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In vivo knee kinematics of ACL-deficient patients after unicompartmental knee arthroplasty

EC Pegg¹, B Popat¹, M Alinejad¹, BH van Duren¹, DW Murray¹, HG Pandit¹
¹Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences (NDORMS), University of Oxford, UK

MAIN OBJECTIVE
• Compare the knee kinematics of ACL-deficient (ACLD) vs. ACL-intact (ACLI) patients after unicompartmental knee surgery using sagittal plane video fluoroscopy.

RESULTS
ACLD patients took ~3s longer to perform the exercises.

Knee fluoroscopy
All patients were asked to perform two exercises while a sagittal plane knee fluoroscopy was taken; a step-up exercise and a knee bend exercise (see images shown to the right).

Patients were allowed to stabilise themselves during the exercise using a handrail with their arm contralateral to the knee being examined. Patients were allowed one practise run for each exercise, after which the fluoroscopy was taken.

After each exercise a static image was taken of a calibration grid to ensure any pin-cushion or barrel distortion effects were removed. Distortion was removed using MATLAB software (version 7.1, MathWorks Inc. MA, USA) with a weighted least-squares method [1].

METHODOLOGY

Patient selection
Case-control study where first ACLD patients were recruited prospectively, then ACLI patients were matched and then recruited for the control group. All patients had undergone Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement on the medial side of their knee between January 2000 and June 2011. This study was granted ethical approval in January 2013. A summary of the ACLD and ACLI cohort groups are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>ACLD</th>
<th>ACLI</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Patients</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>67.0 (50-87)</td>
<td>68.3 (49-86)</td>
<td>0.8046</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Time</td>
<td>6.3 (1.3-12.8)</td>
<td>6.0 (2.6-11.0)</td>
<td>0.8209</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>12 male, 2 female</td>
<td>12 male, 1 female</td>
<td>0.3173</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Knee Score</td>
<td>40.7 (20-48)</td>
<td>42.3 (32-48)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Oxford Knee Score</td>
<td>15.9 (2-33)</td>
<td>12.9 (2-27)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegner Activity Score</td>
<td>3.2 (2.5)</td>
<td>2.8 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAS Pain Score</td>
<td>16.6 (0-70.3)</td>
<td>10.7 (0-85.9)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Description of the ACLD and ACLI patient cohorts. Data shown as: mean value (range). NS=not significant.

MEASUREMENTS
The following measurements were manually made on each frame of every fluoroscopy video:
• Patellar Tendon Angle (PTA) = angle between axis ‘C’ and ‘B’
• Knee Flexion Angle (KFA) = angle between ‘A’ and ‘B’
• Bearing Movement (BM) = distance ‘D’
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CONCLUSIONS
• Patients with ACL ligament deficiency after UKR have abnormal knee kinematics
• Differences were noticeable from 30-60 degrees of flexion and may relate to muscle imbalance [2]
• More variability was observed in AP bearing movement for ACLD patients
• The kinematics of ACLD-UKR knees were more normal than TKR, but less normal than ACLI-UKR and ACL-reconstructed-UKR knees [3].
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