

**Bone mineral density measurements and  
the development of patient selection  
criteria for patients requiring hip  
resurfacing surgery**

**Rebecca Louise Cordingley**

**2005**

**Doctorate in Philosophy, Science**

Faculty of Chemistry, Materials and Forensic Science

University of Technology, Sydney

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP / ORIGINALITY**

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidate

Production Note:  
Signature removed prior to publication.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The long road travelled to complete this Phd has been difficult and rewarding and it would not have been possible without the support and encouragement from a large number of dear and cherished people.

Firstly, I would like to thank MMT (Smith and Nephew) for their financial support, Bishop engineering for their assistance with femoral head cutting, Dr H Zreiqat and for help with histology, Dr G Heanes for co- supervising and the University of Technology for granting me a position to complete this degree.

To my professor Besim Ben-Nissan, there are not enough words to thank you for the support and encouragement you have selflessly given to me. I would not have reached this stage without your never ending smile and intelligent guidance. It has been a pleasure being your student.

To my friend and mentor Lawrence Kohan, thank you for showing me how to believe in my abilities and strive for a goal which has seemed to be a long way out of my reach for a long time. You have constantly been available for support and encouragement the entire way through this process.

To my fabulous friends Helen and Kirby, thank you for your constant words of encouragement and emotional support.

Lastly, to my cherished family, I would not have finished this thesis without your support and never ending positive reinforcement in times when I thought this would never end.

Mum and Bill you are both my heroes and inspiration, thank you for being you.

If this accomplishment has taught me anything, it is never give up on a dream. With hard work, motivation and the support that I have had from all of you, I can achieve anything!!!!

## ABSTRACT

There is concern about femoral neck fractures for patients in the early post operative period following hip resurfacing surgery. Although patient selection is multifactorial bone quality plays an important role in fracture risk. Reduced bone mineral mass induces an increased fracture risk on the superior side of the femoral neck before and after hip resurfacing. Close scrutiny to bone quality other than the use of visual inspection of radiographs (Singh Index) to estimate the mechanical quality of the bone has not been closely analysed. A change in bone mass across the femoral neck can be influenced by disease (Osteoarthritis) or a change in load pattern (pain and disuse). If hip resurfacing is the technique of choice, the major difficulty is to distinguish clearly which patient will have a positive outcome without the complication of femoral neck fracture.

Bone mineral density (BMD) measurement is a well known technique for the diagnoses of poor bone mass (Osteoporosis). To date there has been no published data analyzing the effect of bone mineral density examination in patient selection criteria for hip resurfacing surgery.

This is the first attempt to introduce a practical tool for surgeons to assess bone quality prior to hip resurfacing surgery. A prospective longitudinal outcome analysis of 423 consecutive hip resurfacing procedures was conducted to test the validity of the introduction of BMD in conjunction with unique selection criteria. There were 339 patients under 65 years of age (264 males and 75 females). There were 84 patients 65 years and over (61 males and 23 females).

Bone mineral density examination was introduced preoperatively, 6 months, 12 months and 24 months postoperatively to test for bone mass quality. The short form (SF-36), WOMAC health questionnaire, TEGNER activity score and body mass index (BMI) were used to analysis the patient's outcomes, activity and general health preoperatively, 6 months, 12 months, 24 months and 36 months postoperatively.

The results concluded that this was the first time BMD measurements were successfully introduced as a selection tool for patient requiring hip resurfacing surgery. There were no femoral neck fractures after its introduction. I propose BMD examination is part of a multifactorial approach in the selection of patient for hip resurfacing surgery and it is the one determining factor that will ensure the bone is strong enough to cope with this load sharing device.



