Patient-Specific Computer Model of Dynamic Squatting After Total Knee Arthroplasty

Hideki Mizu-uchi, MD, PhD a, b, Clifford W. Colwell Jr., MD a, Cesar Flores-Hernandez, BS a, Benjamin J. Fregly, PhD d, Shuichi Matsuda, MD, PhD c, Darryl D. D’Lima, MD, PhD a

a Shiley Center for Orthopaedic Research and Education at Scripps Clinic, Scripps Health, La Jolla, California
b Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan
c Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
d Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

A R T I C L E   I N F O

Article history:
Received 30 September 2014
Accepted 29 December 2014

Keywords:
total knee arthroplasty
squatting
computer model
knee contact force
patient-specific

A B S T R A C T

Knee forces are highly relevant to performance after total knee arthroplasty especially during high flexion activities such as squatting. We constructed subject-specific models of two patients implanted with instrumented knee prostheses that measured knee forces in vivo. In vivo peak forces ranged from 2.2 to 2.3 times bodyweight but peaked at different flexion angles based on the type of squatting activity. Our model predicted tibiofemoral contact force with reasonable accuracy in both subjects. This model can be a very useful tool to predict the effect of surgical techniques and component alignment on contact forces. In addition, this model could be used for implant design development, to enhance knee function, to predict forces generated during other activities, and for predicting clinical outcomes.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Total knee arthroplasty (TKA) has become one of the most successful orthopedic procedures in providing pain relief and improving knee function, with reported survival rates of greater than 90% after 15 years [1, 2]. The success of TKA is dependent on many factors including preoperative status, surgical technique, and the design and materials of the components. While survival rates are high, functional outcomes that facilitate common activities involving deep knee flexion such as kneeling, squatting, and sitting cross-legged are rarely achieved [3, 4]. Knee contact force during activities after TKA is very important since it affects component wear and implant loosening. Knee contact force is related directly to the transmission of stresses through the implant, which include contact stresses generated at the bearing surface and subsurface, stresses at the implant–cement–bone interface, and stresses transmitted to underlying bone [5].

Previous studies have measured knee contact forces in cadaver models and biomechanical simulators. However, there are technical challenges in applying high physiologic loads to the knee joint coupled with the inherent weaknesses of extrapolating in vitro results to vivo function. While several computational models have predicted knee contact force, these reports vary widely based on the modeling approach and the assumptions inherent to the model. Predictions of tibiofemoral forces made by computer models have also varied widely for the same activity [6–9]. For example, peak forces predicted for walking prior to the availability of in vivo data ranged from 1.8 ×BW to 8.1 ×BW (times of bodyweight, reviewed by [10]). Peak forces predicted by computer models for squatting have also been variable, ranging from 3.4 ×BW to 7.3 ×BW [11–13].

The complexity of modeling the knee is in part due to tri-compartmental contact with joint stability governed primarily by soft tissues. Knee contact forces can vary widely among patients due to differences in subject anatomy, bodyweight, and kinematic patterns. For accuracy, clinically relevant predictions and a subject-specific approach may be necessary to account for this interpatient variability. Subject-specific approaches have been reported with some validation of knee forces predicted during walking [10]. However, during weight-bearing deep knee bend activities such as squatting, the knee forces of the computer-generated model were much higher and until very recently these predictions had not yet been validated in vivo [11–14]. One recent study validated a subject-specific model of squatting with in vivo measured experimental knee forces and EMG [15]. The purpose of this study was to extend that approach by constructing subject-specific computer models of two different patients implanted with instrumented knee arthroplasty components, each performing two variations of a dynamic closed-kinetic-chain squatting activity. Patient kinematics and ground reaction forces were input into the model and the predicted tibiofemoral contact forces were compared to in vivo measured forces.
Patients were instructed to squat to the maximum knee flexion with both feet parallel to each other. For the second squatting activity, the patients were instructed to keep their hands on their hips and their upper body as upright as possible within tolerance (to minimize trunk flexion and maximize knee flexion moment). These variations were chosen to alter the external flexion moment on the knee. Each squatting cycle was repeated three times. Skin marker-based video motion analysis was used to record knee kinematics, and axial ground reaction forces were measured under each foot (Fig. 1).

