



Beyond Spasticity: Muscle Contracture Biology, Gait Biomechanics, and Precision Orthopedic Decision-Making in Cerebral Palsy

Eslam Saeed El-Sayed Mohamed, Hossam Mohamed Khairy, Mohamed Mahmoud El-hefnawy, Yehia Tarek El-Bromboly

Orthopedic Surgery Department, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Egypt

Corresponding author: Eslam Saeed El-Sayed Mohamed

Received: 28 October 2024, **Accepted:** 17 November 2024, **Published:** 20 November 2024

Abstract

Background: Children with spastic cerebral palsy develop changing gait disorders as neural impairment interacts with muscle growth, tissue stiffness and skeletal geometry. Isolated joint findings may poorly identify the primary mechanical restriction. **Objective:** To synthesize the muscle biology and gait biomechanics that inform individualized orthopedic decisions without treating visible deformity as a sufficient surgical indication. **Content:** This narrative review examines the distinction between spasticity and fixed contracture, sarcomere and extracellular-matrix changes, coupling of ankle, knee and hip mechanics, structured examination, three-dimensional gait analysis and strengths and limitations of operative and nonoperative treatment. **Conclusions:** Better treatment selection depends on identifying the dominant mechanism of dysfunction, preserving active force generation and relating correction to patient-centered goals. Future comparative studies should characterize baseline muscle and lever-arm pathology and separate the effects of mechanical correction from rehabilitation and growth.

Keywords: cerebral palsy, orthopedic surgery, gait biomechanics, motor function

Introduction

Cerebral palsy is a heterogeneous group of disorders of movement and posture resulting from disturbances of the developing brain. Although the initiating neurological injury is nonprogressive, the musculoskeletal manifestations change with growth, strength, activity and treatment. An orthopedic assessment must therefore address not only the direction of a joint deformity but also the mechanism responsible for it. Increased stretch reflex activity, impaired selective motor control, abnormal muscle growth, skeletal torsion and altered lever arms can produce outwardly similar gait patterns while requiring very different interventions. This narrative review examines how muscle biology and dynamic biomechanics can be combined into a defensible clinical decision process. [1]

The underlying research problem is a persistent separation between descriptive diagnoses and actionable mechanical explanations. A label such as equinus or crouch tells the clinician where movement differs from typical development, but not whether that deviation originates in one muscle, another joint or a compensation needed to preserve stability. Surgical reasoning based only on the apparent deformity may correct a measurement while sacrificing useful function. Linking tissue-level pathology to walking mechanics offers a more precise means of identifying which impairments are amenable to treatment and which serve an adaptive purpose.

Neural impairment is not synonymous with fixed contracture

Spasticity describes a velocity-dependent increase in resistance to passive stretch associated with abnormal stretch reflex excitability. In a growing child it coexists with weakness, poor selective control, cocontraction and biomechanical alterations. Resistance felt during a clinical examination may originate from neural activation, passive tissue stiffness, pain or difficulty relaxing. A single ordinal tone score cannot reliably distinguish these components. Assessment becomes



more informative when joint movement is examined at different velocities, adjacent joint positions and functional tasks. A child who resists rapid dorsiflexion yet has adequate slow passive range presents a different mechanical problem from one with a fixed loss of dorsiflexion under relaxed conditions. [2]

Neural and structural phenomena are connected but should not be treated as interchangeable. Repeated abnormal activation, limited excursion and growth-related mismatch between bone and muscle contribute to contracture development; once the tissue is shortened and stiff, reducing neural drive alone may not restore joint mobility. Equally, lengthening the musculotendinous unit does not repair selective motor control or strengthen an inhibited muscle. The distinction is essential when comparing rehabilitation, chemodenervation, casting and operative management. Clinicians should describe the proportion of reversible dynamic restriction and established structural loss before assigning a treatment mechanism. [3]

The clinical interview complements examination by showing when impairment becomes disabling. Parents may report tripping during swing, unstable standing, progressive fatigue or difficulty with dressing despite apparently similar ankle range in the clinic. Functional history also identifies changes after growth spurts and prior treatments that temporarily reduced tone but produced little sustained benefit. Such information prevents classification from becoming detached from everyday performance and makes it possible to frame the intervention around a problem the child actually experiences. [4]

