tibial forces for a specific patient are unknown, the mean tibial forces at 0° flexion in the native knee (medial force = 114 N and lateral force = 63 N)¹³ are used as the target for this example.

294

295

296

297

298

Three methodological issues should be acknowledged because of their potential to affect the results. One methodologic issue concerns the alignment of the tibial component in the reference condition. Tibial component malalignments in this reference condition relative to the native joint line might change the initial tension in the soft tissue restraints. A pair of recent studies showed that (1) the

299 tibial forces after KA TKA are comparable to those of the native knee²⁰ and (2) the laxities and neutral
300 positions were largely not different from those of the native knee²². Thus, if present, then V-V
301 malalignments of the reference tibial components were likely small as described previously in the
302 Methods section². A second methodologic issue was that this study was performed in knees without
303 OA. Thus, the sensitivities might differ in knees with end-stage OA. Additional changes to the
304 mechanical properties of the medial and lateral soft tissue restraints that likely occur in some OA
305 patients would likely increase the variability in the sensitivities. However, while the exact sensitivities
306 might change in OA knees, the conclusions drawn in the present study that tibial forces are better than
307 laxities for detecting overstuffing should still apply to OA patients. Further, using the simple patient-
308 specific approach described previously would enable the patient-specific sensitivity to be determined
309 regardless of the condition of the soft tissue restraints. The third methodological issue is that only nine
310 knee specimens were included. While this number was sufficient to detect strong relationships between
311 V-V malalignment and changes in tibial forces and laxities, this group likely does not capture all the
312 knee-to-knee variability in the population. To best account for this issue, we computed tolerance
313 intervals to represent the predicted range because tolerance intervals take into account the sample size
314 when predicting the range of the population.

315 In conclusion, measuring changes in tibial forces is more useful than measuring changes in
316 laxities for identifying and correcting V-V malalignments of the tibial component that overstuff a
317 compartment. Because of the wide variability in sensitivities between knees, a patient-specific
318 procedure is needed to adjust the tibial resection when high tibial forces are registered due to
319 overstuffing of a compartment. Using the simple patient-specific procedure proposed in this study,
320 surgeons can determine patient-specific sensitivities of tibial forces to V-V malalignments of the tibial
321 component and use these patient-specific sensitivities to determine the re-cut necessary to correct
322 overstuffing caused by V-V malalignment of the tibial component. These patient-specific re-cuts
323 should reduce the risk of improperly tensioned soft tissue restraints and unnecessary ligament releases.

324 **Acknowledgements**

325 The authors acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation (Award No. CBET-
326 067527) and Zimmer Biomet (Award No. CW88095). Additionally, the authors wish to thank
327 individuals who donate their bodies and tissues for the advancement of education and research.

328

329 One author, MLH, received research funding from Zimmer Biomet for this study and receives research
330 support from Medacta that is not related to this study. One author, SMH, receives IP royalties from and
331 is a paid consultant and presenter/speaker for Biomet Sports Medicine and Medacta, and receives
332 research support from Medacta, which are all unrelated to this study.

