Mahoney eAppendix Page 1 of 4

TABLE E-1 Anteroposterior and Mediolateral Dimensions of the Femoral Component of the Total Knee Replacement Utilized in the Study, by Component Size

replacement ethized in the study, by component size							
		Anteroposterior	Mediolateral				
Femoral	Anteroposterior	Inside	Distal				
Component	Outside	Dimension‡	Dimension§				
Size*	Dimension† (mm)	(mm)	(mm)				
5	56	39	62				
6	58	42	65				
7	61	44	67				
8	63	46	70				
9	65	49	72				
11	70	53	77				
13	75	58	82				

^{*}The device is the Scorpio NRG PS (Stryker Orthopaedics, Mahwah, NJ). †The anteroposterior distance between most anterior and most posterior points (outside-to-outside anteroposterior dimension). ‡The anteroposterior distance between the anterior and posterior facets at the junctions of the anterior and posterior chamfers (inside-to-inside dimension). §The mediolateral width at the anteroposterior center of the distal facet.

Mahoney eAppendix Page 2 of 4

TABLE E-2A Regression Models for the Prediction of Femoral Component Overhang in 391 Patients (437 Knees) After Total Knee Arthroplasty

Total Kilee Artifroplasty					
Outcome Variable (Continuous)* with Predictor Variables†	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	P Value	Partial R ² ‡	Model Fit§
Sum of overhang over all zones (mm)					
Female	6.474	0.961	< 0.001	0.095	p < 0.001
Height (cm)	-0.278	0.096	< 0.001	0.080	$R^2 = 0.271$
Femoral component	2.529	0.248	< 0.001	0.195	
size					
Overhang in lateral zone 2 (mm)					
Female	1.511	0.690	< 0.001	0.063	p < 0.001
Height (cm)	-0.068	0.013	< 0.001	0.058	$R^2 = 0.200$
Femoral component	0.573	0.072	< 0.001	0.127	
size					

^{*}Multiple linear regression models. \dagger Interaction terms for sex-femoral component size and sex-height were eliminated for nonsignificance (p > 0.10). \ddagger Partial r² (type II) indicates the proportion of variance in overhang explained by this variable, controlling for the other variables in the model. \$The F test (p value) is for overall model significance, and model R² indicates the proportion of variance in overhang explained overall by this linear model (e.g., 27% and 20%).

TABLE E-2B Regression Models for the Prediction of Femoral Component Overhang in 391 Patients (437 Knees) After Total Knee Arthroplasty

Total Knee Artifroplasty					
Outcome Variable (Binary)* with Predictor Variables†	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	P Value	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)‡	Model Fit
Is there overhang ≥3mm in any zone? (yes/no)					
Female	6.474	0.961	<0.001	5.6 (2.9- 11.0)	p < 0.001§
Height (cm)	-0.278	0.096	< 0.001	0.8 (0.7-0.9)	p = 0.601#
Femoral component size	2.529	0.248	< 0.001	2.1 (1.7-2.5)	
Is there overhang of ≥5 mm in any zone? (yes/no)					
Female	1.633	0.472	0.005	5.1 (2.0- 12.9)	p < 0.001§
Height (cm)	-0.087	0.020	< 0.001	0.8 (0.7-0.9)	p = 0.229#
Femoral component size	0.632	0.122	< 0.001	1.9 (1.5-2.4)	
Do three or more zones have overhang of ≥3 mm? (yes/no)					
Female	1.467	0.428	0.001	4.3 (1.9- 10.0)	p < 0.001§
Height (cm)	-0.105	0.020	< 0.001	0.8 (0.7-0.8)	p = 0.336#
Femoral component size	0.773	0.118	< 0.001	2.2 (1.7-2.7)	

^{*}Multivariate logistic regression models. †Interaction terms for sex-femoral component size and sex-height were eliminated for nonsignificance (p > 0.10). ‡Estimated odds ratio for one unit increase of the variable, controlling for all other variables in the model. For sex, odds ratio compares female to male. L Likelihood ratio test for overall significance of the model. #Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test (a p value of L value of L

Page 3 of 4 Mahoney eAppendix

TABLE E-3 Regression Models for the Effect of Femoral Component Overhang on the Presence of Clinically

