Published in final edited form as:

J Biomech. 2010 June 18; 43(9): 1689–1695. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.02.035.

Mechanical Asymmetry During Articulation of Tibial and Femoral Cartilage: Local and Overall Compressive and Shear Deformation and Properties

Benjamin L. Wong, MS¹ and Robert L. Sah, MD, ScD^{*,1}

¹Department of Bioengineering, University of California–San Diego, La Jolla, CA.

Abstract

During knee movement, femoral cartilage articulates against cartilage from the tibial plateau, and the resulting mechanical behavior has yet to be fully characterized. The objectives of this study were to determine 1) the overall and depth-varying axial and shear strains, and 2) the associated moduli, of femoral and tibial cartilage during the compression and shearing of apposing tibial and femoral samples. Osteochondral blocks from human femoral condyles (FC) characterized as normal and donor-matched lateral tibial plateau (TP) were apposed, compressed 13%, and subjected to relative lateral motion. When surfaces began to slide, axial ($-E_{zz}$) and shear (E_{xz}) strains and compressive (E) and shear (G) modulus, overall and as a function of depth, were determined for femoral and tibial cartilage. Tibial $-E_{zz}$ was ~2-fold greater than FC $-E_{zz}$ near the surface (0.38 versus 0.22) and overall (0.16 versus 0.07). Near the surface, E_{xz} of TP was 8-fold higher than that of FC (0.41 versus 0.05), while overall E_{xz} was 4-fold higher (0.09 versus 0.02). For TP and FC, $-E_{zz}$ and E_{xz} were greatest near the surface and decreased monotonically with depth. E for FC was 1.7-fold greater than TP, both near the surface (0.40 versus 0.24MPa) and overall (0.76 versus 0.47MPa). Similarly, G was 7-fold greater for FC (0.22MPa) than TP near the surface (0.03MPa) and 3-fold higher for FC (0.38MPa) than TP (0.13MPa) overall. These results indicate that tibial cartilage deforms and strains more axially and in shear than the apposing femoral cartilage during tibio-femoral articulation, reflecting their respective moduli.

Keywords

Cartilage; Biomechanics; Compression; Shear; Tibio-Femoral Articulation

1. Introduction

Femoral and tibial cartilage articulate against one other in the knee to biomechanically facilitate joint movement (Mow, et al., 2005). During knee movement, cartilage lining the femoral condyle contacts, compresses, and slides against tibial cartilage (Figure 1A). To reveal cartilage

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Address correspondence and reprint requests to Robert L. Sah, MD, ScD, Department of Bioengineering, Mail Code 0412, University of California-San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093-0412. Tel: (858) 534-0821. Fax: (858) 822-1614. rsah@ucsd.edu..

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

mechanical properties and deformation in response to loading, cartilage samples are typically tested *in vitro* and against non-biologic counter-platens in confined (Neu, et al., 2005, Schinagl, et al., 1997) and unconfined compression (Chahine, et al., 2004, Jurvelin, et al., 2003), torsion (Zhu, et al., 1993), and shear (Buckley, et al., 2008). Physiologically, cartilages articulate against cartilage, and resulting deformation may depend upon the mechanical behavior of the counter-articulating surface during mechanical tests. Therefore, mechanical tests that load physiologically apposing cartilage surfaces (i.e. femoral against tibial cartilage) would be useful to elucidate cartilage deformation, and its associated mechanical properties, that occur during joint loading.

In response to physiologic loading, knee cartilage deforms, and resulting strain magnitudes vary with joint location and tissue depth. Following various physical activities such as knee bending, impact loading, and running, cartilage compresses ~3-20% of the overall thickness (Eckstein, et al., 2006, Kersting, et al., 2005, Van De Velde, et al., 2009) with compression typically being higher in tibial than femoral cartilage (Eckstein, et al., 2006, Kersting, et al., 2005). Such differences in deformation between cartilage regions reflect differences in stiffness, with femoral cartilage being stiffer than tibial cartilage (Lyyra, et al., 1999). Moreover, cartilage stiffness varies across the femoral (Athanasίου, et al., 1991, Setton, et al., 1994) and tibial (Mow, et al., 2005) joint surfaces. During cartilage-on-cartilage articulation, axial and shear deformation of femoral cartilage varies with depth, being highest near the surface and becoming minimal near the tidemark (Wong, et al., 2008a, Wong, et al., 2008b). Collectively, these results suggest deformation of femoral and tibial cartilage is markedly different, overall and locally, during tibio-femoral articulation. While previous studies have elucidated local and overall femoral mechanical properties as well as overall tibial cartilage properties, local tibial compressive and shear mechanics remain to be investigated. Theoretical models of anatomic joint articulation can be used to predict local cartilage deformation (Ateshian, et al., 1994, Swanson, 1979), but depend highly on depth-varying mechanical properties of the anatomical surfaces (Ateshian, et al., 1994). Thus, a comprehensive characterization of femoral and tibial cartilage mechanical properties during tibio-femoral articulation, locally and overall, would further the understanding of cartilage mechanics.

