Is Wear Still a Concern in TKA With Contemporary Conventional and Highly Crosslinked Polyethylene Tibial Inserts in the Mid- to Long-Term?

Devin P. Asher BS[1], Jennifer L. Wright, MS[1], Deborah J. Hall, BS[1], Hannah J. Lundberg, PhD[1], Douglas W. Van Citters, PhD[2], Joshua J. Jacobs, MD[1], Brett R. Levine, MD, MS[1], Robin Pourzal, PhD[1]

[1]Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Rush Medical College, Rush University, Chicago, IL, USA

[2]Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire

Corresponding Author:

Robin Pourzal, PhD
1611 W. Harrison St. Ste. 204-F
Chicago, IL 60612
312-942-7270
robin_pourzal@rush.edu

Abstract:

Background

Modern literature has brought into question if wear of tibial inserts made from conventional or highly-crosslinked polyethylene (HXL PE) is still a factor limiting longevity of total knee arthroplasty (TKA) in the mid- to long-term. It is the objective of this study to determine: 1) most common causes of mid- to long-term TKA failure, 2) the prevalence of delamination, and 3) the medial/lateral linear wear rates of conventional and HXL PE tibial inserts retrieved in the mid- to long-term.

Methods

A tibial insert retrieval cohort of 107 inserts (79 conventional, 28 HXL PE) with a minimum time *in situ* of 6.5 years (mean 11.7±4) was studied. Failure causes were determined from chart-review, delamination presence was assessed microscopically, and medial/lateral linear wear was determined by minimal thickness changes measured with a dial-indicator.

Results

The most common mid-to long-term etiologies for failure were instability (43.9%), PE wear 15%), aseptic loosening (14%) and infection (13.1%). Delamination occurred in 70.1% of inserts (75% conventional, 58% HXLPE). Gross material loss due to delamination appeared to be the underlying reason for at least 35% of cases exhibiting instability. Of the cases removed for infection, 75% exhibited no histopathological hallmarks of acute infection. The medial/lateral wear rates were 0.054/0.051 (conventional) and 0.014/0.001 (HXL) mm/year, respectively.

Conclusions

Polyethylene wear still appears to be a major primary and secondary cause for TKA revision in the mid- to long-term. Wear may manifest as destabilizing delamination or as continuous release of fine wear particles potentially resulting in inflammatory responses and subsequent failure.

Keywords

Total knee arthroplasty, tibial inserts, polyethylene, highly crosslinked, wear, delamination

41 **Introduction:**

42 Total knee arthroplasty (TKA) is performed on more than one million patients in the US
43 annually to treat end-stage osteoarthritis (OA). Revision rates, however, have remained steady in
44 recent years. (1) According to registries and epidemiological studies, the most common causes of
45 failure leading to revision include infection and inflammatory responses, mechanical loosening,
46 and instability, with the proportion of revisions due to aseptic loosening decreasing in favor of
47 infection. (2–5) One limitation of registry reports is that they aggregate early and late failures,
48 which typically represent different rates of etiologies for revision. Therefore, as newer registries
49 increase reporting, they likely overrepresent early failures predominately related to higher rates
50 of early prosthetic joint infection (PJI). (4)

51 Historically, two factors limited long-term implant survivorship: shelf and *in vivo* ultra-high
52 molecular weight polyethylene (PE) oxidation leading to mechanical insert breakdown and
53 particle-induced osteolysis driven by PE wear debris leading to subsequent implant loosening.
54 The advent of highly crosslinked (HXL) PE has led to decreases in revision rates due to wear in
55 the short term (6,7), but long-term clinical and retrieval studies of contemporary HXL PE have
56 not yet been published, particularly with respect to *in vivo* oxidation prevention and long-term
57 biological outcomes. One registry found improved mid-term survivorship (9), but most studies
58 find no difference between conventional and HXL PE performance for TKA in terms of revision
59 rate, cause for revision, or patient satisfaction. (2,6–8) Retrieval studies of contemporary
60 implants retrieved at revision surgery indicate that *in vivo* oxidation is frequent, even in the
61 absence of free radicals. (9–11)

