

This is a repository copy of CT Morphometric analysis of Medial Tibial condyles: Are the currently available designs of Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty suitable for Indian knees?.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: <u>https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/174440/</u>

Version: Accepted Version

## Article:

Kantanavar, R, Desai, MM and Pandit, H orcid.org/0000-0001-7392-8561 (2021) CT Morphometric analysis of Medial Tibial condyles: Are the currently available designs of Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty suitable for Indian knees? Indian Journal of Orthopaedics, 55 (5). pp. 1135-1143. ISSN 0019-5413

https://doi.org/10.1007/s43465-021-00429-y

© Indian Orthopaedics Association 2021. This is an author produced version of an article published in Indian Journal of Orthopaedics. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

#### Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

#### Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

# **1** Title: CT Morphometric analysis of Medial Tibial condyles:

2 Are the currently available designs of Unicompartmental

- **3 Knee Arthroplasty suitable for Indian knees?**
- 4

20

## 5 Background

6 The main purpose of this study is to assess the compatibility of medial tibial condyle (MTC) 7 morphometry of Indian population with that of six contemporary UKA prostheses tibial 8 components. We hypothesized that from the currently available UKA designs at least one 9 would fit the MTC morphometry optimally as per the manufacturer's recommendation. Methods 10 We used CT morphometric data of 100 (66 males and 34 females) consecutive nonarthritic 11 adult knees with reference to the MTC to assess the compatibility of currently available (in 12 India) UKA prostheses. Each MTC was measured the anteroposterior dimension, 13 14 mediolateral at pre-defined points and the MTC aspect ratio calculated. Proportion of knees which could be optimally fitted with the existing UKA tibial components was calculated. 15 Results 16 17 The mean age was 39.6 (SD: 15.9) years. Anteroposterior and mediolateral dimensions in males were higher as compared to females (p<0.001). As the anteroposterior dimension 18 increased, the MTC aspect ratio decreased. There was asymmetry of anteroposterior halves 19

with maximum mediolateral width being posterior to the central mediolateral width by 5.5

21	(SD: 2.8) mm. Optimal anteroposterior fit ranged from 66% to 93%. However, optimal
22	mediolateral fit as well, ranged from 5% to 37% with underhang present in 17% to 61% and
23	>2 mm medial overhang present in 0% to 35% cases. In 23% of cases not a single implant
24	could be fitted optimally.
25	Conclusion
26	Currently available UKA implants do not provide optimal tibial fit in nearly 25% of Indian
27	patients. A surgeon needs to be aware of these limitations of existing implants when
28	considering UKA.
29	
30	Keywords: unicompartmental knee arthroplasty, medial tibial condyle, CT morphometry,
31	Indian knees, implant size and shape mismatch.
32	
33	1. INTRODUCTION
34	For optimal UKA results, selection of an appropriately sized tibial component is essential.
35	Majority of the complications post-UKA are related to the tibia due to a) faulty surgical
36	technique leading to valgus subsidence with increased posterior slope [1], overhang
37	causing soft tissue irritation and pain whereas underhang leading to loosening with
38	subsidence [2], tibial plateau fracture secondary to anything that weakens or overloads the
39	proximal tibia [3] or b) suboptimal component fit leading to similar issues of pain, fracture,
40	loosening and subsidence [4,5]. Indeed, the reported variability in the clinical outcomes
41	and implant survival with UKA [6,7] is higher than that with TKA. This has contributed to
42	UKA usage being restricted to around 10% [6,7] although UKA can be used in up to 50% of

