

1 **Comparison Canal Filling Ratio And Femoral Bone Density Change**  
2 **Between Wedge Taper And Anatomical Stem Design**

3

4 **Patcharavit ploynumpon<sup>1</sup> ,MD ,Thakrit Chompoosang<sup>1</sup> \*,MD**

5

6

7

8 **<sup>1</sup>Department of orthopedics, Faculty of Medicine, Rajavithi Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand**

9

10

11

12

13 **\*Thakrit Chompoosang, Corresponding author**

14 **E-mail:tk\_ortho@hotmail.com**

15 **These authors contributed equally to this work**

16 **Abstract**

17 **Purpose:** comparative the outcome of proximal femoral bone density change in follow-up x-ray film and  
18 proximal filling ratio of stem between anatomical and double taper wedge cementless stem design

19 **Methods:** post-operative follow film of up to 1 year of patients who had undergone Total hip arthroplasty  
20 between 2552 -2563, which is match inclusion criteria, was obtained from the radiology department. The  
21 measurement of Canal filling ratio ( Lesser trochanter, 2 cm above LT and 7 cm below LT ) and Femoral  
22 bone density change using optimal densitometry method to compare between Anatomical and double wedge  
23 taper stem type.

24 **Result:** 92 patients,76% female, and 24% male, were match the inclusion criteria for this study. The mean age  
25 was 53.86±13.00 years old. The canal filling ratio in the double wedge taper group (Accolade II ) was  
26 significantly higher than the anatomical stem group ( ABGII ) ( $p<0.001$ ,  $p<0.001$ ,  $p=0.013$ ) in all levels of  
27 measurement. There were no significant differences between both types of the stem in femoral bone density  
28 change in zone 1,4. However. There were significant differences in femoral bone change, in which bone loss  
29 was higher in the anatomical stem group, in zone 7 (-25 VS -17,  $P= 0.010$ )

30 **Conclusion:** Double taper wedge stem design had a significantly higher canal filling ratio than the Anatomical  
31 stem at all levels and less femoral bone density loss in follow-up post-operative film at Zone 7. However, in  
32 zone 1,4, There was no significant difference in femoral bone density loss.

33 **Keywords:** Bone remodeling, cementless stem, canal filling ratio, comparative bone remodeling in femoral  
34 stem

35

36

37

38

## 39 Introduction

40 Total hip arthroplasty is one of the most common procedures preforms by orthopedic surgeons. As  
41 the number of surgery was raised, The stem design was one of the crucial factors distributed to the longevity  
42 of the overall prosthesis and the satisfaction of the patients. The cementless stem, invented in 1950, is one of  
43 the stem designs that provided Good results and long-term outcomes [1]. However, the early design was  
44 reported in several studies for early loosening and instability due to Proximal femoral osteopenia from the  
45 stress shielding effect [2]. Many modern stem designs were developed by promoting proximal engagement, by  
46 using HA porous coating and more fitting to the patient proximal femoral dense bone using a taper and  
47 anatomical designs, and decreasing the distal engagement of stem, using shorter stem design, which can lead  
48 to a decrease in proximal bone loss up to 14 % [3]. And there are many studies was shown that the revolution  
49 in stem design lead to less stem subsidence, less thigh pain, and less loosening [4-5]

50 However, there is no previous study comparing the progression of bone integration and proximal  
51 bone loss between Double wedge taper stem ( Accolade 2 stem, Stryker) and anatomical stem ( ABGII,  
52 Stryker ). So our study aims to compare the difference in proximal femoral filling between both stem designs  
53 using immediate post-operative film and comparing proximal femoral bone loss using follow-up film x-ray.  
54 which is the result that will lead to a better choice of stem and a decrease in early complications and  
55 satisfaction with the total hip replacement operation.

56

57

58

59

60

61

## 62 **Material and method**

63

### 64 **Study design**

65 This study is a retrospective descriptive-cohort study of immediate and Post-operative follow film up to 1  
66 year of Total hip arthroplasty surgery which is performed in Rajavithi hospital during 2017-2019 The Ethics  
67 Committee of Rajavithi hospital approved the research protocol in this study

68

### 69 **Patients**

#### 70 **Inclusion Criteria**

71 With permission from the radiology department of Rajavithi, Patients aged between 18- 80 years old who  
72 received primary total hip arthroplasty using both types of stem who is performed between 2017-2019 and  
73 have follow-up films up to 1 year were included in this study

74

#### 75 **Exclusion Criteria**

76 Patients under 18 years old, revision hip arthroplasty, patients with prior hip dysplasia, any post-operative  
77 complication, and patients who have follow-up film less than 1 year were excluded from the study.

