

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

1 Hip geometric parameters are associated with radiographic and clinical hip osteoarthritis:
2 findings from a cross-sectional study in UK Biobank

3

4 Heppenstall SV BSc¹, Ebsim R PhD², Saunders FR PhD³, Lindner C PhD², Gregory JS PhD³,
5 Aspden RM DSc³, Harvey NC MD PhD^{4,5}, Cootes T PhD², Tobias JH MD PhD^{1,6}, Frysz M
6 PhD^{1,6*}, Faber BG MBBS PhD^{1,6*}

7 *Joint senior author

8

- 9 1) Musculoskeletal Research Unit, University of Bristol, UK
10 2) Division of Informatics, Imaging and Data Sciences, The University of Manchester,
11 UK
12 3) Centre for Arthritis and Musculoskeletal Health, University of Aberdeen, UK
13 4) Medical Research Council Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre, University of
14 Southampton, UK
15 5) NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and
16 University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, UK
17 6) Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, UK

18

19 Corresponding Author
20 Dr Benjamin Faber
21 Musculoskeletal Research Unit
22 Learning and Research Building
23 Southmead Hospital, Bristol BS10 5FN
24 ben.faber@bristol.ac.uk
25 +44 (0)117 414 7859

26

27 Running title: Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

28 Key words: DXA, epidemiology, hip osteoarthritis, hip geometry, hip shape

29

30

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

31 Abstract

32 Objectives

33 To examine the extent to which geometric parameters derived from dual-energy x-ray
34 absorptiometry (DXA) scans in the UK Biobank (UKB) study are related to hip osteoarthritis
35 (HOA) independently of sex, age and body size.

36

37 Methods

38 Femoral neck width (FNW), diameter of the femoral head (DFH) and hip axis length (HAL)
39 were derived automatically from left hip DXA scans in UKB using outline points placed around
40 the hip by a machine-learning program. Correlations were calculated between geometric
41 parameters, age, height, and weight. Logistic regression was used to examine the relationship
42 of geometric parameters with radiographic hip osteoarthritis (rHOA), and hospital diagnosed
43 HOA (HESOA), and Cox proportional hazards model to evaluate the relationship with total
44 hip replacement (THR). Analyses were adjusted for sex, age, height, weight, and geometric
45 parameters.

46

47 Results

48 Complete data were available for 40,312 participants. In age and sex-adjusted analyses, FNW,
49 HAL and DFH were all related to increased risk of rHOA. Despite strong relationships between
50 geometric parameters and body size, relationships between geometric parameters and HOA
51 showed little attenuation after adjustment for height and weight. Following mutual adjustment,
52 both HAL and FNW retained independent relationships with rHOA, while DFH was now
53 protective. Only FNW was independently related to HESOA and THR.

54

55 Conclusion

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

56 Greater FNW and HAL were independently related to an increased risk of rHOA, whereas
57 greater DFH appeared to be protective. Greater FNW was independently predictive of HESOA
58 and THR. These results suggest DXA-derived geometric parameters, particularly FNW, could
59 help to predict HOA and THR risk.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

60 Introduction:

61 Osteoarthritis (OA) is a major cause of pain and disability globally, with the hip being the third
62 most commonly affected joint (1). Morphological variation in hip shape has long been
63 postulated as a risk factor for the development of hip OA (HOA) (2-5). To explore these
64 associations, geometric parameters of hip shape have been measured on 2-dimensional
65 imaging. Thus, femoral neck width (FNW), hip-axis length (HAL) and diameter of the femoral
66 head (DFH) have been shown to associate with HOA when examined individually in small
67 studies, but the inter-relatedness of these measures have not been explored previously (6, 7).

68

69 Hip shape is known to vary greatly between the sexes with females having a larger neck shaft
70 angle and smaller femoral head and neck (8, 9). However, geometric parameters measuring
71 femur size are intrinsically related to body size and each other (6). This has made understanding
72 independent associations between geometric parameters and HOA difficult especially given
73 previous studies have tended to examine aspects of shape in isolation without sex stratification
74 (6, 7). Statistical Shape Modelling (SSM) has evolved as an alternative approach to quantifying
75 hip morphology and captures the whole of the hip joint. This method does overcome the issue
76 of geometric parameters being correlated with size and each other, however the main limitation
77 of SSM is that it is challenging to determine which specific aspects of hip shape are related to
78 the outcome of interest. Therefore, geometric parameters can provide complementary
79 information, hence why we have decided to look at them separately.

80

81 The availability of large cohorts with hip dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) scans
82 linked to HOA outcomes, such as in the UK Biobank (UKB) study, provides an excellent
83 opportunity to examine relationships between geometric parameters and HOA in more detail.
84 Improvements in scan resolution have shown images acquired with newer DXA scanners to be

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

85 suitable for ascertaining both hip shape and radiographic HOA (rHOA) measures (10, 11). In
86 addition, DXA scans involve lower doses of radiation than traditional radiographs, offering the
87 potential for use in screening. Existing methods such as hip structural analysis (HSA) are
88 already available for deriving geometric parameters such as FNW and HAL for hip DXA scans
89 (12), however this does not generate other parameters potentially related to HOA such as DFH.

90

91 The UKB study has now undertaken ~40,000 high resolution hip DXA scans. This large sample
92 now offers opportunities to explore relationships between geometric parameters and HOA as
93 defined both clinically and radiographically. To understand the relationship between geometric
94 parameters and HOA, in the present study, we aimed to: (i) determine the correlation between
95 geometric parameters and measures of body size, (ii) describe the cross-sectional relationships
96 between geometric parameters with rHOA and hospital diagnosed hip OA (HESOA), (iii)
97 describe the longitudinal associations between geometric parameters and total hip replacement
98 (THR) and (iv) establish which of these are independent as assessed in mutually adjusted
99 models.

