

The Influence of Postoperative Coronal Alignment on Tibial Migration After Total Knee Arthroplasty in Preoperative Varus and Valgus Knees

A Secondary Analysis of 10 Randomized Controlled Trials Using Radiostereometric Analysis

Shaho Hasan, MD, Bart L. Kaptein, MSc, PhD, Rob G.H.H. Nelissen, MD, PhD, Koen T. van Hamersveld, Sören Toksvig-Larsen, MD, PhD, and Perla J. Marang-van de Mheen, PhD

Investigation performed at the Department of Orthopaedics, Håssleholm Hospital, Håssleholm, Sweden, and the Departments of Orthopaedics and Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

Background: Orthopaedic surgeons aim for mechanical alignment when performing total knee arthroplasty (TKA) as malalignment is associated with loosening. Loosening may be predicted by migration as measured with radiostereometric analysis (RSA), but previous RSA studies on postoperative alignment have shown contradictory results and have been limited to cemented implants and small numbers of patients. Therefore, we performed a secondary analysis of 10 previously published randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to compare migration between postoperative in-range and out-of-range cemented and uncemented TKA implants among patients with a preoperative varus or valgus knee.

Methods: All RCTs involving the use of RSA that had been conducted at 2 centers were included. Alignment was classified, with use of the hip-knee-ankle angle (HKA), as in-range ($0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$) or out-of-range ($< -3^\circ$ or $> 3^\circ$). The fixation methods included cemented, uncemented-coated, and uncemented-uncoated. Migration was measured at 3, 12, and 24 months. A linear mixed model was used, with adjustment for fixation method and clustering of patients within centers.

Results: Of 476 TKA implants that had been out-of-range preoperatively, 290 were in-range postoperatively and 186 were out-of-range in either varus ($n = 143$) or valgus ($n = 43$) postoperatively. The mean migration at 3, 12, and 24 months was 0.73 mm (95% confidence interval [CI], 0.66 to 0.79 mm), 0.92 mm (95% CI, 0.85 to 1.00 mm), and 0.97 mm (95% CI, 0.90 to 1.05 mm), respectively, for the in-range group and 0.80 mm (95% CI, 0.72 to 0.87 mm), 0.98 (95% CI, 0.90 to 1.07 mm), and 1.04 mm (95% CI, 0.95 to 1.13 mm), respectively, for the out-of-range group ($p = 0.07$). The fixation method significantly influenced migration, with uncemented-uncoated implants migrating more than cemented and uncemented-coated implants ($p < 0.001$).

Conclusions: Postoperative alignment did not influence migration of TKAs in the first 2 postoperative years in patients with preoperative varus or valgus alignment of the knee. However, the fixation method significantly influenced migration, with uncemented-uncoated implants showing the greatest migration.

Level of Evidence: Therapeutic Level III. See Instructions for Authors for a complete description of levels of evidence.

The debate regarding the optimal coronal alignment of total knee arthroplasty (TKA) implants is ongoing. Traditionally, mechanical alignment as defined as a hip-knee-ankle angle (HKA) of $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$ (that is, in-range) has been considered the so-called gold standard as studies have shown that malaligned implants are associated with an increased risk of loosening and lower clinical scores^{1,2}. Mechanical alignment is considered to be

optimal because the weight-bearing load is distributed evenly on the medial and lateral sides of the prosthesis, which in turn reduces wear and loosening^{3,4}. However, some patients naturally have some degree of varus or valgus preoperatively³, and achieving mechanical alignment can be challenging⁵.

The main concern associated with malalignment is the risk of loosening and wear. Loosening can be predicted with

Disclosure: The **Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest** forms are provided with the online version of the article (<http://links.lww.com/JBJS/G746>).