Recently, cartilage deformation during cartilage-on-cartilage articulation was elucidated (Wong, et al., 2008a, Wong, et al., 2008b) using video microscopy (Schinagl, et al., 1996) and image correlation to track the displacement of fiducial markers (Gratz and Sah, 2008, Wang, et al., 2002). With this experimental approach, a pair of osteochondral blocks was compressed in apposition and subjected to lateral shearing motion to mimic the biomechanical environment during joint movement. Resulting compressive and shear strains of cartilage were determined locally and overall with a resolution sufficient to resolve small magnitudes (~1%) of strain. In addition, measurements of strain and stress were combined to determine local and overall shear modulus. However, such studies examined articulation mechanics in a simplified geometry, with the apposing cartilage samples being from the femoral condyle. Using this configuration, osteochondral samples from the tibia and femoral condyle can be apposed (Figure 1B) and tested to examine the mechanics of tibio-femoral articulation (Figure 1C) to extend previous findings and further the understanding of cartilage mechanics during joint movement.

Thus, the hypothesis of this study was that during tibio-femoral articulation, the deformation and associated properties of tibial cartilage are markedly different from femoral cartilage. To test this hypothesis, the objectives of this study were to determine the overall and depth-varying axial and shear strains, as well as the associated overall and depth-varying moduli, of tibial and femoral cartilage during compression and shear.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Sample preparation

Six osteochondral cores (each with a 10mm diameter) were isolated, one each, from the anterior lateral femoral condyle (FC) of six fresh cadaveric human donors (mean $\pm$ SEM: 46 $\pm$ 1.5 yrs). Additionally, six osteochondral blocks (each with a chondral area of $\sim$ 1cm²) were harvested from the region of the donor-matched lateral tibial plateau (TP) not covered by the meniscus. Femoral cores with grossly normal surfaces (modified Outerbridge grade of 1 (Yamada, et al., 2002)) were selected, while all donor-matched tibial blocks displayed mild surface fibrillation and were grades 2-3. The specimens were immersed in phosphate buffered saline (PBS) containing proteinase inhibitors (PI) (Frank, et al., 1987) and stored at -70°C until use.

2.2. Experimental Design

On the day of testing, the osteochondral specimens were thawed and further processed. The femoral core and tibial block were each trimmed as previously (Wong, et al., 2008a) using a low-speed saw (IsometTM, Buehler, Lake Bluff, IL) to yield an osteochondral fragment for histopathologic analysis (See Appendix A for description) and one $\sim$ rectangular block for biomechanical testing. Each rectangular block had a cartilage surface area of $\sim$ 3 $\times$ 8mm² and a total thickness of $\sim$ 1cm. Paired femoral and donor-matched tibial blocks were created with the 8mm lengths being parallel to the direction of joint articulation.

2.3. Biomechanical Testing

Samples were first tested by micro-scale testing with PBS+PI as lubricant in a custom bi-axial loading chamber mounted onto an epi-fluorescence microscope for digital video (Figure 1C) as previously described (Wong, et al., 2008a) (See Appendix A for description). Following re-swelling at 4 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ for $\sim$ 16h, femoral and tibial samples were then separately tested in a macro-scale system to assess overall cartilage mechanical properties as previously described (Wong, et al., 2008a) (See Appendix A for description).

2.4. Data Analysis and Statistics

To assess depth-variation and compare strains computed from the digital micrographs (See Appendix A for description), local strains were averaged depth-wise and plotted as a function of tissue depth. Sample thickness was normalized and divided into 8 intervals, with 4 intervals being 0.083 times the normalized thickness near the articular surface (i.e. 0 to 0.333) and 0.167 times for the remaining tissue depth (i.e. 0.333 to 1). To reduce noise and consolidate data, strains were averaged at the same normalized depth interval to yield a depth-profile.