43	cases presenting with end-stage symptomatic osteoarthritis [8]. Optimal coverage of
44	cortical bone in particular the tibia is relevant especially in UKA cases. This provides
45	adequate support and reduces the risk of implant subsidence.
46	Various studies across the globe have uncovered the differences in morphologic features of
47	the knee among patients of different races [9,10,11], between male: female gender [12],
48	between medial: lateral condyles [13] and between anatomic: non-anatomic tibial
49	component designs [14] in context of different designs of total knee arthroplasty
50	prostheses. Studies have also been conducted in Indian subjects [15,16] to draw attention
51	to the differences between their morphometry and the resultant mismatch with
52	contemporary TKA prostheses designs. However, studies with respect to UKA prostheses
53	designs are lacking with reference to the tibial components [17].
54	The primary objective of this study is to assess the compatibility of medial tibial condylar
55	morphometry of Indian population with that of six contemporary UKA prostheses tibial
56	components. We aimed to answer these following questions: 1. What percentage of knees
57	had at least one implant which could fit optimally? 2. Was there a difference in the
58	percentage of optimal fit cases in men vs. women?

# 60 <u>2.</u> <u>METHODS</u>

Institutional ethics committee (IRB) approval for study protocol and waiver of informed
consent was taken (Project no. EC/173/2018). We studied computed tomography (CT) data
of 100 skeletally mature Indian knees. These patients had undergone CT scan of their knee
for various clinical indications excluding pathologies which could alter the morphometry of

Medial tibial condyle i.e. fractures, neoplasia, congenital anomalies, old physeal injuries,
arthritis. The medial tibial condyle dimensions were measured by a single surgeon using
RadiAnt<sup>™</sup> DICOM (Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine) viewer software for
Windows (Version - 5.5.0, Poznan, Poland).

69

# 70

#### 2.1. <u>Steps for morphometric measurements of the medial tibial condyle:</u>

In coronal plane, an axis was drawn on the tibial plateau which was equidistant from 71 medial and lateral epicondyles of femur (with reference to femoral epicondylar axis)[Fig 72 73 No. 1]. In sagittal plane, an axis was drawn which was 6 mm below the medial tibial plateau 74 and 90 degrees to the long axis of tibia. Another axis was drawn which was 7 degrees 75 posterior to the above mentioned axis, mimicking the conservative resection of tibia for doing UKA [Fig No. 2]. These simulated cuts were chosen as per the manufacturers' 76 77 recommendations to accommodate minimum thickness of polyethylene bearing. The axial section obtained through above mentioned planes was used for further measurements of 78 different dimensions [Fig No. 3]. A line drawn in the plane which was equidistant from 79 80 medial and lateral epicondyles of femur over the tibia, and this was designated as ML. A 81 bisector line was drawn to the line ML, this was considered as Y. In an attempt to align the 82 tibial component with the femoral mechanical axis, a line X was drawn medially and 83 subtending an angle of 6 degrees anteriorly to the line Y [18]. In a bid to prevent damaging 84 the ACL footprint on tibia, a line AP was drawn side by side to line X medially with 3 mm apart from each other. The AP line was divided into four equal parts and perpendicular 85 86 lines were drawn from the points dividing AP line anteroposteriorly into ¼th and ¾th, ½ 87 and ½, ¾th and ¼th, these lines were designated as D(25%), B(50%) and C(75%) 88 respectively. The line A measures the widest dimension of the medial tibial condyle and ab