100

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

101 **Materials and Methods:**

102 **Population**

103 UKB is a large prospective study, which at baseline (2006-2010), recruited over 500,000 men
104 and women aged 40-69 years (13). Participants have undergone extensive phenotypic
105 assessments through questionnaires, imaging, physical measures, and electronic healthcare
106 record linkage (14). In 2014 UKB commenced the extended imaging study with the aim of
107 conducting DXA scans on 100,000 participants. DXA scans were obtained from both hips
108 (iDXA GE-Lunar, Madison, WI), with participant's limbs being positioned with 15-25°
109 internal rotation using a standardised protocol. UKB has ethical approval from the National
110 Information Governance Board for Health and Social Care and North-West Multi-centre
111 Research Ethics Committee (11/NW/0382) which covers this study (application number
112 17295). All participants gave informed written consent.

113

114 **Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry variables**

115 **Outline points and radiographic osteoarthritis annotation**

116 A machine-learning algorithm placed 85 points to outline the proximal femur and acetabulum
117 in all available left hip DXA scans as of April 2021 (11). Each image was checked, and points
118 were corrected if necessary (~90% of images required no correction) and at the same time
119 osteophytes were manually annotated using a custom tool (The University of Manchester)
120 (Figure 1). The outline points did not encompass any annotated osteophytes. rHOA grades 0-4
121 were assigned semi-automatically to each hip DXA image combining osteophyte and joint
122 space width data as previously described (10).

123

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

124 Geometric parameters

125 Custom Python 3.0 scripts were developed and used to automatically derive FNW, DFH and
126 HAL. These scripts are openly available (15). The DXA DICOM images store pixel dimension
127 data facilitating the calculation of geometric parameters in millimetres (mm). FNW was
128 defined as the shortest distance measured between the superior and inferior side of the femoral
129 neck (16). To measure this, points 6-12 defined the inferior side and points 32-38 defined the
130 superior side of the femoral neck (Figure 1). A line-segment approach was used to
131 automatically calculate the narrowest distance between these points (Figure 2A), a description
132 of this approach has been published previously (17). DFH was defined as the distance across
133 the spherical aspect of the femoral head. To estimate this, a circle of best fit was placed around
134 the femoral head using a least-squares package in Python that was applied to points 15-28 (18).
135 The diameter of the circle was taken to represent the DFH in millimeters (Figure 2B). HAL
136 was defined as the distance from the base of the greater trochanter to the medial aspect of the
137 femoral head in millimeters. In previous studies, HAL measured using HSA software included
138 medial joint space width as it is measured to the inner pelvic rim (19). In this study however,
139 outline points were not reliably available for the medial acetabulum hence the measure only
140 encompassed the femur. To measure this, a straight line was drawn from point 49 through the
141 centre of the circle of best fit (used to calculate DFH). HAL was calculated from point 49 to
142 where the line intersected the circumference of the circle after it has passed through the centre
143 point of the circle (Figure 2C). All images with values +/- 2 standard deviations (SDs) from
144 the mean were reviewed manually. In addition, FNW and HAL measures derived automatically
145 were compared with values derived from HSA software (iDXA GE-Lunar, Madison, WI) in a
146 subset of participants to check comparability.

147

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

148 Clinical outcomes

149 HESOA data were obtained from hospital episode statistics (HES). THR data were based on
150 the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys Classification of Interventions and Procedures
151 codes (ICD-10) obtained from HES data. Further information on how these data were derived
152 has been described previously (10). The clinical outcomes used in this study were not side-
153 specific.

154

155 Statistical analysis

156 Baseline characteristics are shown as means, SDs and ranges for continuous variables and as
157 frequencies for categorical variables. Correlations between geometric parameters, height,
158 weight, and age were derived using Pearson's correlation test statistic (r^2). Distributions of
159 continuous variables were checked visually for normality. Frequencies were used for
160 categorical variables. Correlation values ranging between $r^2 \geq 0.7-1.0$, $r^2 \geq 0.5-0.7$, and $r^2 < 0.5$
161 were deemed as strong, moderate and weak correlations respectively. As we anticipated these
162 to be correlated, a sensitivity analysis was done where the ratio of DFH to FNW was used as
163 an exposure and compared with the associations between DFH, and clinical and radiographic
164 outcomes in models 1-4. Logistic regression was used to examine associations between each
165 standardised exposure (FNW, DFH and HAL) and each HOA outcome (grade ≥ 2 rHOA and
166 HESOA). Sensitivity analyses were carried out using grade ≥ 3 rHOA and grade 4 rHOA only
167 as outcomes. Results are presented as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)
168 and p values. Cox proportional hazard modelling was used to investigate the associations
169 between standardised geometric parameters and THR and results are presented as hazard ratios
170 (HR) with 95% CIs and p values. The Cox proportional hazard assumptions were tested and
171 met. We present unadjusted (model 1), and confounder adjusted analyses (partially adjusted =
172 models 2, 3 and fully adjusted = model 4). Potential confounders were defined *a priori*, and

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

173 these were included in partially adjusted models as covariates (model 2: adjusted for age and
174 sex; model 3: model 2 plus height and weight to account for effects of body size with which
175 geometric parameters are known to be strongly related) (6, 20-22). A final model also included
176 mutual adjustment for other geometric parameters (fully adjusted/model 4). Sex-stratified
177 analyses were conducted due to known differences in hip shape. All statistical analyses were
178 performed using STATA version 17 (Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA). Furthermore, a
179 glossary of terms is provided for the reader in Supplementary Table 1.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

180 Results:

181 Baseline characteristics

182 A total of 40,312 individuals (mean age 63.7, SD 7.6 years, range 44-82) had left hip DXAs
183 available for analysis (Table 1). 21,021 (52.1%) participants were women and 19,291 (47.9%)
184 were men. rHOA grade ≥ 2 was present in 3,014 (7.5%) individuals, rHOA grade ≥ 3 in 700
185 (1.7%) and rHOA grade 4 in 157 (0.4%). Males had a higher prevalence of rHOA across all
186 three grades compared with females. 527 (1.3%) individuals had HESOA and 259 (0.6%)
187 underwent THR after their hip DXA. In contrast with rHOA, the prevalence of clinical
188 outcomes was higher in females compared with males (Table 1).