Overall axial and shear strains as well as the overall compressive (E) and shear modulus were determined as previously described (Wong, et al., 2008a). For this study, shear moduli were determined relative to the compressed (G_1) and uncompressed (G_0) cartilage thickness. In addition, the depth-varying compressive and shear moduli were also estimated from the overall respective moduli and local strain for each sample (Wong, et al., 2008a).

Data are reported as mean $\pm$ standard error of the mean (SEM). Repeated measures ANOVA was used to determine the effects of normalized tissue depth (0-1, surface-bone) and location (FC, TP) on tissue strain and modulus. Planned pair-wise comparisons were used to assess differences between FC and TP groups for strains and moduli near the surface and overall. Modulus data were log transformed before analysis to adjust for sample variances that were proportional to amplitude.

3. Results

3.1. Sample Thickness and Histopathology

Cartilage in TP samples was generally thicker than FC, and the overall histopathology scores were consistent with their gross and histological appearances (Figure 2). Tibial cartilage had an average thickness of 2.88 ± 0.53 mm, while femoral cartilage was 2.20 ± 0.15 mm in thickness. The histopathology score of 6.44 ± 0.72 for tibial samples was significantly higher ($p < 0.01$) than the femoral score of 1.83 ± 0.39 . For tibial samples, structural features (surface irregularity and transverse clefts) exhibited mild degeneration and GAG loss was apparent, which resulted in scores being ~1-point higher than those for femoral samples. In contrast, cellularity and cloning scores were similarly low (i.e. normal) between femoral and tibial samples.

3.2.1. Deformation: Axial Strains—At compressive equilibrium, $-E_{zz}$ decreased significantly with depth from the articular surface ($p < 0.001$) for both locations (Figure 3A,B,D,E) and was lower in magnitude in the FC (Figure 3A,B) than TP cartilage (Figure 3D,E). The axial displacements of the articular surface relative to the tidemark was on average 507 ± 92 and 169 ± 17 μ m for TP and FC samples, respectively. This translated to $-E_{zz}$ near the articular surface being relatively high and decreasing markedly from 0.38 to 0.02 in the deepest regions for TP cartilage, and from 0.22 to 0.01 for FC samples (Figure 4A). Near the articular surface, $-E_{zz}$ was ~2x higher ($p < 0.01$) in TP (0.38) than FC (0.22) cartilage (Figure 5A). Similarly, overall $-E_{zz}$ (nominal strain) of TP (0.16 ± 0.02) was twice that of FC (0.07 ± 0.02) cartilage (Figure 5D). Lateral (E_{xx}) and shear (E_{xz}) strains resulting from the applied compression were low, averaging < 0.03 for all samples, while E_{xx} and $-E_{zz}$ did not apparently change following lateral motion ($< 1\%$) (data not shown).

3.2.2. Deformation: Shear Strains—As described previously (Wong, et al., 2008b), shear loading of apposing cartilage surfaces results in surface sliding with maintenance of peak shear deformation (Figure 3C,F), and at this time, E_{xz} varied markedly with depth from the articular surface for both locations ($p < 0.01$) and between FC (Figure 3C) and TP (Figure 3F) cartilage ($p < 0.01$). On average, the resulting lateral displacements at the surface of TP and FC cartilage were 398 ± 38 and 81 ± 9 μ m, respectively. As a result, E_{xz} decreased significantly ($p < 0.001$) and monotonically from 0.41 and 0.05 near the articular surface, to very low magnitudes (≤ 0.01) near the tidemark for TP and FC cartilage, respectively (Figure 4B). Near the articular surface, E_{xz} was ~8x higher ($p < 0.01$) in TP than FC cartilage (Figure 5B), while overall E_{xz} (nominal strain) was ~4x higher ($p < 0.01$) for TP (0.09 ± 0.01) than FC (0.02 ± 0.01) samples (Figure 5E). Effects of depth ($p < 0.01$) and tissue location ($p < 0.01$) on local (Figure 4C, 5C) and overall (Figure 5F) E_{xz} were similar to those found for E_{xz} ; however, values were lower in magnitude.

