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A gyroscope-based system for intraoperative measurement of tibia coronal plane alignment in total knee arthroplasty

Michael A. Kokko, Ryan M. Chapman, Martin W. Roche, Douglas W. Van Citters

Abstract
Coronal plane alignment in total knee arthroplasty (TKA) is an important predictor of clinical outcomes including patient satisfaction and device longevity. Radiography and computer assisted navigation are the two primary technologies currently available to surgeons for intraoperative assessment of alignment; however, neither is particularly well-suited for use in this increasingly high volume procedure. Herein we propose a novel gyroscope-based instrument for intraoperative validation of tibia coronal plane alignment, and provide initial analytical and experimental performance assessments. The gyroscope-based alignment estimate is derived from simplified joint geometry and verified experimentally using a custom tibial trial insert containing a consumer-grade inertial measurement unit (IMU). Average accuracy of the gyroscope-based tibia coronal angle estimate was found to be within ±1° in mechanical leg jig and cadaver testing. These results indicate that the proposed gyroscope-based method shows promise for low cost, accurate intraoperative validation of limb alignment in TKA patients. Integrating IMU technology into the TKA surgical workflow via low-cost instrumentation will enable surgeons to easily validate implant alignment in real time, thereby reducing cost, operating room time, and future revision burden.

1. Introduction
Total joint arthroplasty (TJA) is one of the most effective medical interventions of the modern age; its high rates of patient satisfaction reflecting the degree to which knee and hip prostheses have enabled aging populations to overcome the debilitating pain associated with osteoarthritis [1–5]. Total knee arthroplasty (TKA) alone is among the most commonly performed surgical procedures in the United States with over 750,000 cases logged each year, and 1–2 million expected annually by 2030 [6–8]. While patients undergoing TKA generally report satisfaction with their prostheses, the high case volume underscores the importance of minimizing complications, and by extension, the need for costly revision surgeries. With 200,000 TKA revisions expected annually by 2030, improved accuracy in placing primary components may reduce the TKA revision burden as malalignment is known to exacerbate many of the conditions for which revision is indicated [2–5,9,10].

Surgeons have historically aimed to achieve neutral post-operative mechanical alignment of the lower extremity (i.e. planar resections made normal to the hip-knee axis on the femur, and the knee-ankle axis on the tibia as shown in Fig. 1), employing a variety of techniques including preoperative radiography and intramedullary or extra-medullary guides to ensure a natural distribution of load across the condyles [11–15]. Much of the orthopedic literature supports mechanical alignment where resections are made within ±3° of the appropriate neutral axes (most critically in the coronal plane) [16]. Recent attempts to further improve patient outcomes have centered on kinematic alignment, in which the articulation of the postoperative knee is tuned to closely match that of each patient’s pre-arthritic anatomy [11,12,15]. While much effort has been directed toward rectifying the various approaches to TKA alignment [11,12,14–21], in all cases surgeons are concerned with the angular accuracy of the distal femur and proximal tibia resections.

Several resection planning and validation tools are currently available, each with its own advantages and limitations [22–27]. At the most basic level, surgical cutting jigs can be configured to guide a bone saw to produce a planar resection surface on either the distal femur or the
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Orthopedic device manufacturers have recently begun to introduce micro-electromechanical systems (MEMS) sensors – typically accelerometers – to identify the orientation of surgical resection planes. Although such devices have demonstrated accuracy to ±2° or ±3° while decreasing procedure lengths compared to traditional computer navigation, the hardware can be cumbersome and the accelerometer-based commercial systems often require rapid or jerky intraoperative manipulations of the leg about the hip joint to achieve sufficiently high linear acceleration for analysis at the knee [45–52]. Thus, there remains a distinct need within the orthopedic community for efficient, cost-effective, user-friendly, and analytically sound methods of quantifying intraoperative TKA alignment.