89	is the distance between the lines A and B. It was also recorded if line A is anterior or
90	posterior to line B [Fig No. 4]. The medial tibial condyle aspect ratio was computed from
91	the formula A/AP × 100. [19]
92	Different sizes of the currently available (In Indian market) UKA tibial component are as
93	shown in Table 1 (in cm).
94	Optimal fit is defined as Anterior fit: Flush or <3 mm overhang, Posterior fit: Flush or <2
95	mm overhang, Medial fit: Flush or ≤2 mm and Lateral fit – Flush, no gap [20].
96	Statistical analysis was performed using Student's Independent <i>t</i> -test and Pearson's
97	correlation by using SPSS software for Windows (Version 20.0, SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA). A p-
98	value of <0.05 was considered significant. Pearson's correlation coefficient was
99	represented as r.
100	
101	<u>3.</u> <u>RESULTS</u>
102	The mean age of the cohort was 39.6 (SD: 15.9, range: 20 to 70 years) and included 66 male
103	and 34 female subjects. Average mediolateral (A) and Anteroposterior (AP) dimensions
104	were significantly higher among males when compared with females (p<0.001) [Table 2].
105	
106	3.1. Mediolateral dimensions [A, B(50%), C(75%) and D(25%)]
106 107	<u><b>3.1.</b></u> <b>Mediolateral dimensions [A, B(50%), C(75%) and D(25%)]</b> The line A was posterior to the line B (50%) in all the study subjects irrespective of gender.
106 107 108	<b><u>3.1.</u></b> Mediolateral dimensions [A, B(50%), C(75%) and D(25%)] The line A was posterior to the line B (50%) in all the study subjects irrespective of gender. The average distance between line A and B, i.e ab was 5.5 ± 2.6 mm and 5.5 ± 3.0 in males
106 107 108 109	3.1.Mediolateral dimensions [A, B(50%), C(75%) and D(25%)]The line A was posterior to the line B (50%) in all the study subjects irrespective of gender.The average distance between line A and B, i.e ab was $5.5 \pm 2.6$ mm and $5.5 \pm 3.0$ in malesand females, respectively [Table 2].
106 107 108 109 110	3.1. Mediolateral dimensions [A, B(50%), C(75%) and D(25%)] The line A was posterior to the line B (50%) in all the study subjects irrespective of gender. The average distance between line A and B, i.e ab was 5.5 ± 2.6 mm and 5.5 ± 3.0 in males and females, respectively [Table 2].

# 111 <u>3.2.</u> Comparison of the optimal anteroposterior and mediolateral fit of UKA tibial 112 components.

113 With the contemporary UKA tibial components, optimal anteroposterior fit (Anterior fit – Flush or <3 mm overhang, Posterior fit – Flush or <2 mm overhang) ranged from 66% (Link 114 115 Sled prosthesis – Metal backed) to 93% (Stryker Triathlon). Among those with optimal 116 anteroposterior fit, those with optimal mediolateral fit (Medial fit -- Flush to ≤2 mm 117 overhang, Lateral fit – Flush, no gap) ranged from 5% (Link Sled prosthesis – Metal backed) 118 to 37% (Zimmer Biomet Oxford). Overall, out of 100 knees, only 77 knees could have at 119 least one implant which could provide an optimal anteroposterior and mediolateral fit. The underhang was estimated to be from 17% (Biomet Oxford) to 61% (Link Sled prosthesis – 120 121 All poly) and >2 mm medial overhang ranged from 0 (Link Sled prosthesis – All poly) to 35% 122 (Zimmer Biomet Oxford) [Fig No. 5,6]. The optimal fit (both AP and ML), in males ranged from 7.6% (Link Sled – Metal back) to 123 124 34.8% (Zimmer Biomet Oxford) whereas in females ranged from 0% (Link Sled – Metal 125 back) to 55.9% (Smith and Nephew Journey) [Fig No. 7]. 126 Comparison of the medial tibial condyle aspect ratio (A/AP×100 in %) of 127 <u>3.3.</u> morphometric data with that of UKA tibial components. 128 129 Although there was positive correlation between anteroposterior and mediolateral 130 dimensions [Fig No. 8,9], we found that the morphometric data showed a progressive decline in the medial tibial condyle aspect ratio (A/AP×100) as the AP dimension increased 131

133

132

in all the study subjects.

#### 134 <u>4.</u> <u>DISCUSSION</u>

This study highlights the limitations in optimal tibial component sizes for UKA when used in Indian patients. Not a single implant could have been used with optimal fit in around one in four cases. In addition, out of the six implants studied, on an average no more than two implants could fit optimally for a patient when the optimal fit was possible.

