ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Effect of cup medialization on primary stability of press-fit acetabular cups

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

*Published Version:*
Morosato F., Cristofolini L., Castagnini F., Traina F. (2020). Effect of cup medialization on primary stability of press-fit acetabular cups. CLINICAL BIOMECHANICS, 80, 1-6 [10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2020.105172].

*Availability:*
This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/808672 since: 2021-02-27

*Published:*
DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2020.105172

*Terms of use:*

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

12 October 2024

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

**Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon). 2020 Dec;80:105172. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2020.105172. Epub 2020 Sep 7.**

**Effect of cup medialization on primary stability of press-fit acetabular cups**

Federico Morosato, Luca Cristofolini , Francesco Castagnini , Francesco Traina

PMID: 32927407 DOI: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2020.105172

The final published version is available online at: **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2020.105092**

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

# Effect of cup medialization on primary stability of press-fit acetabular cups

Federico Morosato, Ph.D[1], Luca Cristofolini, Ph.D[1], Francesco Castagnini, MD[2], Francesco Traina, MD, PhD [2,3]

[1] Department of Industrial Engineering, School of Engineering and Architecture, Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

[2] Chirurgia Protesica, IRCCS Rizzoli Orthopaedic Institute, Bologna, Italy

[3] Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences - Università di Bologna, Italy

***Submitted to:*** **Clinical Biomechanics**

***Version.0:*** 22nd June 2020
***Version.***1: 13th August 2020
***Version.***2: 31st August 2020

***Statistics:***

| | |
|---|---|
| Word count (manuscript): | 2864 words (Introduction through acknowledgements, excluding references, captions and tables) |
| Word count (abstract): | 172 words |
| Figures: | 4 |
| Tables: | 1 |
| References: | 24 |

***Corresponding author:***

Luca Cristofolini
Department of Industrial Engineering
University of Bologna
Via Umberto Terracini 24-28
40131 Bologna, Italy
e-mail: luca.cristofolini@unibo.it

## ABSTRACT

***Background:*** Appropriate restoration of the native centre of rotation is of paramount importance in total hip arthroplasty. Reconstruction of the centre of rotation depends on reaming technique: conventional approaches require more cup medialization than anatomical preparations. To date, the influence of cup medialization on socket stability in cementless implants is still unknown.

***Methods:*** Ten cadaveric hemipelvises were sequentially reamed using anatomical technique (only subchondral bone removal with restoration of the native centre of rotation) and conventional preparation (reaming to the lamina and medializing the cup). A biomechanical test was performed on the reconstructions. Implant motions were measured with digital image correlation while a cyclic load of increasing magnitude was applied.

***Findings:*** No significant difference was measured between the two implantation techniques in terms of permanent cup migrations. The only significant difference was found for the cup inducible rotations, where the conventional technique was associated with larger rotations.

***Interpretation:*** Conventional reaming and cup medialization do not improve initial cup stability. Beyond the recently questioned concerns about medialization and hip biomechanics, this is another issue to bear in mind when reaming the acetabulum.

## Keywords:

Acetabular reaming depth; Hip Centre of rotation; Cup medialization; implant primary stability; permanent migrations; inducible micromotions.

## INTRODUCTION

Restoration of centre of rotation (CoR) is of paramount importance in total hip arthroplasty (THA)[1,2,3]. Anatomical reconstruction of the CoR improves hip biomechanics and function, reduces wear and impingement[1,3]. CoR restoration is strongly dependent on the reaming technique, as well as on the socket design[1,2]. The conventional technique relies un uncemented cups and aims aims to the acetabular floor (*lamina quadrilatera*), medializing the CoR[4]. On the other side, the anatomical method requires only peripheral reaming, limited to the acetabular rim, thus respecting the anatomical medial-lateral position of the CoR[4].