## Table of Contents

<b>Certificate.....</b>	<b>(ii)</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>(iii)</b>
<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>(iv)</b>
<b>Table of contents .....</b>	<b>(v)</b>
<b>List of Figures.....</b>	<b>(ix)</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>(xvii)</b>
<b>Publication List .....</b>	<b>(xix)</b>

---

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction.....</b>	<b>pg 1</b>
-------------------------------------	-------------

---

<b>Chapter 2: Bone: .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.1 Nanostructure of bone.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.2 Microstructure of bone.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.3 Primary and secondary bone.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.4 Macroscopic level.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>2.5 Mechanical properties of bone.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Reference List.....</b>	<b>30</b>

---

<b>Chapter 3: Anatomy/Biomechanics.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.2 Skeletal Anatomy.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.3 Articular Cartilage.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>3.4 Ligaments.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.5 Muscle Attachments and Action.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>3.6 Biomechanics.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>3.7 Gait.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>3.8: Kinematics of the hip.....</b>	<b>62</b>

3.8: Forces.....	64
3.9 External forces.....	65
3.10 Internal Forces.....	67
3.11: Stress.....	68
Reference List.....	72
<hr/>	
<b>Chapter 4: Osteoarthritis.....</b>	<b>74</b>
4.1 Definition / Pathophysiology.....	75
4.2 Diagnosis and Classification.....	80
4.3 Epidemiology.....	83
4.4 Risk factors.....	87
4.5 Treatment.....	89
Reference List.....	95
<hr/>	
<b>Chapter 5: Osteoporosis.....</b>	<b>98</b>
5.1 Definition.....	99
5.2 Pathophysiology.....	100
5.3 Epidemiology.....	104
5.4 Classification.....	105
5.5 Diagnosis.....	106
5.6 Fracture Risk.....	110
5.7 Treatment.....	112
Reference List.....	116
<hr/>	
<b>Chapter 6: Total hip Replacement / Hip Resurfacing.....</b>	<b>119</b>
6.1. History of total hip replacement.....	121
6.2 Implant design and materials.....	136
6.3 THR success and implant survival.....	148
6.4 What is Hip Resurfacing.....	152
6.5 History of hip resurfacing.....	153

6.6 Birmingham Hip Resurfacing.....	166
6.7 The success of hip resurfacing.....	168
Reference List.....	170
<hr/>	
Chapter 7: Methodology.....	174
7.1 Introduction.....	175
Reference List.....	180
<hr/>	
Chapter 8: Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry.....	181
8.1 Introduction.....	182
8.2 History of bone mineral density testing.....	183
8.3 What is bone mineral density?.....	186
8.4 Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry Principles.....	188
8.5 Procedure.....	196
8.6 Interpretation of BMD results.....	202
8.7 Clinical considerations .....	206
8.8 Gender and age issues.....	209
8.9 Periprosthetic Bone.....	211
8.10 Results and discussion.....	213
Reference List.....	231
<hr/>	
Chapter 9: Patient Selection.....	236
9.1 Introduction.....	236
9.2 Current selection criteria.....	237
9.3 Osteoarthritis.....	239
9.4 Activity.....	240
9.5 Age.....	242
9.6 Body mass index.....	243
9.7 Gender.....	245
9.8 Comorbidities.....	246

9.9 Bone Mass .....	251
9.10 Surgical Technique.....	251
9.11. Outcome Analysis.....	254
9.12. Results.....	256
9.13 Complications .....	263
9.14 Discussion.....	265
Reference List.....	268

---

Chapter 10 Conclusion / Future Work.....	271
10.1 Conclusion.....	272
10.2 Future work.....	274
Reference List.....	277

---

Appendix 1 .....	278
Reference List .....	283

---

Appendix 2: Implant Retrieval.....	284
A: Introduction.....	285
B: Methods.....	287
C: Results.....	293
D: Discussion.....	296
Reference List.....	298