TABLE I Study Characteristics

Study	Center	Inclusion Period	No. of Patients	Implant Designs*	Registration
Nieuwenhuijse et al. ¹²	Leiden, the Netherlands	2002-2005	78	NexGen LPS cemented fixed bearing NexGen LPS cemented mobile bearing NexGen LPS high-flexion cemented fixed bearing NexGen LPS high-flexion cemented mobile bearing	Dutch Trial Register NTR3287
Van Hamersveld et al. ¹³	Leiden, the Netherlands	2008-2010	52	Triathlon PS cemented fixed bearing Triathlon PS cemented mobile bearing	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02924961
Molt and Toksvig-Larsen ¹⁴	Hässleholm, Sweden	2006-2006	60	Triathlon CR cemented fixed bearing Triathlon PS cemented fixed bearing	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT00436982
Molt and Toksvig-Larsen ¹⁵	Hässleholm, Sweden	2007-2008	60	Triathlon CR uncemented-uncoated fixed bearing Triathlon CR uncemented-coated (PA) fixed bearing	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT03198533
Molt and Toksvig-Larsen ¹⁶	Hässleholm, Sweden	2008-2010	60	Triathlon standard-stem CR cemented fixed bearing Triathlon short-stem CR cemented fixed bearing	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT00436982
van Hamersveld et al. ¹⁷	Hässleholm, Sweden	2009-2010	60	Triathlon CR cemented fixed bearing Triathlon CR uncemented-coated (PA) fixed bearing	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02525601
Van Hamersveld et al. ¹⁸	Hässleholm, Sweden	2014-2014	60	Triathlon CR cemented fixed bearing Triathlon CR cemented fixed bearing all-polyethylene	ISRCTN Registry ISRCTN04081530
Hasan et al. ¹⁹	Hässleholm, Sweden	2014-2015	60	Triathlon PS cemented fixed bearing Triathlon PS cemented fixed bearing all-polyethylene	ISRCTN Registry ISRCTN10744502
Hasan et al. ²⁰	Hässleholm, Sweden	2015-2016	72	Triathlon CR cemented fixed bearing Tritanium Triathlon CR uncemented-coated fixed bearing	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02578446
Koster et al. ²¹	Leiden, the Netherlands	2014-2015	74	NexGen LPS cemented fixed bearing Persona PS cemented fixed bearing	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02269254

*NexGen and Persona implants are manufactured by Zimmer, and Triathlon implants are manufactured by Stryker. LPS = Legacy posterior stabilizing, PS = posterior stabilizing, CR = cruciate retaining, and PA = peri-apatite coated.

radiostereometric analysis (RSA), a highly accurate technique for measuring migration, a factor that has been shown to be associated with the risk of revision TKA⁶⁻⁸. Three previous studies assessed the effect of postoperative alignment on migration. Laende et al., in a study of 47 patients who were randomized to mechanical alignment with use of computer-assisted surgery or to kinematic alignment with use of patient-specific instruments, found no difference between the groups in terms of migration or clinical outcomes⁹. van Hamersveld et al., in a study of 85 TKA implants that had in-range, varus, or valgus alignment postoperatively, found that out-of-range implants, especially those with varus alignment, migrated more than in-range implants¹⁰. In contrast, Teeter et al., in a small series of 15 TKAs, found no difference in migration between implants with in-range, varus, or valgus postoperative alignment¹¹. Besides the limited numbers of patients, those studies included both patients with preoperative neutral alignment and those with preoperative varus or valgus alignment. As achieving postoperative in-range alignment is more straightforward for knees with neutral alignment preoperatively, the influence of failing to achieve mechanical alignment during TKA on migration is of particular interest for patients with preoperative varus or valgus alignment as more releases and larger resections have to be done. Moreover, the above 3 studies were limited to cemented implants. As the interest in uncemented TKA is growing, studies assessing the influence of alignment strategies on migration are needed for both uncemented and cemented implants. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to compare

tibial component migration for 2 years postoperatively for TKA implants with in-range or out-of-range (varus or valgus) alignment in patients with preoperative varus or valgus alignment.

Materials and Methods

Design

The present study was a secondary analysis of all randomized controlled trials (RCTs) involving RSA for the analysis of primary TKAs that were performed in the last 2 decades at 2 centers (Hässleholm, Sweden; Leiden, the Netherlands). Ten published RSA studies including 636 patients undergoing TKA from 2002 to 2016 were pooled (Table I)¹²⁻²¹. Seven studies were conducted in Hässleholm (432 TKAs)¹⁴⁻²⁰ and 3 in Leiden (204 TKAs)^{12,13,21}. Two studies with cemented TKA implants were included in a recently published study on alignment^{10,12,13}. One study had 4 treatment arms¹², and 9 studies had 2 treatment arms¹³⁻²¹. The number of TKAs per study ranged from 52 to 78. TKA implant designs included cemented, uncemented-coated, and uncemented-uncoated Triathlon implants (Stryker), uncemented-coated Tritanium implants (Stryker), cemented NexGen implants (Zimmer Biomet), and cemented Persona implants (Zimmer Biomet).

Patients

In order for a patient to be included in the present study, preoperative and postoperative anteroposterior standing full-leg radiographs, as well as a direct postoperative RSA radiograph and at least 1 RSA radiograph during follow-up, needed




Fig. 1
Inclusion flowchart.

to be available for the measurement of alignment. Patients were excluded if the knee had a preoperative neutral alignment (an HKA of $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$). Age, sex, American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) score, body mass index (BMI), Ahlbäck classification, primary diagnosis, and fixation method (cemented, uncemented-coated, or uncemented-uncoated) were collected.