189

190 Geometric parameters and their inter-relationships

191 The mean FNW was 31.6 mm (SD 3.5, range 21.4- 45.8), DFH 45.9 mm (3.8, 33.4-64.4) and
192 HAL 96.7 mm (8.0, 68.1-127.1). Males had a greater FNW, DFH and HAL compared with
193 females [FNW: male mean 34.5 mm (SD 2.4, range 22.9-45.8) / female mean 29.0 mm (SD
194 2.0, range 21.4-37.8), DFH: 49.0 mm (2.6, 34.7-64.4)/ 43.0 (2.3, 33.4-53.7) & HAL: 103.1 mm
195 (5.5 76.9-127.1)/ 90.8 mm (4.8, 68.1-115.5)] (Table 1). Comparison with HSA derived FNW
196 and HAL showed strong correlations between these measures (r^2 0.97 & 0.93 respectively),
197 however the mean values derived with HSA were larger (Supplementary Table 2). FNW, DFH,
198 HAL and height were all strongly correlated (r^2 0.75-0.89) (Table 2). Weight also showed
199 moderate correlations with FNW, DFH, HAL and height (r^2 0.52-0.57).

200

201 Femoral neck width versus HOA

202 In analyses adjusted for age, sex, height and weight (model 3) progressive associations between
203 a wider FNW and higher rHOA grades were seen [rHOA grades ≥ 2 : OR 1.81 (95% CI 1.70-

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

204 1.94), grades ≥ 3 : 3.52 (3.09-4.00) and grade 4: 5.11 (3.95-6.60)]. Similar results were also seen
205 in unadjusted (model 1) and age and sex adjusted (model 2) analyses (Supplementary Table 3).
206 If anything, associations with rHOA were strengthened when adjusting for sex, height and
207 weight as well as geometric parameters (model 4) [grade ≥ 2 rHOA: OR 2.38 (95% CI 2.18-
208 2.59), grade ≥ 3 rHOA: 5.26 (4.45-6.22) and grade 4 rHOA: 8.55 (6.11-11.95)] (Figure 3, Table
209 3). Further sex stratified analyses showed similar associations in females and males albeit
210 female effect estimates tended to have wider confidence intervals (Supplementary Figure 1,
211 Supplementary Tables 4 and 5). Partially adjusted sex combined analyses (model 3) showed
212 an association between FNW and HESOA [OR 2.00 (95% CI 1.71-2.34)] and THR [HR 2.27
213 (95% CI 1.82-2.83)]. These associations were strengthened after adjusting for other geometric
214 parameters [model 4: HESOA: OR 2.20 (95% CI 1.80-2.68), THR: HR 2.51 (95% CI 1.89-
215 3.32)]. (Figure 3, Table 3).

216

217 Hip axis length versus HOA

218 In partially adjusted (model 3) sex combined analyses, there were associations between a
219 longer HAL and higher rHOA grades [rHOA grades ≥ 2 : OR 1.28 (95% CI 1.19-1.37), grades
220 ≥ 3 : 1.64 (1.42-1.88) and grade 4: 1.66 (1.24-2.21)]. These findings were consistent with
221 unadjusted (model 1) and age and sex adjusted (model 2) analyses (Supplementary Table 3).
222 On complete adjustment (model 4) there was some attenuation of effect between HAL and
223 each rHOA grade [rHOA grades ≥ 2 : OR 1.25 (95% CI 1.15-1.36), grades ≥ 3 : 1.39 (1.18-1.63)
224 and grade 4: 1.28 (0.93-1.78)] (Figure 4, Table 3). Sex stratified analyses showed stronger
225 associations in females compared with males especially for the higher rHOA grades [model 4:
226 female/male rHOA grade 4 OR 2.05 (95% CI 1.08-3.89) / 1.08 (0.74-1.57)] (Supplementary
227 Figure 1, Supplementary Tables 4 and 5).

228

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

229 In partially adjusted (model 3) sex combined analyses there was some evidence of an
230 association between HAL and HESOA and THR [HESOA: OR 1.29 (95% CI 1.09-1.53), THR:
231 HR 1.49 (95% CI 1.18-1.89)]. After adjusting for other geometric parameters (model 4) these
232 effect sizes were fully attenuated [HESOA: OR 1.06 (95% CI 0.88-1.29), THR: HR 1.23 (95%
233 CI 0.94-1.61)]. (Figure 4, Table 3). Associations between HAL and HESOA and THR were
234 broadly similar in the sex-stratified analyses (Supplementary Figures 2 and 3, Supplementary
235 Tables 4 and 5).

