ASME VVUQ 40.1-2026

An Example of Assessing Computational Model Credibility Using the ASME V&V 40 Risk-Based Framework: Tibial Tray Component Worst-Case Size Identification for Fatigue Testing

AN ASME TECHNICAL REPORT

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers

ASME VVUQ 40.1-2026

An Example of Assessing Computational Model Credibility Using the ASME V&V 40 Risk-Based Framework: Tibial Tray Component Worst-Case Size Identification for Fatigue Testing

AN ASME TECHNICAL REPORT

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Two Park Avenue • New York, NY • 10016 USA

Date of Issuance: January 15, 2026

This Technical Report will be revised when the Society approves the issuance of a new edition.

This code or standard was developed under procedures accredited as meeting the criteria for American National Standards. The standards committee that approved the code or standard was balanced to ensure that individuals from competent and concerned interests had an opportunity to participate. The proposed code or standard was made available for public review and comment, which provided an opportunity for additional public input from industry, academia, regulatory agencies, and the public-at-large.

ASME does not "approve," "certify," "rate," or "endorse" any item, construction, proprietary device, or activity. ASME does not take any position with respect to the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any items mentioned in this document, and does not undertake to insure anyone utilizing a standard against liability for infringement of any applicable letters patent, nor does ASME assume any such liability. Users of a code or standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, is entirely their own responsibility.

Participation by federal agency representatives or persons affiliated with industry is not to be interpreted as government or industry endorsement of this code or standard.

ASME accepts responsibility for only those interpretations of this document issued in accordance with the established ASME procedures and policies, which precludes the issuance of interpretations by individuals.

The endnotes and preamble in this document (if any) are part of this American National Standard.

ASME Collective Membership Mark

All rights reserved. "ASME" and the above ASME symbol are registered trademarks of The American Society of Mechanical Engineers. No part of this document may be copied, modified, distributed, published, displayed, or otherwise reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic, digital, or mechanical, now known or hereafter invented, without the express written permission of ASME. No works derived from this document or any content therein may be created without the express written permission of ASME. Using this document or any content therein to train, create, or improve any artificial intelligence and/or machine learning platform, system, application, model, or algorithm is strictly prohibited.

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Two Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016-5990

Copyright © 2026 by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERS

CONTENTS

Committee Roster v

Correspondence With the VVUQ Committee vii

1 Introduction 1
2 Background 1
3 Tibial Tray Component Example 2
4 Question of Interest 6
5 Context of Use (COU) 6
6 Model Risk 8
7 Model Credibility 11
8 Credibility Assessment 48

Mandatory Appendix

I 50

Nonmandatory Appendices

A Mathematical Derivation for the Linear Relationship Between Alternating Stress and Peak Maximum Principal Stress 52
B Applicability Analysis Based on Pathmanathan et al. (2017) 53
C VVUQ Workflow Summary 58

Figures

1-1 Sections Associated With Each Element of the ASME V&V 40 Risk-Informed Credibility Assessment Framework 1
3-1 Example of a Three-Component Total Knee Replacement 3
3-2 76-mm Medial–Lateral (M–L)/50-mm Anterior–Posterior (A–P) Tibial Tray Design Used for Validation 4
3-3 ISO 14879-1 Test Setup 5
5-1 COU Overview for Modeling and Testing the Tibial Tray Family 7
6.2-1 Decision Consequence Matrix 10
6.3-1 Model Risk Assessment Matrix 11
7.1.1.2-1 Code Verification Problem Details 14
7.1.1.2-2 Representative Computational Mesh Used for the Code Verification Problem With 0.100-mm Element Size on the Surface of the Cavity 15
7.1.1.2-3 Contour Plot of the Maximum Principal Stress, MPa, With 0.025-mm Element Size on the Surface of the Cavity 16
7.1.2.1-1 Mesh Refinement Regions 18
7.1.2.1-2 Two of the Body Element Sizes Used in the Mesh Refinement Study 18
7.1.2.1-3 Four of the Element Sizes Used in Meshing the Posterior Lock Face 20
7.2.1-1 CAD Model of the ISO 14879-1 Tibial Tray Test 23

7.2.1.1-1 Illustration of Model Form for Model 1 (A1–B1–C1) and Model 2 (A2–B1–C1) 26
7.2.1.1-2 Bending Stiffness and Peak Maximum Principal Stress Predictions for Models 1 and 2 26
7.2.1.1-3 Illustration of the Model Form for Models 2 and 3 27
7.2.1.1-4 Bending Stiffness and Peak Maximum Principal Stress Predictions for Models 2 and 3 28
7.2.1.1-5 Illustration of the Model Form for Models 3 and 4 29
7.2.1.1-6 Bending Stiffness and Peak Maximum Principal Stress Predictions for Models 3 and 4 30
7.2.1.1-7 Model 4 (A2–B2–C2) Maximum Principal Stress Contour 31
7.2.1.2.1-1 iPR for Input Sensitivity to Bending Stiffness 33
7.2.1.2.1-2 iPR for Input Sensitivity to Maximum Principal Stress 34
7.3.1-1 Diagram Relating Fatigue Performance, Peak Maximum Principal Stress, and Bending Stiffness 46
B-1-1 Overview of the COU and Validation Domains and Their Associated QOIs 54

Tables

7-1 Verification, Validation, and Applicability Activities and Their Associated Credibility Factors 11
7.1.1.2-1 NCV Study Results 16
7.1.2.1-1 Change in Out-of-Plane Displacement at the Center of the Circular Load Patch With Respect to the Body Element Size 19
7.1.2.1-2 Change in the Peak Maximum Principal Stress With Respect to Face Element Size 21
7.2.1.1-1 Explored Model Form Assumptions 24
7.2.1.1-2 Model Form Assumptions Not Explored 24
7.2.1.1-3 Model Form Assumptions and Test Combinations — Models 1 and 2 25
7.2.1.1-4 Model Form Assumptions and Test Combinations — Models 2 and 3 27
7.2.1.1-5 Model Form Assumptions and Test Combinations — Models 3 and 4. 28
7.2.1.2.1-1 Key Input Parameters Identified for Sensitivity Analysis 35
7.2.1.2.1-2 Sensitivity Analysis Results — Bending Stiffness 35
7.2.1.2.1-3 Sensitivity Analysis Results — Peak Maximum Principal Stress 35
7.2.3.1-1 Equivalency of the Validation Computational Model and Comparator Inputs 43
8-1 Credibility Factors Summary 49
B-2-1 Questions Raised for Aspects of M-VAL and M-COU That Are Identical Regarding Their Applicability to R-COU for Each Difference Between R-VAL and R-COU 57