Patient-specific Computer Model

Preoperative and postoperative computer tomographic scans were reconstructed to extract tibiofemoral bone geometry using MIMICS (Materialise, Leuven, Belgium). Computer-aided design models of the components were directly aligned to the 3-dimensional bone models as we have previously reported (Fig. 2) [25]. Bone and implant geometry was imported into a dynamic, musculoskeletal modeling program (LifeMOD/BodySIM 2008, LifeModeler, Inc., San Clemente, California). We previously validated a LifeMOD/KneeSim model using cadaver data measured in an Oxford knee rig [26]. A 14-segment model (head, trunk, upper arms, forearms, hands, thighs, legs, and feet) was initially constructed based on published generic anthropometric data (age, gender, bodyweight, and height) [27]. The body segments were then scaled, using measurements obtained from each patient. Each lower limb was then populated with 17 base muscles (gluteus maximus [2], gluteus medius [2], psoas major, iliopsoas, rectus femoris, vastus medialis, vastus lateralis, adductor magnus, biceps femoris [2], semitendinosus, tibialis anterior, soleus, and gastrocnemius [2]), three ligaments (medial collateral ligament [MCL], lateral collateral ligament [LCL], and posterior cruciate ligament [PCL]) and two tendons (patellar and quadriceps). Knee ligament attachments were based on subject-specific anatomic landmarks obtained from the preoperative CT scans, and ligaments were modeled as nonlinear springs using previously published material properties [28]. The quadriceps and patellar tendons were modeled with contact-based rigid bodies to simulate contact and wrapping around the trochlear groove and tibial insert, respectively (Fig. 3).

Computer Simulation of Squatting

The computer-generated image of the simulation and photograph for one of the subjects during the squatting activity is shown in Fig. 4. The simulation was carried out in two steps and has been previously described in detail [15]. In the first step, skin marker-based motion data were used to prescribe the trunk, hip, knee, and ankle kinematics for an inverse-dynamics computation. During this step, joint torques and changes in muscle lengths were recorded throughout the activity cycle. In the next step, forward dynamics was used to compute the

Methods

Patient Information

Institutional review board approval and informed patient consents were obtained for this study. Three patients had been implanted with a custom tibial prosthesis instrumented with force transducers and a telemetry system [5,10,16-23]. The tibial prosthesis was customized to house force sensors and a telemetry system. The sensors measured three components of force and three components of moment acting on the tibial tray. These six measurements can be used to calculate the contact forces in the medial and lateral compartment. Two male patients were selected for this study (83-year-old, 69.5 kg, right knee; 88-year-old, 76.3 kg, left knee). One patient had no significant arthritis in his contralateral knee. The other patient had the contralateral knee replaced with the same design but without the custom tibia with electronics. Details of the implant design and surgical technique have been previously reported [18,24]. The distal femoral cut was made at a nominal 6° valgus to the anatomic axis of the femur using intramedullary alignment, while the posterior femoral cut was made in 3° external rotation with reference to the posterior condyles. The tibial bone cut was made at a nominal 90° to the long axis without any posterior slope. Standard cruciate-retaining Natural Knee® II (Zimmer) femoral components were cemented. The custom instrumented tibial prosthesis was cemented, and a 10 mm thick cruciate-retaining polyethylene insert was implanted. Measurements were made on postoperative computerized tomographic scans to obtain subject-specific femoral and tibial component alignment.

Experimental Measurement of Knee Forces In Vivo

The patients were three years postoperative at the time this study was conducted. Two different squatting activities were performed with both feet parallel to each other. For the first squatting activity patients were instructed to squat to the maximum knee flexion angle within tolerance and with the trunk flexed to a patient-preferred degree. For the second squatting activity, the patients were instructed to keep their hands on their hips and their upper body as upright as possible within tolerance (to minimize trunk flexion and maximize knee flexion moment). These variations were chosen to alter the external flexion moment on the knee. Each squatting cycle was repeated three times. Skin marker-based video motion analysis was used to record knee kinematics, and axial ground reaction forces were measured under each foot (Fig. 1).