The claimed advantage of conventional technique is mainly due to a two-dimensional concept of the lever arms: CoR medialization improves the abductor muscle moment arm [5,6]. However, a recent CT-based finite element analysis highlighted that CoR medialization improves abductor biomechanics only in some cases (low femoral ante-torsion) and at some costs (reduction of flexion-extension moment arms)[7]. Moreover, cup medialization may sacrifice a large amount of bone stock, may significantly reduce the acetabular offset (with clinical implications) and may change the joint reaction forces, the proprioception and the muscle functionality[1,3,4,7]. On the contrary, anatomical reaming reduces cup medialization to a minimum, preserving the medial-lateral position of the native CoR and the bone stock. However, it may result in socket under-coverage or overhanging, potentially causing psoas impingement[1,3,4]. To date, there is no evidence that a reaming technique is clearly superior over the other, leaving the choice to surgeon's discretion[4,7]. However, the influence of reaming technique (and thus, cup medialization) on stability of cementless press-fit sockets has not been adequately investigated. In particular, it is not ascertained if deeper cup positioning may reduce the initial inducible

47 (or elastic) implant micromotions that prevent osseointegration and may lead to cup
48 loosening[8,9,10].

49 A cadaveric biomechanical study was designed to compare the effects of two different
50 reaming techniques (conventional and anatomical), and consequently, two different cup
51 medializations, on primary stability of press-fit acetabular cups in the same acetabulum.
52 We hypothesized that deeper implantation (conventional technique, more medialization)
53 provided better implant stability. In particular, stability was assessed in terms of three-
54 dimensional permanent migrations and inducible micromotions between the cup and the
55 host bone.

## 56 MATERIALS AND METHODS

57 To assess the effect of implantation depth (medialization) on primary stability of press-
58 fit acetabular cups, ten cadaveric hemipelvises were used. Specimens were implanted in
59 two different fashions. First, the cups were implanted after a peripheral reaming
60 technique (anatomical implantation). After the biomechanical test, the specimens were
61 reamed until reaching the *lamina quadrilatera* and implanted with the same cup
62 (conventional implantation). Digital image correlation (DIC) was used to measure the
63 relative 3D implant/bone motion[11].

### 64 Preparation of the specimens

65 This Study was authorized by the Bioethics Committee of the University of Bologna
66 (Prot. 179610, 7 December 2018). Ten paired fresh-frozen hemipelvises were obtained
67 through ethically-approved donation programs (Table 1). No information about donor's
68 laterality was available. The bones were wrapped in cloths soaked with physiological
69 saline solution and stored at -30°C when not in use, and were thawed at room temperature
70 prior to testing. The entire preparation and testing procedure lasted approximately 3 hours

71 for each specimen. The soft tissues around the acetabulum were removed. Each
72 hemipelvis was aligned in a reproducible reference frame and potted in correspondence
73 of the sacro-iliac joint with bone cement (Fig. 1)[12]. To avoid excessive bending during
74 the biomechanical test, a constraint was added in the pubic symphysis (Fig. 2).

75 Spherical plugs with controlled dimensions were used to measure the cup size required
76 for each acetabulum, and to estimate the position of the native anatomical CoR (Fig. 1).
77 To avoid the effects on anatomical variability, the same cup size was used for both
78 implantations in the same hemipelvis (Table 1). An experienced hip surgeon (FT)
79 performed reaming and implantation so as to correctly prepare the hemipelvises
80 according to the two implantation techniques. In both cases, the cup was implanted so as
81 to obtain 45° inclination and 20° anteversion, according to previous methodological
82 studies[11,12].

83 • Anatomical implantations (less deep cup position): peripheral reaming was
84 performed aiming to restore the native CoR as close as possible, with a minimal
85 medialization and circumferential, complete cup coverage. Commercial primary
86 cups (Plasma fit® Plus, Aesculap AG, Tuttlingen, Germany) were implanted. To
87 ensure that the cups were within ±2mm from the native CoR, the position of the
88 cup centre after implantation was measured (Fig. 1) (Table 1). Ceramic liners
89 (Biolox® Delta, Ceramtec, Plochingen, Germany) were inserted. After the
90 biomechanical test (see details below), the cups were extracted.

91 • Conventional implantation (deeper cup position): each acetabulum was
92 progressively medialized by further reaming to the *lamina quadrilatera* (using the
93 same reamer size as in anatomical technique), aiming to maximize the difference
94 from the CoR achieved with anatomical implantation. The position of the CoR of

95 such conventional implantation was measured and compared with the position of
96 the CoR previously achieved (Fig. 1). A difference of position smaller than 3mm
97 required the specimen to be reamed deeper (if possible) and re-implanted. In one
98 case this was not possible, and the specimen was excluded. Two extremely
99 osteoporotic specimens were fractured in the posterior column during
100 implantation and were not tested. Therefore, seven specimens were finally
101 available with both implantation techniques (Table 1). The ceramic liners were
102 inserted, and the same biomechanical test was repeated.