Alignment

Preoperative and postoperative alignment was measured on anteroposterior standing full-leg radiographs in concordance with a standardized protocol; the postoperative radiographs were

made at a median of 3 months (interquartile range, 2 to 5 months)²². In short, the femoral mechanical axis was drawn from the center of the femoral head up to the center of the femoral notch, and the tibial mechanical axis was drawn from the center of the talus up to the center of the tibial plateau. The HKA was the angle between these 2 lines^{10,23}. A postoperative HKA of $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$ was considered in-range, and a postoperative HKA of $< -3^\circ$ (varus) or $> 3^\circ$ (valgus) was considered out-of-range. Two observers conducted the measurements regardless of the site. Interobserver variability was assessed by means of measurement of the HKA independently by 2 different observers who were

TABLE II Baseline Characteristics

	Postoperative HKA		P Value	Total (N = 476)
	In-Range (HKA $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$) (N = 290)	Out-of-Range (HKA $< -3^\circ$ or $> 3^\circ$) (N = 186)		
Center (no. of knees)				
Hässleholm	229 (79%)	123 (66%)	0.002	352 (74%)
Leiden	61 (21%)	63 (34%)		124 (26%)
Age* (yr)	67 \pm 7.3	67 \pm 8.2	0.9	67 (8.0)
BMI*,† (kg/m ²)	29 \pm 4.4	29 \pm 4.0	0.3	29 (4.2)
Sex (no. of knees)				
Female	172 (59%)	105 (56%)	0.5	277 (58%)
Male	118 (41%)	81 (44%)		199 (42%)
Preop. alignment (no. of knees)				
Varus (HKA $< -3^\circ$)	240 (83%)	154 (83%)	1.0	394 (83%)
Valgus (HKA $> 3^\circ$)	50 (17%)	32 (17%)		82 (17%)
Diagnosis (no. of knees)			0.4	
Osteoarthritis	269 (93%)	171 (92%)		440 (93%)
Posttraumatic arthritis	1 (0%)	0 (0%)		1 (0%)
Rheumatoid arthritis or other inflammatory disease	19 (7%)	11 (6%)		30 (6%)
Missing	1 (0%)	4 (2%)		5 (1%)
Ahlbäck classification (no. of knees)			0.2	
I	2 (1%)	1 (1%)		3 (1%)
II	67 (23%)	34 (18%)		101 (21%)
III	146 (50%)	86 (46%)		232 (49%)
IV	14 (5%)	2 (1%)		16 (3%)
Missing	61 (21%)	63 (34%)		124 (26%)
ASA classification† (no. of knees)			0.3	
I	59 (20%)	37 (20%)		96 (20%)
II	193 (67%)	129 (69%)		322 (68%)
III	36 (12%)	16 (9%)		52 (11%)
Missing	2 (1%)	4 (2%)		6 (1%)
Fixation (no. of implants)			0.3	
Uncemented-uncoated	13 (4%)	8 (4%)		21 (4%)
Uncemented-coated	54 (19%)	24 (13%)		78 (16%)
Cemented	223 (77%)	154 (83%)		377 (79%)

*The values are given as the mean and the standard deviation. †BMI = body mass index, ASA = American Society of Anesthesiologists.

blinded to each other's measurements. The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) for measuring the preoperative HKA with use of 208 radiographs was 0.97 (95% confidence interval [CI], 0.96 to 0.97), and the ICC for measuring the postoperative HKA with use of 205 radiographs was 0.94 (95% CI, 0.93 to 0.96). A random set of 44 preoperative and postoperative radiographs was selected to measure intraobserver variability. These double measurements were performed after an interval of 2 months to eliminate the memory effect. In this sample, the ICC for intraobserver variability was 0.96 (95% CI, 0.92 to 0.98) preoperatively and 0.99 (95% CI, 0.98 to 0.99) postoperatively.

Radiostereometric Analysis

The primary outcome of interest was tibial component migration as measured with RSA over a 2-year follow-up period, which is a common follow-up period for RSA studies. RSA radiographs were made within 2 to 3 days postoperatively and at 3 months, 1 year, and 2 years in all studies but one. In that study, RSA radiographs were not made at 3 months and were only made at the other time points¹³. UmRSA software (RSA Bio-medical) was used in 4 studies, and Model-Based RSA software (RSACore) was used in 6 studies. Migration was calculated with use of marker-based analysis in 8 studies and model-based




Fig. 2

Histogram showing the distribution of the postoperative hip-knee-ankle angle (HKA). The blue bars represent the number of in-range TKA implants, and the red bars represent the number of out-of-range TKA implants in the primary analysis. An HKA of $<-3^\circ$ is considered varus alignment, and an HKA of $>3^\circ$ is considered valgus alignment.

analysis in 2 studies. Migration was expressed as the maximum total point motion (MTPM), which estimates the length of the translational vector with the largest migration²⁴. As a secondary outcome, implants migrating >0.2 mm in the second postoperative year were considered at risk for early failure⁶. All analyses were performed following the ISO (International Organization for Standardization) standard and RSA guidelines^{24,25}.

