



World Expert Meeting in Arthroplasty 2024

Is the Primary Goal of Total Knee Arthroplasty Soft-Tissue Balancing or Alignment Correction?



Juan D. Lizcano, MD ^{a,*}, Jose A. San Juan, MD ^b, Mariano Balaguer-Castro, MD ^c, Ahmed A. Ebied, MD ^d, Michael A. Mont, MD ^e, Muhammad K. Rahim Najjad, MD ^f, Daniel H. Rienzi, MD ^g, Carlos A. Higuera-Rueda, MD ^a, Stefan Kreuzer, MD ^h

^a Department of Orthopaedics Cleveland Clinic, Weston, Florida

^b Cebu Orthopaedic Institute, Cebu, Philippines

^c Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

^d Menoufia University Hospitals, Menoufia, Egypt

^e The Rubin Institute, Sinai Hospital of Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland

^f Liaquat National Hospital, Karachi City, Pakistan

^g Department of Orthopedic and Traumatology, Hospital Asociación Española, Montevideo, Uruguay

^h INOVA Orthopedics, Houston, Texas

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 18 September 2024

Accepted 14 October 2024

Available online 18 October 2024

Keywords:

TKA
gap balancing
alignment
robotic-assisted
tensioner
PROMS

Is the primary goal of total knee arthroplasty soft tissue balancing or alignment correction?

Recommendation: The main objective of total knee arthroplasty is to ensure the best possible outcome for the patient. The review of literature reveals that both alignment correction and soft tissue balancing are crucial for optimal outcome of total knee arthroplasty.

Strength of Recommendation: Moderate.

Delegate Vote: Agree 91.1%, disagree 3.9%, abstain 5.0% (super majority, strong consensus).

Rationale

Total knee arthroplasty (TKA) is an extremely successful operation, with satisfaction rates over 80% [1]. However, a small fraction of the patients express dissatisfaction due to residual symptoms or lack of adequate improvement. Considering the high survivorship of modern TKA implants, the best way to assess success is through the use of patient-reported outcomes (PROMS). For many years, surgeons have used mechanical alignment as their goal to restore normal knee biomechanics and achieve equal load distribution in both medial and lateral compartments [2]. With the advent of robotic-assisted surgery,

more accurate implant positioning and alignment restoration can be attained. However, other surgeons focus on achieving equal flexion and extension gaps through manual laxity tests or spacer blocks, which are not objective measurements of knee balance. New technologies enable surgeons to accurately balance the knee joint through tension measuring devices that give live feedback of the tension under each knee compartment to guide the bone recuts, implant positioning, and soft-tissue releases [3]. Notwithstanding, whether a well-aligned or well-balanced knee translates into better postoperative outcomes is still a matter of debate.

Alignment and PROMS

Coronal Alignment—Mechanical Axis

The mechanical axis is usually assessed through the use of the hip-knee-ankle angle in full length standing radiographs or via

One or more of the authors of this paper have disclosed potential or pertinent conflicts of interest, which may include receipt of payment, either direct or indirect, institutional support, or association with an entity in the biomedical field which may be perceived to have potential conflict of interest with this work. For full disclosure statements refer to <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2024.10.056>.

* Address correspondence to: Juan D. Lizcano, MD, Department of Orthopaedics Cleveland Clinic, 2950 Cleveland Clinic Blvd, Weston, FL, 33331.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2024.10.056>

0883-5403/© 2024 Elsevier Inc. All rights are reserved, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

computed tomography scan. Out of 25 studies evaluating the relationship of the mechanical axis with PROMs [4–23], 5 (20%) showed an improvement in PROMs when adequate alignment parameters were achieved. There were four studies that showed patients who had an hip-knee-ankle angle within 3° of the mechanical axis had improved Knee Society Scores (KSS) [24], SF-12, Oxford knee score (OKS), and international knee score [25–27] compared to knees outside this range. There was one study that showed a linear correlation between varus alignment and worse KSS [28]. Interestingly, the study by Schiffner et al., analyzing mechanical axis restoration in preoperative varus knees, showed that knees with slight postoperative varus alignment exhibited better Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) compared to knees with a neutral alignment [21]. Improving quality metrics in patients with adequate mechanical axis restoration might be conditioned on preoperative coronal plane deformities.