Important Knee Pain at	Two Years A	After Total K	Inee Arthrop	lasty*			
						Adjusted Odds Ratio for Specified Increases of Overhang (95% Confidence Interval)†	
Overhang Measure with Predictor Variables	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Wald P Value		Model Fit	Specified Units	Odds Ratio
Overhang of ≥3 mm in any zone? (yes or no)							
Intercept	-1.997	0.237	< 0.001		$p = 0.020\ddagger$	Yes or no	1.9 (1.1-3.3)§
Overhang	0.635	0.286	0.027				
Age	-0.027	0.015	0.068				
Number of zones with overhang ≥3 mm (count)							
Intercept	-1.863	0.193	< 0.001		$p = 0.031\ddagger$	1 zone	1.2 (1.0-1.4)§
Overhang	0.175	0.083	0.035		p = 0.353#	2 zones	1.4 (1.0-2.0)§
Age	-0.028	0.015	0.063		•	4 zones	2.0 (1.1-3.9)§
Sum overhang over all zones (mm)							
Intercept	-1.874	0.195	< 0.001		$p = 0.031\ddagger$	1 mm	1.0 (1.0-1.1)§
Overhang	0.037	0.018	0.033		p = 0.172#	5 mm	1.2 (1.0-1.4)§
Age	-0.027	0.015	0.067			21 mm	2.2 (1.1-4.5)§
Maximum overhang in any single zone (mm)							
Intercept	-1.892	0.229	< 0.001		$p = 0.067 \ddagger$	1 mm	1.1 (1.0-1.3)
Overhang	0.103	0.061	0.093		p = 0.882#	3 mm	1.4 (0.9-2.0)
Age	-0.027	0.015	0.076			6 mm	1.9 (0.9-3.8)
Overhang in lateral zone 2 (mm)							
Intercept	-1.830	0.207	< 0.001		$p = 0.080 \ddagger$	1 mm	1.1 (1.0-1.2)
Overhang	0.097	0.062	0.116		p = 0.517#	3 mm	1.2 (1.0-1.5)
Age	-0.027	0.015	0.073			6 mm	1.8 (0.9-3.7)

^{*}Logistic regression models modeling pain greater than occasional mild pain compared with absent or only occasional mild pain. Sex was eliminated from all models for nonsignificance at alpha >0.10. Six knees that had lateral retinacular release were excluded from these analyses. †Odds ratio for the specified number of units of increase of the predictor variable. Values selected represent a single unit, the median, and the 95th percentile. Where p < 0.05 for overhang, odds ratios listed as 1.0 have been decreased by rounding. ‡Likelihood ratio test for overall significance of the model. §Odds ratio was significant (p < 0.05). #Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test (a p value of >0.05 is consistent with good fit).

Mahoney eAppendix Page 4 of 4

TABLE E-4 Regression Models for the Effect of Femoral Component Overhang on Knee Flexion One

Year After Total Knee Arthroplasty* Overhang Measure with Predictor Estimated Standard Wald P Variables Coefficient Error Value Model Fit† Overhang of ≥ 3 mm in any zone? (yes or no) Overhang 0.647 0.811 0.425 p < 0.001 $R^2 = 0.141$ Preop. flexion 0.132 0.034 < 0.001 Female sex -3.0290.827 < 0.001 Body mass index -0.0310.117 0.793 Body mass index × female -0.3950.147 0.008 Number of zones with overhang ≥ 3 mm (count) Overhang -0.2760.262 0.293 p < 0.001Preop. flexion 0.135 0.034 < 0.001 $R^2 = 0.142$ Female sex -2.6370.814 0.001 Body mass index -0.0360.117 0.761 Body mass index × female -0.3970.147 0.007 Sum overhang over all zones (mm) Overhang -0.0670.057 0.238 p < 0.001 $R^2 = 0.143$ Preop. flexion 0.135 0.034 < 0.001 Female sex -2.5780.821 0.002 $-0.03\overline{6}$ 0.760 Body mass index 0.117 -0.3980.147 0.007 Body mass index \times female Maximum overhang in any zone (mm) Overhang -0.0850.188 0.653 p < 0.001 $R^2 = 0.140$ 0.133 0.034 0.001 Preop. flexion -2.7250.001 Female sex 0.832 Body mass index -0.0340.117 0.774 Body mass index \times female -0.3960.147 0.007 Overhang in lateral zone 2 (mm) -0.2080.274 Overhang 0.189 p < 0.001 $R^2 = 0.142$ Preop. flexion 0.137 0.034 < 0.001 Female sex -2.6080.819 0.002 Body mass index -0.0380.117 0.745 $-0.38\overline{9}$ 0.008 Body mass index × female 0.147

^{*}Multiple linear regression models controlling for preoperative flexion, sex, body mass index, and sex-body mass index interaction. The outcome variable is postoperative knee flexion (deg). †The F test is for overall model significance, and model R² indicates the proportion of variance in overhang explained overall by the linear model.