62 The current literature reports varying revision rates for wear, with two studies even finding
63 increased wear-related failures. (4,12) Confounding the issue is the difficulty of stratifying

reasons for aseptic revisions within registries, based on overall coding discrepancies and transparency. (13) Furthermore, PE wear, especially gross wear caused by delamination, may be the underlying cause of the physical examination finding of instability. However, it may not be included in the coding process as it is often an intra-operative finding and not a tangible preoperative finding from physical examination or radiographs.

Moreover, the AJRR reports that only 3% of failures today are associated with wear particle-induced osteolysis. However, with nearly half of all revision cases being attributed to aseptic loosening and non-infectious inflammatory reasons, it is possible that biological reactions to particulate debris still occur on a longer timeline. Further, the reaction to particulate debris may be a secondary factor in a significant number of revision procedures and likely is highly underreported.

Therefore, this study aims to answer the following research questions: 1) What are the most common causes of mid- to long-term TKA failure with conventional PE and contemporary HXL PE inserts? 2) What is the prevalence of delamination, and how does it relate to the cause of failure? 3) What are the medial and lateral linear wear rates of conventional PE and contemporary HXL PE inserts measured from mid- to long-term retrievals?

Material and Methods

A retrospective chart review was conducted to determine general information on all surgically retrieved TKAs made from conventional PE (retrieved between 2019 and 2024) and HXL PE (retrieved between 2014 and 2024) available in our IRB-approved implant retrieval repository. Data collected included time *in situ*, sex, surgery site laterality, and reason for implant/removal,

as well as implant manufacturer, model, and size. Inserts made from conventional or HXL PE with a time *in situ* of > 6.5 years, representing mid- to long-term implants, were included in this study. After performing a review of 688 patients, a total of 110 tibial inserts fit the criteria for the study. Three inserts made from antioxidant doped polyethylene were removed from the study resulting in a final study cohort of 107 inserts. The mean (standard deviation, SD) patient age at revision was 71 (SD 7) years, the mean time in situ was 12 (SD 4) years. There were 63 female and 44 male patients (Table 1). This cohort included 79 conventional and 28 HXL PE inserts from 6 manufacturers (71 Zimmer Biomet—Warsaw, IN, 8 Smith & Nephew—Memphis, TN, 2 DePuy—Warsaw, IN, 18 Stryker—Mahwah, NJ, 5 Biomet—Warsaw, IN, 3 other). There were 81 cruciate retaining inserts and 26 posterior stabilized inserts.

Tibial insert wear and damage was first optically assessed under a stereo microscope. A delamination score was assigned for the medial and lateral sides using a three-tiered numeric rating system where 0 = no visible delamination is present, 1= mild (visible subsurface cracks, milky appearance), and 2 = severe (gross wear and breakdown of the bearing surface) (Figure 1).

Linear wear was quantified analog to a previously published method based on change of minimum thickness (14,15) using a Mitutoyo dial indicator. A 3mm spherical tip was used on both sides of the indicator (Figure 2). Each insert was evaluated for linear wear on the medial and lateral articular surfaces at the narrowest point of the bearing surface. This process was repeated for a total of three measurements per side. Linear wear on each side was defined as the difference between the measured value and the initial minimum thickness. Reference values for the minimal thickness were obtained from either publicly available product information or from short-term retrievals (time *in situ* < 6 months). Linear wear was measured for all inserts, even

those with severe delamination, to determine the maximum linear wear independent of damage mechanism. However, because delamination is an erratic process that does not necessarily correlate with the release of wear particles, linear wear rates were only assessed for inserts that were not severely delaminated (i.e. those with bearing surfaces undergoing sliding wear without gross wear due to delamination).