Muscle architecture and growth-related contracture

Microscopic observations challenge the intuitive idea that a clinically short spastic muscle simply contains short muscle fibers. Contractured muscles can contain fewer sarcomeres in series, with the remaining sarcomeres operating at abnormally long lengths. Passive stiffness can increase because of remodeling of extracellular matrix and connective tissue, not just persistent motor neuron discharge. This architecture helps explain why weak muscles may simultaneously feel resistant to stretch and produce inadequate active joint moments. Lengthening may improve range while further altering the muscle's force-generating length unless the amount and location of correction are controlled. [5]

The relationship between tendon and muscle is equally important. A musculotendinous unit can accommodate skeletal growth through changes in fascicle length, serial sarcomere number and tendon properties. When adaptation is inadequate, passive tension rises at positions previously tolerated. Tendon lengthening primarily changes the mechanical transmission and passive excursion of the unit; it does not directly reverse muscle fibrosis. In some circumstances greater passive range is accompanied by a weaker push-off or reduced knee support. Tissue pathology thus argues for conservative dosing of correction and for careful evaluation of muscle power before accepting a large intraoperative range as inherently desirable. [6]

Age modifies this process but should not be used as a lone indication. The same apparent knee flexion contracture in a young child and an adolescent may have different structural maturity, lever-arm abnormalities and reserve strength. Growth may reveal deformity that was formerly compensated, while previous repeated lengthenings may have changed the mechanical problem from excessive resistance to insufficient muscle capacity. Longitudinal examination is often more informative than a solitary measurement because it distinguishes an established trajectory from day-to-day variability. [7]

From isolated joints to whole-limb mechanics

Walking is a sequence of coordinated transfers of body weight and mechanical energy. Foot position changes the location of the ground reaction force; this affects the moments that must be generated around the knee and hip. Excessive ankle plantarflexion may push the knee toward extension in early stance, whereas altered ankle rocker or weak plantarflexors can contribute to excessive knee flexion. Hip rotation, pelvic motion and foot progression further modify the effective leverage of muscle forces. Treating each joint as an independent hinge obscures these linked effects and increases the risk of attributing a compensatory movement to the wrong impairment. [8]



Crouch gait illustrates the problem. Persistent hip and knee flexion with excessive ankle dorsiflexion may reflect hamstring shortness, inadequate plantarflexor support, impaired hip extensor function, bony torsion or combinations of these factors. Visible knee flexion cannot be assumed to prove a fixed hamstring contracture. Ankle correction that weakens an already marginal plantarflexor can increase the demand at the knee, even when passive dorsiflexion appears improved. A reasonable assessment therefore evaluates ankle moment and power, knee extension capacity, hip extension and trunk behavior as one mechanical system. [9]

Stance and swing abnormalities also have different functional implications. A child may clear the foot by increasing hip flexion, pelvic hiking or circumduction, while another may tolerate a less symmetrical foot progression angle to maintain stability. A successful intervention should reduce the underlying obstacle without unnecessarily removing a useful adaptation. Observation at different speeds, with and without orthoses, can reveal whether a deviation is obligatory or task-dependent. Mechanical correction should be judged against energy demand, balance and participation, not visual symmetry alone. [10]

Classification as a starting point, not the entire plan

The Gross Motor Function Classification System provides a common language for habitual mobility and the degree of assistance required. It is particularly valuable in setting realistic goals and comparing outcomes among groups with different levels of baseline function. However, GMFCS classification does not specify which joint is restricted, whether a contracture is dynamic or structural, or which procedure should be performed. Children at the same level may have sharply different rotational profiles, muscle strength and gait strategies. Classification is most useful when combined with specific clinical and biomechanical findings rather than substituted for them. [11]

Clinical gait classifications can organize common patterns of spastic hemiplegia and diplegia, but patterns overlap as children mature. The categories are descriptive and may not capture mixed presentations or secondary deformities following treatment. A child with apparent equinus can have compensatory proximal kinematics, while one with crouch may show unequal severity in the two limbs. An adequate report documents asymmetry and multiplanar findings, avoiding the assumption that the left and right sides share the same operative requirements simply because the neurological diagnosis is bilateral. [9]