Statistics

An independent t test was used for normally distributed continuous variables, and a chi-square test was used for categorical variables, to assess baseline differences. A linear mixed model was used to analyze MTPM over a 2-year follow-up period^{26,27}. This model included the group (in-range and out-of-range) and time (baseline, 3 months, 1 year, and 2 years) as fixed effects and an interaction term of group with time. Fixation method (cemented, uncemented-coated, uncemented-uncoated) was included as a fixed effect to adjust for known differences in migration patterns, and the surgical center (Hässleholm, Leiden) was included as a random effect to account for clustering of patients within these centers. MTPM was log-transformed to obtain a normal distribution. Presented values were back-transformed to the original scale. Remaining variability was modeled with an autoregressive order-1 covariance matrix. As a secondary analysis, the percentage of at-risk implants (an MTPM of >0.2 mm between the 1 and 2-year follow-ups) was compared between both groups with use of a chi-square test⁶. In addition, the out-of-range group was stratified into varus (HKA $<-3^\circ$) and valgus (HKA $>3^\circ$) groups, and the primary analysis was repeated. Sensitivity analyses were performed to check whether the results differed if a stricter (HKA $0^\circ \pm 1^\circ$) or a less strict (HKA $0^\circ \pm 6^\circ$) threshold was used to classify implants as being in-range. As a post hoc analysis, both the preoperative alignment (that is, varus or valgus) and postoperative alignment

(that is, in-range, varus, or valgus) were considered, creating 6 groups (for example, varus-to-valgus alignment). Mean migration was compared between these groups. Means were reported with 95% CIs or standard deviations (SDs), and the level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Analyses were performed with use of SPSS statistical software (version 26.0; IBM).

Ethics

All studies were approved by an ethical review board before recruitment of the patients, and all patients provided informed consent. The protocol for pooling of the data was presented to the medical ethics committee of Leiden, who waived the need for approval under Dutch law (P.15.198).

Source of Funding

No funding was received for the current study. Seven of the included studies were funded by Stryker; 2 studies, by the Dutch Arthritis Association; and 1 study, by Zimmer Biomet. The sponsors did not take part in the design, conduct, analysis, or interpretations in the current study.

Results

Of the 636 TKAs that were included in the original 10 RSA studies, 476 TKAs were included in the present study (Fig. 1). Of these, 290 TKAs were in-range postoperatively (HKA $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$) and 186 were out-of-range postoperatively (HKA $<-3^\circ$ [varus, $n = 143$] or HKA $>3^\circ$ [valgus, $n = 43$] (Fig. 1). Relatively more patients underwent the operation in Hässleholm in the in-range group as compared with the out-of-range group (79% compared with 66%; $p = 0.002$). The primary diagnoses included osteoarthritis (440 knees), rheumatoid arthritis or another inflammatory disease (30 knees), and trauma (1 knee); the diagnosis was missing for




Fig. 3

Line graph illustrating the mean MTPM in millimeters over the 2-year follow-up period according to postoperative alignment (in-range, HKA $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$; out-of-range, HKA $< -3^\circ$ or $> 3^\circ$). The error bars represent 95% CIs. The interrupted lines represent the MTPM over time with use of a stricter (HKA $0^\circ \pm 1^\circ$) or a less-strict (HKA, $0^\circ \pm 6^\circ$) threshold to determine in-range and out-of-range.

remaining 5 knees (Table II). The mean postoperative HKA was $-1^\circ \pm 3.7^\circ$, and the median postoperative HKA was also -1° (interquartile range, -3.5° to 0.8°) (Fig. 2).

No significant difference in MTPM was observed between the alignment groups over the 2-year follow-up period ($p = 0.07$). The MTPM at 3, 12, and 24 months was 0.73 mm (95% CI, 0.66 to 0.79 mm), 0.92 (95% CI 0.85, to 1.00 mm), and 0.97 mm (95% CI, 0.90 to 1.05 mm), respectively, for the in-range group and 0.80 mm (95% CI, 0.72 to 0.87 mm), 0.98 mm (95% CI, 0.90 to 1.07 mm), and 1.04 mm (95% CI,

0.95 to 1.13 mm), respectively, for the out-of-range group (Fig. 3). No difference between groups was observed when using a stricter (HKA $0^\circ \pm 1^\circ$) or less strict (HKA $0^\circ \pm 6^\circ$) threshold for the classification of in-range (Fig. 3). Similarly, further stratification of the out-of-range group into varus (HKA $< -3^\circ$) and valgus (HKA $> 3^\circ$) showed no difference between postoperative alignment groups ($p = 0.4$), including when varus implants were compared with in-range implants ($p = 0.08$) (Fig. 4). The fixation method itself had a significant effect on migration, with uncemented-uncoated implants migrating the most and cemented implants migrating the least ($p <$




Fig. 4

Line graph illustrating the mean MTPM in millimeters over the 2-year follow-up period with the out-of-range group subdivided into a varus and a valgus group (in-range, HKA $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$; varus, HKA $< -3^\circ$; valgus, HKA $> 3^\circ$). The error bars represent 95% CIs.




