

Acetabular Reconstruction with Bone Graft in Total Hip Arthroplasty

Thesis

Submitted for the partial fulfillment of M.D Degree
in **Orthopaedics**

By

Mohamed Bakr Ibrahim

M.B.,B.Ch, M.Sc., Orthopaedics

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr./ Timour Fikry El-Husseini

Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery

Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr./ Osama Youssef Rabie

Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery

Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

2016

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سبحانك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



Acknowledgments

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **Allah** the Most Beneficent and Merciful.*

*I wish to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr./ Timour Fikry El-Husseini**, Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University, for his constructive criticism, unlimited help and giving me the privilege to work under his supervision.*

*My most sincere gratitude is also extended to Assistant **Prof. Dr./ Osama Youssef Rabie**, Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University for his enthusiastic help, continuous supervision, guidance and support throughout this work.*

*Last but not least, I can't forget to thank all members of my Family, especially my **Parents** and my **Wife** for pushing me forward in every step in the journey of my life.*

Candidate

 **Mohamed Bakr Ibrahim**

List of Contents

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
List of Abbreviations	i
List of Tables.....	ii
List of Figures	iv
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	3
Review of Literature	
- Anatomy of the Acetabulum	4
- Radiological anatomy	13
- Biomechanics of the Hip	29
- Etiology of Acetabular Defects.....	34
- Classification of Acetabular Defects	40
- Bone Graft	56
- Operative Technique	72
Patients and Methods.....	100
Results.....	121
Illustrative Cases	136
Discussion	157
Summary	165
Conclusion.....	167
Recommendations	168
References	169
Arabic Summary	—

List of Abbreviations

<i>Abbr.</i>	<i>Full-term</i>
AAOS	: American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons
DDH	: Developmental dysplasia of the hip
PVNS	: Pigmented villonodular synovitis
THA	: Total hip arthroplasty

List of Tables

<i>Table No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
Table (1):	Causes of acetabular defect	37
Table (2):	AAOS classification for acetabular deficiency	41
Table (3):	Engh and Glassman acetabular deficiency classification.	53
Table (4):	Gross and Associates classification system ...	54
Table (5):	Harrington's classification system for acetabular deficiency	55
Table (6):	Classification of acetabular defects	73
Table (7):	Modular Trabecular Metal Acetabular Augment Construct System.....	97
Table (8):	Age of patients.....	102
Table (9):	Sex of the patients	103
Table (10):	Side of the defect.....	104
Table (11):	Type of the defect.....	105
Table (12):	Primary or secondary defect.....	106
Table (13):	Traumatic or non-traumatic Acetabular defect	107
Table (14):	Classification of acetabular defect	108
Table (15):	Harris Hip Score System (1969).	118
Table (16):	Acetabular reconstruction with bone graft in total hip replacement	122

List of Tables (Cont.)

<i>Table No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
Table (17):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding age.....	124
Table (18):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding sex.	125
Table (19):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding side of the defect ..	126
Table (20):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding etiology.....	127
Table (21):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding HHS	128
Table (22):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding medical illness.....	129
Table (23):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding graft incorporation.	130
Table (24):	Comparison between cavitory defect group and segmental defect group regarding type of the defect	131
Table (25):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding Paprosky classification.	132
Table (26):	Comparison between cavitory group and segmental group regarding AO classification..	133

List of Figures

<i>Figure No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
Fig. (1):	Plan of ossification of the hip bone	4
Fig. (2):	Anatomically defined anterior column of acetabulum.....	6
Fig. (3):	Anatomically defined anterior column of acetabulum.....	6
Fig. (4):	Anatomically defined anterior column of acetabulum.....	7
Fig. (5):	Structures at risk in four quadrants	12
Fig. (6):	Line representations of AP radiographic anatomy of the hip.	15
Fig. (7):	Kohler's line (Protrusion of the femoral head medial to this line indicates acetabular protrusion).....	16
Fig. (8):	Modified acetabular index for adults.....	16
Fig. (9):	The preoperative film shows well-preserved bony integrity of the acetabulum (A)	18
Fig. (10):	Particulate bone grafting was used in this successful lateralization of a medially migrated endoprosthesis. A: Preoperative radiograph. B: Preoperative template with the hatched area representing bone graft. C: Postoperative radiograph	19
Fig. (11a):	A method for locating the center of rotation.	22
Fig. (12):	Showing proper cup anteversion ⁽²³⁾	23
Fig. (13):	Femoral neck anteversion on groin lateral postion.	24

Fig. (14):	Transischial line obtained on axial image through ischial tuberosities	25
Fig. (15):	Cup in neutral position	25
Fig. (16):	A) Line is drawn through the posterior aspect of the medial and femoral	26
Fig. (17):	Acetabular angle of abduction	27
Fig. (18):	Theta angle	28
Fig. (19):	Free-body diagram for the calculation of the hip joint force while walking.....	30
Fig. (20):	Effect of lever arm ratio on the hip joint reaction force, adapted from Greenwald.	32
Fig. (21):	Use of cane on the unaffected side.....	33
Fig. (22):	Type I acetabular segmental defect.	42
Fig. (23):	Type II acetabular cavitary defect.	42
Fig. (24):	Type III acetabular defect.....	42
Fig. (25):	Type-I acetabular defect. Note that the rim remains supportive and will provide full stability for a hemispherical component.	45
Fig. (26):	Type-II acetabular defect. Note the rim defect. The remaining host bone is supportive and will provide full stability for a hemispherical component	45
Fig. (27-A):	Type 2A defects show generalized enlargement of the acetabulum with minimal osteolysis of the dome	46
Fig. (28-A):	Type-III acetabular defect. The remaining host bone is not supportive and will not provide full stability for a hemispherical component	49
Fig. (29):	Illustration depicting the Paprosky acetabular defect classification system.....	51