This work develops a geometric foundation for gyroscope-based assessment of tibial coronal plane alignment, setting the stage for a similarly-implemented multiplane alignment system. The proposed method and evaluation techniques are outlined in Section 2, with a derivation from first principles and a more complete model for error analysis presented in Section 3. Section 4 reviews preliminary experimental results obtained using the prototype device in simulation, with a mechanical leg jig, and with a cadaver model. A discussion of the observed results and future applications follows in Section 5, with a conclusion in Section 6.

2. Materials and methods

The proposed method for validating tibial alignment requires temporarily installing a specialized trial bearing instrumented with a MEMS rate gyroscope on the tibial tray in place of the final polyethylene component. While elevating the leg comfortably (e.g. 30°) above the surgical table, the surgeon performs a series of internal/external rotations about the hip-ankle axis (Fig. 2). This maneuver need not be jerky; even small rotations of amplitude 15–20° at approximately 1 Hz produce reasonable angular velocity streams ωx and ωz from which the tibia coronal angle can be calculated as

\[
\theta_{\text{cor}} = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\omega_z}{\omega_x}\right) - \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\omega_y}{\omega_z}\sin(\theta_{\text{cor}} - \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\omega_x}{\omega_y}\right))\right)
\]

where \(\omega_x\) and \(\omega_z\) are the components \(x\) and \(z\) components of angular velocity, \(\omega_y\) and \(\omega_z\) are the lengths of the femur and tibia, and \(\theta_{\text{cor}}\) is the coronal angle of the distal femur resection plane. This equation is derived from a simplified planar model of the lower extremity and described in more detail in Section 3.1.

Orthopedic device manufacturers have recently begun to introduce the next generation of surgical resection planning and validation tools based on strapdown inertial measurement units (IMUs) which have long been used for nonsurgical measurement of human joint kinematics [41–44]. Intraoperatively, these new devices collect data from proximal tibia whose orientation in space is fully specified with respect to the three standard anatomical planes (sagittal, coronal, and transverse). When indicated, resections made by this method can be validated by intraoperative plain radiography or fluoroscopy; however, these methods add additional time and cost to the procedure, and expose both the patient and the surgical team to ionizing radiation. Moreover, these traditional methods are relatively inaccurate. Teter et al. showed that while 92% of resections made via an extramedullary cutting system fall within ±4° of the target coronal angle, they fail to achieve the widely accepted target of ±3° [16,23]. As a result, some surgeons have turned to optical (e.g. infrared) or electromagnetic (e.g. radio frequency) navigation to achieve accuracy better than ±1° [28]. Increased operating room (OR) time for registration and planning as well as high capital costs are, however, distinct barriers to widespread adoption [22,24–27,29–37]. Robot-assisted knee surgery also provides an opportunity for both specifying and validating resection plane orientation, offering tibial alignment accuracy on the order of ±1°, but like tracked navigation requiring significant capital investment and imposing a learning curve on OR time [38–40].

Fig. 1. Left: Lower extremity in neutral mechanical alignment \(\theta_{\text{f,cor}} = \theta_{\text{t,cor}} = 0\) with the distal femur and proximal tibia resections (dashed lines) taken in the transverse plane normal to the mechanical axis of the leg (solid line). Right: Coronal leg geometry from which (1) is derived. The IMU device is aligned with the \(B_{\text{xyz}}\) coordinate system. This model assumes neutral alignment in the sagittal plane and no transverse rotation of the tibial component. The black lines of lengths \(l_f\) and \(l_t\) represent the mechanical (rather than anatomical) axes of the femur and tibia.

Fig. 2. A prototype OrthoSensor VERASENSE™ tibial trial housing is shown outfitted with an ST LSM6DS3 IMU evaluation board. With the instrumented trial temporarily placed in the joint, the leg is elevated and gently rotated about the hip-ankle axis. Coronal alignment of the proximal tibia resection plane is estimated from gyroscope output.
2.1. In silico planar sensitivity analysis