78

#### 79 **Data Collection and measurement**

80 After immediate and Post-operative follow film up to 1 year of the patients who had undergone Total hip  
81 arthroplasty were obtained from the radiology department, and the data was reviewed and analyzed.

82 Immediate post-operative films were measured using canal filling ratio (Fig 1)[6], By measuring proximal  
83 femoral diameter and diameter of the stem in Anteroposterior view in 3 levels, lesser trochanter, 2cm proximal  
84 to lesser trochanter and 6 cm distal to lesser trochanter by the orthopedic surgeon of adult hip and knee  
85 reconstruction.

86 Fig 1: **Canal filling ratio measurement** measuring at lesser trochanter level 2cm proximal to lesser trochanter  
87 and 6 cm distal to lesser trochanter

88           The follow-up film was analyzed for proximal femoral bone density change using optimal  
89 densitometry method [7] using digital optical image analysis program which is public domain, ImageJ for  
90 window, which measured bone change at zone 1,4,7 according to Gruen zone of fixation [8] (figure2) then  
91 all data was collected and recorded using Microsoft Excel

92 Fig 2: **Proximal femoral bone density measurement** using optimal densitometry method

### 93 **Statically analysis**

94           Use descriptive statistics to describe the various patient characteristics of the sample. Use the number,  
95 percentage, Mean, Median, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum values. For Comparing category data  
96 using the Chi-square test. Comparing independent data such as both type of stem and femoral type by Paired  
97 T-test and using student T-test for dependent data such as comparing post-operative film. The level of  
98 significance was defined as a p-value <0.05. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Version 20

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

## 108 Results

### 109 Demographics data

110 92 patients were included in this study. 22 patients were male and 70 were female. Mean age  
111 53.86±13.00 years old. 34 patients were in undergone anatomical stem (ABGII, Stryker) group and 58 were in  
112 undergone double wedge taper stem (Accolade II, stryker) group

113 When comparing the canal-filling ratio between both stems, the double wedge taper stem had a  
114 significantly higher canal-filling ratio than the anatomical stem group at all 3 measurement levels ( $p<0.001$ ,  
115  $p<0.001$ ,  $p=0.013$ ) as the result was shown in Table 2.

Level	Anatomical stem	Double wedge taper	Difference (95%CI)	p-value
	(n=34)	stem (n=58)		
Lesser trochanter	81.56	88.13	-6.57 (-9.74 to -3.39)	<0.001*
2cm above LT	85.98	93.49	-7.51 (-10.07 to -4.95)	<0.001*
6cm below LT	78.58	85.64	-7.06 (-12.56 to -1.56)	0.013*

116 Table 2: Comparison of canal filling ratio between 2 types of stem

117 The post-operative film was analyzed in each of the stem designs as shown in Table 3 . both of the  
118 stems showed a femoral proximal bone loss from the baseline and every time point.

#### 119 1. Proximal bone density change in anatomical stem

120 At 6 months postoperatively, There was a significant difference in femoral bone loss at zone 1,4,7  
121 ( $p=0.024$ ,  $p<0.001$ ,  $p=0.006$  respectively). The most femoral bone loss is at zone 4 (5.74)

122 At 1 year postoperatively, There was a significant difference in femoral bone loss at zone 1,4,7  
123 ( $p<0.001$ ). The most femoral bone loss is at zone 7 (20.65)

124 At 2 years postoperatively, There was a significant difference in femoral bone loss at zone 1,4,7  
 125 ((p<0.001, p=0.004, p<0.001 respectively). The most femoral bone loss is at zone 1 (34.48)

126 **2. Proximal bone density change in double wedge taper stem**

127 At 6 months postoperatively, There was a significant difference in femoral bone loss at zone 1,4,7  
 128 (p<0.001). The most femoral bone loss is at zone 1 (8.28)

129 At 1 year postoperatively, There was a significant difference in femoral bone loss at zone 1,4,7  
 130 (p<0.001). The most femoral bone loss is at zone 1 (12.48)

131 At 2 years postoperatively, There was a significant difference in femoral bone loss at zone 1,4,7  
 132 (p<0.001,). The most femoral bone loss is at zone 1 (22.37)