Coronal Tibio-femoral Alignment

The knee anatomical axis, which is also a target for alignment during TKA, is often measured by the tibio-femoral angle, or its individual lateral distal femoral (LDFA) and medial proximal tibial angles. From eight articles evaluating the postoperative tibio-femoral angle, no article showed a relationship between this angle and PROMs [14,15,20,29–33]. The femoral coronal angle was associated with improved KSS and Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) in 3 of 15 articles [4–6,8,9,14,15,20,29–31,33–36]. Of note, the study by Hooper et al. found a significant but weak association (Pearson's correlation: -0.162 , $P = 0.006$) with the WOMAC score [35]. Similarly, the study by Chen et al. describes a positive weak correlation (Pearson's: 0.344 , $P < 0.001$), between the mechanical LDFA and the KSS, instead of the anatomical LDFA [14]. Although positive, the results of these studies are of low clinical relevance. Tibial coronal alignment was associated with PROMs only in 1 of 12 studies [5,6,8,14,15,20,29–31,33,36,37]. Rassir et al. found that the degrees of tibial coronal alignment malalignment were an independent risk factor for worse KSS functional score ($\beta = -3.43$, $P < 0.001$) [37].

Tibial and Femoral Sagittal Alignment

The femoral sagittal angle and tibial sagittal angle or tibial slope are the most common measurements used to evaluate alignment in the sagittal plane. We found 11 studies evaluating these measurements and their relationship with the KSS, WOMAC, SF-12, OKS, and visual analog scale of pain [7,14,15,20,22,29,30,33,34,36,37]. In none of these studies was sagittal alignment associated with PROMs. An additional measurement that can be assessed in the sagittal plane is the posterior femoral condylar offset, which can be a determinant of alignment and biomechanics during knee flexion. Of three studies reporting posterior femoral condylar offset, none found a significant association with PROMs [36,38,39].

Axial Alignment

Axial alignments are measured by the amount of internal or external rotation of the femoral and tibial components noted in a computerized tomography scan. This is calculated by the relation of the posterior aspect of the femoral and tibial component with the transepicondylar axis and the tibial tubercle. Of 13 studies, six showed an association between axial alignment and PROMs [4,9,15,22,31,34,40–44]. In the only prospective study by Lutzner et al., they found that patients with a rotational mismatch greater than 10° had worse postoperative KSS functional scores [45].

Moreover, the study by Nicoll et al. showed that a worse KSS is associated with femoral component internal rotation $> 6^\circ$, tibial component internal rotation $> 9^\circ$, and tibial component internal rotational mismatch $> 11^\circ$ [31]. Additional PROMs linked with axial alignment in these studies were OKS, SF-12, WOMAC, and visual analog scale for pain.

Balancing and PROMs

Using digital tensioners allowed for an accurate estimation of medial and lateral compartment pressures throughout the range of motion. From 13 studies evaluating the influence of balance in PROMs [46–53], five studies showed a better performance in PROMs when specific balance thresholds were achieved [54–58]. Most studies investigating this technology define knee balance as an intercompartmental pressure not greater than 15 pounds at 10, 40, and 90° of knee flexion. Better KSS, WOMAC, OKS, and forgotten joint score were achieved when intercompartmental pressure was below the aforementioned cutoff [54–56]. Wakelin et al. used a robotic tensioner with a Simulated Annealing optimization algorithm to determine global optimum laxity and balance windows at different flexion angles [57]. They describe an improvement in the KOOS pain subscale at 2 years when all the balance windows were satisfied. Using the same robotic system, Lee et al. found a similar improvement in the KOOS pain subscale when the medio-lateral compartment difference was < 1 mm [58]. The development of patient-specific cutoff values for balance is a promising tool for further improving patient satisfaction. However, all the level 1 studies included in this review showed comparable results with the use of a tensioning device and a freehand gap-balancing technique [46–48,50].

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Juan D. Lizcano: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Jose A. San Juan:** Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Mariano Balaguer-Castro:** Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Ahmed A. Ebied:** Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Michael A. Mont:** Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Muhammad K. Rahim Najjad:** Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Daniel H. Rienzi:** Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Carlos A. Higuera-Rueda:** Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Stefan Kreuzer:** Investigation, Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

References

- [1] DeFrance MJ, Scuderi GR. Are 20% of patients actually dissatisfied following total knee arthroplasty? A systematic review of the literature. *J Arthroplasty* 2023;38:594–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2022.10.011>.
- [2] Abdel MP, Oussedik S, Parratte S, Lustig S, Haddad FS. Coronal alignment in total knee replacement: historical review, contemporary analysis, and future direction. *Bone Joint J* 2014;96-B:857–62. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.96B7.33946>.
- [3] Kayani B, Konan S, Ayuob A, Onochie E, Al-Jabri T, Haddad FS. Robotic technology in total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review. *EFORT Open Rev* 2019;4:611–7. <https://doi.org/10.1302/2058-5241.4.190022>.
- [4] Howell SM, Howell SJ, Kuznik KT, Cohen J, Hull ML. Does A kinematically aligned total knee arthroplasty restore function without failure regardless of alignment category? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2013;471:1000–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-012-2613-z>.
- [5] 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;469:3443–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-011-1988-6>.