## List of figures

---

<b>Chapter 2: Bone:</b> .....	Page 6
<b>Figure 1:</b> The structural organisation of bone.....	8
<b>Figure 2:</b> Collagen Fibril.....	9
<b>Figure 3:</b> The structure of collagen in terms of the organization of a triple helix.....	10
<b>Figure 4:</b> The assembly of collagen fibrils and fibres and bone mineral crystals.....	11
<b>Figure 5:</b> Schematic illustration (not drawn to scale) showing A: An arrangement of mineralized collagen fibrils aligned both with respect to crystal layers and fibril axes. This structure has orthotropic symmetry. B: Arrangement of mineralized collagen fibrils with only the fibril axes aligned. This structure has transversal isotropy.....	12
<b>Figure 6:</b> A: Multiphoton image of periosteum. The collagen is visualized by SHG (green pseudocolor) B: An illustration highlighting the anatomical position of the periosteum.....	13
<b>Figure 7:</b> A: An illustration highlighting the anatomical position of the Endosteum B: Medium magnification view of the inner surface of the diaphysis (Endosteum).....	14
<b>Figure 8:</b> A congregation of osteoblasts.....	15
<b>Figure 9:</b> A: An illustration of the anatomical position of the osteocyte B: Histology slide showing an osteocyte.....	16
<b>Figure 10:</b> A: Osteoclast at work dissolving bone. B: Microscopic photograph of an osteoclast.....	17
<b>Figure 11:</b> The phases of bone formation and bone remodeling.....	18
<b>Figure 12:</b> The cycle of bone remodeling.....	19
<b>Figure 13:</b> This is a low power shot of ground bone. The yellow arrows are showing the borders of the Osteons, also known as a Haversian system.....	20
<b>Figure 14:</b> High magnification shot of ground bone. The Osteon or Haversian system is outlined by the green dotted line. This same line is also showing the cement lines. Cement lines are outer borders of the Haversian system that look like a line. The blue arrows are pointing to the Haversian canals. These house the blood supply to the osteocytes in the bone. This was once a larger canal that was filled starting from	



outside to in with concentric lamellae of bone, indicated by the yellow dotted lines. The white dotted line is indicating interstitial lamellae. These are remnants of old Osteons which were remodeled and left behind in the remodeling process. The white arrows are pointing to the osteocytes.....21

**Figure 15:** Trabecular bone.....23

**Figure 16:** Cortical Bone.....24

**Figure 17:** Equation for Adaptive bone remodeling.....26

**Figure 18:** Net rate of Bone remodeling.....27

**Figure 19:** Feedback loop for bone remodeling.....28

### **Chapter 3: Anatomy/ biomechanics**

**Figure 20:** Ilium, Ischium and Pubis.....34

**Figure: 21** Anterior femur.....36

**Figure 22:** Posterior femur.....36

**Figure 23:** Femoral head and neck.....36

**Figure 24:** Intertrochanteric Crest.....38

**Figure 25:** Articulating Cartilage.....39

**Figure: 26** Cartilage Zones.....40

**Figure 27:** Ligaments of the hip joint.....42

**Figure 28:** Ilio femoral ligaments.....43

**Figure 29:** Ligamentum Teres.....45

**Figure 30:** Cotyloid Ligament.....44

**Figure 31:** Transverse Ligament .....44

**Figure 32:** Muscle attachments in the hip joint .....46

**Figure 33:** Muscle attachments to the proximal and distal femur.....46

**Figure 34:** Gluteus maximus, medius and minimus.....47

**Figure 35:** Piriformis, Obturator internus and Gemelli.....48

**Figure 36:** Obturator externus.....51

**Figure 37:** Biceps femoris, Semitendinosus, Semimembranosus.....51

**Figure 38:** Muscles of the anterior and medial thigh.....53

**Figure 39:** Muscles of the medial thigh .....56

<b>Figure 40:</b> Muscles of the iliac region.....	<b>57</b>
<b>Figure 41:</b> Centre of gravity through both hips.....	<b>59</b>
<b>Figure 42:</b> Gait cycle, Stance phase.....	<b>60</b>
<b>Figure 43:</b> Stance and swing phase of gait.....	<b>61</b>
<b>Figure 44:</b> Extension/ Flexion and rotation of the hip .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Figure 45:</b> Sequence dependant rotations showing that 3-D rotation are sequence dependant.....	<b>64</b>
<b>Figure 46:</b> Model of four rigid links.....	<b>65</b>
<b>Figure 47:</b> Illustrates external forces applied to normal ambulation .....	<b>66</b>
<b>Figure 48:</b> Illustrates body mass caused by acceleration and deceleration.....	<b>67</b>
<b>Figure 49:</b> Stresses on the hip joint .....	<b>69</b>
<b>Figure 50:</b> Congenital Hip disease.....	<b>70</b>
<b>Figure 51:</b> Osteoarthritis of the hip.....	<b>70</b>
<b>Figure 52:</b> Femoral neck fracture .....	<b>71</b>