Results

In this tibial insert retrieval cohort, the primary reasons for revision were 43.9% instability (48% conventional PE, 34.4% HXL PE), 15% polyethylene wear (17.3% conventional PE, 9.4% HXL PE), 14% aseptic loosening (14.7% conventional PE, 12.5% HXL PE), and 13.1% infection (12% conventional PE, 15.6% HXL PE) (Figure 3). The other reasons for revision included 4.7% pain (2.7% conventional PE, 9.4% HXL PE), 3.7% extensor mechanism disruption (1.3% conventional PE, 9.4% HXL PE), 1.9% osteolysis (1.3% conventional PE, 3.1% HXL PE), 2.8% stiffness (1.3% conventional PE, 6.8% HXL PE), and 0.9% distal femur fracture (1.3% conventional PE, 0% HXL PE). With respect to the PJI cases, review of the pathology reports revealed that only 2 of 8 (25%) cases exhibited acute infection, while the others were classified as inflammatory reactions.

Delamination occurred in 70.1% of inserts with 36.5% exhibiting mild and 33.6% severe delamination. Both conventional and HXL PE inserts had delamination (75% conventional PE: 34.2% mild, 40.8% severe; 58% HXL PE: 41.9% mild, 16.1% severe). If delamination was present, it occurred on both the medial and lateral tibial condyles in 54.7% (conventional PE 56.1%, HXL PE 50%) of cases, only the medial condyle in 32% (conventional PE 33.3%, HXL

PE 27.8%), only the lateral condyle in 9.3% (conventional PE 8.8%, HXL PE 11.1%), and only on the central post in 4% (conventional PE 1.8%, HXL PE 11.1%).

When stratified by reason for revision, delamination occurred in 66% (31% mild, 35% severe) of inserts with instability, 94% (31% mild, 63% severe) of inserts removed for wear, 87% (47% mild, 40% severe) of inserts that underwent aseptic loosening, and 54% (31% mild, 23% severe) of insert removed for infection or other inflammatory responses (Figure 4).

The medial and lateral median (minimum, maximum) linear wear was 0.8 mm (0.09, 4.26) and 0.71 mm (0, 2.1) for conventional PE, and 0.12 mm (0, 2.6) and 0.11 mm (0, 1.65) for HXL PE inserts, respectively. When excluding inserts with severe delamination, the medial and lateral median (min., max.) linear wear was 0.73 mm (0.09, 2.69) and 0.67 mm (0, 1.44) for conventional PE, and 0.11 mm (0, 0.54) and 0.084 mm (0, 0.7) for HXL PE inserts, respectively.

Including inserts with severe delamination there was no linear relationship between wear and time *in situ* for either PE type, except for a positive correlation on the lateral side of conventional PE inserts (R^2=0.14, p=0.002). Excluding inserts with severe delamination, conventional PE inserts had a positive correlation between linear wear and time *in situ* on both the medial (R^2=0.11, p=0.015) and lateral side (R^2=0.19, p<0.001). For HXL PE inserts without severe delamination, only the lateral side exhibited a positive correlation between wear and time *in situ* (R^2=0.17, p=0.033) (Figure 5).

Wear rates were computed for inserts without severe delamination as the median linear wear over time *in situ*. The median medial and lateral wear rates for conventional and HXL PE were 0.054 mm/year (0, 0.17), 0.051 mm/year (0, 0.12), 0.014 mm/year (0, 0.07), and 0.011 mm/year (0, 0.05), respectively.

Discussion

Instability, PE wear, aseptic loosening and inflammatory responses were the most common mid- to long-term failure reasons for all retrievals whether made of conventional or HXL PE. Delamination and progressive surface wear were also prolific findings within all reasons for revision. This is a departure from recent registry reports which found infection and other inflammatory responses to be the most common cause of failure. (2) However, registry data is skewed by early failures and therefore are not a reliable measure for mid- to long-term revision causes.