Of the five parameters included in (1), $\omega_x$ and $\omega_y$ are obtained directly from the IMU, $\ell_1$ and $\ell_2$ must be measured by the surgical team or estimated from imaging, and $\theta_{\text{cor}}$ is assumed to be known or measured separately. To assess the sensitivity of $\theta_{\text{cor}}$ to perturbations (e.g. measurement error) in each of these five parameters, a linear approximation of (1) was obtained by computing partial derivatives and evaluating each about a nominal operating point. The absolute expected contribution to overall error associated with each parameter was computed from the product of the partial derivative and the expected maximum parameter deviation. We assumed reasonable deviations based on typical gyroscope nonlinearity ($\Delta \omega_x = \Delta \omega_y = 1^\circ/s$), manual measurements of bone lengths between anatomical landmarks ($\Delta \ell_1 = \Delta \ell_2 = 1\text{cm}$), and the expected accuracy of the femur coronal cut ($\Delta \theta_{\text{cor}} = 2^\circ$) [53].

Using nominal parameter values consistent with our benchtop mechanical leg model, we estimated an upper bound for the instantaneous absolute error in (1) given a sinusoidal leg rotation of amplitude $120^\circ/s$ and frequency $1\text{ Hz}$ as observed during cadaver experimentation. This analysis informed our choice of method for computing $\tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\Delta \omega_x}{\Delta \omega_y} \right)$ during benchtop and cadaver evaluations.

2.2. In silico 3D sensitivity analysis

In addition to examining the effects of sensor noise and other measurement errors on the $\theta_{\text{cor}}$ estimate in (1), it is also important to understand the expected error contributions from sagittal and transverse plane angular misalignment, as well as from joint flexion or flexion contracture. We therefore constructed a more complete geometrical model of the relevant anatomy, detailed in Section 3.2, which relates a known limb state to the expected gyroscopic output and $\theta_{\text{cor}}$ estimate. The forward model was evaluated across a clinically-relevant range of absolute error in (1) given a sinusoidal leg rotation of amplitude $120^\circ/s$ and frequency $1\text{ Hz}$ as observed during cadaver experimentation. This analysis informed our choice of method for computing $\tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\Delta \omega_x}{\Delta \omega_y} \right)$ at roughly $30^\circ$ as would be expected in the OR.

2.3. Experimental data collection system

Four prototypes of the proposed instrumented tibial trial (Fig. 2) were fabricated from VERASENSE™ housings (OrthoSensor Inc., Dania Beach, FL) and ST LSM6DS3 IMU development boards (ST Microelectronics, Geneva, Switzerland). Angular rate data from each device were captured using an ATxmega256A3BU microcontroller (Atmel Corporation, San Jose, CA) running at $16\text{ MHz}$ via a tethered SPI connection. Gyroscope output was recorded at $100\text{ Hz}$, timestamped by the microcontroller upon collection, then passed via RS232 to a laptop and processed through a series of custom MATLAB scripts (MathWorks, Natick, MA). Each prototype device was calibrated to correct for variations in sensitivity and misalignment of gyroscopic axes within the VERASENSE™ housing using a purpose-built rotational fixture with synchronized optical encoder output.

2.4. In vitro leg jig evaluation

Laboratory assessment of the gyroscopic-based tibial coronal plane alignment procedure described in Section 2 was performed using a mechanical “leg jig” model of knee arthroplasty as shown in Fig. 3. This simulated left leg comprises a ball and socket hip joint, a TKA femoral component, aluminum femur and tibia rods, and graduated, lockable articulation points for adjusting the femur and tibia coronal angles. The joint line rotation maneuver was performed repeatedly (ten trials per configuration) with the prototype device installed between the femur and tibia, for tibia coronal angles between $-4.4^\circ$ (varus) and $+4.4^\circ$ (valgus). Rotations were first performed with fixed hip and ankle pivot points to constrain motion to the desired axis, and then again with the leg elevated at roughly $30^\circ$ as would be expected in the OR.

![Fig. 3. Experimental setup for bench-top assessment of the proposed tibia coronal angle estimation procedure.](image-url)
In all testing, the knee joint was compressed with cable ties to prevent parasitic rotation of the instrumentation, and the femur coronal angle was held constant at $+1^\circ$ varus (measured using digital photography). The true tibia coronal angle $\theta_{\text{cor}}$ is reported as the leg jig tibia setting scaled by a factor of 0.88 which accounts for the 4.25 cm offset between the pivot point of the coronal adjustment and the knee joint.