Fig. 5

Line graph illustrating the mean MTPM in millimeters over the 2-year follow-up period according to fixation method. The error bars represent 95% CIs. The results are also subdivided into an in-range group (HKA, $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$) and an out-of-range group (HKA, $< -3^\circ$ or $> 3^\circ$), which are represented by interrupted lines. Significant differences are marked with an asterisk (*).

0.001) (Fig. 5). Both cemented and uncemented-coated implants showed limited migration between 3 months and 2 years (Fig. 5). The difference in migration between the uncemented-uncoated out-of-range group and the uncemented-uncoated in-range group did not reach significance as the MTPM at 3, 12, and 24 months was 1.01 mm (95% CI, 0.74 to 1.33 mm), 1.38 mm (95% CI, 1.05 to 1.76 mm), and 1.45 mm (95% CI, 1.11 to 1.94 mm), respectively, for the in-range group and 1.42 mm (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.92 mm), 1.82 mm (95% CI, 1.31 to 2.43 mm), and 1.97 mm (95% CI, 1.46 to 2.59 mm), respectively, for the out-of-range group ($p = 0.4$) (Fig. 5). Thirty-two of 290 implants in the in-range group and 25 of the 186 implants in the out-of-range group were considered at risk for early failure as the migration between the 1 and 2-year follow-up intervals was > 0.2 mm ($p = 0.3$). Stratifying the out-of-range group into varus and valgus groups showed that 22 implants were at risk for early failure in the varus group and 3 implants were at risk for early failure in the valgus group.

The post hoc analysis, including 6 groups based on preoperative and postoperative alignment (for example, varus-to-valgus alignment), showed that there was a significant difference in migration between groups ($p = 0.04$) and that patients with preoperative valgus and postoperative varus alignment (that is, valgus-to-varus) had the most migration (Fig. 6).

Discussion

The present study of knees with preoperative varus or valgus alignment showed that there was no significant difference between those with postoperative in-range alignment and those

with out-of-range alignment in terms of implant migration as measured with RSA during the first 2 postoperative years. The number of implants at risk for early failure was comparable between the groups. These results did not change when stricter or less-strict thresholds were used to define in-range implants or when implants with postoperative varus and valgus alignment were analyzed separately. Post hoc analysis indicated that knees with preoperative valgus alignment that was over-corrected into varus had significantly more migration. In all analyses, the fixation method influenced migration, with uncemented-uncoated implants migrating the most and cemented implants migrating the least. Both cemented and uncemented-coated implants showed limited migration from 3 months onward.

The long-held belief that coronal alignment has a significant influence on results after TKA has been challenged both because the evidence supporting this belief is limited and because studies have demonstrated contradictory results. The results of the present study, which included a larger number of patients than in previous studies, provide further evidence to challenge this belief. Our findings are in line with a case series comparing 7 in-range and 6 varus-aligned TKA implants, which showed no difference in migration at up to 10 years of follow-up¹¹. However, another study demonstrated that 29 varus-aligned implants had more migration in comparison with 47 in-range implants over a 5-year period¹⁰. Likewise, studies comparing survival or clinical outcomes between in-range and out-of-range implants have demonstrated ambiguous results. Rhee et al. found no differences in terms of clinical outcome or survivorship between computer-assisted and




Fig. 6

Line graph illustrating the mean MTPM in millimeters over the 2-year follow-up period according to preoperative and postoperative alignment. Varus was defined as an HKA of $<-3^\circ$, valgus as an HKA of $>3^\circ$, and neutral as an HKA of $0^\circ \pm 3^\circ$.

conventional TKAs, even though better postoperative alignment with fewer outliers was seen in the computer-assisted group²⁸. Several studies have shown no difference between in-range and out-of-range implants in terms of clinical scores or survivorship²⁹⁻³¹, whereas other studies have shown better clinical outcomes for in-range implants^{32,33}. Despite these inconsistent findings, much effort has been put into the development of novel methods to perfectly align implants, such as robot-assisted surgery and patient-specific instrumentation. However, those novel surgical techniques have not resulted in less migration or increased patient satisfaction³⁴⁻³⁶. Future studies should assess whether other factors, such as implant size or bone quality, may be important when considering alignment strategies and migration of TKA implants.