The most dominant mid- to long-term TKA failure reason was instability, which coincided with delamination in 68% of cases, of which 33% was severe delamination damage with material loss. Instability is commonly attributed to malpositioning, cement debonding, or other mechanical issues, which would likely manifest within the first 5 years after primary surgery. (16–21) Therefore, it is plausible that instability in the mid- to long-term frequently may occur secondary to delamination. Delamination, which is the result of surface fatigue wear under combined rolling and sliding motion in the knee, has been a prominent problem in TKA with tibial inserts made from historic PE leading to early failures. (22,23) Embrittlement of the material due to *in vivo* oxidation enables this wear mechanism. Improvements to the material such as sterilization and packaging in an inert atmosphere and the introduction of highly crosslinked materials have mitigated this issue. (24,25) However, several studies have demonstrated that contemporary conventional and HXL PE inserts also undergo subsurface *in vivo* oxidation although on a longer time scale. (10,26,27) The maximum oxidation index is typically located a few 100 micrometers underneath the bearing surface. Our study demonstrates that delamination persists in contemporary conventional and HXL PEs for tibial inserts retrieved in the mid- to long-term.

Gross wear associated with delamination may cause instability of the joint or accelerate the process from subtle to symptomatic instability. Even the presence of multiple subsurface cracks that have not yet caused material breakdown may change the mechanical and wear behavior of the insert. While the problem of *in vivo* oxidation has been further addressed by the introduction of antioxidant doped polyethylene (6,7,28), our repository did not yet have a sufficient number of retrievals with the required implantation duration available to investigate trends with these newer materials.

After instability, the main reasons for revision were PE wear, aseptic loosening, and PJI or other inflammatory responses. PE wear cases all exhibited some degree of delamination, which was not surprising because delamination is characterized by severe damage to the articular surface. Such gross PE wear can often be assessed as eccentric wear on preoperative radiographs evaluated in the office. In the American Joint Replacement Registry (AJRR) PE wear and osteolysis cases are grouped together as a single category, based on ICD 10 coding parameters. In the current study, the two failure reasons were separated because the underlying damage mechanisms are different. Osteolysis presents with obvious osteolytic lesions/bony changes (29), while PE wear cases undergo delamination with material loss. Osteolysis is frequently driven by a foreign body particle response to small particles on the scale of tens to hundreds of micrometers (29–31). Particles trigger a macrophage response that can begin a cascade of cell responses resulting in periprosthetic bone loss and loosening. Delamination leads to larger particle release which may also trigger a tissue response, especially the formation of foreign body giant cells, but not necessarily osteolysis (32,32). While inserts undergoing delamination also generate fine particles during articulation, the main concern with delamination is mechanical in nature.

Particle induced osteolysis or inflammatory response may also be responsible for failure cases categorized as aseptic loosening and infection. As stated above, it can be assumed that the majority of aseptic loosening cases are not related to mechanical issues such as malpositioning or cement debonding as those would likely manifest early. (16–21) Thus, in the current study of mid- to long-term failures, early stage osteolysis caused by wear debris or other foreign bodies (e.g. cement debris, corrosion products, etc.) may be a possible reason for failure. Additionally, 75% of cases labeled as infection related failures did not exhibit hallmarks of PJI according to pathology reports, suggesting a likely inflammatory response to wear debris.

The wear analysis in this study clearly shows that measurable wear occurs during the normal articulation of the knee for both conventional and HXL PE. While there was no or only a weak correlation between wear and time *in situ*, it must be considered that there are multiple other factors that drive wear (sex, implant positioning, design, etc.) which could not be considered here. (33) It was of note that the linear wear rates for this mid- to long-term retrieval study were similar to previous studies using the same dial method, (9) but lower than that reported by surface reconstruction methods (33). Yet, it is of note that the latter study focused on early to mid-term TKA failures of a single design. Both the wear rate and the incidence of delamination were higher on the medial compared to lateral compartment, which was expected based on the higher joint loading and surface pressure on the medial side. Joint loading on the medial side has been reported as up to 90% of the total force through the joint depending on TKA design due to the action of the abductors during *in vivo* activity and knee alignment. (34,35)