2.5. Ex vivo cadaver evaluation

Accuracy of the gyroscope-based tibia alignment estimate was also assessed with the prototype instrumented trial placed in the left leg of a 51-year-old cadaveric specimen with no known or observed orthopedic abnormalities. A board-certified orthopedic surgeon prepared the specimen following standard TKA protocol, then inserted the prototype device on the tibial tray in place of the polyethylene bearing (Fig. 4). Throughout testing the femur was maintained at $-2^\circ$ (valgus) in the coronal plane and $+2^\circ$ (flexion) in the sagittal plane. The tibia was cut progressively from $-2^\circ$ (varus) through $0^\circ$ (neutral) to $+2^\circ$ (valgus) in the coronal plane. The surgeon and an assistant with significant orthopedic experience each performed 2–3 trials of the joint line rotation maneuver in every configuration, and the tibia coronal angle computed based on gyroscope output was compared against ground truth measurements made with an optically-tracked Stryker TKA navigation system (Stryker Corporation, Kalamazoo, MI).

3. Calculation

In this section we first develop (1) directly from simplified coronal plane geometry, and then construct a three dimensional forward model to analyze the effects of sagittal and transverse plane misalignment. Sign conventions with respect to distal femur and proximal tibia angles are defined lower extremity presented in Fig. 1 gives $\theta_{\text{cor}} = \theta_{\text{gyro}} - \beta$. Solving for $\beta$ using the law of sines yields a direct expression for the tibia coronal angle:

$$\theta_{\text{cor}} = \theta_{\text{gyro}} - \sin^{-1}\left(\frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} \sin(\theta_{\text{cor}} - \theta_{\text{gyro}})\right)$$

(3)

Combining (2) and (3) produces (1) which expresses the tibial coronal alignment estimate $\hat{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$ in terms of gyroscope measurements $\omega_0$ and $\omega_x$.

3.2. Forward measurement model

The femoral side of the forward model starts with a neutral distal femur represented by a rectangular prism extending from the hip ($O_{A\text{xyz}}$) in the direction of the femur mechanical axis (Fig. 6, left). Once cut, the orientation of the resection plane can be described in terms of two angles: $\theta_{\text{car}}$, the angle formed between the femur mediolateral axis and its projection on the resection plane; and $\theta_{\text{sag}}$, the angle formed between the femur anteroposterior axis and its projection. Although the two vectors that represent these axis projections are not necessarily orthogonal, they do form a basis for the resection plane and their cross product identifies its normal direction.

The resection plane normal as $A_{0x}$ (Fig. 6), a right-handed coordinate system $A_{0y0z}$ is established by placing orthogonal vectors $A_{0x}$ and $A_{0y}$ in the resection plane such that $A_{0x}$ also lies within the femur sagittal plane. The $A_{0y0z}$ coordinate frame is then defined by rotating $A_{0y0z}$ by $\theta_{\text{gyro}}$ about $A_{0x}$ through $A_{0y}$ to simulate rotational misalignment of the femoral component. Finally, a convex, semi-cylindrical articular surface with radius $r_{\text{art}}$ is affixed to $A_{0y0z}$ such that the cylinder axis is parallel to $A_{0x}$. This procedure fully determines the orientation of $A_{0y0z}$, and its position in space is given by a displacement $\ell_1$ in the $-O_x$ direction from the origin of the $O_{A\text{xyz}}$ (hip) frame. Although in practice resection of the distal femur typically requires multiple oblique cuts, the pose of the femoral component is sufficiently described by this planar approximation.