236

237 Diameter of the femoral head versus HOA

238 An association between a greater DFH and higher rHOA grades was present in partially
239 adjusted (model 3) sex combined analyses [rHOA grade ≥ 2 : OR 1.08 (95% CI 1.01-1.16),
240 grade ≥ 3 : 1.49 (1.30-1.71) and grade 4 rHOA: 1.73 (1.30-2.30)]. These effect sizes were
241 reduced compared with the unadjusted (model 1) and age and sex adjusted (model 2) analyses
242 (Supplementary Table 3). After adjusting for other geometric parameters, the direction of effect
243 was reversed with increasing DFH displaying a protective effect with rHOA [rHOA grades ≥ 2 :
244 OR 0.55 (95% CI 0.50-0.61), grades ≥ 3 : 0.42 (0.35-0.51) and grade 4: 0.36 (0.24-0.54)] (Figure
245 5, Table 3). Sex stratified analyses revealed similar results in females and males
246 (Supplementary Figure 1, Supplementary Tables 4 and 5).

247

248 On partial adjustment (model 3) there was some evidence of an association of DFH with
249 HESOA [OR 1.41 (95% CI 1.19-1.67)] and THR [OR 1.50 (95% CI 1.19-1.90)]. After
250 adjusting for other geometric parameters (model 4) these associations attenuated [HESOA OR
251 0.82 (0.65-1.03)] and THR [HR 0.75 (95% CI 0.54-1.04)] (Figure 5, Table 3). Sex stratified
252 results were similar to combined results in terms of magnitude and direction of effect
253 (Supplementary Figures 2 and 3, Supplementary Tables 4 and 5).

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

254

255 Given the strong correlation between DFH and other geometric parameters, particularly FNW
256 (Table 2), sensitivity analyses were conducted to confirm that the reversal of the association
257 between DFH and rHOA following adjustment for other geometric parameters was not a
258 spurious result due to collinearity between these variables. Therefore, we also examined
259 whether DFH/FNW ratio showed equivalent relationships with HOA outcomes compared with
260 DFH in our fully adjusted model (model 4). A similar inverse association between DFH/FNW
261 and rHOA risk was observed in model 3 compared to that seen for DFH in model 4
262 (Supplementary Table 6). Moreover, the association between DFH/FNW and rHOA risk was
263 unaffected by additional adjustment for geometric parameters. DFH/FNW was also associated
264 with a reduced risk of other HOA outcomes namely HESOA and THR.

265

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

266 Discussion:

267 This is the largest observational study to date (N=40,312) exploring the associations between
268 hip geometric parameters (FNW, DFH and HAL) and HOA. As expected, the geometric
269 parameters were highly correlated with height and each other, as well as differing between the
270 sexes. FNW, HAL and DFH were all related to increased risk of rHOA in age and sex adjusted
271 analyses (model 2). Despite strong relationships between geometric parameters and height and
272 weight, relationships between geometric parameters and HOA showed little attenuation once
273 adjusted for height and weight. Following adjustment for geometric parameters (model 4) both
274 HAL and FNW retained independent relationships with rHOA, whereas DFH was now
275 protective. When considering the clinical outcomes, only FNW was independently related to
276 HESOA and THR. These analyses suggest that a wider FNW, longer HAL and smaller DFH
277 were associated with higher risk of rHOA. In contrast, only a wider FNW appeared to be
278 associated with increased risk of HESOA and predictive of THR.

279
280 FNW showed the strongest associations with all HOA outcomes, consistent with findings from
281 previous studies (6, 7, 23). In addition, these associations were strengthened when adjusted for
282 body size (i.e., height and weight) and other geometric parameters which suggests that FNW
283 is the leading geometric parameter associated with HOA, something which has not been shown
284 before. Previous explanations for the association of FNW with HOA have focused on the
285 mechanism of impingement of the widened femoral neck on the acetabulum akin to
286 femoroacetabular impingement (23-25). An alternative explanation is that the femoral neck is
287 widened as part of, or in parallel to the onset of HOA rather than the widened femoral neck
288 causing HOA. Recent evidence from studies using SSM suggests a wider femoral neck is
289 associated with more severe HOA and separately a genetic study suggested that a genetic
290 predisposition to HOA led to cam-like changes at the femoral head (11, 26, 27). Both these

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

291 studies suggest that hip shape is associated with but might not be a cause of HOA which has
292 treatment implications.

293

294 DFH showed positive associations with HOA when considered in isolation, similar to a
295 previous study (6), but when adjusted for the other geometric parameters the direction of effect
296 reversed to show a relatively smaller femoral head was in fact a risk factor for rHOA.
297 Equivalent findings were obtained after analysing relationships between DFH/FNW ratio and
298 rHOA, and in addition, reduced DFH/FNW was a risk factor for HESOA and THR. A smaller
299 femoral head has been shown to be associated with HOA before when measured on plain
300 radiographs, with the authors suggesting a smaller contact area at the joint would raise the force
301 going through it leading to degeneration (23). That said, these results are in contrast to previous
302 studies based on SSM which reported associations with HOA to have both a larger femoral
303 head and neck (11, 28, 29). This might be explained by how DFH is defined; for example, with
304 a spherical hip, the diameter across the femoral head is the same when measured on multiple
305 axes. Whereas, on an aspherical (cam-type) femoral head the elliptical nature means that the
306 transverse diameter is greater than the vertical. In this study, the circle of best fit was fitted to
307 the medial aspect of the femoral head so as not to be distorted by cam-type femoral heads. This
308 is not the case for the aforementioned SSM studies. The corollary of this might be that a smaller
309 spherical femoral head is a risk factor for HOA alongside larger aspherical (cam-type) femoral
310 heads.

311

312 Whilst there was evidence of an association between HAL and HOA outcomes, these
313 associations were fully attenuated following adjustment. Previously, when assessed in isolation
314 a study had shown associations with HOA similar to model 3 in this study i.e. without
315 adjustment for other geometric parameters (6). These results highlight the importance of

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

316 considering measures of hip morphology alongside each other when examining relationships
317 with HOA, as well as body size. Height and weight are both known risk factors for HOA and
318 were correlated with the geometric parameters featured in this study (30).