3.3.1. Tissue Properties: Compressive—To estimate compressive loads during micro-scale tests, axial compression for each cartilage layer (FC, TP) in micro-scale shear tests was replicated by applying axial displacements measured in micro-scale tests (reported above) to FC and TP cartilage in macro-scale tests. As a function of normalized tissue depth, compressive modulus (E) was not apparently different between locations at all depths ($p = 0.11$) and near the articular surface ($p = 0.17$) (Figure 6A). Since cartilage thickness was generally greater in TP samples, each normalized depth interval was thicker for TP cartilage, and comparisons of E may be more appropriate between similar thickness depth regions. Within the top 125 μ m of the articular surface (Figure 6B, 7A), E was 0.40 ± 0.19 MPa for FC cartilage, being markedly higher ($p < 0.05$) than that of TP samples (0.24 ± 0.08 MPa). Similarly, overall E was markedly higher ($p < 0.01$) for FC (0.76 ± 0.13 MPa) than TP cartilage (0.47 ± 0.08 MPa) (Figure 7D).

3.3.2. Tissue Properties: Shear—Similarly for measurement of shear loads, resulting shear deformation of each cartilage layer (FC, TP) in micro-scale tests was replicated in macro-scale tests by applying resulting lateral surface displacement measured from micro-scale tests (reported above) to FC and TP cartilage. For FC cartilage, shear modulus relative to the compressed cartilage thickness (G_1) near the surface was 0.22 ± 0.11 MPa, which was 7-fold higher ($p < 0.05$) than the surface G_1 of TP cartilage (0.03 ± 0.003 MPa) (Figure 6D, 7B). Overall G_1 was markedly higher ($p < 0.001$) in FC (0.38 ± 0.06 MPa) than TP cartilage (0.13 ± 0.01 MPa) (Figure 7E). Effect of location on local (Figure 6D, 7C) and overall (Figure 7G) shear modulus relative to the uncompressed thickness (G_0) was found to be similar to G_1 , with G_0 being markedly higher in FC cartilage near the surface ($p < 0.01$) and overall ($p < 0.001$). In all cases, values of G_0 were slightly higher in magnitudes than that of G_1 .

4. Discussion

This study utilized a micro-scale cartilage-on-cartilage testing system to elucidate cartilage strain during tibio-femoral articulation as well as the mechanical properties of femoral and tibial cartilage. The present results indicate that during axial and lateral loading of tibial against femoral cartilage (Figure 8A), tibial cartilage deforms and strains markedly more in both compression and shear than femoral cartilage (Figure 8B), and such trends are a result of femoral cartilage being stiffer in compression and shear. Under axial displacement, tibial $-E_{zz}$ was 0.38 near the articular surface and 0.16 overall, being 50% higher than femoral $-E_{zz}$ (surface - 0.22; overall - 0.07). During lateral motion, tibial E_{xz} was 0.41 near the surface and 0.09 overall, being ~80% higher than that of FC (surface - 0.05; overall - 0.02). In addition, E near the surface and overall for FC were both ~40% higher than that of TP. Analogously, G_1 and G_0 were greater in magnitude for FC than TP, being 80% higher near the surface and 65% overall.

The experimental approach utilized in the present study mimics the compression and sliding between femoral and tibial cartilage that occurs during physiologic tibio-femoral joint articulation. Samples were taken from the loading bearing regions of the lateral femoral condyle and donor-matched tibial plateau, where such surfaces appose and articulate against each other anatomically (Mow, et al., 2005). Such regions experience a wide range of compression (3-20%) (Eckstein, et al., 2006; Kersting, et al., 2005; Van De Velde, et al., 2009) and sliding (up to ~50 mm) during normal activities (estimated from refs (Whittle, 2002) and (Shelburne, et al., 2005)). The present study addresses certain physiologic loading parameters (i.e. high compressive loading and low sliding velocity during contralateral toe-off and heel rise (Whittle, 2002)) as well as the relative loading and sliding of physiologically articulating cartilage surfaces. Furthermore, shear moduli and strain were determined for a part of the gait cycle, with high compression and low sliding rate, that likely initiated a relatively large interaction between two opposing tissue surfaces. Since samples were stress relaxed for 1h, the resulting deformation and strains is likely representative of that occurring following prolonged cyclic loading of the femoral and tibial surfaces (i.e. prolonged running, walking, etc.). With prolonged cyclic compression, cartilage gradually depressurizes and eventually reaches a steady-state compression. Furthermore, certain regions of the femoral joint are in constant contact with an apposing articular surface during cyclic loading, and the present results for femoral cartilage would likely be representative for such regions.