Examination that identifies the operative mechanism

Examination should distinguish joint range with biarticular muscles slackened from range measured with them tensioned. For example, ankle dorsiflexion in knee flexion and extension helps characterize gastrocnemius contribution; the interpretation still depends on careful positioning and subtalar control. Hip rotation, torsional alignment, popliteal angle, knee extension and foot flexibility require similarly reproducible techniques. Strength and selective motor control should be assessed alongside passive range, since an apparently powerful movement may depend on mass flexor or extensor synergies rather than isolated control. [12]

Repeated measurements are valuable because children with spastic cerebral palsy may resist handling or fatigue quickly. Examination under anesthesia can clarify passive limitations when relaxation is not achieved in clinic, but it removes active stabilizing behavior and should not replace the dynamic assessment. Planning ideally reconciles the awake examination, gait observation, radiographic evaluation where indicated and intraoperative findings. Disagreement between measurements is a reason to reconsider the mechanism rather than automatically privileging the most invasive observation. [13]

The physical examination must document previous operative changes. Scar location, altered tendon tension, residual weakness and a history of casting or injection can account for current restrictions. Records of earlier surgical levels are especially important when recurrent deformity is suspected. Without that history, a recurrence driven by skeletal torsion or growth can be mistaken for failure of a previously treated muscle and lead to inappropriate repeat lengthening. [14]



What three-dimensional gait analysis adds

Instrumented three-dimensional gait analysis describes segment motion during the gait cycle and can combine kinematics with ground reaction forces, joint kinetics and surface electromyography. It is useful when visual inspection cannot distinguish primary pathology from compensation or when several plausible procedures carry competing risks. An overall gait score can summarize deviation from typical walking, but does not reveal which mechanism caused it. Interpretation needs the individual joint curves, foot progression data, timing of muscle activation and the child's examination findings. [15]

A laboratory recording is a standardized sample rather than a complete representation of mobility. Speed, footwear, instructions and awareness of observation can influence the measured pattern. Abnormalities recorded during short level walking may differ from those encountered on stairs, during fatigue or in crowded environments. Functional planning is strengthened by asking whether the laboratory pattern matches family concerns and, when feasible, adding performance measures outside the laboratory. This reduces the chance of prioritizing a statistically detectable angular improvement over a meaningful change in daily walking. [16]

Resource limitations do not make sound clinical reasoning impossible. Where a gait laboratory is unavailable, structured video observation in sagittal and frontal planes, standardized physical examination, careful radiographs and multidisciplinary discussion can increase consistency. Yet these substitutes should not be described as equivalent to instrumented kinetics. The limitation matters most when the proposed intervention could weaken a muscle that performs an important protective function or when rotational and sagittal-plane abnormalities interact. [13]

Hip mechanics and proximal contributions

Persistent hip flexion may reflect iliopsoas shortening, compensatory trunk positioning, insufficient hip extensor power or proximal femoral deformity. Hip adductor overactivity can narrow step width and contribute to scissoring, while structural restriction may affect hygiene, sitting and hip migration. These problems should be separated from the dynamic needs of ambulatory children because the preferred goals differ: stable and efficient gait in one setting, comfortable positioning or preservation of hip health in another. Surgical and nonsurgical decisions must begin with the relevant functional objective rather than a generic diagnosis of hip tightness. [4]

Rotational abnormalities affect the direction in which muscle forces act. Femoral anteversion and tibial torsion may change foot progression and apparent knee alignment even when sagittal passive range is satisfactory. Soft tissue procedures cannot reliably correct a structural rotational deformity, and apparently persistent intoeing following muscle lengthening does not necessarily indicate inadequate release. Conversely, bony correction without appropriate assessment of fixed muscle restriction may leave an important sagittal-plane problem unaddressed. Multiplanar evaluation helps determine which level deserves treatment and which deviation may resolve after correction elsewhere. [17]

Knee mechanics and the risk of excessive lengthening

Hamstring overactivity or shortening can restrict knee extension, but its contribution depends on hip position, pelvic tilt and the phase of walking. Knee flexion in stance is not always generated by a short hamstring; weak knee or hip extensors and insufficient ankle support can create similar findings. Lengthening a hamstring that is already functioning near its limit may weaken swing control or alter pelvic tilt without correcting the dominant cause of crouch. Clinical popliteal angles and dynamic muscle-tendon behavior therefore require joint interpretation. [7]