103 **Biomechanical testing**

104 In order to reproduce a critical loading configuration, standing up from seated was
105 selected among the typical post-operative patient activities [13]. Such motor task generates
106 the highest load peak in the acetabulum compared with other post-op activities[14], and it
107 results in a migration direction of the cup consistent with that observed clinically[15]. In
108 particular, the direction of the peak force measured *in vivo* during standing up from seated
109 was identified from the open dataset by Orthoload Club[14]. It is important to stress that
110 the dataset of *in vivo* forces was used to identify the relevant force direction, whereas the
111 magnitude of the applied force increased during the test in a standardized way, so as to
112 avoid the risk of specimen damage, while enabling a comparison of the two implantation
113 techniques. The specimens were aligned in the testing machine so as to apply the force
114 in the selected direction (Fig. 2). A system of low-friction linear bearings was used to
115 avoid transmission of any other undesired force components. A uni-axial servo-hydraulic
116 testing machine (Mod. 8800, Instron, UK) was used to apply packages of cyclic load with
117 increasing magnitude similar to Morosato *et al.*[15]. To account for the donor's anatomy,
118 loading was scaled according to the donors' body weight (BW). Each package consisted

119 of 50 load cycles. The first load package reached a peak force of 1BW, the following
120 packages were always 10% larger than the previous one (Fig. 2).

121 As each specimen had to be tested twice (with the two implantation techniques), it was
122 crucial to prevent a sequence effect due to damage or conditioning. Therefore, a coarse
123 stop criterion was implemented during the first test session (anatomical implantation) in
124 real time throughout the test: the test was continued (with load packages of increasing
125 magnitude) until the measured cup permanent migration exceeded 0.5 mm. In addition,
126 if the strains measured with DIC (see below) exceeded 2000 microstrains (i.e. similar to
127 the physiological deformations experienced by bone[16]) the test was stopped. To allow
128 paired comparisons between the two implant conditions, each specimen was tested after
129 conventional implantation up to the same load reached in the previous testing with
130 anatomical implantation.

131 **Measurement of implant motion**

132 As the digital image correlation (DIC) software requires the surface to have a high-
133 contrast speckle pattern, a black-on-white pattern was painted on the periprosthetic bone
134 and one the rim of the cup insert before the biomechanical tests[11]. A commercial DIC
135 system (Q400, Dantec-Dynamics, Denmark) was used to measure the motions of the
136 implant and of the bone throughout the test, following a validated procedure[11]. The
137 system also allowed to measure full-field strains during the test. Two cameras (5
138 MegaPixels, 8-bit) with high-quality metrology-standard 17-mm lenses (Xenoplan,
139 Schneider-Kreuznach, Bad Kreuznach, Germany) were used to obtain 3D measurements.
140 The cameras were positioned so as to frame the implant, the superior aspect of the
141 acetabulum, part of the iliac wing and of the posterior column (Fig. 2).

142 In order to compute the three components of translation and rotation of the implant, the
143 DIC-measured displacements were post-processed through a dedicated script in Matlab
144 (2017 Edition, MathWorks, Natick, MA)[11]. In particular the permanent migration (i.e.
145 the migration accumulated cycle after cycle), and the inducible micromotion (i.e. the
146 recoverable motion between load peak and valley) were analysed.

147 **Statistical analysis**

148 The sample size was defined based on a previous similar study that allowed predicting
149 measurement uncertainty [11,15]. A sample of N = 5 was estimated for detecting 150
150 micrometers motion (the threshold for implant loosening[8,9,10]), with alfa = 0.05 and beta
151 = 0.2. This relatively small sample size is due to the high measurement precision, and of
152 the use of the specimens in a paired fashion.

153 To assess if the effect of the two implantation techniques on implant motions was
154 statistically different, a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was performed using Matlab. The
155 level of significance was p = 0.05 for all analysis. The following results were analysed
156 as paired data (the same load peak was reached for the two implantation techniques in
157 each specimen):

158 • The cup migration after the application of the last load package in the anatomical
159 vs the conventional implantation.

160 • The median of the inducible micromotions during the last load package in the
161 anatomical vs the conventional implantation.

