



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/133607/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Partridge, S, Buckley, P, de Boer, G et al. (2018) A novel method to measure rim deformation in UHMWPE acetabular liners. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 59. pp. 56-62. ISSN: 1350-4533

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medengphy.2018.04.023>

© 2018 IPEM. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 A novel method to measure rim deformation in UHMWPE 2 acetabular liners

3

4 Susan Partridge^{1*}, Paige Buckley¹, Greg de Boer¹, Sophie Williams¹

5 1. School of Mechanical Engineering, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

6 *corresponding author (s.partridge@leeds.ac.uk)

7 Abstract

8 Fluoroscopy studies of total hip replacement (THR) have shown that the femoral head and
9 acetabular cup can separate *in vivo*, causing edge loading on the rim of the cup. Pre-clinical testing
10 of THR involves ISO standard motion and loading parameters that are representative of a standard
11 walking gait. However, a requirement for more robust testing of THR has been identified and
12 protocols for edge loading in hip simulators have been developed. This technical note describes a
13 method to measure rim wear and deformation on ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene
14 acetabular liners using 2D contacting profilometry and Matlab[®] analysis. The method is
15 demonstrated on liners that have been subjected to edge loading in hip simulator tests and that
16 have been retrieved at revision surgery. A quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the rim
17 deformation was performed with good repeatability using the method.

18 1. Introduction

19 Fluoroscopy studies of total hip replacement (THR) have shown that the femoral head and
20 acetabular cup can separate *in vivo*, causing edge loading on the rim of the cup [1–3]. It is thought
21 that this may be caused by sub-optimal component positioning, such as a steeply inclined cup or
22 unmatched centres of rotation of the head and cup, or by joint laxity or lever-out following femoral
23 neck impingement [4–8]. Pre-clinical testing of THR involves ISO standard motion and loading
24 parameters that are representative of a standard walking gait [9]. However, a requirement for more
25 robust testing of THR has been identified [10] and protocols for edge loading in hip simulators have
26 been developed [11].

27 Rim wear, cracking, fracture and liner dissociation have been reported in retrieved ultra-high
28 molecular weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) acetabular liners and edge loading may be implicated in
29 these failures [12–22]. Edge loading is of particular concern where material degradation or reduced

30 mechanical properties exist, as in the case of oxidised or highly crosslinked UHMWPE [23–26]. Rim
31 damage observed clinically can also be the result of impingement [27,28].

32 Geometric measurement of acetabular rim deformation may provide important information
33 relating to the prevalence, location, severity and mechanism of *in vivo* rim deformation. This would
34 contribute to our understanding of the effects of edge loading on UHMWPE liners and allows
35 evaluation of the clinical relevance of current simulator edge loading protocols.


36 Existing geometrical methods to measure wear in acetabular cups often focus on the bearing
37 surface and don't accurately measure geometrical changes high up on the rim or on a chamfered
38 region of the liner [29–32].

39 This study describes and evaluates a novel method for two dimensional quantitative and qualitative
40 evaluation of rim deformation on UHMWPE acetabular liners.

41 2. Materials and Methods

42 2.1. Materials

43 This study measured UHMWPE acetabular liners of one design (Pinnacle®, DePuy Synthes, UK),
44 which comprised a flat horizontal rim region and a chamfered rim region (Figure 1). The liner was
45 designed to be press fit using a taper lock into a titanium shell with anti-rotation device (ARD) tabs
46 that mated with scallops in the titanium shell at 60° intervals.



47

48 *Figure 1 Image of a 36mm Pinnacle UHMWPE liner in a titanium shell (left) and a schematic of a cross-sectional unworn*
49 *rim profile with the nomenclature used in this study (right)*

50

51 The liners had either been hip simulator tested under edge loading conditions for 5Mc (simulator
 52 samples), as described in a previous study [11] or were retrieved at revision surgery (explants; NHS
 53 Ethical approval 09/H1307/60). Four liners were randomly selected from a larger collection of
 54 explants to demonstrate the method. Neutral Pinnacle liners with no visible damage on the
 55 horizontal rim were selected. The simulator liners were all 36mm inner diameter and 56mm outer
 56 diameter and were either cross-linked Marathon® UHMWPE (XLPE) liners or Gamma Vacuum Foil®
 57 UHMWPE liners that had been aged at 70°C and 75psi for 14 days in oxygen (aged PE). The explants
 58 were various diameters and were either crosslinked or conventional (non-crosslinked) UHMWPE
 59 liners. An untested XLPE liner was measured to determine the sensitivity of the method. Summary
 60 details of the liners used to evaluate the rim measurement method are provided in Table 1.