The quadriceps and rectus femoris contribute differently across the gait cycle. Stiff-knee gait is characterized by restricted or delayed knee flexion during swing, potentially associated with inappropriate rectus femoris activity. A decision about transfer or release should consider timing of electromyographic activity, pre-swing knee flexion velocity and competing limitations at the hip and ankle. It is unsafe to infer that every stiff-knee pattern shares the same pathology merely because peak knee flexion is low. [10]



Ankle and foot as dynamic lever arms

The gastrocnemius and soleus produce plantarflexor support during stance and contribute substantially to forward progression. Their apparent shortness must be interpreted with the knee positioned appropriately, because an isolated gastrocnemius restriction and a combined triceps surae contracture have different implications. Excessive correction of the plantarflexor complex can promote calcaneus positioning, diminish push-off and worsen crouch. The objective should be restoration of usable ankle motion while preserving sufficient active power and mechanical stability. [5]

Foot deformity can also compromise the effective lever arm of the calf muscles. Planovalgus, forefoot malalignment or torsional deformities alter how ground forces are transmitted to the tibia. An isolated tendon procedure may restore passive ankle range but leave poor foot stability and continued inefficiency. Orthotic response helps test whether external alignment and support improve function; persistent rigid deformity requires a different appraisal from a flexible, dynamic foot posture. [12]

Selecting intervention and interpreting evidence

Management lies along a continuum of therapy, orthoses, focal tone reduction, serial casting and orthopedic procedures. Each option changes a different part of the impairment pathway. A temporary reduction in neural hyperexcitability may assist stretching and task practice, but cannot be assumed to reverse established fibrosis. Orthoses may redistribute joint moments during walking without changing fixed structure. Surgery can alter mechanical length or alignment but imposes risks of weakness, recurrence and a prolonged recovery period. Interventions should therefore be compared according to the child's limiting mechanism and desired function rather than ranked as universally stronger or weaker treatments. [2]

Evidence on multilevel orthopedic intervention is informative but heterogeneous. Surgical packages differ in joints treated, tissue procedures, accompanying osteotomies and postoperative therapy. Improvements in kinematic scores do not establish that every component was necessary or that the same operation would suit a child with a different mechanical phenotype. Observational comparisons are vulnerable to selection bias, maturation and changes in rehabilitation intensity. Decision-making should acknowledge these limitations and use the best available measurements to select the minimum effective combination rather than copying a standard package. [18]

Family preferences and treatment burden deserve explicit consideration. A theoretically ideal alignment may require an extended period of reduced walking and intensive therapy, which is not equally feasible for every household. Priorities might include independent transfers, community distances, pain reduction or maintaining participation at school. A transparent decision process explains expected benefits, the uncertainty around functional gains and the specific ways an intervention could weaken existing compensations. [19]

Mechanical interpretation of functional weakness

Strength deficits in cerebral palsy cannot be inferred from the passive excursion of a joint. A muscle may appear short during examination and yet contribute too little active torque during a demanding task. The distinction is particularly relevant when plantarflexor action controls forward movement of the tibia or when hip extensors resist forward trunk collapse. Manual strength testing offers a useful initial impression, but it is influenced by selective motor control, cooperation, position and examiner resistance. Instrumented dynamometry, where feasible, can help characterize force capacity at standardized joint angles. An orthopedic plan should record whether the apparent contracture is accompanied by meaningful active reserve; otherwise lengthening may exchange one limitation for another. [5]

Muscle performance is joint-angle dependent. Changing tendon length alters the range within which the contractile tissue can generate effective force, even if the maximum passive range becomes more normal. This raises a practical question before each release: which portion of the movement arc is needed for daily activity, and what strength must be preserved within it? The operative endpoint should not be maximal excursion in isolation. A slight residual restriction can sometimes be less disabling than the loss of stabilization required for stance or propulsion. That reasoning is not a universal argument



against correction but a reminder that active motor performance is part of the intended outcome. [3]

Fatigue provides another perspective on weakness. Some children maintain alignment for a short examination but gradually increase trunk lean, knee flexion or reliance on aids during longer walks. Such deterioration may reflect inadequate muscular endurance rather than fixed contracture progression. The functional history should specify when a deviation appears, whether rest reverses it and which tasks expose it most clearly. Decisions grounded in the performance of a few laboratory strides risk overlooking the level of reserve needed for school and community environments. [16]