139 The long-term survival results of UKA are encouraging [21] with designer surgeons reporting 98% survival at 10 years [22,23]. This procedure also provides quicker functional recovery, 140 an improved range of motion, and is more cost-effective than TKA [24]. The success of UKA 141 142 rely on the surgical technique, the post-operative physiotherapy and the design of prosthesis [25,26]. The match between resected surface of tibia and the tibial component is 143 crucial. In TKA, if there is a smaller size component on tibial side, there will be inadequate 144 support by the cortical rim and the implant can subside and loosen [27]. If it is too large, the 145 overhang will cause soft tissue irritation and pain. The amount of cortical rim support in UKA 146 147 is less than half of that available for TKA. Matching the shape and size of the implant to the resected surface is crucial especially in UKA to ensure optimal load transfer and this is 148 particularly the case for tibial implant as majority of mechanical complications with UKA are 149 150 tibia related. Although one can ascertain the best size that can fit a resected tibial plateau by using tibial baseplate templates intra-operatively, by that time the surgeon has 151 152 committed to using a particular company's implant for that particular case. It is difficult to 153 intra-operatively change to use of another company's implant. Preoperative CT scans are not routinely performed in patients undergoing UKA. It is therefore difficult if not impossible 154 to predict actual tibial size and shape at the site of desired resection without the aid of a 155 156 cross-sectional imaging and this can lead to intra- and/or post-operative complications.

Most of the UKA implants are designed based on anthropometric measurements of 158 159 Caucasian population. As compared with the western population, Indians have smaller built 160 and shorter stature [15]. There is lack of literature on the fit of different designs of the tibial 161 component for UKA, based on the morphometry of medial tibial condyle in the Indian population. The shape of the components is as critical as the anteroposterior and 162 mediolateral dimensions to match the resected surface. The tibial component rotation was 163 matched to that of femur component by using epicondylar axis of femur as reference while 164 165 measuring the length of mediolateral dimension [28]. The assessment of shape of medial 166 tibial condyle was done by measuring mediolateral dimensions at four different points as described by Surendran S et al. [18]. 167

168

The widest part in mediolateral plane was present in the posterior half of the medial tibial 169 170 condyle and the mediiolateral width measured in posterior half was more than the one measured in anterior half of the medial tibial condyle in all the study subjects. This supports 171 172 the hypothesis by Surendran S et al [18] that long hours of flexion attitude of knees during 173 various activities of daily routine might create more stress on posterior half of the condyles. 174 This higher stress, as per Wolff's law stimulates hypertrophy in mediolateral dimension in 175 the posterior half of tibial condyles in Indian population. This suggests asymmetry in the 176 anterior and posterior halves of the medial tibial condyles. Hence the design having an antero-posterior asymmetry with the widest mediolateral width present in the posterior 177 half of the tibial component is suitable for our population. 178

Our results are similar to studies carried out in other non-Caucasian populations. Cheng et al 179 assessed the tibial fit in Chinese population for five different UKA implant designs [29]. The 180 181 authors analyzed 3D-CT of 172 normal knees obtained from 94 males and 78 females. They 182 concluded that the majority of the prostheses currently employed in China showed a tendency towards over sizing in the widest dimension of the tibia. Surendran S et al 183 184 conducted a similar study in the Korean population [18]. They assessed 50 male and 50 185 female Korean 200 cadaveric knees using 3D-CT and examined tibial fit for 5 different UKA designs. The authors noticed the tendency towards mediolateral overhang. Another author 186 187 Koh et al, assessed the misfit of existing UKA designs in Korean population [30]. The author 188 concluded that frequency of having smaller medial tibial condylar dimensions were more in 189 women than in men and there was mediolateral overhang in three out of five prostheses in 190 the medial tibial condyles, leading to a mediolateral overhang when trying to optimize the 191 AP coverage. A decrease in the medial tibial condyle aspect ratio with an increasing AP 192 dimension was found for both the male and female population. Lastly Küçükdurmaz et al 193 assessed knee MRIs of 260 Turkish patients (150 women and 110 men) to establish the fit 194 for four different UKA designs [31]. The authors concluded that there are significant 195 differences between the anthropometric measurements of Turkish tibiae when compared 196 with Western population. All these above mentioned studies used tibial resection level 197 same as used in the current study (6 mm below the upper MTC) and reached similar 198 conclusions to the current study in Indian population.