319

320 In this study we have used a new method based on SSM points to automatically derive
321 geometric parameters from a large number of DXA scans. In contrast to previous HSA studies,
322 we were able to use this method to derive DFH measurements. FNW, DFH and HAL were all
323 larger in males in contrast to females which is consistent with previous studies showing body
324 measures are on average greater in males than females (31, 32). The geometric parameters
325 obtained in this study compared favourably to those obtained by HSA in terms of correlation,
326 but this study showed smaller mean measures likely due to differences in calculating the
327 geometric parameters (12). For example, this study calculates FNW as the shortest distance
328 across the femoral neck whereas HSA derives the FNW from its area measure making direct
329 comparison difficult. Also, the HAL definition in this study does not include the pelvis unlike
330 HSA; a previous study found a mean HSA-derived HAL of 104.7 mm, slightly higher than the
331 mean in this study (96.7 mm) (33). Comparing geometric parameters derived in this study with
332 other studies provides further face validity for our methods; mean FNW in this study is similar
333 to that reported in the female only Study of Osteoporotic Fractures (mean FNW 29.0 mm v
334 30.7 mm) (7). DXA-derived DFH was very similar to DFH measured on proximal femurs
335 removed during hemiarthroplasty in a previous cross-sectional study (mean 45.9 mm vs 44.9
336 mm respectively) (34).

337

338 The strengths of this study include its large sample size obtained through novel automated
339 measures which have facilitated the description of DXA-derived hip geometry in UKB,
340 including the derivation of DFH which is not provided by existing HSA software. A sample

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

341 size of this magnitude paves the way for future use of genetic epidemiological methods, which
342 can add further understanding of aetiology of hip shape and its role in the pathogenesis of HOA
343 (26, 35). In addition, the use of DXA scans which require lower radiation exposure than X-
344 rays makes them more desirable for screening (10, 36).

345

346 There are several limitations to this study. Firstly, this was an observational study, so we cannot
347 infer causality. The UKB database contains predominantly Caucasian participants, limiting
348 generalisability of findings to other populations and warranting further research in more
349 ethnically diverse settings. In addition, the clinical outcomes examined (HESOA and THR)
350 were not side specific and this may have biased our effect sizes towards the null. It was not
351 possible to calculate neck-shaft angle or femoral shaft width as the outline points did not extend
352 distally below the lesser trochanter. That said, prior studies suggested that the three parameters
353 which were included may have the greatest relevance for hip OA (6, 7, 23). Finally, although
354 HSA is an established methodology for deriving hip geometry, we were keen to explore the
355 role of DFH, which is not calculated by HSA. Therefore, we developed a bespoke platform for
356 deriving FNW, HAL and DFH from 85 points outlining the proximal femur and acetabulum.
357 Reassuringly, FNW and HAL generated by both methods correlated closely in a subset of
358 participants.

359

360 In conclusion, three geometric parameters (FNW, DFH and HAL) were automatically derived
361 from high resolution DXA scans in UKB. Incorporating their inter-relatedness into regression
362 models, strong independent associations were observed between FNW and HOA outcomes
363 (rHOA, HESOA and THR). Weaker independent associations were seen between DFH and
364 HAL, and rHOA. This work paves the way for clinical translation as it suggests geometric
365 parameters derived from DXA are associated with HOA, including the risk of future hip

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

366 replacement, but further work is needed to understand how to combine measures of hip
367 morphology to better predict HOA risk and progression.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

368 Acknowledgements:

369 This work has been conducted using the UK Biobank resource, access application 17295.

370

371 Author contributions:

372 All authors have made significant contributions to the conception and design of this study,

373 the acquisition of data, its analysis and interpretation. All authors helped draft the article

374 before approving the final version of this manuscript. Sophie Heppenstall

375 (sophie.heppenstall.2018@bristol.ac.uk) takes responsibility for the integrity of the work in

376 its entirety.

377

378 Role of the funding source:

379 SVH was a self-funded undergraduate student for this work. RE, MF, FS are supported, and

380 this work is funded by a Wellcome Trust collaborative award (reference number 209233). This

381 research was funded in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust [Grant number

382 223267/Z/21/Z]. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public

383 copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

384 CL was funded by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship jointly funded by the Wellcome Trust and the

385 Royal Society (223267/Z/21/Z). NCH acknowledges support from the MRC and NIHR

386 Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University

387 Hospital Southampton. BGF, MF & JHT work in the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at

388 the University of Bristol, which is supported by the MRC (MC_UU_00011/1). BGF is a

389 National Institute for Health and Care Research Academic Clinical Lecturer and was

390 previously supported by a Medical Research Council (MRC) clinical research training

391 fellowship (MR/S021280/1). No funders had any role in the study design, collection, analysis

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

392 and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the
393 manuscript for publication.