Boundary conditions of the present study provide insight into the effect of pathophysiologic lubrication on cartilage deformation. While conditions [1h stress relaxation and relatively high overall compressive strain (~13%)] that result in cartilage boundary lubrication (Schmidt and Sah, 2007) were utilized, overall compressive strain was much greater in tibial than femoral cartilage, and thus, the resulting lubrication mode between the two surfaces, which may be mixed mode and/or boundary, would be difficult to discern due to this asymmetry. Furthermore,

synovial fluid (SF) normally lubricates surfaces physiologically and reduces absolute magnitudes of E_{xz} during articulation in the boundary mode (Wong, et al., 2008a, Wong, et al., 2008b), the present study used PBS as lubricant to allow sufficient lateral displacements in femoral samples so that G_1 could be appropriately estimated. In addition, such a condition mimics impaired SF function and gives insight into the effect of pathophysiologic lubrication on cartilage deformation. However, relative differences in strain and modulus between regions should be consistent, although measured E_{xz} would likely be reduced if SF had been used (Wong, et al., 2008a). Future studies could be conducted to assess the effects of normal and abnormal lubricants on cartilage deformation during tibio-femoral articulation.

Depth-variations in $-E_{zz}$, E_{xz} , E , and G_1 for the cartilage used in this study are consistent with those previously reported. In both compressed tibial (Neu, et al., 2005) and patella-femoral cartilage (Schinagl, et al., 1997), $-E_{zz}$ was depth-varying, decreasing monotonically with increasing depth from the articular surface. During lateral articulation, E_{xz} was also highest at articular surface and lowest near the tidemark (Wong, et al., 2008a, Wong, et al., 2008b) in femoral cartilage. For the present study, both $-E_{zz}$ and E_{xz} of femoral and tibial cartilage exhibited similar depth-varying trends (Figure 4), decreasing markedly with increasing depth. Reflective of the depth-variation in strain, cartilage stiffness in compression (Schinagl, et al., 1997) and shear (Wong, et al., 2008a) for patella-femoral and femoral cartilage, respectively, increased with increasing depth. Similarly, E and G_1 for femoral and tibial cartilage both increased with increasing depth, being ~ 1.5 - $2\times$ lower near the surface and 5 - $10\times$ higher near the tidemark than the overall values (Figure 5). Since shear loads were measured at a lateral strain after 10s, G_1 determined in the present study indicates the cartilage shear stiffness after ~ 0.8 mm of relative surface motion, being ~ 10 - 50% higher than that at equilibrium (Spirt, et al., 1989).

In contrast to the present results, G_1 was found to be lowest just beneath the superficial zone in cartilage in a recent study (Buckley, et al., 2008). This may stem from differences in the methodologies employed, which include the method to induce shear and the resolution of presented data. In the previous study, sliding did not occur between cartilage and platen surfaces since a platen was gripped to the articular surface and displaced laterally to induce shear. In the present study, shear behavior was determined when unbound cartilage surfaces were sliding relative to one another. The presence of sliding may further drag the superficial tissue and induce shear strains to be greatest at the surface and result in the depth-variation in shear modulus observed in the present study. In addition, the resolution of the present data (~ 100 - $150\mu\text{m}$ near the surface) is lower than that of the previous study ($\sim 40\mu\text{m}$), which could possibly mask peaks just beneath the surface (0 - $100\mu\text{m}$). Future investigations may clarify the reasons for these differences.

The magnitudes of E and G_1 reported in this study for cartilage from human femoral condyles and tibial plateau are consistent with those previously reported. From indentation tests, overall E was estimated to be 0.47 and 0.68 MPa for cartilage from the lateral aspects of the tibial plateau and femoral condyle, respectively, (Lyyra, et al., 1999) being similar to those found in the current study (TP: 0.47 MPa, FC: 0.76 MPa). Analogous to E , overall G_1 for femoral cartilage reported for this study (0.38 MPa) was also consistent with those previously reported (0.32 MPa) (Wong, et al., 2008a). Thus, for human tibio-femoral cartilage, mechanical properties in compression and shear were similar to those previously described.