Patient-specific Computer Model

Preoperative and postoperative computer tomographic scans were reconstructed to extract tibiofemoral bone geometry using MIMICS (Materialise, Leuven, Belgium). Computer-aided design models of the components were directly aligned to the 3-dimensional bone models as we have previously reported (Fig. 2) [25]. Bone and implant geometry was imported into a dynamic, musculoskeletal modeling program (LifeMOD/BodySIM 2008, LifeModeler, Inc., San Clemente, California). We previously validated a LifeMOD/KneeSim model using cadaver data measured in an Oxford knee rig [26]. A 14-segment model (head, trunk, upper arms, forearms, hands, thighs, legs, and feet) was initially constructed based on published generic anthropometric data (age, gender, bodyweight, and height) [27]. The body segments were then scaled, using measurements obtained from each patient. Each lower limb was then populated with 17 base muscles (gluteus maximus [2], gluteus medius [2], psoas major, iliopsoas, rectus femoris, vastus medialis, vastus lateralis, adductor magnus, biceps femoris [2], semitendinosus, tibialis anterior, soleus, and gastrocnemius [2]), three ligaments (medial collateral ligament [MCL], lateral collateral ligament [LCL], and posterior cruciate ligament [PCL]) and two tendons (patellar and quadriceps). Knee ligament attachments were based on subject-specific anatomic landmarks obtained from the preoperative CT scans, and ligaments were modeled as nonlinear springs using previously published material properties [28]. The quadriceps and patellar tendons were modeled with contact-based rigid bodies to simulate contact and wrapping around the trochlear groove and tibial insert, respectively (Fig. 3).

Computer Simulation of Squatting

The computer-generated image of the simulation and photograph for one of the subjects during the squatting activity is shown in Fig. 4. The simulation was carried out in two steps and has been previously described in detail [15]. In the first step, skin marker-based motion data were used to prescribe the trunk, hip, knee, and ankle kinematics for an inverse-dynamics computation. During this step, joint torques and changes in muscle lengths were recorded throughout the activity cycle. In the next step, forward dynamics was used to compute the
muscle forces required to reproduce the recorded changes in muscle lengths (to simulate muscle contraction). These muscle forces generated the required joint torque and force to reproduce the experimentally measured kinematics (used in the inverse-dynamics simulation). Tibiofemoral and patellofemoral contact forces during squatting were then computed from the forward dynamics analysis.

Results

Total ground reaction force was 0.9 to 1.1 × BW during squatting and was more or less evenly divided between extremities during squatting. Maximum passive flexion for was 100 and 110°, however, maximum flexion angle during squatting was only up to 92° to 96°. Peak forces measured during squatting were similar for both patients. Peak tibiofemoral contact forces in vivo were 2.4 × BW at 68°, 2.3 × BW at 71°, and 2.2 × BW at 74°, for the first patient; 2.4 × BW at 87°, 2.4 × BW at 86°, and 2.4 × BW at 90° for the second patient. However, the dynamic pattern of in vivo measured knee forces was different for both patients and also varied with the degree of trunk-flexion during squatting. While both patients squatted up to 90° flexion, contact forces peaked at different knee flexion angles. Our model predicted peak tibiofemoral contact forces of 2.2 to 2.3 × BW, which were close to those measured in vivo for each of the subjects (Fig. 5). When squatting with patient-preferred trunk flexion, deeper knee flexion was possible. Contact force peaked at 60° knee flexion and decreased with increasing trunk flexion after 60° knee flexion. In contrast, when squatting with minimal trunk flexion, patients were unable to squat beyond 60° knee flexion, and contact forces peaked at the maximum flexion angle. Model-predicted peak patellofemoral contact forces were 0.8 and 1.1 × BW for each patient respectively. Quadriceps forces peaked between

---

Fig. 3. Left: Lower extremity model constructed in LifeMOD; Right: Detail model of the implanted knee.

Fig. 4. (A) Photograph and corresponding model of patient squatting with patient-preferred trunk flexion. (B) Photograph and corresponding model of patient squatting with minimal trunk flexion.
1.8 and 2.0 × BW, which also coincided with maximum tibiofemoral contact force.

**Discussion**

The contact force between components is one of the major factors influencing polyethylene wear and aseptic loosening. There are many reports of computer models predicting contact forces during various activities; however, there is a wide variation in contact forces predicted by computer models, even for similar activities such as walking [6–9] and squatting [11–14]. With the availability of knee forces measured in vivo, significant advances have been made in modeling, which have increased the accuracy of predicted forces during walking [23]. However, only one subject-specific model of squatting has been reported [15]. We therefore developed and validated two additional different patient-specific models that accurately predicted the femorotibial contact force based on in vivo measured tibial contact forces.