394

395 Competing interest statement:

396 TC & CL have a patent image processing apparatus and method for fitting a deformable shape

397 model to an image using random forest regression voting. This is licensed with royalties to

398 Optasia Medical. NH reports consultancy fees and honoraria from UCB, Amgen, Kyowa Kirin,

399 Thornton Ross, Consilient.

400

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

401 References

- 402 1. Hunter DJ, Bierma-Zeinstra S. Osteoarthritis. *Lancet*. 2019; 393(10182):1745-59.
- 403 2. Doherty M, Courtney P, Doherty S, Jenkins W, Maciewicz RA, Muir K, et al.
404 Nonspherical femoral head shape (pistol grip deformity), neck shaft angle, and risk of hip
405 osteoarthritis: a case-control study. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2008; 58(10):3172-82.
- 406 3. McWilliams DF, Doherty SA, Jenkins WD, Maciewicz RA, Muir KR, Zhang W, et al.
407 Mild acetabular dysplasia and risk of osteoarthritis of the hip: a case-control study. *Ann Rheum*
408 *Dis*. 2010; 69(10):1774-8.
- 409 4. Nicholls AS, Kiran A, Pollard TC, Hart DJ, Arden CP, Spector T, et al. The association
410 between hip morphology parameters and nineteen-year risk of end-stage osteoarthritis of the
411 hip: a nested case-control study. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2011; 63(11):3392-400.
- 412 5. Murray RO. The aetiology of primary osteoarthritis of the hip. *Br J Radiol*. 1965;
413 38(455):810-24.
- 414 6. Castano-Betancourt MC, Van Meurs JB, Bierma-Zeinstra S, Rivadeneira F, Hofman
415 A, Weinans H, et al. The contribution of hip geometry to the prediction of hip osteoarthritis.
416 *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2013; 21(10):1530-6.
- 417 7. Javaid MK, Lane NE, Mackey DC, Lui LY, Arden NK, Beck TJ, et al. Changes in
418 proximal femoral mineral geometry precede the onset of radiographic hip osteoarthritis: The
419 study of osteoporotic fractures. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2009; 60(7):2028-36.
- 420 8. Pavlova AV, Saunders FR, Muthuri SG, Gregory JS, Barr RJ, Martin KR, et al.
421 Statistical shape modelling of hip and lumbar spine morphology and their relationship in the
422 MRC National Survey of Health and Development. *J Anat*. 2017; 231(2):248-59.
- 423 9. Edwards K, Leyland KM, Sanchez-Santos MT, Arden CP, Spector TD, Nelson AE, et
424 al. Differences between race and sex in measures of hip morphology: a population-based
425 comparative study. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*. 2020; 28(2):189-200.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

- 426 10. Faber BG, Ebsim R, Saunders FR, Frysz M, Lindner C, Gregory JS, et al. A novel semi-
427 automated classifier of hip osteoarthritis on DXA images shows expected relationships with
428 clinical outcomes in UK Biobank. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*. 2021.
- 429 11. Frysz M, Faber BG, Ebsim R, Saunders FR, Lindner C, Gregory JS, et al. Machine-
430 learning derived acetabular dysplasia and cam morphology are features of severe hip
431 osteoarthritis: findings from UK Biobank. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2022.
- 432 12. Beck TJ. Extending DXA beyond bone mineral density: understanding hip structure
433 analysis. *Curr Osteoporos Rep*. 2007; 5(2):49-55.
- 434 13. Littlejohns TJ, Holliday J, Gibson LM, Garratt S, Oesingmann N, Alfaro-Almagro F,
435 et al. The UK Biobank imaging enhancement of 100,000 participants: rationale, data collection,
436 management and future directions. *Nat Commun*. 2020; 11(1):2624.
- 437 14. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK Biobank
438 resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature*. 2018; 562(7726):203-9.
- 439 15. Faber B. Geometric Parameters Python 3.0 Code. GitHub 2022 [Available from:
440 <https://zenodo.org/badge/latestdoi/518486087> [Accessed 2022].
- 441 16. Ackerman KE, Pierce L, Guereca G, Slattery M, Lee H, Goldstein M, et al. Hip
442 structural analysis in adolescent and young adult oligoamenorrhic and eumenorrhic athletes
443 and nonathletes. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2013; 98(4):1742-9.
- 444 17. Faber BG, Ebsim R, Saunders FR, Frysz M, Lindner C, Gregory JS, et al. Osteophyte
445 size and location on hip DXA scans are associated with hip pain: findings from a cross sectional
446 study in UK Biobank. *Bone*. 2021:116146.
- 447 18. K K, P R. Hyper least square fitting of circles and ellipses. *Computational Statistics &*
448 *Data Analysis*. 2011; 55(6):2197-208.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

- 449 19. Faulkner KG, Cummings SR, Black D, Palermo L, Glüer CC, Genant HK. Simple
450 measurement of femoral geometry predicts hip fracture: the study of osteoporotic fractures. J
451 Bone Miner Res. 1993; 8(10):1211-7.
- 452 20. Muthuri SG, Saunders FR, Hardy RJ, Pavlova AV, Martin KR, Gregory JS, et al.
453 Associations between body mass index across adult life and hip shapes at age 60 to 64:
454 Evidence from the 1946 British birth cohort. Bone. 2017; 105:115-21.
- 455 21. Faber BG, Ebsim R, Saunders FR, Frysz M, Lindner C, Gregory JS, et al. Osteophyte
456 size and location on hip DXA scans are associated with hip pain: Findings from a cross
457 sectional study in UK Biobank. Bone. 2021; 153:116146.
- 458 22. Frysz M, Gregory J, Aspden RM, Paternoster L, Tobias JH. Sex differences in proximal
459 femur shape: findings from a population-based study in adolescents. Sci Rep. 2020;
460 10(1):4612.
- 461 23. Abdulrahim H, Jiao Q, Swain S, Sehat K, Sarmanova A, Muir K, et al. Constitutional
462 morphological features and risk of hip osteoarthritis: a case-control study using standard
463 radiographs. Ann Rheum Dis. 2020.
- 464 24. Ganz R, Parvizi J, Beck M, Leunig M, Nötzli H, Siebenrock KA. Femoroacetabular
465 Impingement: A Cause for Osteoarthritis of the Hip. Clinical Orthopaedics and Related
466 Research. 2003; 417:112-20.
- 467 25. Heerey J, Kemp J, Agricola R, Srinivasan R, Smith A, Pizzari T, et al. Cam morphology
468 is associated with MRI-defined cartilage defects and labral tears: a case-control study of 237
469 young adult football players with and without hip and groin pain. BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med.
470 2021; 7(4):e001199.
- 471 26. Faber BG, Frysz M, Hartley AE, Ebsim R, Boer CG, Saunders FR, et al. Investigation
472 of the genetic architecture of cam morphology, and its relationship with hip osteoarthritis, using
473 alpha angle as a proxy measure. medRxiv. 2022:2022.07.22.22277884.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