The tissue deformation being greater in cartilage from the tibia than the femoral condyle is consistent with *in vivo* tibio-femoral deformation and predictions accounting for past studies on tibial and femoral tissue stiffness. Following impact loading, tibial cartilage deformation was observed with MRI to be significantly higher than that of femoral cartilage (Eckstein, et al., 2006). In addition, indentation stiffness for femoral cartilage was ~ 1.2 - 1.5 times greater

than tibial cartilage in human joints (Lyyra, et al., 1999), being consistent with trends (1.5-2 times) found in this study. As a result, femoral cartilage would be predicted to deform less than tibial cartilage during articulation because it is relatively stiffer. In addition to the intrinsic structural differences between regions (Arokoski, et al., 1999), differences in deformation, and associated stiffness, may be partly attributed to the mild degeneration observed in tibial cartilage (Figure 2). Since the region of tibial cartilage that is uncovered by the meniscus typically shows signs of early degeneration (Bennett, et al., 1942) and femoral cartilage typically displays signs of degeneration in elder individuals (>60 yrs old), the present results would be representative for that of a normal mature adult.

This study further elucidates cartilage mechanics by providing insight into the cartilage deformation of articulating surfaces during tibio-femoral joint articulation. Collectively, the present results suggest cartilage deformation in compression and shear are asymmetric between cartilage surfaces, locally and overall, during tibio-femoral articulation, being markedly higher in tibial cartilage than femoral cartilage, and are reflected by differences in mechanical stiffness. Cell metabolism and matrix synthesis, and as result tissue structure, are markedly regulated by mechanical deformation (Jin, et al., 2001, Nugent, et al., 2006, Sah, et al., 1989). Thus, relative differences in deformation between articulating surfaces may be a biomechanical stimulus that regulates the regional variations in cartilage stiffness, as well as the metabolic and cellular responses to maintain homeostasis normally and in injury, within the physiologic knee joint.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by NIH and Howard Hughes Medical Institute through the Professors Program Grant to UCSD for Dr. Robert L. Sah. We thank the many residents and staff at Dr. Lotz's Laboratory at the Scripps Research Institute for harvesting and providing the human tissue used in this study, and Chris Kim and Dr. Won Bae for their help in the histopathology assessments.

References

- Arokoski JP, Hyttinen MM, Helminen HJ, Jurvelin JS. Biomechanical and structural characteristics of canine femoral and tibial cartilage. *J Biomed Mater Res* 1999;48:99–107. [PubMed: 10331900]
- Ateshian GA, Lai WM, Zhu WB, Mow VC. An asymptotic solution for the contact of two biphasic cartilage layers. *J Biomech* 1994;27:1347–1360. [PubMed: 7798285]
- Athanasios KA, Rosenwasser MP, Buckwalter JA, Malinin TI, Mow VC. Interspecies comparisons of in situ intrinsic mechanical properties of distal femoral cartilage. *J Orthop Res* 1991;9:330–340. [PubMed: 2010837]
- Bae WC, Temple MM, Amiel D, Coutts RD, Niederauer GG, Sah RL. Indentation testing of human cartilage: Sensitivity to articular surface degeneration. *Arthritis Rheum* 2003;48:3382–3394. [PubMed: 14673990]
- Bennett, GA.; Waite, H.; Bauer, W. Changes in the knee joint at various ages with particular reference to the nature and development of degenerative joint disease. The Commonwealth Fund; New York: 1942.
- Buckley MR, Gleghorn JP, Bonassar LJ, Cohen I. Mapping the depth dependence of shear properties in articular cartilage. *J Biomech* 2008;41:2430–7. [PubMed: 18619596]
- Chahine NO, Wang CC, Hung CT, Ateshian GA. Anisotropic strain-dependent material properties of bovine articular cartilage in the transitional range from tension to compression. *J Biomech* 2004;37:1251–1261. [PubMed: 15212931]