It is important to state that the majority of particles generated from contemporary PE inserts, especially HXL PE inserts, are too small to be identified using polarized light microscopy. However, recent studies of HXL PE acetabular inserts in total hip replacement have shown a

223 prominent presence of PE debris within periprosthetic macrophages by means of infrared
224 spectroscopic imaging.(36,37) In fact, it was shown that osteolysis could occur in inserts with a
225 total volumetric wear rate comparable to well-functioning inserts made from historic PE. These
226 findings demonstrate that despite resulting in an overall smaller wear volume, the finer particles
227 generated from HXL PE inserts carry a larger osteolytic potential. (38,39) Future studies need to
228 examine the tissue response of mid- to long-term TKA histologically in more detail as well as the
229 possible association with intracellular fine polyethylene debris.

230 This study had several limitations. First, the study cohort is too limited in size to
231 differentiate differences between tibial insert designs and manufacturers, different insert sizes, or
232 between cruciate retaining and posterior stabilized inserts. It is of great importance to increase
233 this cohort of mid- to long-term retrievals to gain a better understanding of the *in vivo* wear
234 performance in contemporary TKA. Second, an important comparison group—antioxidant doped
235 inserts—could not be included because too few were available in our retrieval database at this
236 time. Third, this study was limited to linear wear measurements based on thickness change. Yet,
237 linear wear was shown to be a good surrogate measure for wear to accurately reflect trends in
238 wear behavior of a retrieval cohort, while underestimating wear on an individual basis. (40)
239 Another limitation of this study is the differences among both conventional and HXL PEs across
240 manufacturers. While treated as only two different groups in this study, the degree of
241 crosslinking and resulting mechanical properties are likely to differ broadly among HXL inserts,
242 for example, resulting in additional confounders. (9,14) Finally, this study lacked
243 histopathological analysis of corresponding periprosthetic tissues because tissue samples were
244 not available for all cases. Future studies need to investigate the relationship between wear
245 volume, extent of macrophage response, particle size, and the ultimate reason of failure.

Conclusions

This study demonstrates that the reasons for TKA failure in the mid- to long-term differ drastically from registry studies that include early failure. While infection and other inflammatory responses are the most common reason for revision according to the AJRR, in this retrieval cohort the predominant reason for failure was instability. Only 8 of 107 inserts failed due to infection and other inflammatory reactions in our cohort, and only two were removed for acute infection. In both conventional and HXL PE tibial inserts, implant wear can still manifest as 1) delamination leading to gross wear, and 2) milder wear—usually characterized by polishing and three-body wear—resulting in the continuous generation of fine wear debris. The results of this study suggest that delamination may be linked to the onset of instability in the mid- to long-term due to the breakdown of the bearing surface and loss of integrity. Other than instability, tibial inserts were removed predominantly for aseptic loosening, PE wear, and other inflammatory responses. The diagnosis of PE wear related TKA failure was mostly linked to the occurrence of delamination. Considering that wear rates were measurable for both conventional and HXL PE, and the fact that loosening due to mechanical issues commonly manifest early, it is likely that the accumulation of wear debris within periprosthetic tissue can cause an inflammatory response resulting in aseptic loosening, effusion, and pain. While only 2% of cases in this cohort were diagnosed with osteolysis, it appears likely that this number is underestimated. The success of HXL PE in arthroplasty may have resulted in a false sense of security, and only ongoing long-term studies will tell us if PE-related issues are truly eliminated. This study suggests that PE wear resulting in loss of integrity, manifesting as instability, and/or

inflammatory tissue response to wear debris is still a major reason for TKA failure in the mid- to long-term.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by an internal pilot grant from Rush University Medical Center (Rush Catalyst Award, PIs Lundberg and Pourzal). The authors would like to thank Julia Hochstatter for her valuable contributions in the laboratory.

Tables

Table 1 Demographics of the study cohort.