- 474 27. Faber BG, Frysz M, Hartley AE, Ebsim R, Boer CG, Saunders FR, et al. A GWAS
475 meta-analysis of alpha angle suggests cam-type morphology may be a specific feature of hip
476 osteoarthritis in older adults. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 2023.
- 477 28. Faber BG, Bredbenner TL, Baird D, Gregory J, Saunders F, Giuraniuc CV, et al.
478 Subregional statistical shape modelling identifies lesser trochanter size as a possible risk factor
479 for radiographic hip osteoarthritis, a cross-sectional analysis from the Osteoporotic Fractures
480 in Men Study. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2020; 28(8):1071-8.
- 481 29. Barr RJ, Gregory JS, Yoshida K, Alesci S, Aspden RM, Reid DM. Significant
482 morphological change in osteoarthritic hips identified over 6–12 months using statistical shape
483 modelling. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage.* 2018; 26(6):783-9.
- 484 30. Croft P, Coggon D, Cruddas M, Cooper C. Osteoarthritis of the hip: an occupational
485 disease in farmers. *BMJ.* 1992; 304(6837):1269-72.
- 486 31. Nissen N, Hauge EM, Abrahamsen B, Jensen JE, Mosekilde L, Brixen K. Geometry of
487 the proximal femur in relation to age and sex: a cross-sectional study in healthy adult Danes.
488 *Acta Radiol.* 2005; 46(5):514-8.
- 489 32. Elbuken F, Baykara M, Ozturk C. Standardisation of the neck-shaft angle and
490 measurement of age-, gender- and BMI-related changes in the femoral neck using DXA.
491 *Singapore Med J.* 2012; 53(9):587-90.
- 492 33. Leslie WD, Lix LM, Morin SN, Johansson H, Odén A, McCloskey EV, et al. Hip axis
493 length is a FRAX- and bone density-independent risk factor for hip fracture in women. *J Clin*
494 *Endocrinol Metab.* 2015; 100(5):2063-70.
- 495 34. Lee CK, Kwan MK, Merican AM, Ng WM, Saw LB, Teh KK, et al. Femoral head
496 diameter in the Malaysian population. *Singapore Med J.* 2014; 55(8):436-8.
- 497 35. Sanderson E, Glymour MM, Holmes MV, Kang H, Morrison J, Munafò MR, et al.
498 Mendelian randomization. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers.* 2022; 2(1):6.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

499 36. Yoshida K, Barr RJ, Galea-Soler S, Aspden RM, Reid DM, Gregory JS.
500 Reproducibility and Diagnostic Accuracy of Kellgren-Lawrence Grading for Osteoarthritis
501 Using Radiographs and Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry Images. J Clin Densitom. 2015;
502 18(2):239-44.
503

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis




Figure 1: An example of a grade 4 rHOA hip from UK Biobank with superolateral (red) and inferomedial (blue) osteophytes marked.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis




Figure 2: Geometric parameter measurements: A – Femoral Neck Width (FNW) derived using the line-segment method using points 6-12 on the medial side and points 32-38 on the lateral side, B- Diameter of the femoral head (DFH) derived by fitting a circle to points 15-28, C – Hip Axis Length (HAL) derived by finding the distance between point 49 and where the line intersects the circumference of the circle having passed through the centre of the femoral head.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis




Figure 3: Logistic regression results for the associations between femoral neck width (FNW) and radiographic hip osteoarthritis \geq grade 2, \geq grade 3, grade 4 and hospital diagnosed OA (HESOA) and cox proportional hazard modelling results between FNW and total hip replacement (THR) in combined sex analyses. Each symbol represents odds/ hazard ratios with 95% CIs. Circle symbol represents unadjusted analyses (model 1), square indicates adjustment for age and sex (model 2), diamond for age, sex, height and weight (model 3) and triangle for age, sex, height, weight, and remaining geometric parameters (model 4).

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis




Figure 4: Logistic regression results for the associations between hip axis length (HAL) and radiographic hip osteoarthritis \geq grade 2, \geq grade 3, grade 4 and hospital diagnosed OA (HESOA) and cox proportional hazard modelling results between HAL and total hip replacement (THR) in combined sex analyses. Each symbol represents odds/ hazard ratios with 95% CIs. Circle symbol represents unadjusted analyses (model 1), square indicates adjustment for age and sex (model 2), diamond for age, sex, height and weight (model 3) and triangle for age, sex, height, weight, and remaining geometric parameters (model 4).

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis




Figure 5: Logistic regression results for the associations between diameter of the femoral head (DFH) and radiographic hip osteoarthritis \geq grade 2, \geq grade 3, grade 4 and hospital diagnosed OA (HESOA) and cox proportional hazard modelling results between DFH and total hip replacement (THR) in combined sex analyses. Each symbol represents odds/ hazard ratios with 95% CIs. Circle symbol represents unadjusted analyses (model 1), square indicates adjustment for age and sex (model 2), diamond for age, sex, height and weight (model 3) and triangle for age, sex, height, weight, and remaining geometric parameters (model 4).