---

#### **Chapter 4: Osteoarthritis**

<b>Figure 53:</b> A: Normal articulating cartilage B: fibrillation and destruction of articulating cartilage due to arthritis.....	<b>77</b>
<b>Figure 54:</b> A: Radiographic evidence of Osteoarthritis of the hip joint and loss of articulating cartilage. B: Normal hip joint .....	<b>78</b>
<b>Figure 55:</b> Articulating cartilage damage in Osteoarthritis in the hip.....	<b>78</b>
<b>Figure 56:</b> A: MRI of subchondral bone damage in Osteoarthritis. B: Histological slide showing the formation of subchondral damage and cyst formation.....	<b>79</b>
<b>Figure 57:</b> A: An x-ray displaying Osteophyte formation. B: Histology of an Osteophyte.....	<b>80</b>
<b>Figure 58:</b> Incidence of osteoarthritis in Australia.....	<b>83</b>
<b>Figure 59:</b> National Health Survey SF-36 scores (1997).....	<b>85</b>
<b>Figure 60:</b> Limitations on activity by adults with hip OA.....	<b>85</b>
<b>Figure 61:</b> Emotional status for adults with hip OA .....	<b>86</b>
<b>Figure 62:</b> Number of hip and knee replacements performed in Australia from 1996 to 2001 .....	<b>87</b>

## **Chapter 5: Osteoporosis**

<b>Figure 63:</b> A: Normal mineralized trabecular bone. B: Osteoporotic bone.....	101
<b>Figure 64:</b> Structure of bone and the process of densitometry .....	102
<b>Figure 65:</b> Model for pathogenesis of osteoporosis.....	103
<b>Figure 66:</b> Mechanism of loss of trabecular bone in women and trabecular thinning in men .....	104
<b>Figure 67:</b> Explanation of T- and Z-scores, with World Health Organization thresholds.....	109

---

## **Chapter 6: Total hip Replacement / Hip Resurfacing**

<b>Figure 68:</b> Surgeon Anthony White.....	121
<b>Figure 69:</b> A: Dr Jean Judet. B: Acrylic femoral component used by the Judet brothers.....	123
<b>Figure 70:</b> A: Dr Phillip Wiles. B: Wiles Arthroplasty.....	123
<b>Figure 71:</b> A: Austin Moore. B: Cobalt chrome alloy Austin Moore implant. C: Patient x-ray with an Austin Moore component.....	124
<b>Figure 72:</b> Thompson cobalt chrome implant.....	125
<b>Figure 73:</b> A: Kenneth McKee. B: The first McKee component design.....	126
<b>Figure 74:</b> Sir John Charnley.....	127
<b>Figure 75:</b> Charnley's Teflon on Teflon hip components.....	128
<b>Figure 76:</b> Charnley's metal on plastic components.....	129
<b>Figure 77:</b> A: Cement bonding to bone and metal interface. B: The process of cementing a femoral component.....	130
<b>Figure 78:</b> A: An X-ray of a Charnley metal on polyethylene component. B: Charnley femoral component.....	131
<b>Figure 79:</b> Updated version of the McKee Farrar design.....	132
<b>Figure 80:</b> A: Peter Ring. B: The Ring component.....	132
<b>Figure 81:</b> The Stanmore Total hip component.....	133
<b>Figure 82:</b> The Muller/ Huggler components.....	134