	Age (years)	**Time in situ (years)**	**Sex (female, male)**	**Liner type (cruciate retaining or posterior stabilized)**
All	71.16 ± 6.72	11.7 ± 4	63, 44	81 CR, 26 PS
Conventional PE	70.49 ± 6.67	12.62 ± 4.01	44, 32	65, 11
HXL PE	72.82 ± 6.66	9.38 ± 2.62	19, 12	16, 15

Table 2 Medial and lateral linear wear and wear rate for inserts made from conventional and HXL PE.

	medial linear wear (mm)	**lateral liner wear (mm)**	**medial linear wear without delamination (mm)**	**lateral liner wear without delamination (mm)**	**medial linear wear rate (mm/year)**	**lateral liner wear rate (mm/year)**
Conventional PE	0.8 (0.09, 4.26)	0.72 (0, 2.1)	0.73 (0.09, 2.69)	0.67 (0, 1.44)	0.054 (0, 0.17), 0.052	0.052 (0, 0.12),
HXL PE	0.13 (0, 2.6)	0.12 (0, 1.65)	0.12 (0, 0.69)	0.093 (0, 0.7)	0.015 (0, 0.07)	0.012 (0, 0.07)

Figures



Figure 1 Photographs illustrating characteristic features of various degrees of delamination: A) The PE bearing surface exhibits characteristic wear features such as polishing, scratches, striated patterns, and pitting, however, no delamination was noted. B) Subsurface cracks can be seen on the bearing surface characterized by a 'milky' surface appearance, but there is no significant material loss. C) Gross material loss associated with delamination on the bearing surface. Note that delamination scores 1 and 2 can vary in the number of affected locations and overall area.



Figure 2 Measuring rig used for thickness change evaluation as a proxy measure for linear wear.



Figure 3 Illustration of the main reason for mid- to long-term failures associated with this tibial insert cohort and breakdown by type of polyethylene.



Figure 4 Distribution of delamination for tibial inserts grouped by the major reasons for failure in this cohort.



Figure 5 Scatter plots illustrating linear wear over time *in situ* on the A) medial, and B) lateral side.

References

1. AJRR. American Joint Replacement Registry (AJRR): 2022 Annual Report. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS); 2022.

2. AJRR. American Joint Replacement Registry (AJRR): 2023 Annual Report. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS); 2023.

3. Upfill-Brown A, Hsiue PP, Sekimura T, Shi B, Ahlquist SA, Patel JN, et al. Epidemiology of Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty in the United States, 2012 to 2019. Arthroplasty Today. 2022;15:188-195.e6.

4. Sabah SA, Knight R, Alvand A, Murray DW, Petrou S, Beard DJ, et al. No exponential rise in revision knee replacement surgery over the past 15 years: an analysis from the National Joint Registry. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2022 Dec 1;30(12):1670–9.

5. Lewis PL, Robertsson O, Graves SE, Paxton EW, Prentice HA, W-Dahl A. Variation and trends in reasons for knee replacement revision: a multi-registry study of revision burden. Acta Orthop. 2021;182–8.

6. Rowell SL, Muratoglu OK. Investigation of surgically retrieved, vitamin E-stabilized, crosslinked UHMWPE implants after short-term in vivo service. J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater. 2016;104(6):1132–40.

7. Ftaita S, Vanden Berghe A, Thienpont E. Vitamin E-enriched polyethylene bearings are not inferior to Arcom bearings in primary total knee arthroplasty at medium-term follow-up. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2021 Jun 1;141(6):1027–33.

8. Costa L, Luda MP, Trossarelli L, Prever EMBD, Crova M, Gallinaro P. Oxidation in orthopaedic UHMWPE sterilized by gamma-radiation and ethylene oxide. Biomaterials. 1998;19:659–68.

9. Currier BH, Jevsevar KC, Van Citters DW. Oxidation in Retrieved, Never-Irradiated UHMWPE Bearings: What Can We Learn About in Vivo Oxidation? JBJS. 2023 Feb 15;105(4):293.