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

Table 1: Population Characteristics

	Combined N=40,312	Female N=21,021	Male N=19,291
	Mean [SD, Range]	Mean [SD, Range]	Mean [SD, Range]
Age at 2nd follow up (years)	63.7 [7.6, 44-82]	63.0 [7.4, 45-82]	64.3 [7.7, 44-81]
Weight (kg)	75.3 [15.1, 34-171]	68.2 [12.9, 34-169]	83.2 [13.4, 47-171]
Height (cm)	170.1 [9.4, 135-204]	163.6 [6.4, 135-196]	177.2 [6.6, 150-204]
FNW (mm)	31.6 [3.5, 21.4-45.8]	29.0 [2.0, 21.4-37.8]	34.5 [2.4, 22.9-45.8]
DFH (mm)	45.9 [3.8, 33.4-64.4]	43.0 [2.3, 33.4-53.7]	49.0 [2.6, 34.7-64.4]
HAL (mm)	96.7 [8.0, 68.1-127.1]	90.8 [4.8, 68.1-115.5]	103.1 [103.1, 76.9-127.1]
	N [%]	N [%]	N [%]
rHOA ≥ 2	3,014 [7.5]	928 [4.4]	2,086 [10.8]
rHOA ≥ 3	700 [1.7]	191 [0.9]	509 [2.6]
rHOA 4	157 [0.4]	44 [0.2]	113 [0.6]
HESOA	527 [1.3]	307 [1.5]	220 [1.1]
THR	259 [0.6]	153 [0.7]	106 [0.6]

Abbreviations: FNW – Femoral Neck Width, DFH – Diameter of the Femoral Head, HAL – Hip Axis Length, rHOA – radiographic hip osteoarthritis, HESOA – Hospital Diagnosed Hip Osteoarthritis, THR – Total Hip Replacement.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

Table 2: Correlation (r^2) matrix between geometric parameters, height, weight, and age.

	FNW	DFH	HAL	Height	Weight	Age
FNW	1					
DFH	0.89	1				
HAL	0.82	0.87	1			
Height	0.75	0.81	0.81	1		
Weight	0.55	0.52	0.53	0.57	1	
Age	0.13	0.11	0.13	-0.06	-0.07	1

Green indicates a strong correlation ($r^2 \geq 0.7-1.0$), yellow a moderate correlation ($r^2 \geq 0.5-0.7$) and amber/red a weak correlation ($r^2 < 0.5$). Abbreviations: FNW

– Femoral Neck Width, DFH – Diameter of the Femoral Head, HAL – Hip Axis Length.

Hip geometry and its associations with hip osteoarthritis

Table 3: Logistic regression/ Cox proportional hazard modelling results showing the association between geometric parameters and HOA outcomes.

		Grade \geq 2 rHOA		Grade \geq 3 rHOA		Grade 4 rHOA		HESOA		THR	
		OR [95% CI]	p	OR [95% CI]	p	OR [95% CI]	p	OR [95% CI]	p	HR [95% CI]	p
Model 3	FNW	1.81 [1.70-1.94]	9.20x10 ⁻⁶⁹	3.52 [3.09-4.00]	7.50x10 ⁻⁸²	5.11 [3.95-6.60]	1.64x10 ⁻³⁵	2.00 [1.71-2.34]	3.78x10 ⁻¹⁸	2.27 [1.82-2.83]	2.80x10 ⁻¹³
Model 4	FNW	2.38 [2.18-2.59]	1.40x10 ⁻⁸⁸	5.26 [4.45-6.22]	1.20x10 ⁻⁸⁴	8.55 [6.11-11.95]	4.59x10 ⁻³⁶	2.20 [1.80-2.68]	1.06x10 ⁻¹⁴	2.51 [1.89-3.32]	1.44x10 ⁻¹⁰
Model 3	HAL	1.28 [1.19-1.37]	1.17x10 ⁻¹¹	1.64 [1.42-1.88]	3.72x10 ⁻¹²	1.66 [1.24-2.21]	5.88x10 ⁻⁴	1.29 [1.09-1.53]	2.71x10 ⁻³	1.49 [1.18-1.89]	8.32x10 ⁻⁴
Model 4	HAL	1.25 [1.15-1.36]	5.99x10 ⁻⁸	1.39 [1.18-1.63]	4.95x10 ⁻⁵	1.28 [0.93-1.78]	0.13	1.06 [0.88-1.29]	0.52	1.23 [0.94-1.61]	0.13
Model 3	DFH	1.08 [1.01-1.16]	0.03	1.49 [1.30-1.71]	2.01x10 ⁻⁸	1.73 [1.30-2.30]	1.65x10 ⁻⁴	1.41 [1.19-1.67]	5.38x10 ⁻⁵	1.50 [1.19-1.90]	7.12x10 ⁻⁴
Model 4	DFH	0.55 [0.50-0.61]	3.32x10 ⁻³²	0.42 [0.35-0.51]	1.07x10 ⁻¹⁷	0.36 [0.24-0.54]	9.55x10 ⁻⁷	0.82 [0.65-1.03]	0.09	0.75 [0.54-1.04]	0.09

Table shows logistic regression results for the associations between geometric parameters and radiographic hip osteoarthritis (rHOA) \geq grade 2, \geq grade 3, grade 4 and hospital diagnosed hip osteoarthritis (HESOA) and Cox proportional hazard modelling results between geometric parameters and total hip replacement (THR) in partially and fully adjusted combined sex analyses (model 3 included the covariates age, sex, height and weight whereas model 4 was adjusted for these as well as the remaining geometric parameters).