<b>Figure 83:</b> Ceramic femoral component with a taper fixation.....	<b>135</b>
<b>Figure 84:</b> Various different hip components.....	<b>136</b>
<b>Figure 85:</b> Different combinations of materials in total hip replacement.....	<b>137</b>
<b>Figure 86:</b> Ceramic head fracture under proof testing conditions.....	<b>139</b>
<b>Figure 87:</b> Example of Alumina ceramic femoral heads and acetabular cups.....	<b>140</b>
<b>Figure 88:</b> Example of Zirconia head.....	<b>141</b>
<b>Figure 89:</b> Structure of Cross-linked UHMWPE.....	<b>143</b>
<b>Figure 90:</b> Different types of fixation for hip replacement.....	<b>144</b>
<b>Figure 91:</b> <b>A:</b> Cement bone interface. <b>B:</b> Histology of cement bone interface.....	<b>146</b>
<b>Figure 92:</b> <b>A:</b> Pressfit femoral stem. <b>B:</b> Pressfit acetabular cup. <b>C:</b> Electron microscope view of the porous coating surface on the hip components.....	<b>147</b>
<b>Figure 93:</b> THR results for cemented, uncemented and hybrid implants.....	<b>149</b>
<b>Figure 94:</b> Long term follow-up of the first generation hip implants.....	<b>150</b>
<b>Figure 95:</b> Survival by age.....	<b>152</b>
<b>Figure 96:</b> <b>A:</b> A post operative x-ray of a hip replacement. <b>B:</b> A post operative x-ray of hip resurfacing.....	<b>153</b>
<b>Figure 97:</b> Charnley hip resurfacing.....	<b>154</b>
<b>Figure 98:</b> Muller THR and hip resurfacing component.....	<b>155</b>
<b>Figure 99:</b> Freeman hip resurfacing components.....	<b>156</b>
<b>Figure 100:</b> <b>A:</b> Wagner hip resurfacing component. <b>B:</b> X-rays of the Wagner components post operatively.....	<b>157</b>
<b>Figure 101:</b> THARIES surfacing component.....	<b>158</b>
<b>Figure 102:</b> Survival curve from the first series of THARIES.....	<b>159</b>
<b>Figure 103:</b> Second generation Wagner metal on metal hip resurfacing.....	<b>161</b>
<b>Figure 104:</b> Early McMinn resurfacing design.....	<b>162</b>
<b>Figure 105:</b> Corin, Cormet -2000 hip resurfacing device.....	<b>163</b>
<b>Figure 106:</b> Birmingham hip resurfacing device.....	<b>163</b>
<b>Figure 107:</b> Conserve Plus implant.....	<b>164</b>
<b>Figure 108:</b> Durom implant.....	<b>165</b>
<b>Figure 109:</b> ASR Implant.....	<b>165</b>
<b>Figure 110:</b> ReCap Implant.....	<b>166</b>
<b>Figure 111:</b> Casting process for hip resurfacing implant.....	<b>167</b>



**Figure 112:** A: Macro picture of the Porocast surface on the acetabular component.  
 B: Microscopic picture of the Porocast surface on the acetabular component .....167

**Figure 113:** Polishing process of the Birmingham hip resurfacing component .....168

**Figure 114:** Survival analysis of the McMinn implant from 1997-2001.....168

**Chapter 7: Methodology**

**Figure 115:** Classification of femoral neck fracture. A: Tension B: Compression C:  
 Displaced .....176

**Figure 116:** A: Well positioned functioning BHR. B: Tension fracture pattern .....177

**Chapter 8: Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry**

**Figure 117:** Dual Photon Absorptiometry.....184

**Figure 118:** DEXA machine.....185

**Figure 119:** CT machine.....186

**Figure 120:** 3D image of a Peony flower.....187

**Figure 121:** 2D image pressed Peony.....187

**Figure 122:** Absorption of x-rays indicating principles of bone mineral density....188

**Figure 123:** Areal bone mineral density.....190

**Figure 124:** Example of areal bone mineral density of two different sized bones....191

**Figure 125:** Norland XR series densitometry machine.....193

**Figure 126:** Schematic drawing of a Norland XR series densitometry machine....193

**Figure 127:** 77 step calibration phantom.....195

**Figure 128:** Comparison of X-ray beam. Pencil on right and fan on left.....196

**Figure 129:** Example of Norland scan report software showing various factors on  
 selected areas for this specific work.....198