- [6] Matziolis G, Adam J, Perka C. Varus malalignment has no influence on clinical outcome in midterm follow-up after total knee replacement. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2010;130:1487–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00402-010-1064-9>.
- [7] Stulberg SD, Yaffe MA, Shah RR, Gall-Sims SE, Palmese N, Granieri MA, et al. Columbus primary total knee replacement: a 2- to 4-year followup of the use of intraoperative navigation-derived data to predict pre and post-operative function. *Orthopedics* 2008;31:orthosupersite.com/view.asp?rID=35545.
- [8] Gøthesen Ø, Espehaug B, Havelin LI, Petursson G, Hallan G, Strøm E, et al. Functional outcome and alignment in computer-assisted and conventionally operated total knee replacements: a multicentre parallel-group randomised controlled trial. *Bone Joint J* 2014;96-B:609–18. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.96B5.32516>.
- [9] Czurdza T, Fennema P, Baumgartner M, Ritschl P. The association between component malalignment and post-operative pain following navigation-assisted total knee arthroplasty: results of a cohort/nested case–control study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2010;18:863–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-009-0990-y>.
- [10] Abdel MP, Ollivier M, Paratte 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;100:472–8. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.16.01587>.
- [11] Alosch H, Behery OA, Levine BR. Radiographic predictors of patient satisfaction following primary total knee arthroplasty. *Bull Hosp Jt Dis* (2013) 2018;76:105–11.
- [12] Bilgin E, Bombaci H, Turgut A, Kalenderer Ö, Kiliç BE, Adıyke L, et al. How are clinical outcomes related to the deviation severity of the tibiofemoral mechanical axis on coronal plane following knee arthroplasty? *J Clin Orthop Trauma* 2019;10:91–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2017.08.019>.
- [13] Hatayama K, Terauchi M, Saito K, Higuchi H. Does residual varus alignment cause increasing varus laxity at a minimum of five years after total knee arthroplasty? *J Arthroplasty* 2017;32:1808–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2017.01.006>.
- [14] Chen Z, Deng Z, Ma Y, Shu X, Chen G, Li Q, et al. Analysis of the correlation between postoperative effects of total knee arthroplasty and angles of axial alignments of the lower extremities. *Int J Clin Exp Med* 2019;12:4993–5002.
- [15] Huijbregts HJTAM, Khan RJK, Fick DP, Jarrett OM, Haebich S. Prosthetic alignment after total knee replacement is not associated with dissatisfaction or change in Oxford Knee Score. *Knee* 2016;23:535–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2015.12.007>.
- [16] Nakajima A, Sonobe M, Akatsu Y, Aoki Y, Takahashi H, Suguro T, et al. Association between limb alignment and patient-reported outcomes after total knee arthroplasty using an implant that reproduces anatomical geometry. *J Orthop Surg Res* 2018;13:320. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13018-018-1030-8>.
- [17] Lee H-J, Jung H-J, Jung Y-B, Ko Y-B, Song M-K, Kim S-H. Time-dependent clinical results of rotating-platform total knee arthroplasty according to mechanical axis deviation. *Knee Surg Relat Res* 2014;26:141–8. <https://doi.org/10.5792/ksrr.2014.26.3.141>.
- [18] Slevin O, Amsler F, Hirschmann MT. No correlation between coronal alignment of total knee arthroplasty and clinical outcomes: a prospective clinical study using 3D-CT. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2017;25:3892–900. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-016-4400-y>.
- [19] Stucinskas J, Robertson S, Sirkka A, Lebedev A, Wingstrand H, Tarasevicius S. Moderate varus/valgus malalignment after total knee arthroplasty has little effect on knee function or muscle strength: 91 patients assessed after 1 year. *Acta Orthop* 2015;86:728–33. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17453674.2015.1059689>.
- [20] Kim Y-H, Park J-W, Kim J-S, Park S-D. The relationship between the survival of total knee arthroplasty and postoperative coronal, sagittal and rotational alignment of knee prosthesis. *Int Orthop* 2014;38:379–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-013-2097-9>.
- [21] Schiffrer E, Wild M, Regenbrecht B, Schek A, Hakimi M, Thelen S, et al. Neutral or natural? Functional impact of the coronal alignment in total knee arthroplasty. *J Knee Surg* 2019;32:820–4. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1669788>.
- [22] Abdelnasser MK, Elsherif ME, Bakr H, Mahran M, Othman MHM, Khalifa Y. All types of component malrotation affect the early patient-reported outcome measures after total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Relat Res* 2019;31:5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43019-019-0006-2>.
- [23] Chowdhry M, Bamne AB, Na YG, Kang YG, Kim TK. Prevalence and predictors of post-operative coronal alignment outliers and their association with the functional outcomes in navigated total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 2014;29:2357–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2014.07.015>.
- [24] Manjunath KS, Gopalakrishna KG, Vineeth G. Evaluation of alignment in total knee arthroplasty: a prospective study. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol* 2015;25:895–903. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00590-015-1638-x>.
- [25] 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;24:560–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2008.02.018>.
- [26] Blakeney WG, Khan RJK, Palmer JL. Functional outcomes following total knee arthroplasty: a randomised trial comparing computer-assisted surgery with conventional techniques. *Knee* 2014;21:364–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2013.04.001>.
- [27] Huang NFR, Dowsey MM, Ee E, Stoney JD, Babazadeh S, Choong PF. Coronal alignment correlates with outcome after total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 2012;27:1737–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2012.03.058>.