The present study found that uncemented-uncoated implants migrated the most and cemented implants migrated the least. Studies assessing migration for different fixation methods at up to 5 and 10 years have shown comparable results^{37,38}. The present study also showed that uncemented-coated implants tended to migrate more initially but were as stable as cemented implants beyond 3 months, which is in agreement with the findings of several studies^{20,39-42}. A long-term RSA study comparing different fixation methods suggested that biological fixation of uncemented-coated implants could outperform cemented implants in terms of migration⁴³. Those results further strengthen the case for using uncemented-coated TKA implants. The present study adds to that literature indicating that postoperative in-range versus out-of-range alignment does not influence migration of implants at 2 years of follow-up but that it is the fixation method, particularly uncemented-uncoated fixation, that influences migration. Long-term follow-up of the patients in the included studies is needed to address whether postoperative alignment influences migration across a 5 or 10-year period.

To our knowledge, the present study is one of the few multicenter, pooled RSA studies involving the use of individual patient-

level data. In most RSA studies, RSA is used to assess the initial migration of a novel implant design as compared with its predecessor. The benefits of using RSA for this purpose are that small groups of approximately 30 patients each are needed, and results become available after 1 or 2 years of follow-up. However, as such studies are powered to compare the migration between 2 groups of specific implants, they are mostly underpowered to answer other clinical questions requiring subgroup analyses. Future studies should consider pooling RSA studies to address such unanswered questions, including the impact of alignment on long-term migration.

Several limitations should be noted. First, all TKA procedures were performed with the intention to achieve mechanical alignment, and reasons why this was not achieved were not registered. Second, preoperative and postoperative anteroposterior standing full-leg radiographs, which were used to define in-range and out-of-range groups, were not made at standardized time points. In theory, the HKA could change preoperatively and postoperatively over time because of progressive osteoarthritis or migration of an implant. Third, although migration was corrected for the originating center and fixation method, there may have been residual confounding due to factors such as osteoporosis if these factors were distributed differently across the groups. Fourth, migration may depend on implant design, so ideally the impact of alignment would be investigated within the same implant design. Fifth, the group of uncemented-uncoated implants was small ($n = 21$), which could have resulted in a type-II error as the point estimates of in-range and out-of-range implants seemed different but had large confidence intervals. Finally, the present study assessed migration up to 2 years as a proxy for tibial loosening. Studies assessing the long-term effect of varus or valgus alignment on revision rates are needed before drawing conclusions regarding the longevity of out-of-range TKA implants.

In conclusion, the present study showed that for patients with preoperative varus or valgus knees, postoperative alignment did not influence the mean tibial component migration in the first 2 postoperative years or the number of implants at risk for early loosening. Applying stricter or less-strict thresholds for defining an in-range aligned TKA implant gave similar results. The fixation method significantly influenced implant migration, with uncemented-uncoated implants showing the most migration. ■

Shaho Hasan, MD¹
Bart L. Kaptein, MSc, PhD¹

Rob G.H.H. Nelissen, MD, PhD¹
Koen T. van Hamersveld¹
Sören Toksvig-Larsen, MD, PhD^{2,3}
Perla J. Marang-van de Mheen, PhD⁴

¹Department of Orthopaedics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

²Department of Orthopaedics, Håssleholm Hospital, Håssleholm, Sweden

³Department of Clinical Sciences, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