162 **RESULTS**

163 The permanent translations at the end of the biomechanical test ranged 0.064 - 0.354
164 millimetres for the anatomical implantations and 0.065 - 0.210 millimetres for the

165 conventional ones. The inducible micromotions never exceeded 0.130 millimetres for
166 both types of implantation. The resultant permanent translation was slightly larger for
167 the conventional implantation than for the anatomical one (not statistically significant,
168 Fig. 3). However, looking at the single components, the permanent translations were
169 slightly larger for the anatomical implantation (again, with no statistical significance). A
170 similar trend was found for the inducible translations, with no statistically significant
171 difference (Fig. 3).

172 The permanent rotations at the end of the biomechanical test ranged 0.001° - 0.59° for
173 the anatomical implantations and 0.006° - 0.30° for the conventional ones. The inducible
174 rotations never exceeded 0.20° millimetres for both types of implantation. No significant
175 difference was detected between the permanent rotations of the two implantation
176 techniques (Fig. 4). The only statistically significant differences were detected for the
177 inducible rotations around the antero-posterior and around the medio-lateral axis (Fig. 4).

178 A detailed analysis of the individual specimens highlighted that there was no correlation
179 nor visible trend between the difference between the two implantation depths (Table 1)
180 and the implant motions (both inducible and permanent).

## 181 DISCUSSION

182 Cup medialization, and reaming technique, has implications for hip biomechanics
183 (muscle lever arms, offset) and bone stock: some of these effects are still under
184 question[1,4,7]. Another issue about cup medialization is still unanswered: if cup
185 medialization may improve the initial cup stability of press-fit sockets and, thus, may
186 promote a better bony ingrowth through minimization of micromotions.

187 Thus, an *in vitro* biomechanical study was performed on human hemipelvises. Press-fit
188 acetabular cups were implanted, first aiming to restore the native CoR (anatomical

implantation), then reaming to the lamina (conventional technique), maximizing the distance between the position of the CoR achieved with the two techniques. Thus, cup medialization was progressively increased (median value: 3.4 ± 0.4 mm). The hypothesis was: cup medialization, and thus conventional reaming technique, improved primary cup stability. However, the biomechanical results showed that anatomical and conventional implantations produced comparable implant motions. The permanent translations and rotations were similar for the two techniques, with no statistically significant difference. Only inducible rotations around the antero-posterior and the medio-lateral axes were significantly different. However, such rotations were so small in all cases (less than 0.04°, close to the intrinsic error of the measurement protocol[11]).

A few biomechanical studies focusing on the relationship between cup medialization and implant stability can be found in the literature. To the Author's best knowledge, only one study assessed the effect of reaming depth, bone defects and under-reaming in Sawbones foam block and bovine spongy bone specimens[17]. Adler *et al*. concluded that proper bone preparation (hemispherical cavity with no focal defects) and cup medialization (5 mm) improved cup stability. They proposed that cup medialization may have overcome dense subchondral bone and polar gaps, providing more stability[17]. O'Rourke *et al*. partially supported these suggestions, highlighting a non-significant correlation between polar gaps and intact acetabular depth (that is, minimal medialization) in a cohort of patient-specific finite element models[18].

These findings were not supported by the present study: even if the surgeon aimed at medializing the CoR as much as possible, cup medialization did not significantly improve cup stability. It is likely that the 3 mm medialization provided by conventional reaming technique in the study was too modest to provide a significant difference in cup stability. As a matter of fact, Adler *et al*. implanted the cups at three medial-lateral configurations,

214 reaming 5 mm deeper every time[17]. While in some laboratory settings, a 5 mm
215 medialization may be possible, such an aggressive reaming seems not suitable for many
216 pelvic morphologies in *in vivo* studies (66% of the acetabula, mainly female ones)[4]. In a
217 CT-based study, Bonnin *et al*. implanted press-fit cups on 100 hips using conventional
218 and anatomical techniques, achieving a mean cup medialization of 3.2 ± 1.9mm, similar
219 to our study[4]. Moreover, the medial-lateral position of the cup plays a complex role in
220 the whole hip biomechanics, impacting on offset and range of motion[19]. Aggressive
221 medialization may definitively violate the acetabular offset and, in some cases, increasing
222 femoral offset is not sufficient to compensate for the global loss of lateralization[3]. As a
223 consequence, hip abductors lever arm may be significantly reduced, with a possible
224 clinical impact[4,7,20]. Moreover, recent literature highlighted that cup medialization and
225 loss of offset were associated to increased wear of polyethylene liners and increased
226 stresses at the bone-implant interface in press-fit sockets, overturning the classic
227 perspective "more cup medialization-less loosening" (based on cemented cups and very
228 old implants)[4,21,22,23]. Conversely, anatomical reaming provides accurate CoR
229 reconstruction, adequate offset restoration and, as the present study highlighted, sufficient
230 cup stability[1,3,4]. It also preserves bone stock, which is of paramount importance,
231 considering that THAs are more and more common in younger patients and the revision
232 rate is steadily increasing[4,24].