Peak tibiofemoral contact forces (2.2–2.3 × BW) were generally lower than those previously reported by other computer models [11–13,29–31]. For example, Smith et al computed peak forces averaging at 2.8 × BW and 3.8 × BW (peaking at average 125° and 139°) for different types of squatting in subjects without arthritis or TKA [13]. Shelburne et al predicted tibiofemoral contact forces peaking at 4.2 × BW at less than 90° flexion [12], while Nagura et al predicted tibiofemoral contact forces of 7.3 × BW, peaking at an average of 146° [30]. These differences in previous reports of computer models and our results may be in part due to differences in age (our subjects were older), due to surgery (post-TKA), and due to limited flexion (our subjects only flexed up to 90° during active squatting). The previously reported subject-specific model of squatting by Stylianou et al reported peak forces approximating 3.25 × BW. Stylianou et al modeled a 67-year-old female, weighing 78.4 kg. Our patients were males, older (by 16–21 years), and weighed less (69.5 and 76.3 kg). These subject-specific differences in knee forces that were accurately reflected in subject-specific models support the value of our modeling approach. These results also suggest that in the older post-TKA patient population, knee forces may be limited by the lower muscle strength.

In addition to differences in subject populations, there has been a general tendency for mathematical models of the knee to overestimate knee contact forces. Previous predictions for squatting have ranged from 2.8 × BW to 7.3 × BW [11–13,29–31]. Presumably, this overestimation is due to error in muscle moment arm measurement and due to assumptions used to predict antagonistic co-contraction. Smith et al reported that tibiofemoral contact forces were most sensitive to the estimate for quadriceps moment arm [13]. In our model, muscle moment arms were generated from CT-measured anatomic landmarks and our model predicted very little hamstring co-contraction. The predicted contact forces over the entire squatting cycle followed the pattern of experimentally collected in vivo data over multiple cycles with less than 10% difference. Moreover, differences in femorotibial contact force between the computer model and in vivo data were smaller than the experimental cycle-to-cycle variation within subjects.

Trunk flexion significantly affected tibiofemoral contact force, especially at higher knee flexion angles. Trunk flexion reduced the external flexion moment at the knee leading to reduced quadriceps force and therefore reduced tibiofemoral contact force. During walking, trunk flexion has also been shown to compensate for "quadriceps avoidance" gait during the stance phase [32]. Decreased contribution of the vasti muscles to vertical acceleration was associated with increased contribution of the contralateral back extensor muscle (erector spinae) and contralateral back rotators (internal and external obliques). Our model was able to accurately predict this effect of trunk flexion on contact force during squatting.

Peak patellofemoral contact forces and quadriceps muscle forces were also lower than previously reported [33]. Although others have reported on hamstring muscle activity during the squat, hamstring forces were low in our models in qualitative agreement with the EMG data.
EMG activity of hamstring muscles during the squatting activity is typically low and only necessary to prevent excessive hip flexion and to stabilize the knee [12, 32, 34–36]. The lack of significant hamstring antagonistic co-contraction reduces the total quadriceps force required to extend the knee and may also explain the lower tibiofemoral and patellofemoral contact forces.

One weakness of our model was that the software program did not use optimization of the muscle forces to reduce muscle redundancy and antagonistic co-contraction but used the muscle lengths calculated during the inverse dynamics phase to compute the required muscle forces during the forward dynamics phase. Another weakness was that although landmark attachment locations were based on subject-specific CT-generated bony landmarks the soft-tissue material properties were not subject-specific but were obtained from published averages. A third weakness, was that the peak passive flexion angle was 100° to 110°, however this was close to the mean reported for total knee arthroplasty in western populations [37]. Despite these limitations, the model predicted tibiofemoral contact force with reasonable accuracy in two different subjects performing two different squatting activities.

This model can be a very useful tool to predict the effect of surgical techniques and component alignment on contact forces. In addition, this model could be used for implant design development, to enhance knee function, and to predict forces generated during other activities. Finally, subject-specific models could be useful for predicting clinical outcomes.
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