133

Femur	Anatomical stem (n=34)				Double wedge taper stem (n=58)			
	Post-operation (Baseline)	6 months	1 years	2 years	Post-operation (Baseline)	6 months	1 years	2 years
<b>Zone 1</b>								
FBD.	135.59	131.15	117.35	84.74	130.33	122.05	109.57	91.63
S.D.	12.20	10.53	14.19	7.29	13.30	15.14	12.09	9.06
% change		-4.44	-13.79	-34.48		-8.28	-12.48	-22.37
p-value		0.024*	<0.001*	<0.001*		<0.001*	<0.001*	<0.001*
<b>Zone 4</b>								
FBD.	164.03	158.29	145.74	135.39	152.86	148.14	138.64	129.77
S.D.	16.41	17.11	16.92	12.74	29.44	24.19	18.49	11.34
% change		-5.74	-12.56	-13.65		-4.72	-9.50	-16.23
p-value		0.001*	<0.001*	0.004*		0.098	<0.001*	<0.001*

**Zone 7**

FBD.	157.85	152.71	132.06	107.83	152.29	144.29	135.12	126.87
S.D.	13.84	11.31	12.33	19.79	13.11	14.85	14.89	10.59
% change		-5.15	-20.65	-29.57		-8.00	-9.17	-11.13
p-value		0.006	<0.001*	<0.001*		<0.001*	<0.001*	<0.001*

134 **Table 3 Femoral bone density change in each stem type** in Gruen zone 1,4,7

135

136 Comparing proximal femoral bone loss between both stem designs, the double wedge-taper stem  
 137 showed significantly less proximal femoral bone loss in Gruen zone 7(Fig 5). However, There were no  
 138 significant differences in proximal femoral bone loss in Gruen zone 1,4 as shown in (Fig3-4) and Table 4.

139

Femoral bone density	Stem Type		p-value
	Anatomical stem (n=34)	Double wedge taper stem (n=58)	
<b>Zone 1</b>			
Post-operation (Baseline)	135.59±12.20	130.33±13.30	0.062
6 months	131.15±10.53	122.05±15.14	0.003*
1 years	117.35±14.19	109.57±12.09	0.006*
2 years	84.74±7.29	91.63±9.06	0.004*
Change (1 years – post-operative)	-18.24±20.48	-20.76±9.36	0.501
<b>Zone 4</b>			
Post-operation (Baseline)	164.03±16.41	152.86±29.44	0.022*
6 months	158.29±17.11	148.14±24.19	0.021*
1 years	145.74±16.92	138.64±18.49	0.070
2 years	135.39±12.74	129.77±11.34	0.096
Change (1 years – post-operative)	-18.29±14.79	-14.22±24.22	0.320
<b>Zone 7</b>			
Post-operation (Baseline)	157.85±13.84	152.29±13.11	0.058
6 months	152.71±11.31	144.29±14.85	0.005*



1 years	132.06±12.33	135.12±14.89	0.314
2 years	107.83±19.79	126.87±10.59	<0.001*
Change (1 years – post-operative)	-25.79±15.85	-17.17±13.23	0.010*

---

140

141 **Table 4 Comparison of Femoral bone density change in each zone in both types of stem** The table shows

142 a significant difference in femoral bone density change only in zone 7 between both stems (P=0.01)

143

144 **Fig 3** Comparing proximal femoral bone density change in Gruen Zone 1 of both stem

145 (A=anatomical stem ,B=double wedge taper stem )

146

147 **Fig 4** Comparing proximal femoral bone density change in Gruen Zone 4 of both stem

148 (A=anatomical stem ,B=double wedge taper stem )

149

150 **Fig.5** Comparing proximal femoral bone density change in Gruen Zone 7 of both stem

151 (A=anatomical stem ,B=double wedge taper stem )

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

## 166 **Discussion**

167 Total hip arthroplasty is one of the most common procedure was performed by orthopedic surgeons.  
168 Cementless total hip arthroplasty is one of the popular procedures to be performed, especially for younger  
169 patients [9], which can achieve a good long-term outcome, Although There were reported proximal femoral  
170 osteopenia and early aseptic loosening in early design [4] due to stress shielding effect and proximal  
171 micromotion of the stem. Later, The cementless stem was developed by decreasing distal filling, increasing  
172 proximal filling, and improving proximal coating to achieve better osteointegration