References

1. Johnson, JM, Mahfouz, MR, Midillioglu, MR, et al. 2017. Three-dimensional analysis of the tibial resection plane relative to the arthritic tibial plateau in total knee arthroplasty. *J Exp Orthop* 4:1 27.
2. Nedopil, AJ, Singh, AK, Howell, SM, Hull, ML. 2018. Does Calipered Kinetically Aligned TKA Restore Native Left to Right Symmetry of the Lower Limb and Improve Function? *J Arthroplasty* 33:2 398-406.
3. Nedopil, AJ, Howell, SM, Hull, ML. 2016. Does Malrotation of the Tibial and Femoral Components Compromise Function in Kinetically Aligned Total Knee Arthroplasty? *Orthop Clin North Am* 47:1 41-50.
4. Hashemi, J, Chandrashekar, N, Gill, B, et al. 2008. The geometry of the tibial plateau and its influence on the biomechanics of the tibiofemoral joint. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 90:12 2724-2734.
5. Harmon, MK, Markovich, GD, Banks, SA, Hodge, WA. 1998. Wear Patterns on Tibial Plateaus From Varus and Valgus Osteoarthritic Knees. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 352:7 149-158.
6. Nedopil, AJ, Howell, SM, Hull, ML. 2017. What mechanisms are associated with tibial component failure after kinematically-aligned total knee arthroplasty? *Int Orthop* 41:8 1561-1569.
7. Elmallah, RK, Mistry, JB, Cherian, JJ, et al. 2016. Can We Really "Feel" a Balanced Total Knee Arthroplasty? *J Arthroplasty* 31:9 Suppl 102-105.
8. Siston, RA, Maack, TL, Hutter, EE, et al. 2012. Design and cadaveric validation of a novel device to quantify knee stability during total knee arthroplasty. *J Biomech Eng* 134:11 115001.
9. Camarata, DA. 2014. Soft tissue balance in total knee arthroplasty with a force sensor. *Orthop Clin North Am* 45:2 175-184.
10. Gustke, KA, Golladay, GJ, Roche, MW, et al. 2014. A new method for defining balance: promising short-term clinical outcomes of sensor-guided TKA. *J Arthroplasty* 29:5 955-960.
11. Walker, PS, Meere, PA, Bell, CP. 2014. Effects of surgical variables in balancing of total knee replacements using an instrumented tibial trial. *Knee* 21:1 156-161.
12. Riviere, C, Iranpour, F, Auvinet, E, et al. 2017. Alignment options for total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 103:7 1047-1056.
13. Verstraete, MA, Meere, PA, Salvatore, G, et al. 2017. Contact forces in the tibiofemoral joint from soft tissue tensions: Implications to soft tissue balancing in total knee arthroplasty. *J Biomech* 58:195-202.
14. Roth, JD, Hull, ML, Howell, SM. 2015. The Limits of Passive Motion Are Variable Between and Unrelated Within Normal Tibiofemoral Joints. *J Orthop Res* 33:11 1594-1602.
15. Maletsky, LP, Sun, J, Morton, NA. 2007. Accuracy of an optical active-marker system to track the relative motion of rigid bodies. *J Biomech* 40:3 682-685.
16. Nicolet-Petersen, SJ, Howell, SM, Hull, M. 2018. Force and Contact Location Measurement Errors of the VERASENSE. *J Biomech Eng* 140:12 124502-124502-124506.
17. Faul, F, Erdfelder, E, Buchner, A, Lang, AG. 2009. Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behav Res Methods* 41:4 1149-1160.
18. Bach, JM, Hull, ML. 1995. A new load application system for in vitro study of ligamentous injuries to the human knee joint. *J Biomech Eng* 117:4 373-382.