The strengths of this study include use of CT scan data for precision, making sure that soft tissues didn't interfere in measurements. None of the patients suffered from knee arthritis or any other pathology which could potentially have affected the size and shape of proximal tibia. The limitations of our study included smaller sample size, height of the patient was not

recorded so the correlation of height and morphometry of MTC couldn't be opined, 203 measurement of MTC morphometry only at one level (6 mm below articular surface) and 204 205 using guidance from one manufacturer (Zimmer Biomet) only to define radiological criteria 206 for optimal fit [20]. No other manufacturer guidance to define radiological criteria for 207 optimal fit of that particular prostheses design was available in the public domain. We measured the dimensions of the medial tibial condyle at 6 mm below the articular surface 208 209 with 7° posterior slope. This is a conservative tibial resection and therefore is likely to be the 210 best-case scenario. If indeed, the tibial cut is more distal, the bone shape and dimensions 211 will vary further and make it more difficult to fit even the smallest tibial component without 212 a risk of posterior cortical blow out or significant anterior and/or medial overhang. Further studies are recommended to analyze morphometric data at different levels of cutting 213 214 thickness and angles of slope.

215

#### 216 <u>5.</u> <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>

Currently available UKA implants do not provide optimal tibial fit in nearly 25% of Indian
patients. A surgeon needs to be aware of these limitations of existing implants when
considering UKA.

220

#### 221 <u>6.</u> DECLARATIONS

222 <u>6.1.</u> **Funding:** No funds, grants, or other support was received.

223 **<u>6.2.</u>** Conflict of interest: Author C reports grants and personal fees from Zimmer

Biomet, personal fees from Smith and Nephew, grants and personal fees from

225 Depuy Synthes, personal fees from Medacta International, personal fees from

- 226 Meril Life, grants from Invibio, grants and personal fees from GSK, personal fees 227 from JRI, outside the submitted work.
- <u>6.3.</u> Availability of data and material: The data generated during and analyzed
   during the current study are available from the corresponding author on
   request.
- 231

## 232 <u>7.</u> <u>REFERENCES</u>

- 1. Liddle AD, Pandit HG, Jenkins C, et al. (2014) Valgus subsidence of the tibial
- 234 component in cementless Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement. Bone Joint
- 235 Journal 96-B (3) 345-349.
- 236 2. Chau R, Gulati A, Pandit H, et al. (2009) Component overhang and Unicompartmental
  237 Knee Replacement Does it matter? The Knee 16-5:310-313.
- 238 3. Pandit H, Murray DW, Dodd CA, et al. (2007) Medial Tibial Plateau Fracture and the
- 239 Oxford Unicompartmental Knee. Orthopaedics 30(5 Suppl): 28-31.
- 240 4. Ali AM, S. D. S. Newman, P. A. Hooper, C. M. Davies, J. P. Cobb. (2017) The effect of
- implant position on bone strain following lateral unicompartmental knee arthroplasty.
- A Biomechanical Model Using Digital Image Correlation. Bone Joint Res 6(8):522-529.
- 243 5. Pegg EC, J. Walter, S.J. Mellon, H.G. Pandit, et al. (2013) Evaluation of factors
- 244 affecting tibial bone strain after unicompartmental knee replacement. J Orthop Res
- 245 31(5): 821-828.