The significance of skeletal torsion and lever-arm dysfunction

Abnormal femoral and tibial rotation can diminish the effectiveness of muscles even when their anatomical attachment and intrinsic force capacity are preserved. The force vector of the knee extensor mechanism and the direction of the foot relative to the line of progression determine how muscular work is transferred to the ground. Excessive torsion may therefore coexist with a seemingly adequate muscle length and still produce inefficient walking. On physical examination, hip rotation profiles and thigh-foot alignment help identify rotational contributions. Where surgical correction is contemplated, the observed foot progression angle must be interpreted alongside pelvic rotation and compensatory movements. [17]

The distinction between the axis of movement and the direction of travel is often overlooked. An internally rotated foot during walking does not always imply a tibial deformity, because hip rotation and pelvic orientation contribute to the final position. Similarly, valgus or planovalgus feet can alter knee moments without any new knee contracture. Treating the distal visible deviation without locating its source can leave the mechanical inefficiency unchanged. A comprehensive orthopedic assessment should therefore describe torsion, foot structure, muscle-tendon restriction and the resulting dynamic pattern before deciding which level is responsible for functional impairment. [13]

Structural rotational correction can alter gait in ways that are not captured by a single sagittal-plane measurement. Improvement in foot progression may influence balance, clearance and ease of orthotic fitting, but it can also expose muscle weakness or a previously concealed sagittal problem. The possibility of such interactions is a reason for staged interpretation of outcomes and for avoiding claims that an isolated rotational metric determines clinical success. Multiplanar mechanics explain why complex deformity requires more than a checklist of local joint angles. [8]

Timing intervention during a changing growth trajectory

The optimal timing of orthopedic treatment cannot be reduced to one age threshold. Earlier intervention may address restrictions before substantial secondary skeletal adaptation, but growth can also reintroduce imbalance and create a need for subsequent treatment. Delaying surgery may allow a clearer functional pattern to emerge while exposing the child to longer periods of compensatory movement and fatigue. The trade-off depends on the severity of fixed restriction, functional decline, skeletal maturity, previous treatment and achievable rehabilitation. Even high-quality gait information cannot remove uncertainty about how a particular child will develop over several years. [14]

Decision-making is strengthened by repeated observations documenting the speed and direction of change. When joint range declines steadily across visits and the limitation increasingly affects activity, structural progression becomes more plausible. A child whose walking pattern is stable with acceptable function may reasonably follow a different pathway from one with rapid loss of endurance and emerging pain. The relevant trigger is therefore a combination of impairment trajectory and meaningful restriction, not appearance alone. Families should be told that growth introduces future uncertainty regardless of the timing chosen. [4]

A second timing issue concerns the sequence of correction across anatomical levels. Fixed contracture, skeletal torsion and deformity of the foot may interact, and altering one can change the apparent need for another. Comprehensive surgery may reduce repeated admissions in selected patients, but a larger surgical package also makes attribution of benefit or harm to individual procedures difficult. The important question is whether each planned component has a distinct



justification from clinical or biomechanical evidence. [20]

Why outcome measures sometimes disagree

Reported orthopedic outcomes can appear inconsistent because they measure different constructs. Range of motion is a local property of a joint, three-dimensional kinematics describe movement patterns, kinetics examine the forces associated with movement, and gross motor assessments evaluate task capacity. A statistically significant change in one domain is compatible with little change in another. The explanation may be incomplete recovery, persistent neurological limitations or the fact that the improved joint variable was never the principal barrier to the targeted activity. Evidence synthesis must preserve those distinctions rather than interpreting all favorable postoperative measurements as equivalent clinical success. [21]

Global gait indices compress multiple joint deviations into a single number, which can facilitate longitudinal reporting but conceal opposing changes. For example, ankle kinematics may normalize while knee mechanics deteriorate or pelvic compensation increases. Interpretation should return to the joint traces and the functional goal behind the intervention. A lower aggregate deviation score cannot by itself establish that walking costs less energy, requires less assistance or feels more comfortable. Conversely, a modest change in aggregate score may coexist with meaningful reduction in tripping or pain. [8]

Meaningful change also depends on baseline severity and measurement precision. A child with relatively mild gait deviation has less numerical room to improve, whereas larger reductions in an index may be achievable in severe deformity without leading to independent mobility. Changes must be evaluated against reliability and any established thresholds for clinical relevance. Comparisons across treatment series should account for different baseline mobility, surgical combinations and rehabilitation exposures before reaching conclusions about superiority. [19]