**Figure 130:** Relationship between T-scores and hip fracture risk .....201

**Figure 131:** Areas of interest utilized in this current work to measure the BMD  
 .....204



<b>Figure 132:</b> A, represents the patient at the midline of the scanning table. B, illustration of the foot holder with the foot rotated inward. $\alpha$ indicates the angle of internal rotation.....	207
<b>Figure 133:</b> Superimposed bone mineral density scan from one patient, pre and post hip resurfacing.....	208
<b>Figure 134:</b> Linear regression for age vs BMD.....	213
<b>Figure 135:</b> Linear regression for BMI vs BMD.....	214
<b>Figure 136:</b> T-scores for the mature females.....	215
<b>Figure 137:</b> T-scores for young females.....	216
<b>Figure 138:</b> T-scores for mature males.....	217
<b>Figure 139:</b> T scores for young males.....	218
<b>Figure 140:</b> Total BMD for mature females.....	219
<b>Figure 141:</b> Total BMD for young females.....	220
<b>Figure 142:</b> Total BMD for mature males.....	221
<b>Figure 143:</b> Total BMD for young males.....	222
<b>Figure 144:</b> Femoral neck scores for mature females.....	223
<b>Figure 145:</b> Femoral neck score for young females.....	224
<b>Figure 146:</b> Femoral neck scores for mature males.....	225
<b>Figure 147:</b> Femoral neck score for young males.....	226

---

## Chapter 9: Patient Selection

<b>Figure 148:</b> Age and gender distribution for 423 resurfaced hips.....	243
<b>Figure 149:</b> Average BMI in all age groups.....	245
<b>Figure 150:</b> Co Morbidity breakdown for this cohort.....	250
<b>Figure 151:</b> Posterior approach exposing the femoral head.....	251
<b>Figure 152:</b> (A) Guide wire insertion to decrease femoral neck notching (B) A cylindrical femoral head cutter is passed as far as the head/neck junction. (C) Placement of femoral component.....	252
<b>Figure 153:</b> Cement key holes drilled into femoral head.....	253
<b>Figure 154:</b> Discharge times for the first 289 patients.....	254
<b>Figure 155:</b> Cumulative survival rate for all hip resurfacing components.....	256
<b>Figure 156:</b> Cumulative survival rate for BHR implants in patients aged 65 and over.	

.....	257
<b>Figure 157:</b> WOMAC scores for males 65 years and over.....	260
<b>Figure 158:</b> WOMAC scores for males under 65 years.....	261
<b>Figure 159:</b> WOMAC scores for females 65 years and over.....	261
<b>Figure 160:</b> WOMAC scores for females under 65 years.....	262
<b>Figure 161:</b> Tegner activity scores.....	263

---

## **Chapter 10: Conclusion/ Future Work**

<b>Figure 162: A:</b> Femoral head divided into a grid. B: Micro CT of trabecular bone.....	275
---	-----

---

## **Appendix 2: Implant Retrieval**

<b>Figure 163:</b> Femoral hip resurfacing Head cut with diamond saw.....	286
<b>Figure 164: A:</b> Photograph of a Sodick A320D wire electrical-discharge machine (WEDM) used for this thesis work .....	289
<b>Figure 165:</b> Cutting process with 0.24mm brace wire and 5amps of electricity.....	290
<b>Figure 166:</b> Remnant head in pieces.....	290
<b>Figure 167:</b> Reassembled femoral head.....	290
<b>Figure 168:</b> A: A close up photograph of the remnant femoral head showing PMMA cement interface. B: Hip resurfacing femoral heads after removal of the metal component.....	291
<b>Figure 169:</b> Detailed 3D CT scan of the retrieved femoral component.....	292
<b>Figure 170:</b> A: Sagittal and B: Coronal slices of fracture line in femoral heads.....	292
<b>Figure 171:</b> Number of femoral head components.....	294
<b>Figure 172:</b> A and B Healthy femoral head specimen.....	295
<b>Figure 173:</b> Bone-cement interface.....	296