246	6. Liddle AD, Judge A, Pandit H, Murray DW. (2014) Determinants of revision and
247	functional outcome following unicompartmental knee replacement. Osteoarthritis
248	Cartilage 22(9):1241-1250.
249	7. Murray DW, Liddle AD, Dodd CA, Pandit H. (2015) Unicompartmental knee
250	arthroplasty: is the glass half full or half empty? Bone Joint J 97-B(12):1732.
251	8. Hamilton TW, Rizkalla JM, Kontochristos L, et al. (2017) The Interaction of Caseload
252	and Usage in Determining Outcomes of Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: A Meta-
253	Analysis. J Arthroplasty 32(10):3228-3237.e2.
254	9. Kim TK, Phillips M, Bhandari M, Watson J, Malhotra R. (2017) What differences in
255	morphologic features of the knee exist among patients of various races? A systematic
256	review. Clin Orthop Relat Res 475(1):170-182.
257	10. Qian-Li Ma, Lipman JD, Cheng CK, Wang XN, Zhang YY, You B. (2017) A comparison
258	between Chinese and Caucasian 3-dimensional bony morphometry in presimulated and
259	postsimulated osteotomy for total knee arthroplasty, J Arthroplasty 32(9):2878-2886.
260	11. Gurava Reddy AV, Sankineani SR, Agrawal R, Thayi C. (2020) Comparative study of
261	existing knee prosthesis with anthropometry of Indian patients and other races, a
262	computer tomography 3D reconstruction-based study. J Clin Orthop Trauma 11(Suppl
263	2):5228-5233.
264	12. Kwak DS, Surendran S, Pengatteeri YH, et al. (2007) Morphometry of the proximal
265	tibia to design the tibial component of total knee arthroplasty for the Korean
266	population. Knee 14(4):295-300.

267	13. Meier M, Zingde S, Best R, Schroeder L, Beckmann J, Steinert AF. (2020) High
268	variability of proximal tibial asymmetry and slope: A CT data analysis of 15,807
269	osteoarthritic knees before TKA. Knee Surg Sports Tramatol Arthrosc 28(4):1105-1112.
270	14. Dai Y, Scuderi GR, Bischoff JE, Bertin K, Tarabichi S, Rajgopal A. (2014) Anatomic
271	tibial component design can increase tibial coverage and rotational alignment accuracy:
272	A comparison of six contemporary designs. Knee Surg Sports Tramatol Arthrosc
273	22(12):2911-23.
274	15. Vaidya SV, Ranawat CS, Aroojis A, Laud NS. (2000) Anthropometric measurements
275	to design total knee prostheses for the Indian population. J Arthroplasty 15:79–85.
276	16. Gandhi S, Singla RK, Kullar JS, Suri RK, Mehta V. (2014) Morphometric analysis of
277	upper end of tibia. J Clin Diagn Res 8(8):AC10-3.
278	17. Malhotra R, Gaba S, Wahal N, Kumar V, Srivastava DN, Pandit H. (2019) Femoral
279	Component Sizing in Oxford Unicompartmental Knee Replacement: Existing Guidelines
280	Do Not Work for Indian Patients. J Knee Surg 32(3):205-210, 2019.
281	18 Surendran S, Kwak DS, Lee UY, Park SE, Gopinathan P, Han SH, Han CW. (2007)
282	Anthropometry of the medial tibial condyle to design the tibial component for
283	unicondylar knee arthroplasty for the Korean population. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol
284	Arthrosc 15:436–442.
285	19. Hitt K, Shurman JR II, Greene K, McCarthy J, Moskal J, Hoeman T, Mont MA. (2003)
286	Anthropometric measurements of the human knee: correlation to the sizing of current
287	knee arthroplasty systems. J Bone Joint Surg Am 85:115122.