233 The two consecutive reaming techniques performed on the same acetabulum are a
234 limitation of this study. The anatomical reaming and the subsequent biomechanical tests
235 may have partially influenced the shape of the second acetabular cavity and the grip of
236 the second cup implantation. Furthermore, the conventional reaming was performed
237 using an "anatomical technique": the last reamer used for peripheral acetabular
238 preparation was aimed to the *lamina* (and, thus, without progressively increasing the

239 reamer sizes from the beginning of the preparation). In this way, reaming is concentric
240 with a medial-lateral vector (superior-inferior and anterior-posterior displacements do not
241 take place) and cup medialization is the sole positioning variable. Moreover, the use of
242 the same hemipelvis for both types of implantation reduced the influences of the
243 anatomical features of the native acetabulum (e.g., dysplasia or bone quality) on cup
244 stability, allowing a direct comparison of the two treatments without confounding
245 anatomical factors. A single loading configuration was applied in our biomechanical tests,
246 reducing the complexity of the forces acting in the acetabulum to a single resultant force.
247 This simplification was demonstrated to be suitable to generate *in vitro* implant motions
248 consistent with the clinical observations[15]. Our study had a limited sample size (N=7),
249 but this was sufficient to provide adequate statistical, as the same specimen was used in
250 testing of anatomical and conventional implantation. A similar sample size is often used
251 in *in vitro* implant stability tests[25,26]. The need to prevent bone damage (to allow testing
252 each specimen in two implant conditions) forced us to limit the magnitude of the forces
253 applied during the test. Therefore, absolute implant motions in real patients might be
254 larger than those found in our tests. However, implant motions were analysed in
255 comparative terms, thus allowing to assess differences between anatomical and
256 conventional implantation. Moreover, keeping the force magnitude low allowed to avoid
257 the risk of specimen conditioning due to the two tests being applied to the same
258 specimens. This study did not include any evaluation of the global and femoral offset
259 restoration as this was not the focus of this experiment.

260 **CONCLUSIONS**

261 This study demonstrated that cup medialization did not improve initial stability of press-
262 fit sockets. This finding tends to support a more circumferential reaming instead of the
263 conventional method. In fact, the classical belief that cup medialization provides

264 biomechanical benefits has been recently questioned[7]. Cup medialization may increase
265 wear rate, stresses at the bone-implant interface, loss of bone stock and loss of offset, with
266 significant effects on implant survival, biomechanics and stability[1,2,3,21,22]. Conversely,
267 anatomical reaming closely restores the native CoR and provides sufficient initial cup
268 stability. Long-term studies comparing the two reaming techniques in the same patients
269 (bilateral THAs) may provide additional decisive data about the clinical consequences of
270 these two surgical approaches, in particular aseptic cup loosening, polyethylene wear and
271 implant stability.

## Acknowledgments and funding information

The Authors wish to thank Aesculap AG Research & Development for the financial support and Philipp Damm of the OrthoLoad Club for the force direction data (www.orthoload.com). The authors gratefully acknowledge the advice of the pool of hip surgeons, namely Prof. Vollkmar Jansson, Prof. Maximilian Rudert, Prof. Heiko Graichen. Ms. Anisha Tresa Azhakathu is acknowledged for the help during the test sessions.