Fig. (30):	The X-change revision instruments system for socket revision developed by the Nijmegen group	58
Fig. (31):	The X-change revision mesh instruments system for the femur and the pelvis	58
Fig. (32A-C):	Case 1. 1 month postoperatively. A. The graft-cement interface in fuchisine-stained thick section. Note penetration of cement into the graft. Band C. No incorporation of graft in HE-stained section. Note acellular medullary tissue in C (A and B, x20, C x90) D, E. Case (2). 4 months postoperatively. New woven bone (We) is formed on the remnants of the graft (G) by active osteoblasts (arrows). D. HE-stained section. E. Goldner-stained adjacent section. Note red-stained osteoid indicating active bone formation (x225) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ .	70
Fig. (33):	A and C. Case (3). 8 months postoperatively. The graft is incorporated into a new trabecular structure. If inspected with polarized light, the structure mainly consists of woven bone, with many active bone remodeling sites indicated by the red osteoid staining (Goldner staining, x30).C. Magnification of part of Figure A. Note active osteoblasts (arrows) (x55).0 and D. Case (5). 28 months postoperatively. At the graft-cement (C) interface, new bone (NB) is locally present, graft remnants are absent and locally a soft tissue interface (I)and/or fibrocartilage (F) is present (HE and Goldner staining, x140). ⁽⁷⁷⁾	71
Fig. (34):	Allograft bone is secured to the superior dome with multiple 6.5-mm cancellous screws ⁽⁴³⁾	80
Fig. (35-A):	Allograft is reamed until the host anterior and posterior columns are engaged.....	82

Fig. (36):	A) Model with hemiplevis insertion for acetabular defect. B) acetabular reconstruction with bone graft and antiprotrusio component for type IIIB Paprosky.....	84
Fig. (37):	Diagram of reconstruction of a combined medial and peripheral segmental defect with wire mesh, impacted chip graft, and cemented cup. The cup is placed against the transverse ligament.	86
Fig. (38):	Figures of the X-change revision instruments system for socket revision. From left: allograft bone impaction after reconstruction of bottom and lateral rim of the acetabulum, cement inserted and pressurized, and socket cemented in the allograft bone.....	87
Fig. (39):	Algorithm approach for acetabular revision.....	88
Fig. (40):	Trabecular Metal. A scanning electron micrograph demonstrates the extremely porous microstructure. ...	89
Fig. (41):	Trabecular Metal Modular Cup and Polyethylene Liner.....	91
Fig. (42-A):	Trabecular Metal Augment in flying buttress position.	91
Fig. (43 (A))	Preoperative x ray with segmental acetabular defect.	92
Fig. (44):	A. Trabecular Metal Buttress	93
Fig. (45 (A))	Preoperative x ray with acetabular defect type III A Paprosky. (B) treated with trabecul metal cup and buttress augment.	94
Fig. (46):	Trabecular metal augment for type III B ⁽⁹⁰⁾	94
Fig. (47):	(A) trabecular metal Cup/Cage Construct ⁽⁹⁰⁾	96
Fig. (48):	Age of patients	102

Fig. (49):	Sex of the patients.	103
Fig. (50):	Side of the defect.....	104
Fig. (51):	Type of the defect.....	105
Fig. (52):	Primary or secondary defect.....	106
Fig. (53):	Traumatic or non-traumatic acetabular defect.....	107
Fig. (54):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding age.....	124
Fig. (55):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding sex	125
Fig. (56):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding side of the defect	126
Fig. (57):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding etiology	127
Fig. (58):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding HHS	128
Fig. (59):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding medical illness	129
Fig. (60):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding graft incorporation	130
Fig. (61):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding type of the defect	131
Fig. (62):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding Paprosky classification	132
Fig. (63):	Comparison between cavitary and segmental group regarding AO classification	133
Fig. (64):	Patient outcome after surgery.....	135
Fig. (65-A):	Paprosky type I or AAO type II central defect for both acetabulum.....	136

Fig. (66-A): Preoperative x ray with paprosky type IIIA or AAO type III acetabular defect	139
Fig. (67-A): Plain x ray show trumatic acetabular defect Paprosky type IIIA or AAO III	142
Fig. (68-A): Perioperative x ray with Lt acetabular defect type IIIA paprosky or AAO type III	145
Fig. (69-A): Paprosky type IIB or AAO type I traumatic Acetabular defect.....	148
Fig. (70-A): Preoperative x ray for Type IIB or AAO type I dysplastic acetabular defect	152
Fig. (71-A): Preoperative x ray for Type IIB or AAO type I acetabular traumatic defect.....	155

Introduction

Total hip arthroplasty is one of the most successful procedures in modern medicine and the number of patients receiving a total hip implant is increasing every year⁽¹⁾.

In the long term the main reason for failure of all types of total hip implant is aseptic loosening. Other reasons for failure are septic loosening, recurrent dislocation, malposition, periprosthetic fractures, and mechanical failure of the implant. In most cases failure leads to bone stock loss and revision surgery in cases with extensive bone loss is demanding. In general the outcome of a revision of a failed hip implant is less successful in those hips with greatest bone stock loss⁽²⁾.

On the acetabular side, the loosening process can result in a cavitary bone defect but in the more serious cases segmental wall defects also develop in combination with a cavitary bone deficiency. Traumatic acetabular defect and dysplastic acetabulum are common causes of acetabular defect. Many acetabular reconstruction techniques have been described both with cemented and non cemented cups⁽³⁾.

The most challenging aspect of acetabular revision or primary acetabular defect is managing the bone stock loss and creating a stable reconstruction with long term durability⁽⁴⁾. Reports show that restoring of the normal biomechanical