Designing studies that test decisions rather than procedures

Many observational series report what happens after a selected operation but provide limited insight into why that operation was chosen over reasonable alternatives. The resulting treatment groups often differ systematically in severity, bony alignment and walking capacity. Even careful statistical adjustment cannot account for all unmeasured clinical judgment. A more informative study records the eligibility decision, the proposed treatment target and the alternatives considered before intervention. This allows readers to distinguish selection effects from treatment effects and makes the findings useful for clinical decision-making rather than merely descriptive outcome reporting. [14]

Mechanistic subgroups could improve interpretability. Children with predominantly dynamic hypertonia, severe passive contracture, lever-arm dysfunction or combined impairments should not automatically be pooled when the chosen procedures act through different mechanisms. Data on previous injections, orthoses, surgeries and rehabilitation are necessary covariates, not optional background details. If a study aims to evaluate the effect of a muscle release, it should specify how preoperative evidence established that particular muscle as a contributor to the functional problem. [2]

Longitudinal studies should distinguish early correction, rehabilitation-mediated adaptation and changes during later growth. Assessments at repeated intervals may identify a temporary deterioration followed by improvement, or an initially successful correction followed by progressive weakness or recurrence. Recording the full course is more clinically useful than a single final follow-up value. Patient-reported pain, fatigue and participation can help determine whether objectively measured biomechanical change is worth the recovery burden. [22]

Practical multidisciplinary decision conferences

Complex orthopedic decisions benefit from discussion across surgery, rehabilitation, orthotics and gait assessment services, particularly when the impairments are not neatly localized. The surgeon contributes knowledge about the achievable correction and associated tissue costs. Therapists describe the child's active motor repertoire, ability to learn



new strategies and day-to-day challenges. Orthotists assess whether external support can improve lever-arm function without an operation. Families identify which activities matter and the practical limits of prolonged recovery. Such perspectives do not replace evidence; they help identify mismatches between an anatomically plausible intervention and a meaningful functional goal. [23]

A useful conference begins with a problem statement rather than a predetermined procedure. For example, the question may be whether persistent stance-phase knee flexion is driven mainly by fixed knee restriction, inadequate ankle support or proximal weakness. The team can then specify what observation would favor each explanation and review the available examination and gait data against those predictions. When uncertainty remains substantial, a reversible intervention such as an orthotic trial may provide useful functional information. This process makes operative decisions more transparent and allows the clinical record to distinguish assumptions from measured findings. [13]

It is also helpful to define possible adverse outcomes before treatment. Loss of plantarflexor power, persistent crouch, excessive anterior pelvic tilt or increased orthotic dependence are foreseeable problems in selected patients. Recording them prospectively encourages balanced follow-up and supports more complete consent. A high-quality discussion should communicate what improvement is probable, what is uncertain and which findings would lead the team to reconsider the plan. The measure of success is not whether every proposed structure was altered, but whether the child achieves a durable improvement with an acceptable cost. [14]

Individualized surveillance and the limits of prediction

The primary neurological lesion does not progress, but the biomechanical system is never static during childhood. Growth, activity, muscle adaptation and changing load can modify the relationship between a correction and functional performance. Long-term follow-up is therefore part of treatment planning rather than an administrative afterthought. Examinations should compare passive range, strength, torsional alignment and walking function over time, ideally with consistent measurement methods. An isolated apparent change in one joint angle should be interpreted cautiously when walking speed, orthotic use or cooperation differs from earlier assessments. [4]

Clinicians cannot accurately predict every future deformity. This uncertainty makes shared decision-making and careful documentation especially important. The child who maintains satisfactory walking after a limited correction should not be presumed to need additional prophylactic procedures without a distinct indication. Conversely, a previously successful intervention does not guarantee that new pain or deterioration is benign. Functional decline should prompt renewed assessment of contracture, strength, skeletal alignment and environmental demands. A longitudinal approach provides a framework for interpreting changes without assigning every problem to the original surgical site. [24]