- 288 20. Murray DW, et al. (1999) Oxford Unicompartmental knee: manual of the surgical
  289 technique. Biomet UK Ltd, Bridgend. 1-40.
- 290 21. Deshmukh RV, Scott RD. (2001) Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: long-term
- results. Clin Orthop Relat Res 392:272–278.
- 292 22. Berger RA, Nedeff DD, Barden RM, Sheinkop MM, Jacobs JJ, Rosenberg AG, Galante
- JO. (1999) Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: Clinical experience at 6- to 10-year
- followup. Clin Orthop 367:50–60.
- 295 23. Murray DW, Goodfellow JW, O'Connor. (1998) The oxford medial
- unicompartmental arthroplasty: a ten-year survival study. J Bone Joint Surg Br 80:983–
  989.
- 237 303.
- 298 24. Carr A, Keyes G, Miller R, O'Connor J, Goodfellow J. (1993) Medial
- 299 unicompartmental arthroplasty: a survival study of the Oxford meniscal knee. Clin
- 300 Orthop 295:205–213.
- 301 25. NIH Consensus Statement on total knee replacement. NIH Consens State Sci
- 302 Statements 20:1-34, 2003.
- 30326. Choong PF, Dowsey MM. (2011) Update in surgery for osteoarthritis of the knee. Int
- 304 J Rheum Dis 14:167-74.
- 305 27. Nielsen PT, Hansen EB, Rechnagel K. (1992) Cementless total knee arthroplasty in
- 306 unselected cases of osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis: A 3-year follow-up study of
- 307 103 cases. J Arthroplasty 7:137-43.

308	28. Uehara K, Kadoya Y, Kobayashi A, Ohashi H, Yamano Y. (2002) Anthropometry of the
309	proximal tibia to design a total knee prosthesis for the Japanese population. J
310	Arthroplasty 17:1028–1032.
311	29. Cheng FB, Ji XF, Zheng WX, Lai Y, Cheng KL, Feng JC, Li YQ. Use of anthropometric
312	data from the medial tibial and femoral condyles to design unicondylar knee prostheses
313	in the Chinese population. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2010 Mar;18(3):352-8.
314	doi: 10.1007/s00167-009-0876-z. Epub 2009 Jul 24. PMID: 19629438.
315	30. Koh YG, Nam JH, Chung HS, Lee HY, Kang KT. Morphologic difference and size
316	mismatch in the medial and lateral tibial condyles exist with respect to gender for
317	unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in the Korean population. Knee Surg Sports
318	Traumatol Arthrosc. 2020 Jun;28(6):1789-1796. doi: 10.1007/s00167-019-05600-5.
319	Epub 2019 Jul 1. PMID: 31263927.
320	31. Küçükdurmaz F, Tuncay I, Elmadağ M, Tunçer N. Morphometry of the medial tibial
321	plateau in Turkish knees: correlation to the current tibial components of
322	unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc. 2014;48(2):147-51.
323	doi: 10.3944/AOTT.2014.3006. PMID: 24747621.
324	

# 325 <u>8.</u> Figure legends

- 326 **Fig No. 1:** Coronal CT showing axis parallel and collinear to the clinical
- 327 epicondylar axis of femur mediolaterally.

- 328 Fig No. 2: Sagittal CT showing axis passing through upper tibial cut of 6 mm
- 329 thickness, perpendicular to the mechanical axis of the tibia with 7° posterior
- 330 slope.
- **Fig No. 3:** Axial section obtained for measurements of different dimensions.
- 332 Fig No. 4: Anteroposterior and mediolateral dimensions at well-defined points
- 333 Fig No. 5: Chart comparing optimal anteroposterior fit or no fit (in
- 334 percentage) of UKA tibial components with respect to morphometric data.
- 335 Fig No. 6: Chart comparing optimal anteroposterior fit and optimal
- 336 mediolateral fit, underhang or >2 mm overhang (in percentage) of UKA tibial
- 337 components with respect to morphometric data.
- 338 Fig No. 7: Chart comparing the Optimal fit (both anteroposteriorly and
- mediolaterally) of UKA tibial components in male and female subjects.
- 340 Fig No. 8: Scatter plot of anteroposterior against mediolateral dimensions
- 341 (in cm) of male subjects. Coefficient of correlation is 0.72 (r>0.7),
- 342 suggestive of High positive correlation between the two dimensions.
- 343 Fig No. 9: Scatter plot of anteroposterior against mediolateral dimensions
- 344 (in cm) of female subjects. Coefficient of correlation is 0.57 (r>0.5),
- 345 suggestive of Moderate positive correlation between the two dimensions.