⁴Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

Email for corresponding author: S.Hasan@lumc.nl

References

- Jeffery RS, Morris RW, Denham RA. Coronal alignment after total knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 1991 Sep;73(5):709-14.
- Lotke PA, Ecker ML. Influence of positioning of prosthesis in total knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1977 Jan;59(1):77-9.
- Bellemans J, Colyn W, Vandenneucker H, Victor J. The Chitranjan Ranawat award: is neutral mechanical alignment normal for all patients? The concept of constitutional varus. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2012 Jan;470(1):45-53.
- Oussedik S, Abdel MP, Cross MB, Haddad FS. Alignment and fixation in total knee arthroplasty: changing paradigms. *Bone Joint J.* 2015 Oct;97-B(10)(Suppl A):16-9.
- Allen MM, Pagnano MW. Neutral mechanical alignment: Is it Necessary? *Bone Joint J.* 2016 Jan;98-B(1)(Suppl A):81-3.
- Ryd L, Albrektsson BE, Carlsson L, Dansgård F, Herberts P, Lindstrand A, Regné L, Toksvig-Larsen S. Roentgen stereophotogrammetric analysis as a predictor of mechanical loosening of knee prostheses. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 1995 May;77(3):377-83.
- Pijls BG, Plevier JWM, Nelissen RGHH. RSA migration of total knee replacements. *Acta Orthop.* 2018 Jun;89(3):320-8.
- Pijls BG, Valstar ER, Nouta KA, Plevier JW, Fiocco M, Middelkamp S, Nelissen RG. Early migration of tibial components is associated with late revision: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 21,000 knee arthroplasties. *Acta Orthop.* 2012 Dec;83(6):614-24.
- Laende EK, Richardson CG, Dunbar MJ. A randomized controlled trial of tibial component migration with kinematic alignment using patient-specific instrumentation versus mechanical alignment using computer-assisted surgery in total knee arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J.* 2019 Aug;101-B(8):929-40.
- van Hamersveld KT, Marang-van de Mheen PJ, Nelissen RGHH. The Effect of Coronal Alignment on Tibial Component Migration Following Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Cohort Study with Long-Term Radiostereometric Analysis Results. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2019 Jul 3;101(13):1203-12.
- Teeter MG, Naudie DD, McCalden RW, Yuan X, Holdsworth DW, MacDonald SJ, Lanting BA. Varus tibial alignment is associated with greater tibial baseplate migration at 10 years following total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2018 Jun;26(6):1610-7.
- Nieuwenhuijse MJ, van der Voort P, Kaptein BL, van der Linden-van der Zwaag HM, Valstar ER, Nelissen RG. Fixation of high-flexion total knee prostheses: five-year follow-up results of a four-arm randomized controlled clinical and roentgen stereophotogrammetric analysis study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2013 Oct 2;95(19):e1411-11.
- Van Hamersveld KT, Marang-Van De Mheen PJ, Van Der Heide HJL, Van Der Linden-Van Der Zwaag HMJ, Valstar ER, Nelissen RGHH. Migration and clinical outcome of mobile-bearing versus fixed-bearing single-radius total knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthop.* 2018 Apr;89(2):190-6.
- Molt M, Toksvig-Larsen S. Similar early migration when comparing CR and PS in Triathlon™ TKA: A prospective randomised RSA trial. *Knee.* 2014 Oct;21(5):949-54.
- Molt M, Toksvig-Larsen S. Peri-Apatite™ enhances prosthetic fixation in TKA - A prospective randomised RSA study. *J Arthritis.* 2014;3(3):134.
- Molt M, Toksvig-Larsen S. 2-year follow-up report on micromotion of a short tibia stem. A prospective, randomized RSA study of 59 patients. *Acta Orthop.* 2015;86(5):594-8.
- van Hamersveld KT, Marang-van de Mheen PJ, Tsonaka R, Valstar ER, Toksvig-Larsen S. Fixation and clinical outcome of uncemented peri-apatite-coated versus cemented total knee arthroplasty: five-year follow-up of a randomised controlled trial using radiostereometric analysis (RSA). *Bone Joint J.* 2017 Nov;99-B(11):1467-76.
- Van Hamersveld KT, Marang-Van De Mheen PJ, Nelissen RGHH, Toksvig-Larsen S. Migration of all-polyethylene compared with metal-backed tibial components in cemented total knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthop.* 2018 Aug;89(4):412-7.
- Hasan S, Marang-Van De Mheen PJ, Kaptein BL, Nelissen RGHH, Toksvig-Larsen S. All-polyethylene versus metal-backed posterior stabilized total knee arthroplasty: similar 2-year results of a randomized radiostereometric analysis study. *Acta Orthop.* 2019 Dec;90(6):590-5.
- Hasan S, van Hamersveld KT, Marang-van de Mheen PJ, Kaptein BL, Nelissen RGHH, Toksvig-Larsen S. Migration of a novel 3D-printed cementless versus a cemented total knee arthroplasty: two-year results of a randomized controlled trial using radiostereometric analysis. *Bone Joint J.* 2020 Aug;102-B(8):1016-24.
- Koster LA, Meinardi JE, Kaptein BL, Van der Linden-Van der Zwaag E, Nelissen RGHH. Two-year RSA migration results of symmetrical and asymmetrical tibial components in total knee arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. *Bone Joint J.* 2021 May;103-B(5):855-63.
- Moreland JR, Bassett LW, Hanker GJ. Radiographic analysis of the axial alignment of the lower extremity. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1987 Jun;69(5):745-9.
- Cooke TD, Sled EA, Scudamore RA. Frontal plane knee alignment: a call for standardized measurement. *J Rheumatol.* 2007 Sep;34(9):1796-801.
- International Organization for Standardization. ISO 16087:2013(en). Implants for surgery: Roentgen stereophotogrammetric analysis for the assessment of migration of orthopaedic implants. International Organization for Standardization; 2013. <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:16087:ed-1:v1:en>
- Valstar ER, Gill R, Ryd L, Flivik G, Börlin N, Kärrholm J. Guidelines for standardization of radiostereometry (RSA) of implants. *Acta Orthop.* 2005 Aug;76(4):563-72.
- Krueger C, Tian L. A comparison of the general linear mixed model and repeated measures ANOVA using a dataset with multiple missing data points. *Biol Res Nurs.* 2004 Oct;6(2):151-7.
- Ranstam J, Turkiewicz A, Boonen S, Van Meirhaeghe J, Bastian L, Wardlaw D. Alternative analyses for handling incomplete follow-up in the intention-to-treat analysis: the randomized controlled trial of balloon kyphoplasty versus non-surgical care for vertebral compression fracture (FREE). *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2012 Mar 24;12:35.
- Rhee SJ, Kim HJ, Lee CR, Kim CW, Gwak HC, Kim JH. A Comparison of Long-Term Outcomes of Computer-Navigated and Conventional Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2019 Oct 16;101(20):1875-85.
- Bonner TJ, Eardley WG, Patterson P, Gregg PJ. The effect of post-operative mechanical axis alignment on the survival of primary total knee replacements after a follow-up of 15 years. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2011 Sep;93(9):1217-22.
- Abdel MP, Ollivier M, Parratte S, Trousdale RT, Berry DJ, Pagnano MW. Effect of Postoperative Mechanical Axis Alignment on Survival and Functional Outcomes of Modern Total Knee Arthroplasties with Cement: A Concise Follow-up at 20 Years. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2018 Mar 21;100(6):472-8.
- Magnussen RA, Weppe F, Demey G, Servien E, Lustig S. Residual varus alignment does not compromise results of TKAs in patients with preoperative varus. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2011 Dec;469(12):3443-50.
- Choong PF, Dowsey MM, Stoney JD. Does accurate anatomical alignment result in better function and quality of life? Comparing conventional and computer-assisted total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* 2009 Jun;24(4):560-9.
- Longstaff LM, Sloan K, Stamp N, Scaddan M, Beaver R. Good alignment after total knee arthroplasty leads to faster rehabilitation and better function. *J Arthroplasty.* 2009 Jun;24(4):570-8.
- Teeter MG, Marsh JD, Howard JL, Yuan X, Vasarhelyi EM, McCalden RW, Naudie DDR. A randomized controlled trial investigating the value of patient-specific