Across future investigations, the most useful predictors are likely to combine neurological function, mechanical phenotype and treatment exposure. Simple age cutoffs or one preoperative gait metric may prove insufficient for such a heterogeneous population. Transparent reporting of unsuccessful outcomes and additional treatments is as important as documenting improvements. Progress in precision orthopedics will depend on explaining why a treatment helped one mechanical phenotype but not another, while preserving a clinically realistic view of the uncertainty present in every growing child. [14]

Concluding clinical synthesis

Precision treatment does not demand access to every advanced measurement in every child; it demands clarity about which observations support the proposed mechanism. A carefully performed examination that demonstrates fixed restriction, linked to a consistent functional complaint, provides stronger reasoning than an elaborate battery of tests disconnected from a decision. Equally, when dynamic forces are central to the choice between procedures, the absence of kinetic data should be acknowledged as an important limitation. This distinction promotes appropriate use of specialized gait services without dismissing the contribution of experienced clinical observation. [13]



Counseling can be organized around three questions: what limits the child now, which mechanical or neurological factors produce that limitation, and what new limitation might follow the proposed correction? Each question should be answered in language understandable to caregivers and, where appropriate, the patient. The first determines the value of intervention, the second guides selection, and the third clarifies risk. A technically attainable correction may not be justified when the expected gains are marginal and the affected muscle supplies an important stabilizing function. Conversely, a progressive fixed deformity with substantial daily consequences may warrant intervention despite uncertainty in the exact magnitude of future benefit. [4]

The most defensible orthopedic care combines humility about prediction with precision about current findings. It avoids equating muscle tone with tissue shortening, visible gait deviation with operative indication, or postoperative symmetry with patient benefit. A longitudinal view and a multidisciplinary record help distinguish growth-related change from treatment effects. Further research should test whether this explicit mechanistic approach improves functional outcomes compared with less structured decision processes. [14]

Risk mitigation through procedure-specific appraisal

A surgical plan should specify what is expected to improve at each anatomical level and what functional cost could follow. In a child with combined fixed ankle restriction and weak knee extensors, for example, increased passive dorsiflexion may expose rather than resolve inadequate stance support. The projected response should be tested against the child's baseline walking pattern and available muscular reserve. This reasoning discourages automatic inclusion of a procedure solely because a traditional multilevel package contains it. It also provides a useful standard for auditing postoperative outcomes: the intervention can be assessed against the mechanism stated in advance instead of judged only by whether the tendon or bone was corrected anatomically. [14]

Risk assessment should recognize asymmetry. A bilateral diagnosis does not imply identical mechanical needs or equivalent strength on both sides. Operations performed symmetrically despite asymmetric function can create avoidable weakness or leave the more severely affected limb undercorrected. Limb-specific examination and gait observation are therefore necessary even when a common intervention strategy is anticipated. Intraoperative reassessment can refine the amount of correction, but the active walking mechanics of an awake child remain essential to understanding which restrictions were clinically meaningful before surgery. [13]

Finally, postoperative deterioration needs a mechanism-based review rather than an immediate conclusion that the original operation failed. A new crouched posture could result from plantarflexor weakness, growth, pain, reduced activity or persistent proximal pathology. Revision planning should compare current impairment with the earlier baseline and document what changed. This approach can reduce repeated procedures undertaken without clear evidence that another lengthening would improve the child's life. [24]

Research priorities and conclusions

Future studies should characterize baseline neuromuscular and structural impairments, not simply list the surgical procedures performed. Serial measures of passive stiffness, strength, muscle architecture and multiplanar gait mechanics could help identify which children benefit from a particular correction and which are at greater risk of functional weakness. Comparisons should distinguish the effects of surgery from those of subsequent rehabilitation and growth. Standardized reporting of baseline classification, previous treatment, orthotic use and functional goals would make the literature more interpretable across centers. [24]

The central clinical principle is that visible deformity represents the final expression of interacting neural, muscular and skeletal constraints. A precision orthopedic approach identifies the dominant mechanism, anticipates compensations elsewhere in the limb and protects active muscle capacity while correcting genuinely restrictive pathology. Better integration of tissue biology, dynamic analysis and patient-centered goals offers a sounder route to treatment selection



than an isolated measurement of joint range.