- [28] Aglietti P, Lup D, Cuomo P, Baldini A, De Luca L. Total knee arthroplasty using a pie-crusting technique for valgus deformity. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2007;464:73–7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BLO.0b013e3181591c48>.
- [29] Bach CM, Mayr E, Liebensteiner M, Gstöttner M, Nogler M, Thaler M. Correlation between radiographic assessment and quality of life after total knee arthroplasty. *Knee* 2009;16:207–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2008.11.003>.
- [30] Bankes MJK, Back DL, Cannon SR, Briggs TWR. The effect of component malalignment on the clinical and radiological outcome of the Kinemax total knee replacement. *Knee* 2003;10:55–60. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-0160\(02\)00050-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-0160(02)00050-9).
- [31] Nicoll D, Rowley DI. Internal rotational error of the tibial component is a major cause of pain after total knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2010;92-B:1238–44. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.92B9.23516>.
- [32] Sardana V, Burzynski JM, Khan M, Stone N, Weening BS, Zalzal PK. Long-term functional outcomes and knee alignment of computer-assisted navigated total knee arthroplasty. *Musculoskelet Surg* 2017;101:37–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12306-016-0442-z>.
- [33] Ahmed I, Paraoan V, Bhatt D, Mishra B, Khatri C, Griffin D, et al. Tibial component sizing and alignment of TKR components does not significantly affect patient reported outcome measures at six months. A case series of 474 participants. *Int J Surg* 2018;52:67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2018.02.039>.
- [34] Longstaff LM, Sloan K, Stamp N, Scaddan R, Beaver R. Good alignment after total knee arthroplasty leads to faster rehabilitation and better function. *J Arthroplasty* 2009;24:570–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2008.03.002>.
- [35] Hooper G, Rothwell A, Frampton C. The low contact stress mobile-bearing total knee replacement: a prospective study with a minimum follow-up of ten years. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2009;91-B:58–63. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.91B1.20484>.
- [36] Jabloniski J, Sibiński M, Polguj M, Kowalczewski J, Marczak D, Faflik Ł, et al. The influence of implant position on final clinical outcome and gait analysis after total knee arthroplasty. *J Knee Surg* 2019;32:891–6. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1669913>.
- [37] Rassir R, Van De Bunt F, Sierevelt IN, Nolte PA. The value of postoperative prosthesis alignment and patellar height measurements on standard X-rays after Total Knee Arthroplasty: does it relate to knee function after 5 years? *Knee* 2019;26:213–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2018.09.014>.
- [38] Pierson JL, Ritter MA, Keating EM, Faris PM, Meding JB, Berend ME, et al. The effect of stuffing the patellofemoral compartment on the outcome of total knee arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2007;89:2195–203. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.E.01223>.
- [39] Wang J-T, Zhang Y, Liu Q, He Q, Zhang D-L, Zhang Y, et al. Effect of posterior condylar offset on clinical results after posterior-stabilized total knee arthroplasty. *Chin J Traumatol* 2015;18:259–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjtee.2015.09.003>.
- [40] Barrack RL, Schrader T, Bertot AJ, Wolfe MW, Myers L. Component rotation and anterior knee pain after total knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2001;392:46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003086-200111000-00006>.
- [41] Bell SW, Young P, Drury C, Smith J, Anthony I, Jones B, et al. Component rotational alignment in unexplained painful primary total knee arthroplasty. *Knee* 2014;21:272–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2012.09.011>.
- [42] Lützner J, Beyer F, Dixel J, Fritzsch H, Lützner C, Kirschner S. No difference in range of motion between ultracongruent and posterior stabilized design in total knee arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2017;25:3515–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-016-4331-7>.
- [43] Riemüller A, Guggi T, Gruber G, Preiss S, Drobny T. The effect of femoral component rotation on the five-year outcome of cemented mobile bearing total knee arthroplasty. *Int Orthop* 2012;36:2067–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-012-1628-0>.
- [44] Nedopil AJ, Howell SM, Hull ML. Does malrotation of the tibial and femoral components compromise function in kinematically aligned total knee arthroplasty? *Orthop Clin N Am* 2016;47:41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocl.2015.08.006>.
- [45] Lützner J, Günther K-P, Kirschner S. Functional outcome after computer-assisted versus conventional total knee arthroplasty: a randomized controlled study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2010;18:1339–44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-010-1153-x>.
- [46] Sarpong NO, Held MB, Grosso MJ, Herndon CL, Santos W, Lakra A, et al. No benefit to sensor-guided balancing compared with freehand balancing in TKA: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2022;480:1535–44. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CORR.0000000000002168>.
- [47] MacDessi SJ, Wood JA, Diwan A, Harris IA. Intraoperative pressure sensors improve soft-tissue balance but not clinical outcomes in total knee arthroplasty: a multicentre randomized controlled trial. *Bone Joint J* 2022;104-B:604–12. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.104B5.BJJ-2021-1299.R2>.
- [48] Wood TJ, Winemaker MJ, Williams DS, Petrucci DT, Tushinski DM, de Beer JV. Randomized controlled trial of sensor-guided knee balancing compared to standard balancing technique in total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 2021;36:953–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2020.09.025>.