173 In our study, we found a significantly higher canal filling ratio in the double wedge taper stem than in  
174 the anatomical stem group at all levels ( LT,2 cm above LT, 6 cm below LT) and There was significantly  
175 higher femoral bone density loss at zone 7 in the anatomical stem than double taper wedge stem (-25 VS -17,  
176 P= 0.010), however, there was no significant femoral bone density loss in zone 1,4 .which is corresponding  
177 with a previous study of Cooper et al. found that increase distal filling ratio which leads to less  
178 osteointegration [10]

179 The strength of this study was that it was conducted by a single surgeon and a single center which  
180 minimized the confounding factor from surgical technique and post-operative care of the patients.

181 The limitation of our study is that it was retrospective in design, making it difficult to acquire data on  
182 some patients. Another limitation was the short follow-up time frame, which could lead to underestimating the  
183 complication rate and loss of femoral bone density.

184

185

186

187

188

189 **Conclusion**

190 Double taper wedge stem design had a significantly higher canal filling ratio than the Anatomical  
191 stem at all levels and less femoral bone density loss in follow-up post-operative film at Zone 7. However, in  
192 zone 1,4, There were no significant differences in femoral bone density loss.

193

194 **Conflict of interest disclosure**

195

196 There was no conflict of interest in this study

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206


207

208

## 209 Reference

- 210 1. van der Wal BC, de Kramer BJ, Grimm B, Vencken W, Heyligers IC, Tonino AJ. Femoral fit in  
211 ABG-II hip stems, influence on clinical outcome and bone remodeling: a radiographic study. Arch  
212 Orthop Trauma Surg. 2008;128(10):1065-1072. Engh Jr CA, Young AM, Engh Sr CA, Hopper Jr  
213 RH. Clinical consequences of stress shielding after porous-coated total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop  
214 Relat Res. 2003 Dec; (417): 157-63.
- 215 2. Herrera A, Canales V, Anderson J, García-Araujo C, Murcia-Mazón A, Tonino AJ. Seven to 10  
216 years followup of an anatomic hip prosthesis: an international study. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2004  
217 Jun; (423): 129-37.
- 218 3. Juan j, change in periprosthetic bone after redesign anatomical cementless stem, international  
219 orthopedic, 2009
- 220 4. de Boer FA, Sariali E. Comparison of anatomic vs. straight femoral stem design in total hip  
221 replacement - femoral canal fill in vivo. Hip Int. 2017 May 12;27(3):241-244. doi:  
222 10.5301/hipint.5000439. Epub 2016 Nov 22. PMID: 27886361.
- 223 5. Laine HJ, Puolakka TJ, Moilanen T, Pajamäki KJ, Wirta J, Lehto MU. The effects of cementless  
224 femoral stem shape and proximal surface texture on 'fit-and-fill' characteristics and bone  
225 remodeling. Int Orthop. 2000;24(4):184-190.
- 226 6. Umer M, Sepah YJ, Khan A, et al. Morphology of the proximal femur in a Pakistani population. J  
227 Orthop Surg (Hong Kong) 2010;18:27
- 228 7. Hernandez-Vaquero D, Garcia-Sandoval MA, Fernandez-Carreira JM, Suarez-Vázquez A, Perez-  
229 Hernández D. Measurement of bone mineral density is possible with standard radiographs: a study  
230 involving total knee replacement. Acta Orthop. 2005 Dec;76(6):791-5. DOI:  
231 10.1080/17453670510045381. PMID: 16470431.
- 232 8. Gruen TA, McNeice GM, Amstutz HC. "Modes of failure" of cemented stem-type femoral  
233 components: a radiographic analysis of loosening. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1979 Jun;(141):17-27.  
234 PMID: 477100.
- 235 9. Stea S, Comfort T, Sedrakyan A, et al. Multinational comprehensive evaluation of the fixation  
236 method used in hip replacement: interaction with age in context. J Bone Joint Surg Am.  
237 2014;96(Suppl 1):42-51.

- 238           10. Cooper HJ, Jacob AP, Rodriguez JA. Distal fixation of proximally coated tapered stems may  
239                 predispose to a failure of osteointegration. J Arthroplasty. 2011;26(6)(Suppl):78-83.




Figure\_1




Figure\_2

### Zone 1




Figure\_3





Figure\_4



Figure\_5