61 *Table 1 Details of the UHMWPE liners that were used to evaluate the rim deformation measurement method*

Sub group	Inner ∅ (mm)	Outer ∅ (mm)	Material (UHMWPE)	Loading Conditions/Time in vivo (months)	N
Control sample XLPE	36	56	XLPE	Untested	1
Simulator sample XLPE	36	56	XLPE	5 million cycles (Mc) of edge loading	4
Simulator sample aged PE	36	56	Aged PE	5Mc edge loading	4
Explanted neutral Pinnacle® Liners	28	Range: 50- 56	UHMWPE: crosslinked & non-crosslinked	Time <i>in vivo</i> range: 47-101 Revised for various reasons	4


62

63 2.2. Measurement procedure

64 Measurements were performed using a contacting profilometer (Talysurf 120L, Taylor Hobson,
 65 Leicester, UK) with a 2µm recessed conical diamond stylus and a contact force of 1mN. A fixture
 66 was designed to allow measurement and alignment of a range of liner diameters, rotation of the
 67 liners at 10° intervals and inclination of the liners to 45° (Figure 2: left). Inclination of the liner
 68 prevented ‘shanking out’ of the stylus when taking measurements. The face of the liner was flush
 69 with the fixture so that a 45° degree angle was maintained when the liner was rotated, preventing
 70 tilting of the liner and ensuring a radial trace orientation with respect to the centre of rotation (COR)
 71 of the liner. For the simulator samples, five profilometry traces of 9mm length were taken at 10°
 72 intervals across the worn region of the rim (worn traces) and five across the unworn region of the
 73 rim (unworn traces; Figure 2: right). The centre trace on the unworn region of the rim was selected

74 as a reference trace to which all other traces were compared. For the untested liners, the traces
75 were taken in the same way but both regions were unworn. For the explants, where the orientation
76 *in vivo* was unknown, 12 traces at 30° intervals were taken around the circumference of the liner.
77 Data points were taken at intervals of 0.25µm for all liners. The raw data (x and z coordinates of
78 each trace) were exported for analysis.

79



80

81 *Figure 2 (left): Schematic (Solidworks®, Dassault Systèmes, USA) of the fixture used to take the rim profile traces: (A) the*
82 *liner was held in place by (B) a stem that pushed the liner against the flat face of the cup holder using a spring (not shown),*
83 *(C) the cup holder was inclined at 45° to prevent ‘shanking out’ of the stylus and (D) a series of holes at 10° intervals that*
84 *mated with pegs on the cup holder were used to allow rotation of the cup holder without removing the liner between*
85 *traces and Figure 2 (right) Schematic of a simulator tested acetabular liner showing the locations of the five rim profile*
86 *traces taken at 10° intervals across the worn, edge loaded region of the liner rim and five traces taken across unworn*
87 *region of the liner. The reference trace is highlighted in red. The trace length was 9mm and was taken perfectly radial with*
88 *the centre of rotation of the cup.*


89

90 2.3. Analysis procedure

91 A Matlab® (version R2016b, The Mathworks Inc., Natick, MA, USA) code was written to plot and
92 align the traces (worn and unworn) from the acetabular rim and to calculate the rim deformation
93 where edge loading had occurred.

94 To align the traces, a datum was selected where the horizontal rim met the chamfered region of
95 the liner for all traces (Figure 3A). It was assumed that this datum would have undergone relatively
96 little wear and/or deformation compared to other regions on the worn bearing surface and areas
97 of loading. The datum on each trace was translated to the reference trace and the traces were

108 rotated around the datum to align with the reference trace along the horizontal rim (Figure 3B). All
 109 of the traces were then rotated around the datum so that the horizontal rims lay along the
 110 horizontal plane (Figure 3C). The rim deformation (penetration) was defined as the distance
 111 between the reference trace and a worn trace normal to a tangential unit vector obtained between
 112 two points along the reference trace. This was calculated where the mean deformation for all traces
 113 was at a maximum between $z=0$ and $z=\alpha$, where α is to a point defined by the user (Figure 4D).The
 114 z cut-off (α) was included to allow the user to exclude areas deemed to be bearing surface rather
 115 than rim.