- 392 19. Roth, JD, Howell, SM, Hull, ML. 2015. Native Knee Laxities at 0°, 45°, and 90° of Flexion and
393 Their Relationship to the Goal of the Gap-Balancing Alignment Method of Total Knee Arthroplasty. *J*
394 *Bone Joint Surg Am* 97:20 1678-1684.
395
- 396 20. Roth, JD, Howell, SM, Hull, ML. 2018. Kinematically aligned total knee arthroplasty limits high
397 tibial forces, differences in tibial forces between compartments, and abnormal tibial contact kinematics
398 during passive flexion. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 26:6 1589-1601.
399
- 400 21. Roth, JD, Howell, SM, Hull, ML. 2017. An Improved Tibial Force Sensor to Compute Contact
401 Forces and Contact Locations In Vitro After Total Knee Arthroplasty. *J Biomech Eng* 139:4 041001-
402 041001-041008.
403
- 404 22. Roth, JD, Howell, SM, Hull, ML. 2019. Analysis of differences in laxities and neutral positions
405 from native after kinematically aligned TKA using cruciate retaining implants. *J Orthop Res* 37:2 358-
406 369.
407
- 408 23. Arnold, EM, Ward, SR, Lieber, RL, Delp, SL. 2010. A model of the lower limb for analysis of
409 human movement. *Ann Biomed Eng* 38:2 269-279.
410
- 411 24. Markolf, KL, Gorek, JF, Kabo, JM, Shapiro, MS. 1990. Direct measurement of resultant forces in
412 the anterior cruciate ligament. An in vitro study performed with a new experimental technique. *J Bone*
413 *Joint Surg Am* 72:4 557-567.
414
- 415 25. Howell, SM, Papadopoulos, S, Kuznik, KT, Hull, ML. 2013. Accurate alignment and high function
416 after kinematically aligned TKA performed with generic instruments. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol*
417 *Arthrosc* 21:10 2271-2280.
418
- 419 26. Merican, AM, Ghosh, KM, Deehan, DJ, Amis, AA. 2009. The transpatellar approach for the knee
420 in the laboratory. *J Orthop Res* 27:3 330-334.
421
- 422 27. Paschos, NK, Howell, SM, Johnson, JM, Mahfouz, MR. 2017. Can kinematic tibial templates assist
423 the surgeon locating the flexion and extension plane of the knee? *Knee* 24:5 1006-1015.
424
- 425 28. Ward, SR, Eng, CM, Smallwood, LH, Lieber, RL. 2009. Are current measurements of lower
426 extremity muscle architecture accurate? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 467:4 1074-1082.
427
- 428 29. Churchill, DL, Incavo, SJ, Johnson, CC, Beynnon, BD. 2001. The influence of femoral rollback on
429 patellofemoral contact loads in total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 16:7 909-918.
430
- 431 30. Ghosh, KM, Blain, AP, Longstaff, L, et al. 2014. Can we define envelope of laxity during
432 navigated knee arthroplasty? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 22:8 1736-1743.
433
- 434 31. Hunt, NC, Ghosh, KM, Blain, AP, et al. 2014. How does laxity after single radius total knee
435 arthroplasty compare with the native knee? *J Orthop Res* 32:9 1208-1213.
436
- 437 32. Kwak, SD, Ahmad, CS, Gardner, TR, et al. 2000. Hamstrings and iliotibial band forces affect knee
438 kinematics and contact pattern. *J Orthop Res* 18:1 101-108.
439
- 440 33. Li, G, Rudy, TW, Sakane, M, et al. 1999. The importance of quadriceps and hamstring muscle
441 loading on knee kinematics and in-situ forces in the ACL. *J Biomech* 32:4 395-400.
442
- 443 34. Stoddard, JE, Deehan, DJ, Bull, AM, et al. 2013. The kinematics and stability of single-radius
444 versus multi-radius femoral components related to mid-range instability after TKA. *J Orthop Res* 31:1
445 53-58.
446
- 447 35. Victor, J, Labey, L, Wong, P, et al. 2010. The influence of muscle load on tibiofemoral knee
448 kinematics. *J Orthop Res* 28:4 419-428.
449