## REFERENCES:


1. Meermans G, Doorn J Van, Kats J-J. 2016. Restoration of the centre of rotation in primary total hip arthroplasty. Bone Joint J. 98-B(12):1597–1603
2. Messer-Hannemann P, Bätz J, Lampe F, et al. 2019. The influence of cavity preparation and press-fit cup implantation on restoring the hip rotation center. Clin. Biomech. (Bristol, Avon) 63:185–192
3. Merle C, Innmann MM, Waldstein W, et al. 2019. High Variability of Acetabular Offset in Primary Hip Osteoarthritis Influences Acetabular Reaming—A Computed Tomography–Based Anatomic Study. J. Arthroplasty 34(8):1808–1814
4. Bonnin MP, Archbold PHA, Basiglini L, et al. 2011. Should the Acetabular Cup be Medialised in Total Hip Arthroplasty? HIP Int. 21(4):428–435
5. Gaffney BMM, Clohisy JC, Van Dillen LR, Harris MD. The association between periacetabular osteotomy reorientation and hip joint reaction forces in two subgroups of acetabular dysplasia. J Biomech. 2020 Jan 2;98:109464. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2019.109464.
6. Müller ME. 1970. Total hip prostheses. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 72:46–68.
7. Terrier A, Levrero Florencio F, Rüdiger HA. 2014. Benefit of cup medialization in total hip arthroplasty is associated with femoral anatomy. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 472(10):3159–65
8. Bobyn JD, Stackpool GJ, Hacking SA, et al. 1999. Characteristics of bone ingrowth and interface mechanics of a new porous tantalum biomaterial. J. Bone Joint Surg. Br. 81(5):907–14
9. Engh CA, Bobyn JD, Glassman AH. 1987. Porous-coated hip replacement. The factors governing bone ingrowth, stress shielding, and clinical results. J. Bone Jt. Surg. Br 69(1):45–55.
10. Pilliar RM, Lee JM, Maniatopoulos C. 1986. Observations on the effect of movement on bone ingrowth into porous-surfaced implants. Clin Orthop Relat Res (208):108–113
11. Morosato F, Traina F, Cristofolini L. 2019. A reliable in vitro approach to assess the stability of acetabular implants using digital image correlation. Strain :e12318
12. Morosato F, Traina F, Cristofolini L. 2018. Standardization of hemipelvis alignment for in vitro biomechanical testing. J. Orthop. Res. 36(6):1645–1652
13. Bergmann G, Bender A, Dymke J, et al. 2016. Standardized Loads Acting in Hip Implants. PLoS One 11(5):e0155612
14. Damm P, Graichen F, Rohlmann A, et al. 2010. Total hip joint prosthesis for in vivo measurement of forces and moments. Med. Eng. Phys. 32(1):95–100
15. Morosato F, Traina F, Cristofolini L. 2019. Effect of different motor tasks on hip cup primary stability and on the strains in the periacetabular bone: An in vitro study. Clin. Biomech. (Bristol, Avon) 70:137–145
16. Yang PF, Rittweger J. 2011. What do we currently know from in vivo bone strain measurements in humans? J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact 11(1):8–20.
17. Adler E, Stuchin SA, Kummer FJ. 1992. Stability of press-fit acetabular cups. J Arthroplast. 7(3):295–301

18. O'Rourke D, Al-Dirini RM, Taylor M. 2017. Primary stability of a cementless acetabular cup in a cohort of patient-specific finite element models. J. Orthop. Res. 36(3):1012–1023

19. Shoji T, Yamasaki T, Izumi S, et al. 2018. The effect of cup medialization and lateralization on hip range of motion in total hip arthroplasty. Clin. Biomech. (Bristol, Avon) 57:121–128

20. Delp SL, Wixson RL, Komattu A V., Kocmond JH. 1996. How Superior Placement of the Joint Center in Hip Arthroplasty Affects the Abductor Muscles. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 328(328):137–146

21. Ardestani MM, Amenábar Edwards PP, Wimmer MA. 2017. Prediction of Polyethylene Wear Rates from Gait Biomechanics and Implant Positioning in Total Hip Replacement. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 475(8):2027–2042

22. Little NJ, Busch CA, Gallagher JA, et al. 2009. Acetabular polyethylene wear and acetabular inclination and femoral offset. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 467(11):2895–900

23. Miles AW, McNamee PB. 1989. Strain Gauge and Photoelastic Evaluation of the Load Transfer in the Pelvis in Total Hip Replacement: The Effect of the Position of the Axis of Rotation. Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. Part H J. Eng. Med. 203(2):103–107

24. Kurtz SM, Lau E, Ong K, et al. 2009. Future young patient demand for primary and revision joint replacement: national projections from 2010 to 2030. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 467(10):2606–12

25. Amirouche F, Solitro G, Broviak S, et al. 2015. Primary cup stability in THA with augmentation of acetabular defect. A comparison of healthy and osteoporotic bone. Orthop. Traumatol. Surg. Res. 101(6):667–673

26. Beckmann NA, Bitsch RG, Janoszka MB, et al. 2018. Treatment of High-Grade Acetabular Defects: Do Porous Titanium Cups Provide Better Stability Than Traditional Titanium Cups When Combined With an Augment? J. Arthroplasty 33(6):1838–1843.