116

117 *Figure 3 Plots to outline the steps in the analysis procedure for rim deformation on an aged PE liner following 5Mc of edge loading: (A) separate rim profile traces for worn and unworn rim plotted with identification of the datum at the point where the chamfer meets the horizontal rim (raw data), (B) all traces were translated and rotated around the datum to align with the reference trace along the horizontal rim, (C) all traces were rotated around the datum to align with the horizontal plane and (D) a magnified section of the rim area showing the points of maximum deformation where the distance normal to the reference trace was calculated (data analysed between $z=0$ and user defined z cut-off). Black traces represent the unworn rim and pink traces represent the worn rim.*

118

119 The mean deformation between the reference trace and the five worn traces and the standard
 120 deviations were calculated for each sub group. All unworn traces were plotted to visually confirm
 121 that the selected reference trace was representative of the unworn rim.

118 The sensitivity of the method was established using the untested XLPE liner. To do this, each
119 individual trace (all 10 traces) was assigned as the reference trace in turn and the distances to the
120 remaining traces were calculated to create a matrix of rim deformation values. The mean distance
121 between all traces for each reference trace and the standard deviation was then calculated. This
122 was repeated three times, removing and replacing the liner from the fixture, and the mean of all
123 matrices was used to establish the sensitivity of the method. This was done by a single operator.


124 The measurements of the aged PE simulator samples were performed by two operators and the
125 mean and standard deviations were obtained. Each operator performed the entire measurement
126 protocol, including set-up of the liner and fixture. Intra-class correlation estimates for the two
127 operators were calculated using SPSS (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA) based on an absolute-agreement,
128 two-way random-effects model and single measures and was obtained by comparing the distance
129 from the reference trace and each worn trace for each liner for each operator (20 traces). An aged
130 PE liner was measured three times by a single operator and the liner and fixture were removed
131 between each measurement.

132 For the evaluation of the method in this study, rim deformation on the explants was identified as
133 two or more adjoining traces with reduced radii of curvature at the inner rim, giving a sharpened
134 appearance, and a penetration value exceeding the threshold measurement value obtained by
135 measuring the untested liner. Change in shape or deformation on any other non-adjoining areas of
136 the liner were excluded from the rim deformation calculation. The reference trace for each explant
137 was selected as one of the traces with no change of shape at the rim and a penetration value that
138 did not exceed the threshold value.

139 **3. Results**

140 *3.1. Simulator Samples*

141 Deformation at the worn rim was measurable for all of the simulator samples. A mean deformation
142 of 0.11 ± 0.05 mm was observed for the XLPE liners (Figure 4A) and 0.21 ± 0.16 mm for the aged PE
143 liners (Figure 4B).




144

145 *Figure 4 Example rim profiles traces of the worn (pink) and unworn (black) rim regions following 5Mc of edge loading for*
 146 *an (A) XLPE liner (mean deformation $0.11 \pm 0.05 \text{mm}$) and (B) an aged PE liner (mean deformation $0.21 \pm 0.16 \text{mm}$).*

147

148 **3.2. Explants**

149 Two of the explants exhibited measurable penetration at the rim and the mean values were $0.57 \pm$
 150 0.11mm and $0.78 \pm 0.09 \text{mm}$ (Figure 5A and Figure 5B, respectively). The variation in the remaining
 151 unworn traces was much greater for the explants than the simulator samples. No measurable
 152 deformation at the rim, defined in this study as clear change in shape and a deformation value
 153 exceeding the threshold value for two or more adjacent traces, was observed on the remaining
 154 explants but changes to the shape of the rim were observed.



155

156 *Figure 5 Rim profile traces of the two explanted liners that exhibited measurable rim deformation. The regions of the liner*
 157 *that were identified as exhibiting measurable deformation are shown in pink and the remaining traces are shown in black.*

158

159 For both simulator samples and explants, the shape of the measured deformation at the rim was
 160 observed as a ‘sharpening’ of the rim. This was more apparent for the aged PE liners and the
 161 explants than the XLPE liners.

162 3.3. Repeatability and Sensitivity Analysis

163 The mean difference between traces on the untested XLPE liner was 0.02 ± 0.01 mm which is smaller
 164 than the deformations measured on the simulator samples and explants in this study. A single liner
 165 (Aged PE 2) was measured three times by a single operator and a mean deformation value of 0.24
 166 ± 0.08 mm was obtained. The rim deformations for the aged PE liners were measured by two
 167 operators and an intra-class coefficient of 0.86 was obtained, indicating good agreement between
 168 operators. Table 2 provides the mean and standard deviation for each operator. The mean absolute
 169 difference between operators for each liner was 0.03mm.