## List of Tables

### Chapter 3 Anatomy / biomechanics

<b>Table 1:</b> Muscles of the hip and thigh.....	<b>45</b>
---	-----------

---

### Chapter 4 Osteoarthritis

<b>Table 2:</b> Secondary OA related to systemic metabolic disease.....	<b>279</b>
<b>Table 3:</b> Secondary OA related to endocrine disease.....	<b>279</b>
<b>Table 4:</b> Secondary OA related to bone dysplasia.....	<b>280</b>
<b>Table 5:</b> Secondary OA related to crystal deposition.....	<b>280</b>
<b>Table 6:</b> Secondary OA related to other systematic disease.....	<b>281</b>
<b>Table 7:</b> Management algorithm for OA in the hip.....	<b>90</b>
<b>Table 8:</b> Sources of Patient education material.....	<b>281</b>

---

### Chapter 5: Osteoporosis

<b>Table 9:</b> Secondary forms of Osteoporosis.....	<b>282</b>
--	------------

---

### Chapter 8: Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry

<b>Table 10:</b> WHO definition of Osteoporosis.....	<b>198</b>
<b>Table 11:</b> Percentage change in bone mineral density for the femoral neck region.....	<b>226</b>

---

### Chapter 9: Patient Selection

<b>Table 12:</b> Conditions contributing to bone loss and potentially detrimental to patients undergoing hip resurfacing.....	<b>248</b>
---	------------

**Table 13:** Female SF-36 scores, blue indicate mature female and green indicates young females.....**258**

**Table 14:** Male SF-36 scores, red indicate mature male and black indicates young males.....**258**

**Table 15:** Complications in patients less than 65 years and years 65 years and older.....**264**

---

**Appendix 2: Implant Retrieval**

**Table 16:** Femoral component size and number of component remnants.....**293**

## Publications

### Podium Presentations:

October 2001: Orthopaedic Association for Australia and New Zealand (New Zealand Queenstown)

*1. Predicting Femoral neck fractures in hip resurfacing using bone mineral density.*

October 2002: Orthopaedic association for Australia New Zealand (Melbourne, Australia)

*2. An analysis of Alendronate Sodium in patients undergoing hip resurfacing.*

*3. Birmingham hip resurfacing after failed proximal femoral osteotomy.*

December 2002: Society of Military Orthopaedics (San Diego, America)

*4. A two year survival analysis of patients undergoing hip resurfacing*

August 2003: World congress on Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering (Sydney).

*5. Hip resurfacing: a 2 year survival analysis*

July 2003: 1<sup>st</sup> International Hip Resurfacing Forum (Spain).

*6. Short stay hip resurfacing*

*7. Predicting femoral neck fracture in patients undergoing hip resurfacing*

November 2004: 2<sup>nd</sup> International Hip Resurfacing Forum (Dubai)

*8. Follow-up of 431 consecutive hip resurfacings*

October 2005: Australian Orthopaedic Association Annual Scientific Meeting (Perth).

*9. The effect of femoral component alignment on femoral neck remodeling after hip resurfacing- a finite element analysis.*

*10. Hip resurfacing, Selection criteria and results of 423 consecutive hips at 5 years.*

*Awarded Evelyn Hamilton award for best scientific paper*



## Poster presentations

October 2002: Australian conference of science and medicine in sport (Melbourne, Australia)

1. *Assessing the risk of fractures using bone mineral density measurements in hip resurfacing surgery*
2. *A prospective analysis of Autologous Chondrocyte implant for regeneration of hyaline cartilage in full thickness defects in the knee*

October 2002: World Biomaterials conference (Sydney, Australia).

3. *Assessing the risk of fractures using bone mineral density measurements in hip resurfacing surgery*

February 2003: Orthopaedic research society (New Orleans, America).

4. *Birmingham hip resurfacing: A two year survival analysis.*

May 2004: Biomaterials 7<sup>th</sup> World Conference (Sydney).

5. *Birmingham Hip Resurfacing: A 2 year Survival Analysis*

June 2005: Australian Society for Medical Research (Sydney).

6. *Adaptive Bone Remodeling of Unicompartmental Tibial Bearings*

## Paper Publications

“Alumina and Zirconia Bioceramics in Orthopaedic Applications”

*Journal of the Australian Ceramic Society*, 39(1): 20-35, 2003

Cordingley, RL, Kohan, L, Ben-Nissan, B, Pezzotti, G.