## TABLES

**Table 1 -** List of specimens, including the donors' details, and the size of the implanted cups. The position of cup with respect to the native centre of rotation is reported for the anatomical and conventional implantation (negative values indicate that the cup was inserted deeper than the native CoR). The last column reports the difference between the two implantations.

| Donor | Cause of death | Sex | Age (years) | Height (cm) | Body weight (kg) | BMI (kg/m^2) | Side | Cup size (mm) | Cup centre Anatomical implantation (mm) | Cup centre Conventional implantation (mm) | Difference btw anatomical and conventional (mm) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **#1** | Sepsis | F | 83 | 164 | 63 | 23 | L | 56 | 2.0 | -1.8 | 3.8 |
| | | | | | | | R | 56 | 1.1 | fractured | - |
| **#2** | Respiratory paralysis | M | 70 | 175 | 79 | 26 | L | 52 | 1.3 | -2.1 | 3.4 |
| | | | | | | | R | 54 | 0.9 | -2.2 | 3.1 |
| **#3** | Unknown | M | 74 | 176 | 78 | 25 | L | 48 | 0.4 | fractured | - |
| | | | | | | | R | 48 | -1.6 | -5.6 | 4.0 |
| **#4** | Coronary thrombosis | M | 71 | 187 | 92 | 26 | L | 60 | 1.7 | -1.8 | 3.5 |
| | | | | | | | R | 62 | -0.7 | -1.8 | 1.1(*) |
| **#5** | Cardiac arrhythmia | M | 61 | 181 | 96 | 29 | L | 56 | 1.4 | -1.6 | 3.0 |
| | | | | | | | R | 54 | 1.5 | -1.6 | 3.1 |
| | **Median** | **-** | **71** | **176** | **79** | **26** | **-** | **55** | **1.2** | **-1.8** | **3.4** |
| | **SD** | **-** | **7.9** | **8.5** | **13.2** | **2.2** | **-** | **4.5** | **1.1** | **1.4** | **0.4** |

**Note (*):** this specimen could not be tested because the difference between anatomical and conventional implantation was less than 3 mm.

## CAPTIONS OF FIGURES




**Fig. 1** - Ten paired hemipelvises from five donors were prepared (a). The size of each acetabulum was measured to plan implantation and to record the position of the native anatomical centre of rotation (b). All the specimens were first implanted so as to restore as close as possible the native centre of rotation (anatomical implantation, c) and subjected to biomechanical test. The specimens were then implanted after reaming towards the *lamina quadrilatera* (conventional implantation, d). The specimens in c) and d) were tilted so that the acetabular rim was horizontal.




**Fig. 2 -** The specimen was mounted in the testing frame so as to apply a force (red arrow) in the selected direction (a); the hemipelvis was constrained through the pot on the sacroiliac joint, and through a support at the pubic symphysis; the cameras of the DIC system were placed so as to frame both the cup and the surrounding bone. Load cycles of increasing magnitude were applied in packages of 50 cycles (b); each load package was 10% larger than the previous one; the force was scaled on the patient body weight (BW).




**Fig. 3 -** Cup translations when the largest load was applied to the anatomical and conventional implantations. The permanent migrations (top) and inducible micromotions (bottom) are presented as components of translation along the antero-posterior (AP), cranio-caudal (CC) and medio-lateral (ML) axis, and as a resultant. The three components of cup translation are sketched together with a hemipelvis from the three views. The bars show the median and standard deviation of seven specimens. The *P*-value from the Wilcoxon signed-rank test is indicated for pairwise comparisons.




**Fig. 4 -** Cup rotations when the largest load was applied to the anatomical and conventional implantations. The permanent migrations (top) and inducible micromotions (bottom) are presented as components of rotation about the antero-posterior (AP), cranio-caudal (CC) and medio-lateral (ML) axis. The three components of cup rotation are sketched together with a hemipelvis from the three views. The bars show the median and standard deviation of seven specimens. The *P*-value from the Wilcoxon signed-rank test is indicated for pairwise comparisons.