The Tibial side of the forward model proceeds identically to the femoral development up to the point of establishing $B_{0y0z}$ on the proximal tibia resection plane (Fig. 6, right). Note that the ankle is known to be at a distance $\ell_2$ along the femur mechanical axis from the center of the resected surface, so its position can be expressed in $B_{0y0z}$ by a simple rigid transformation. A concave articular surface, otherwise equivalent to that applied to the femur, is attached to $B_{0y0z}$, then the two articular surfaces are aligned such that $B_{0y0z}$ coincides with $A_{0y0z}$. At this stage $B_{0y0z}$ is relabeled $B_{y0z}$ for clarity.

As illustrated in Fig. 7, we next rotate the tibia model about the mated cylindrical surface (i.e. articulate the knee) by an angle $\theta_{\text{gyro}}$ that makes the line from the origin of the $B$ frame to the ankle (tibia mechanical axis) parallel to the $O_x$ – $O_y$ (femur coronal) plane. The $B$ frame is again relabeled $B_{y0z}$ at this stage as it now represents the pose of the IMU during the intraoperative joint line rotation maneuver.

The final step in construction of the forward model is expressing the joint line vector ($O_{y0z}$ to ankle) in the sensor $B_{y0z}$ frame. The ratio of the joint line component along $B_{y0z}$ to that along $B_{y0z}$ replaces the argument of the arctangent term in (2) which, when combined with (3), yields the

Fig. 4. Experimental setup for cadaver model assessment of the proposed tibia coronal angle estimation procedure.
expected estimate of $\hat{\theta}_t^{\text{cor}}$ from (1) given the coronal, sagittal, and transverse angles, long bone lengths, and articulation radius from which the model was constructed. The expected error in the tibia coronal angle estimate is calculated as the difference between $\hat{\theta}_t^{\text{cor}}$ and the value of $\theta_t^{\text{cor}}$ specified in construction of the forward model.
4. Experimental testing and results

4.1. Planar sensitivity analysis

Simulated sinusoidal leg rotations (Fig. 8) reveal the time evolution of the error contributed to $\hat{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$ by variations in each of the parameters of (1). The sum of absolute error (SAE) metric serves as a “worst case” upper bound on noise-related error in $\hat{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$, and is minimized to 3.55° at mid-rotation as angular speed peaks. The accuracy of the proposed procedure is largely driven by the accuracy of the femur coronal angle measurement, whose variations translate almost directly into tibia coronal angle measurement error ($\frac{\Delta \theta_{\text{cor}}}{\Delta \theta_{\text{cor}}}$ = 1.17) for the assumed geometry. Erroneous bone length measurements, on the other hand, are much less consequential ($\frac{\Delta \theta_{\text{cor}}}{\Delta \theta_{\text{cor}}}$ = 0.10). The peaks in SAE at low angular speed are driven by gyroscope noise, and could in theory be avoided by estimating $\hat{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$ only when the magnitude of angular velocity exceeds some threshold. In benchtop and cadaver testing, rather than computing (1) in a pointwise fashion and discarding low speed data, we computed the argument of the arctangent term in (2) as the slope of a regression line between $\omega_x$ and $\omega_z$ for all maneuver data where $\omega_x$ is the dependent and $\omega_z$ the independent variable. Low speed gyroscope errors have relatively little effect on this regression due to the symmetric nature of the maneuver, and a single value of $\hat{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$ is returned irrespective of the number of oscillations performed.

4.2. 3D sensitivity analysis

Fig. 9 illustrates how clinically relevant coronal, sagittal, and transverse angular misalignments of the tibial tray translate into error in $\hat{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$. Again assuming a 41.1 cm femur and a 35.0 cm tibia with a mechanically neutral femur, restricting the sagittal misalignment to ±10° and the tibial component transverse rotation to ±5° results in $\hat{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$ error of at most ±1°.

The forward model assumes that the surgeon articulates the knee, bringing the tibia parallel to the femur coronal plane (Fig. 7), prior to performing the specified joint line rotation maneuver. In practice it is difficult to determine when this parallel relationship is satisfied; furthermore, such alignment may not be possible in patients with an uncorrected flexion contracture. The effect of residual flexion stemming from flexion contracture, improper technique, or any other cause was assessed by injecting an offset into $\theta_{\text{artic}}$ in the forward model. As shown in Fig. 10, the tibia coronal angle estimate error associated with moderate (±10°) residual flexion falls within ±0.5° and is relatively insensitive to significant changes in the effective articulation radius.