instrumentation for total knee arthroplasty in the Canadian healthcare system. *Bone Joint J.* 2019 May;101-B(5):565-72.

35. Nam D, Park A, Stambough JB, Johnson SR, Nunley RM, Barrack RL. The Mark Coventry Award: Custom Cutting Guides Do Not Improve Total Knee Arthroplasty Clinical Outcomes at 2 Years Followup. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2016 Jan;474(1):40-6.

36. Jeon SW, Kim KI, Song SJ. Robot-Assisted Total Knee Arthroplasty Does Not Improve Long-Term Clinical and Radiologic Outcomes. *J Arthroplasty.* 2019 Aug;34(8):1656-61.

37. Carlsson A, Björkman A, Besjakov J, Onsten I. Cemented tibial component fixation performs better than cementless fixation: a randomized radiostereometric study comparing porous-coated, hydroxyapatite-coated and cemented tibial components over 5 years. *Acta Orthop.* 2005 Jun;76(3):362-9.

38. Pijls BG, Valstar ER, Kaptein BL, Fiocco M, Nelissen RG. The beneficial effect of hydroxyapatite lasts: a randomized radiostereometric trial comparing hydroxyapatite-coated, uncoated, and cemented tibial components for up to 16 years. *Acta Orthop.* 2012 Apr;83(2):135-41.

39. van Ooij B, Sierevelt IN, van der Vis HM, Hoornenborg D, Haverkamp D. What is the role of cemented fixation in total knee arthroplasty? The two-year results of a randomized RSA controlled trial. *Bone Joint J.* 2021 Jan;103-B(1):98-104.

40. Nivbrant NO, Khan RJK, Fick DP, Haebich S, Smith E. Cementless Versus Cemented Tibial Fixation in Posterior Stabilized Total Knee Replacement: A Randomized Trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2020 Jun 17;102(12):1075-82.

41. Dunbar MJ, Wilson DA, Hennigar AW, Amirault JD, Gross M, Reardon GP. Fixation of a Trabecular Metal knee arthroplasty component. A prospective randomized study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2009 Jul;91(7):1578-86.

42. Laende EK, Astephen Wilson JL, Mills Flemming J, Valstar ER, Richardson CG, Dunbar MJ. Equivalent 2-year stabilization of uncemented tibial component migration despite higher early migration compared with cemented fixation: an RSA study on 360 total knee arthroplasties. *Acta Orthop.* 2019 Apr;90(2):172-8.

43. Laende EK, Richardson CG, Dunbar MJ. Predictive value of short-term migration in determining long-term stable fixation in cemented and cementless total knee arthroplasties. *Bone Joint J.* 2019 Jul;101-B(7_Supple_C):55-60.