10. Currier BH, Currier JH, Franklin KJ, Mayor MB, Reinitz SD, Van Citters DW. Comparison of Wear and Oxidation in Retrieved Conventional and Highly Cross-Linked UHMWPE Tibial Inserts. J Arthroplasty. 2015 Dec;30(12):2349–53.

11. Currier BH, Currier JH, Holdcroft LA, Van Citters DW. Effectiveness of anti-oxidant polyethylene: What early retrievals can tell us. J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater. 2018;106(1):353–9.

12. Kerzner B, Kunze KN, O'Sullivan MB, Pandher K, Levine BR. Temporal Trends of Revision Etiologies in Total Knee Arthroplasty at a Single High-Volume Institution: An Epidemiological Analysis. Arthroplasty Today. 2021 Jun;9:68–72.

13. Wilson JM, Broida SE, Maradit-Kremers H, Browne JB, Springer BD, Berry DJ, et al. Is the American Joint Replacement Registry Able to Correctly Classify Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty Procedural Diagnoses? J Arthroplasty. 2023 Jun 1;38(6, Supplement):S32-S35.e3.

14. Currier JH, Currier BH, Abdel MP, Berry DJ, Titus AJ, Van Citters DW. What factors drive polyethylene wear in total knee arthroplasty? Bone Jt J. 2021 Nov;103-B(11):1695–701.

15. Berry DJ, Currier JH, Mayor MB, Collier JP. Knee Wear Measured in Retrievals: A Polished Tray Reduces Insert Wear. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2012 Jul;470(7):1860.

16. Wilson CJ, Theodoulou A, Damarell RA, Krishnan J. Knee instability as the primary cause of failure following Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA): A systematic review on the patient, surgical and implant characteristics of revised TKA patients. The Knee. 2017 Dec;24(6):1271–81.

17. Meehan JP, Danielsen B, Kim SH, Jamali AA, White RH. Younger age is associated with a higher risk of early periprosthetic joint infection and aseptic mechanical failure after total knee arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2014 Apr 2;96(7):529–35.

18. Torino D, Damsgaard C, Kolessar DJ, Hayes DS, Foster B, Constantino J, et al. Tibial Baseplate-Cement Interface Debonding in the ATTUNE Total Knee Arthroplasty System. Arthroplasty Today. 2022 Oct;17:165–71.

19. Keohane D, Sheridan GA, Masterson E. High rate of tibial debonding and failure in a popular knee replacement : a follow-up review. Bone Jt Open. 2022 Jun;3(6):495–501.

20. Sadauskas A, Engh C, Mehta M, Levine B. Implant Interface Debonding After Total Knee Arthroplasty: A New Cause for Concern? Arthroplasty Today. 2020 Dec;6(4):972–5.

21. Keohane D, Power F, Cullen E, O'Neill A, Masterson E. High rate of tibial debonding and failure in a popular knee replacement: A cause for concern. The Knee. 2020 Mar;27(2):459–68.

22. Wimmer MA, Laurent MP, Haman JD, Jacobs JJ, Galante JO. Surface damage versus tibial polyethylene insert conformity: A retrieval study. Clin Orthop. 2012;470(7):1814–25.

23. Medel FJ, Kurtz SM, Parvizi J, Klein GR, Kraay MJ, Rimnac CM. In Vivo Oxidation Contributes to Delamination but not Pitting in Polyethylene Components for Total Knee Arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty. 2011;26(5):802–10.

24. Berry DJ, Currier BH, Mayor MB, Collier JP. Gamma-irradiation sterilization in an inert environment: a partial solution. Clin Orthop. 2012 Jul;470(7):1805–13.

25. Currier BH, Currier JH, Collier JP, Mayor MB, Scott RD. Shelf life and in vivo duration. Impacts on performance of tibial bearings. Clin Orthop. 1997;1997(342):111–22.

26. Hasegawa M, Tone S, Naito Y, Sudo A. Ultra-High-Molecular-Weight Polyethylene in Hip and Knee Arthroplasties. Materials. 2023 Mar 7;16(6):2140.