- [49] Cochetti A, Ghirardelli S, Iannotti F, Giardini P, Risitano S, Indelli PF. Sensor-guided technology helps to reproduce medial pivot kinematics in total knee arthroplasty. *J Orthop Surg* 2020;28:230949902096613. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2309499020966133>.
- [50] Song SJ, Kang SG, Lee YJ, Kim KI, Park CH. An intraoperative load sensor did not improve the early postoperative results of posterior-stabilized TKA for osteoarthritis with varus deformities. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2019;27:1671–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-018-5314-7>.
- [51] Livermore AT, Erickson JA, Blackburn B, Peters CL. Does the sequential addition of accelerometer-based navigation and sensor-guided ligament balancing improve outcomes in TKA? *Bone Joint J* 2020;102-B:24–30. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.102B6.BJJ-2019-1634.R1>.
- [52] Koenig JA, Wakelin EA, Passano B, Shalhoub S, Plaskos C. Impact of a digital balancing tool on femur and tibial first total knee arthroplasty: a prospective nonrandomized controlled trial. *Arthroplast Today* 2022;17:172–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artd.2022.06.020>.
- [53] Geller JA, deMeireles AJ, Gazgalis A, Santos W, Neuwirth AL, Shah RP, et al. Collateral ligament tension and balance alone does not ensure improved outcome after total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 2023;38:S196–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2023.03.042>.
- [54] Golladay GJ, Bradbury TL, Gordon AC, Fernandez-Madrid IJ, Krebs VE, Patel PD, et al. Are patients more satisfied with a balanced total knee arthroplasty? *J Arthroplasty* 2019;34:S195–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2019.03.036>.
- [55] Gustke KA, Golladay GJ, Roche MW, Elson LC, Anderson CR. A new method for defining balance. *J Arthroplasty* 2014;29:955–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2013.10.020>.
- [56] Chow JC, Breslauer L. The use of intraoperative sensors significantly increases the patient-reported rate of improvement in primary total knee arthroplasty. *Orthopedics* 2017;40:e648–51. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01477447-20170503-01>.
- [57] Wakelin EA, Ponder CE, Randall AL, Koenig JA, Plaskos C, DeClaire JH, et al. Intra-operative laxity and balance impact 2-year pain outcomes in TKA: a prospective cohort study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2023;31:5535–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-023-07601-x>.
- [58] Lee G-C, Wakelin E, Randall A, Plaskos C. Can a robot help a surgeon to predict a good total knee arthroplasty? *Bone Joint J* 2021;103-B:67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.103B6.BJJ-2020-2305.R1>.