THE EFFECT OF TOTAL KNEE ARTHROPLASTY ON BIOMECHANICAL ASYMMETRY AND KNEE STRENGTH IN SUBJECTS WITH AND WITHOUT BACK PAIN

¹Naira H. Campbell-Kyureghyan, PhD, David R. Burnett, MS, Robert V. Topp, PhD, Peter M. Quesada, PhD University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292 USA; ¹email: <u>nhcamp01@louisville.edu</u>

INTRODUCTION

Studies estimate that 54 million Americans suffer from low back pain (LBP) [1] and 21 million have osteoarthritis (OA), which commonly affects the weight bearing joints of the lower extremities [2]. Total knee arthroplasty (TKA) is a commonly used surgical intervention for knee OA in which the OA diseased joint is replaced by a prostetic device. To date, limited research exists on the relationship between TKA and LBP, and biomechanical relationships between the development and progression of knee OA and LBP are unclear. Specific symptoms of LBP that are suspected to be risk factors for knee OA resulting in TKA include strength and biomechancial asymmetry. The objective of this study is to quantify knee strength and biomechanical asymmetry among TKA patients either with or without LBP.

METHODS

8 subjects (2 male, 6 female) who had reported LBP were included in Group 1 and 7 subjects (2 male, 5 female) who did not report LBP were included in Group 2. All subjects have undergone TKA and signed the IRB approved informed consent form. Data collection occurred 8 weeks prior to and 12 weeks after TKA (T1 & T4, respectively). Reflective markers were placed in a modified Helen Hayes arrangement and marker spatial coordinates were obtained at 100 Hz with a Hawk Motion Tracking System (Motion Analysis Corp.). A force plate (Bertec Corp.) simultaneously recorded ground reaction force (GRF) at 1000 Hz. Subjects performed a single sit-to-stand repetition with the non-operated leg on the force plate followed by a 30 second trial with the operated leg on the force plate. Knee strength measurements were subsequently obtained using a Biodex Isokinetic Dynamometer. Five outcome measures (Table 1) are presented in this paper. Differences between these outcome measures at T1 and T4 were determined using student t-tests with p < 0.05 considered to be significant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GRF SI values for Group 2 increased significantly (p=0.02) from 0.79 at T1 to 0.88 at T4 (Fig 1b). Improvements in GRF SI between T1 and T4 were not seen for Group 1 (GRF SI = 0.88). These results indicate that subjects in Group 1 may have developed certain compensatory mechanisms to minimize pain in the surgically repaired knee as well as the lower back, and these compensatory methods were still apparent even after TKA.

For Group 2, PTBW significantly increased by 104% for the

non-operated leg and by 38.9% for the operated leg (p = 0.01 & 0.02, respectively). In Group 1 however, PTBW increased by only 14.9% for the non-operated leg and 4.5% for the operated leg (Fig 1a). This finding is in agreement with a previous study that concluded that chronic LBP or reduced endurance of the spinal musculature was associated with significant inhibition of knee extensors [3].



Figure 1: a) Comparison of PTBW during knee extension; b) Comparison of GRF SI during sit-to-stand

Although not statistically significant, subjects in both groups displayed smaller or comparable values for LSD, MLPS, and MLTL at T4 compared to T1 (Table 2). Additionally, subjects without LBP exhibited less trunk kinematic asymmetry at both sessions than subjects with LBP.

 Table 2: Average trunk kinematic parameters for Group 1

 and Group 2 at T1 and T4

| | LSD (mm) | | MLPS (mm) | | MLTL (°) | |
|----|----------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|------|
| | G1 | G2 | G1 | G2 | G1 | G2 |
| T1 | 23.7 | 8.57 | 35.05 | 28.64 | 5.17 | 3.08 |
| T4 | 17.2 | 10.59 | 32.14 | 26.90 | 4.37 | 3.84 |
| р | 0.22 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.39 | 0.15 | 0.15 |

CONCLUSIONS

Quantitative biomechanical data collected 8 weeks prior to and 12 weeks after TKA was evaluated for subjects with and without LBP. TKA patients without LBP showed significant improvements in knee extension strength and biomechanical asymmetry during sit-to-stand tasks. Similar trends were not found in a group of TKA patients with LBP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by a grant from the NIH (NINR) R01 R008135-01A2

REFERENCES

e 1. Deyo R, et al., *Spine*. **31**: 2724-2727, 2006.

2. Felson DT, et al., Arth & Rheum. 41: 1343-1355, 1998.

Table 1: Description of outcome measures used in the study3. Suter E, et al., Spine. 26:361-366, 2001.

| Outcome Measure | Description | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Vertical GRF Symmetry Index (SI) | Peak GRF operated leg/peak GRF non-operated leg | | |
| Lateral Seat Displacement | Shift between the centers of the shoulders and ankles while seated prior to sit-stand | | |
| Maximum Lateral Pelvic Shift (MLPS) | Maximum displacement between the centers of the pelvis and ankles during sit-stand | | |
| Maximum Lateral Trunk Lean (MLTL) | Angular displacement between the centers of the shoulders and ankles during sit-stand | | |
| Peak Torque/Body Weight (PTBW) | Knee flexion and extension strength measures for the operated and non-operated leg | | |