27. Wilhelm SK, Henrichsen JL, Siljander M, Moore D, Karadsheh M. Polyethylene in total knee arthroplasty: Where are we now? J Orthop Surg. 2018 Sep 1;26(3):2309499018808356.

28. Grupp TM, Fritz B, Kutzner I, Schilling C, Bergmann G, Schwiesau J. Vitamin E stabilised polyethylene for total knee arthroplasty evaluated under highly demanding activities wear simulation. Acta Biomater. 2017 15;48:415–22.

29. Gallo J, Goodman SB, Konttinen YT, Wimmer MA, Holinka M. Osteolysis around total knee arthroplasty: a review of pathogenetic mechanisms. Acta Biomater. 2013 Sep;9(9):8046–58.

30. Ngai V, Kunze J, Cip J, Laurent MP, Jacobs JJ, Wimmer MA. Backside wear of tibial polyethylene components is affected by gait pattern: A knee simulator study using rare earth tracer technology. J Orthop Res Off Publ Orthop Res Soc. 2020 Jul;38(7):1607–16.

31. Tipper JL, Ingham E, Galvin AL, Fisher J. Estimation of the Osteolytic Potential of Noncrosslinked and Crosslinked Polyethylenes and Ceramic-on-Ceramic Total Hip Prostheses. J ASTM Int. 2006 May 17;3(6):1–16.

32. Panez-Toro I, Heymann D, Gouin F, Amiaud J, Heymann MF, Córdova LA. Roles of inflammatory cell infiltrate in periprosthetic osteolysis. Front Immunol. 2023;14:1310262.

33. Pourzal R, Cip J, Rad E, Laurent MP, Berger RA, Jacobs JJ, et al. Joint line elevation and tibial slope are associated with increased polyethylene wear in cruciate-retaining total knee replacement. J Orthop Res Off Publ Orthop Res Soc. 2020 Jul;38(7):1596–606.

34. Halder A, Kutzner I, Graichen F, Heinlein B, Beier A, Bergmann G. Influence of limb alignment on mediolateral loading in total knee replacement: In vivo measurements in five patients. J Bone Jt Surg - Ser A. 2012;94(11):1023–9.

35. Lundberg HJ, Knowlton C, Wimmer MA. Fine tuning total knee replacement contact force prediction algorithms using blinded model validation. J Biomech Eng [Internet]. 2013;135(2). Available from: http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84873659082&partnerID=40&md5=661925c19ccbec627ef7f8bc25b537c1

36. Liu S, Hall DJ, Dommann-Scherrer C, Pourzal R, Wahl P. Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy imaging is a useful adjunct to routine histopathology to identify failure of polyethylene inlays in revision total hip arthroplasty. APMIS [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 May 14];n/a(n/a). Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/apm.13421

37. Liu S, Hall DJ, Della Valle CJ, Walsh MJ, Jacobs JJ, Pourzal R. Simultaneous Characterization of Implant Wear and Tribocorrosion Debris within its Corresponding Tissue Response Using Infrared Chemical Imaging. Biotribology. 2021 Jun 1;26:100163.

420 38. Liu A, Ingham E, Fisher J, Tipper JL. Generation of a large volume of clinically relevant
421 nanometre-sized ultra-high-molecular-weight polyethylene wear particles for cell culture
422 studies. Proc Inst Mech Eng [H]. 2014 Apr;228(4):418–26.

423 39. Tipper JL, Ingham E, Galvin AL, Fisher J. Estimation of the Osteolytic Potential of
424 Noncrosslinked and Crosslinked Polyethylenes and Ceramic-on-Ceramic Total Hip
425 Prostheses. J ASTM Int. 2006 May 17;3(6):JAI100558.

426 40. Rad EM, Laurent MP, Knowlton CB, Lundberg HJ, Pourzal RR, Wimmer MA. Linear
427 penetration as a surrogate measure for volumetric wear in TKR tibial inserts. In 2018. p. 75–
428 92.

429

430