- Eckstein F, Hudelmaier M, Putz R. The effects of exercise on human articular cartilage. *J Anat* 2006;208:491–512. [PubMed: 16637874]
- Frank EH, Grodzinsky AJ, Koob TJ, Eyre DR. Streaming potentials: A sensitive index of enzymatic degradation in articular cartilage. *J Orthop Res* 1987;5:497–508. [PubMed: 3681524]
- Fung, YC. A first course in continuum mechanics. Prentice-Hall; Englewood Cliffs: 1977.
- Fung, YC. Biomechanics: Mechanical properties of living tissues. Springer-Verlag; New York: 1981.
- Gratz KR, Sah RL. Experimental measurement and quantification of frictional contact between biological surfaces experiencing large deformation and slip. *J Biomech* 2008;41:1333–40. [PubMed: 18329650]
- Jin M, Frank EH, Quinn TM, Hunziker EB, Grodzinsky AJ. Tissue shear deformation stimulates proteoglycan and protein biosynthesis in bovine cartilage explants. *Arch Biochem Biophys* 2001;395:41–8. [PubMed: 11673864]
- Jurvelin JS, Buschmann MD, Hunziker EB. Mechanical anisotropy of the human knee articular cartilage in compression. *Proc Inst Mech Eng [H]* 2003;217:215–9.
- Kersting UG, Stubendorff JJ, Schmidt MC, Bruggemann GP. Changes in knee cartilage volume and serum comp concentration after running exercise. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2005;13:925–34. [PubMed: 16154364]
- Lyrra T, Kiviranta I, Vaatainen U, Helminen HJ, Jurvelin JS. In vivo characterization of indentation stiffness of articular cartilage in the normal human knee. *J Biomed Mater Res* 1999;48:482–7. [PubMed: 10421691]
- Mow, VC.; Gu, WY.; Chen, FH. Structure and function of articular cartilage and meniscus. In: Mow, VC.; Huijskes, R., editors. Basic orthopaedic biomechanics and mechano-biology. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Philadelphia: 2005. p. 720
- Neu CP, Hull ML, Walton JH. Heterogeneous three-dimensional strain fields during unconfined cyclic compression in bovine articular cartilage explants. *J Orthop Res* 2005;23:1390–8. [PubMed: 15972257]
- Nugent GE, Aneloski NM, Schmidt TA, Schumacher BL, Voegtline MS, Sah RL. Dynamic shear stimulation of bovine cartilage biosynthesis of proteoglycan 4 (prg4). *Arthritis Rheum* 2006;54:1888–96. [PubMed: 16729294]
- Ross, MH.; Kaye, GI.; Pawlina, W. Histology: A text and atlas. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Philadelphia, PA: 2003.
- Sah RL, Kim YJ, Doong JH, Grodzinsky AJ, Plaas AHK, Sandy JD. Biosynthetic response of cartilage explants to dynamic compression. *J Orthop Res* 1989;7:619–636. [PubMed: 2760736]
- Schinagl RM, Gurskis D, Chen AC, Sah RL. Depth-dependent confined compression modulus of full-thickness bovine articular cartilage. *J Orthop Res* 1997;15:499–506. [PubMed: 9379258]
- Schinagl RM, Ting MK, Price JH, Sah RL. Video microscopy to quantitate the inhomogeneous equilibrium strain within articular cartilage during confined compression. *Ann Biomed Eng* 1996;24:500–512. [PubMed: 8841725]
- Schmidt TA, Sah RL. Effect of synovial fluid on boundary lubrication of articular cartilage. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2007;15:35–47. [PubMed: 16859933]
- Scott JE, Dorling J. Differential staining of acid glycosaminoglycans (mucopolysaccharides) by alcian blue in salt solutions. *Histochemie* 1965;5:221–33. [PubMed: 4223499]
- Setton LA, Mow VC, Muller FJ, Pita JC, Howell DS. Mechanical properties of canine articular cartilage are significantly altered following transection of the anterior cruciate ligament. *J Orthop Res* 1994;12:451–463. [PubMed: 8064477]
- Shapiro F, Glimcher MJ. Induction of osteoarthritis in the rabbit knee joint. Histologic changes following meniscectomy and meniscal lesions. *Clin Orthop Rel Res* 1980;147:287–295.
- Shelburne KB, Torry MR, Pandy MG. Muscle, ligament, and joint-contact forces at the knee during walking. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;37:1948–56. [PubMed: 16286866]
- Spirt AA, Mak AF, Wassell RP. Nonlinear viscoelastic properties of articular cartilage in shear 1989;7:43–49.
- Swanson, SAV. Friction, wear, and lubrication. In: Freeman, MAR., editor. Adult articular cartilage. Pitman Medical, Tunbridge Wells; England: 1979. p. 415–460.