170 *Table 2 Mean deformation measurements and standard deviations for the aged PE liners for two operators*

	Operator 1 (deformation mm)		Operator 2 (deformation mm)	
	Mean	St.dev	Mean	St.dev
Aged PE 1	-0.016	0.07	-0.06666	0.10
Aged PE 2	0.2363	0.05	0.23206	0.07
Aged PE 3	0.2993	0.03	0.35136	0.02
Aged PE 4	0.3496	0.01	0.353928	0.03
Mean	0.21 ± 0.16		0.22 ± 0.20	

171

172 4. Discussion

173 A method that can be used to measure rim deformation and to qualitatively evaluate rim
 174 deformation in UHMWPE acetabular liners has been demonstrated in this study using Pinnacle®
 175 liners that were hip simulator tested and removed from patients. The quantitative measurements
 176 can be used to determine the severity of rim deformation and wear and the qualitative observations
 177 of the shape of the rim profile have the potential to provide insight into possible damage
 178 mechanisms through the identification of distinct rim geometries for different loading conditions.

179 It has previously been suggested that different rim profiles may have been caused by different
 180 loading mechanisms. Hall et al. (1998) suggested that the shape of the rim is different for
 181 impingement conditions, observed as a blunted edge on the rim, and articulative wear in the
 182 superior region of the bearing surface, observed as a sharpening of the rim [33]. Femoral head edge
 183 loading on the rim may again produce a distinct shape to the rim profile. This method therefore has
 184 the potential to be used to determine if the cause of deformation can be better understood by

185 analysing the shape of the rim profile. Further to this, the method can be used to evaluate wear
186 and deformation on the chamfer, which is an advantage over many existing methods that measure
187 penetration on the bearing surface only [29–31].

188 A separation of the femoral head and acetabular cup *in vivo* has been reported [1–3]. This can lead
189 to edge loading of the acetabular rim. Relatively little is known about the prevalence and clinical
190 consequences of edge loading of the femoral head on an UHMWPE acetabular rim but it could
191 potentially lead to excessive wear, rim fracture and/or liner dissociation, which have been
192 associated with other edge loading mechanisms such as impingement, and has been shown to
193 increase stresses in the rim [11,22,34,35]. The method developed and evaluated in the present
194 study could be used to help determine the prevalence, location, severity and mechanism of *in vivo*
195 rim deformation. Validation of the loading mechanisms in edge loading protocols for simulator
196 studies could also be achieved by comparing rim deformation measurements and profiles for
197 varying degrees of edge loading with those measured on explanted liners.

198 The method may not be suitable for measuring very small rim deformations. Some variation
199 (0.02 ± 0.01 mm) between rim profile traces was observed on the untested liner and this may be a
200 result of deformation during manufacture, manufacturing tolerances or due to measurement error.
201 However, the rim deformations measured in this study (0.11 ± 0.05 mm, 0.21 ± 0.16 mm and $0.57 \pm$
202 0.11 mm & 0.78 ± 0.09 mm for the XLPE liners, aged PE liner and explants, respectively) exceeded this
203 measurement threshold and it may therefore be reasonably assumed that most clinically relevant
204 deformations would exceed this threshold.

205 The method does not allow distinction between wear resulting in material loss and cold flow or
206 creep. However, this is a common problem when measuring UHMWPE geometrically and a problem
207 that is inherent in many existing measurement methods.

208 The method described in this study uses contacting profilometry, but the code could be developed
209 to process similar coordinate data from non-contacting profilometers or coordinate measuring
210 machines (CMM). Contacting profilometry provides good resolution and point density compared to
211 CMM methods, allowing visualisation of the shape of the rim. However, a CMM would provide a
212 3D dataset without the need for rotation of the sample. Contacting methods can potentially mark
213 the material surface, which would be avoided with the use of a non-contact method.