4.3. Leg jig and cadaver evaluations

The left frame of Fig. 11 shows results from constrained leg jig testing in which we observed a highly linear coronal angle prediction, slightly deviating from unity slope, with very little inter-trial variation (maximum standard deviation 0.15°). The more realistic elevated leg jig simulation (Fig. 11, center) produced a trend line of nearly identical slope, but as expected, more variation was present between trials at each setting of the tibia coronal angle (maximum standard deviation 0.50°).

During the cadaver evaluation the -2° (varus) and 0° (neutral) tibia coronal angle configurations were associated with a 3° posterior slope, and the +2° (valgus) coronal angle configuration was associated with a 6° posterior slope. The results (Fig. 11, right) show a trend line through the mean estimates with slope very near unity and a static offset of 0.5°. Significant variation is present within each configuration (maximum
standard deviation $0.82^{\circ}$), consistent with a mechanically unconstrained surgical environment.

5. Discussion

Our analysis of error in the proposed tibia coronal angle calculation (1) associated with measurement noise (Fig. 8) and out-of-plane misalignment (Figs. 9 and 10), along with bench-top testing and an initial cadaver study (Fig. 11), support the feasibility of gyroscope-based intraoperative evaluation of tibia alignment in the presence of $\pm 5^{\circ}$ sagittal and $\pm 5^{\circ}$ transverse deviations from neutral. Overall estimation accuracy on the order of $\pm 1^{\circ}$ approaches that of traditional surgical navigation, and shows promise for meeting or exceeding the $\pm 2^{\circ}$ accuracy reported for state-of-the-art accelerometer-based alignment systems [46,47].

The proposed method offers a number of advantages over similar portable systems. The gyroscope-based system is compatible with smoother, less-jerky intraoperative manipulations than systems that rely on generating substantial linear acceleration at the knee. As a post-resection alignment verification tool rather than a cutting guide positioning aid, the proposed system provides a more direct measure of component orientation taken from within the fully-assembled prosthetic. Given that the device housing is designed to mimic actual TKA bearing geometry, it is inherently compatible with specific implant systems and does not require any additional sterile instrumentation beyond the gyroscope-enabled insert and a display for readout. Finally, the error characteristics of the gyroscope-based $\tilde{\theta}_{\text{cor}}$ estimate can be readily determined as we describe herein to inform both system design and clinical implementation.

Further analysis and evaluation of this method will be required to better understand the bias observed during leg jig testing and reduce the estimate variability observed in the cadaver experiment. Future cadaver studies may require radiographic validation of the coronal and sagittal plane cut angles to serve as a more direct ground truth measurement than navigation, which is itself subject to error and variability [22,24–26].

As currently implemented, this method requires accurate knowledge of the femur coronal angle, taken with respect to the mechanical axis of the femur; however, similar IMU-based techniques may be employed to extract this information from intraoperative manipulation. If required, the coronal model developed herein can be integrated into an estimation scheme in which all IMU accelerometer and gyroscope data are assimilated, along with knowledge of the nominal manipulations and anatomical constraints, to simultaneously estimate the relevant femur and tibia alignment parameters. IMU data fusion is an evolving technology [43,55–57] that may enable accommodation of significant off-axis dynamic deviations in the intraoperative manipulation (an acknowledged limitation of the current method), but would also require a broader validation effort prior to clinical deployment due to the complexities and stochastic nature of state estimation.

Although beyond the scope of this work, it is interesting to observe that a similar form of (2) in which $\omega_x$ replaces $\omega_y$ can be used (with a factor of $-1$) to estimate the sagittal inclination of the proximal tibia resection plane. The resulting calculation is more sensitive to out-of-plane errors, but sagittal alignment (e.g. posterior slope) is typically less of a clinical concern as knee articulation accommodates even moderate variation.
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