References

1. Graham HK, Selber P. Musculoskeletal aspects of cerebral palsy. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2003;85(2):157-166.
2. Delgado MR, Hirtz D, Aisen M, et al. Practice parameter: pharmacologic treatment of spasticity in children and adolescents with cerebral palsy. *Neurology.* 2010;74(4):336-343.
3. Mathewson MA, Lieber RL. Pathophysiology of muscle contractures in cerebral palsy. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am.* 2015;26(1):57-67.
4. Graham HK, Rosenbaum P, Paneth N, et al. Cerebral palsy. *Nat Rev Dis Primers.* 2016;2:15082.
5. Lieber RL, Fridén J. Muscle contracture and passive mechanics in cerebral palsy. *J Appl Physiol* (1985). 2019;126(5):1492-1501.
6. Fridén J, Lieber RL. Spastic muscle cells are shorter and stiffer than normal cells. *Muscle Nerve.* 2003;27(2):157-164.
7. Haberfehlner H, Jaspers RT, Rutz E, et al. Outcome of medial hamstring lengthening in children with spastic paresis: a biomechanical and morphological observational study. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(2):e0192573.
8. Armand S, Decoulon G, Bonnefoy-Mazure A. Gait analysis in children with cerebral palsy. *EFORT Open Rev.* 2016;1(12):448-460.
9. Rodda JM, Graham HK. Classification of gait patterns in spastic hemiplegia and spastic diplegia: a basis for a management algorithm. *Eur J Neurol.* 2001;8(suppl 5):98-108.
10. Novacheck TF. Gait analysis in cerebral palsy. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am.* 2003;14(2):407-422.
11. Palisano R, Rosenbaum P, Walter S, Russell D, Wood E, Galuppi B. Development and reliability of a system to classify gross motor function in children with cerebral palsy. *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 1997;39(4):214-223.
12. Gage JR, Novacheck TF. An update on the treatment of gait problems in cerebral palsy. *J Pediatr Orthop B.* 2001;10(4):265-274.
13. Chang FM, Rhodes JT, Flynn KM, Carollo JJ. The role of gait analysis in treating gait abnormalities in cerebral palsy. *Orthop Clin North Am.* 2010;41(4):489-506.
14. McGinley JL, Dobson F, Ganeshalingam R, Shore BJ, Rutz E, Graham HK. Single-event multilevel surgery for children with cerebral palsy: a systematic review. *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2012;54(2):117-128.
15. Lamberts RP, Burger M, du Toit J, Langerak NG. A systematic review of the effects of single-event multilevel surgery on gait parameters in children with spastic cerebral palsy. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(10):e0164686.
16. Carcreff L, Gerber CN, Paraschiv-Ionescu A, et al. Comparison of gait characteristics between clinical and daily life settings in children with cerebral palsy. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10:2091.
17. Carty CP, Walsh HP, Gillett JG, et al. The effect of femoral derotation osteotomy on transverse plane hip and pelvic kinematics in children with cerebral palsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gait Posture.* 2014;40(3):333-340.
18. Thomason P, Baker R, Dodd K, et al. Single-event multilevel surgery in children with spastic diplegia: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2011;93(5):451-460.
19. Gorton GE III, Abel MF, Oeffinger DJ, et al. A prospective cohort study of the effects of lower extremity orthopaedic surgery on outcome measures in ambulatory children with cerebral palsy. *J Pediatr Orthop.* 2009;29(8):903-909.
20. Švehlík M, Steinwender G, Lehmann T, Kraus T. Predictors of outcome after single-event multilevel surgery in children with cerebral palsy: a retrospective ten-year follow-up study. *Bone Joint J.* 2016;98-B(2):278-281.



-
21. Baker R, McGinley JL, Schwartz MH, et al. The gait profile score and movement analysis profile. *Gait Posture*. 2009;30(3):265-269.
 22. Sung KH, Chung CY, Lee KM, et al. Long term outcome of single event multilevel surgery in spastic diplegia with flexed knee gait. *Gait Posture*. 2013;37(4):536-541.
 23. Gillett JG, Boyd RN, Carty CP, Barber LA. The impact of strength training on skeletal muscle morphology and architecture in children and adolescents with spastic cerebral palsy: a systematic review. *Res Dev Disabil*. 2016;56:183-196.
 24. Thomason P, Selber P, Graham HK. Single event multilevel surgery in children with bilateral spastic cerebral palsy: a 5 year prospective cohort study. *Gait Posture*. 2013;37(1):23-28.