- 450 36. Wang, X, Malik, A, Bartel, DL, et al. 2014. Asymmetric varus and valgus stability of the anatomic
451 cadaver knee and the load sharing between collateral ligaments and bearing surfaces. *J Biomech Eng*
452 136:8.
453
- 454 37. Bach, JM, Hull, ML, Patterson, HA. 1997. Direct measurement of strain in the posterolateral
455 bundle of the anterior cruciate ligament. *J Biomech* 30:3 281-283.
456
- 457 38. Blankevoort, L, Huiskes, R, de Lange, A. 1988. The envelope of passive knee joint motion. *J*
458 *Biomech* 21:9 705-720.
459
- 460 39. Markolf, KL, Mensch, JS, Amstutz, HC. 1976. Stiffness and laxity of the knee--The contributions
461 of the supporting structures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 58-A:5 583-594.
462
- 463 40. Eagar, P, Hull, ML, Howell, SM. 2001. A method for quantifying the anterior load-displacement
464 behavior of the human knee in both the low and high stiffness regions. *J Biomech* 34:12 1655-1660.
465
- 466 41. Mayman, D, Plaskos, C, Kendoff, D, et al. 2009. Ligament tension in the ACL-deficient knee:
467 assessment of medial and lateral gaps. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 467:6 1621-1628.
468
- 469 42. Heesterbeek, PJC, Verdonschot, N, Wymenga, AB. 2008. In vivo knee laxity in flexion and
470 extension: A radiographic study in 30 older healthy subjects. *Knee* 15:1 45-49.
471
- 472 43. Witkovsky, V. 2014. On the exact two-sided tolerance intervals for univariate normal distribution
473 and linear regression. *Austrian J Stat* 43:4 279-292.
474
- 475 44. LaPrade, RF, Bollom, TS, Wentorf, FA, et al. 2005. Mechanical properties of the posterolateral
476 structures of the knee. *Am J Sports Med* 33:9 1386-1391.
477
- 478 45. Robinson, JR, Bull, AM, Amis, AA. 2005. Structural properties of the medial collateral ligament
479 complex of the human knee. *J Biomech* 38:5 1067-1074.
480
- 481 46. Race, A, Amis, AA. 1994. The mechanical properties of the two bundles of the human posterior
482 cruciate ligament. *J Biomech* 27:1 13-24.
483
- 484

485 **Supplement 1: Illustrative example of difficulty with using mean sensitivities to**
486 **guide balancing KA TKA**
487

488 To appreciate the difficulty with using the mean sensitivities to guide corrections in all knees,
489 consider an illustrative case in which the surgeon measures a medial tibial force of 300 N and a lateral
490 tibial force of 65 N in extension. Because the ideal tibial forces for a particular patient are unknown, it
491 is reasonable to strive to achieve tibial forces comparable to the average in the native knee¹³, which are
492 similar to those measured in calipered kinematically aligned TKA *in vitro*²⁰. Using the mean tibial
493 forces of the native knee as a target (114 N in the medial compartment and 63 N in the lateral
494 compartment¹³), the medial force is 186 N too high, and the lateral force is 2 N too high, which
495 indicates that there is a valgus malalignment of the tibial component (Figure 2, Table 1). Thus, a varus
496 re-cut should correct the valgus malalignment and reduce the medial tibial force with minimal changes
497 to the lateral tibial force (Figure 2, Table 1). However, the appropriate size of the varus re-cut remains
498 to be determined.

499 To understand the importance of considering knee-to-knee variability in the sensitivities of the
500 tibial forces, first assume that this patient has sensitivities equal to the highest determined in the
501 present study (213 N/deg valgus malalignment, specimen 1, Table 3). If the surgeon used the average
502 sensitivity to determine the appropriate re-cut, then a varus re-cut of 1.6° would be performed (186 N /
503 (118 N/deg) = 1.6°). However, in this high-sensitivity knee, a 1.6° varus re-cut would be much too
504 large because the actual decrease in the medial force would be 336 N. Because a decrease of 336 N
505 would be greater than the measured medial force, this re-cut would likely slacken the soft tissue
506 restraints in the medial compartment, which might cause excessive laxity post-operatively. Next,
507 assume that this patient has sensitivities equal to the lowest in the present study (35 N/deg valgus
508 malalignment, specimen 7, Table 3). In this low-sensitivity knee, the 1.6° varus re-cut would be too
509 small because the actual decrease in medial tibial force would only be 56 N. In both these patients,
510 additional surgical steps would be necessary to achieve tibial forces comparable to those of the native
511 knee, which is undesirable due to increasing time and complexity of the procedure.