- Van de Velde SK, Bingham JT, Gill TJ, Li G. Analysis of tibiofemoral cartilage deformation in the posterior cruciate ligament-deficient knee. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2009;91:167–75. [PubMed: 19122092]
- Wang CC, Deng JM, Ateshian GA, Hung CT. An automated approach for direct measurement of two-dimensional strain distributions within articular cartilage under unconfined compression. *J Biomech Eng* 2002;124:557–567. [PubMed: 12405599]
- Whittle, M. Gait analysis: An introduction. Butterworth-Heinemann; Oxford; Boston: 2002.
- Wong BL, Bae WC, Chun J, Gratz KR, Lotz M, Sah RL. Biomechanics of cartilage articulation: Effects of lubrication and degeneration on shear deformation. *Arthritis Rheum* 2008a;58:2065–2074. [PubMed: 18576324]
- Wong BL, Bae WC, Gratz KR, Sah RL. Shear deformation kinematics during cartilage articulation: Effect of lubrication, degeneration, and stress relaxation. *Mol Cell Biomech* 2008b;5:197–206. [PubMed: 18751528]
- Yamada K, Healey R, Amiel D, Lotz M, Coutts R. Subchondral bone of the human knee joint in aging and osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2002;10:360–9. [PubMed: 12027537]
- Zhu W, Mow VC, Koob TJ, Eyre DR. Viscoelastic shear properties of articular cartilage and the effects of glycosidase treatment. *J Orthop Res* 1993;11:771–781. [PubMed: 8283321]

Figure 1. Schematic of (A) knee joint movements at multiple scales and (B) deformation of cartilage under (from left to right) no load, compression, and compression + shear loading. Schematic of (C) experimental setup and loading protocol for micro-scale testing.

Figure 2. Representative micrographs of femoral (FC, **A, B**) and tibial (TP, **C, D**) cartilage in apposition and stained with Alcian blue (**A, C**) and H&E (**B, D**) showing structural and cellular detail of the full thickness (**I**), superficial (**II**), middle (**III**), and deep (**IV**) regions.

Figure 3. Micrographs with superimposed strain colormaps taken of apposing femoral (FC, A-C) to tibial (TP, D-F) samples when unloaded (A, D), after axial compression (B, E), and during lateral shear (C, F). Maps of compressive strain relative to the unloaded thickness (color maps: B, E) and shear strain relative to the compressed thickness (color maps, C, F) after achieving surface sliding were determined. Dashed lines (—) encompass the analyzed regions on the undeformed images, while strain map boundaries encompass the corresponding deformed states.

Figure 4.

Local compressive strain ($-E_{zz}$) relative to the unloaded cartilage thickness versus normalized tissue depth under applied compression alone (A) for both femoral (FC) and tibial (TP) cartilage. Local shear strain relative to the compressed cartilage thickness (E_{xz} in B) and to the unloaded cartilage thickness ($E_{xz'}$ in C) under compression and during shear. Values are mean $\pm$ SEM.

Figure 5.

Comparison of peak compressive ($-E_{zz}$) surface (A) and overall strains (D) relative to the unloaded cartilage thicknesses between femoral (FC) and tibial (TP) sample groups. Peak surface (B, C) and overall (E, F) shear strains relative to either the compressed cartilage thickness (E_{xz} in B, E) or the unloaded cartilage thickness ($E_{xz'}$ in C, F).

Figure 6.

Local compressive modulus (E) relative to the unloaded cartilage thickness versus normalized tissue depth (**A**) and absolute depth from the articular surface (**B**) and tidemark (**C**) under applied compression alone for both femoral (FC) and tibial (TP) cartilage. Local shear modulus versus normalized tissue depth relative to the compressed cartilage thickness (G_1 in **D**) and to the unloaded cartilage thickness (G_0 in **E**) under compression and during shear. Values are mean $\pm$ SEM.

Figure 7.

Comparison of peak compressive (E) surface (A) and overall moduli (D) relative to the unloaded cartilage thicknesses between femoral (FC) and tibial (TP) sample groups. Peak surface (B, C) and overall (E, F) shear moduli relative to either the compressed cartilage thickness (G_1 in B, E) or the unloaded cartilage thickness (G_0 in C, F).

Figure 8. (A) Schematic of cartilage compressive and shear deformation of femoral cartilage apposing tibial cartilage when unloaded, compressed, and compressed and sheared. (B) Table of relative magnitudes for compressive ($-E_{zz}$) and shear strain (E_{xz}) for both femoral and tibial cartilage when they are unloaded, compressed, and compressed and sheared in apposition.