214 It was also noted that the wear and deformation of the entire liner and therefore the rim is greater
215 in the explanted liners than the simulator liners and identification of worn regions was therefore
216 more challenging. Suitable protocols for identifying areas of edge loading should be developed

217 when using this measurement method. Furthermore, the method relies on the datum not being
218 deformed or worn. In reality, UHMWPE is known to undergo large deformations during
219 implantation and/or testing as well as during manufacturing and it is likely that the datum would
220 experience small deformations and in some cases may be worn. While this may influence the
221 measurements, the datum was identified as the point where least deformation would occur and
222 where wear is less likely to occur. It was thought that any deformation at the datum would be
223 insignificant in comparison to any wear and deformation at the rim. However, in some cases, the
224 datum may be worn and the method would be unsuitable. At present the method has only been
225 evaluated using neutral Pinnacle® acetabular liners. However, it is postulated that the method
226 could be used with minimal or no adaptation to measure any liner with a horizontal rim and a
227 chamfer, which are features of other commonly implanted liners such as the Trilogy® acetabular
228 cup (Zimmer Inc., Warsaw, USA).

229 Future developments would include modifications to the Matlab analysis and measurement
230 method to include acetabular liners of different designs as well as liners with elevated rims. There
231 is potential to modify the Matlab analysis in future work to create 3D geometric images and
232 calculate wear volumes at the rim. However, a 2D analysis is more effective for visualising rim
233 profiles.

234 5. Conclusion

235 A method that can be used to quantitatively and qualitatively evaluate simulated and clinical rim
236 deformation in UHMWPE acetabular liners has been demonstrated. This method has the potential
237 to provide improved understanding of the prevalence and severity of edge loading *in vivo*.

238 6. Ethical Approval

239 The explants were collected as part of wider study, which has been given favourable opinion by an
240 NHS Ethics Committee (Reference number: 09/H1307/60).

241 7. Conflict of Interest Statement

242 Sophie Williams is a paid consultant to DePuy International, a Johnson & Johnson company.

243 8. Acknowledgements

244 The acetabular liners for the simulator tests were provided by DePuy Synthes Joint Reconstruction,
245 UK. Susan Partridge was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Leeds
246 Musculoskeletal Biomedical Research Unit.

- 247 [1] Lombardi a V, Mallory TH, Dennis D a, Komistek RD, Fada R a, Northcut EJ. An in vivo
248 determination of total hip arthroplasty pistoning during activity. *J Arthroplasty*
249 2000;15:702–9.
- 250 [2] Dennis D a., Komistek RD, Northcut EJ, Ochoa J a., Ritchie A. “In vivo” determination of
251 hip joint separation and the forces generated due to impact loading conditions. *J*
252 *Biomech* 2001;34:623–9.
- 253 [3] Komistek RD, Dennis DA, Ochoa JA, Haas BD, Hammill C. In vivo comparison of hip
254 separation after metal-on-metal or metal-on-polyethylene total hip arthroplasty. *J*
255 *Bone Joint Surg Am* 2002;84–A:1836–41. <http://jbjs.org/content/84/10/1836.abstract>
256 (accessed April 16, 2015).
- 257 [4] Nevelos J, Ingham E, Doyle C, Streicher R, Nevelos a, Walter W, et al. Microseparation
258 of the centers of alumina-alumina artificial hip joints during simulator testing produces
259 clinically relevant wear rates and patterns. *J Arthroplasty* 2000;15:793–5.
- 260 [5] Stewart T, Tipper J, Streicher R, Ingham E, Fisher J. Long-term wear of HIPed alumina
261 on alumina bearings for THR under microseparation conditions. *J Mater Sci Mater Med*
262 2001;12:1053–6.
- 263 [6] Leslie IJ, Williams S, Isaac G, Ingham E, Fisher J. High cup angle and microseparation
264 increase the wear of hip surface replacements. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2009;467:2259–
265 65.
- 266 [7] Al-Hajjar M, Fisher J, Tipper JL, Williams S, Jennings LM. Wear of 36-mm BIOLOX (R)
267 delta ceramic-on-ceramic bearing in total hip replacements under edge loading
268 conditions. *Proc Inst Mech Eng Part H-Journal Eng Med* 2013;227:535–42.
- 269 [8] Al-Hajjar M, Jennings LM, Begand S, Oberbach T, Delfosse D, Fisher J. Wear of novel
270 ceramic-on-ceramic bearings under adverse and clinically relevant hip simulator
271 conditions. *J Biomed Mater Res - Part B Appl Biomater* 2013;101:1456–62.
- 272 [9] BS ISO 14242:2002. Implants for surgery — Wear of total hip-joint prostheses —, 2002.
- 273 [10] Jennings LM, Al-Hajjar M, Brockett CL, Williams S, Tipper JL, Ingham E, et al. (iv)
274 Enhancing the safety and reliability of joint replacement implants. *Orthop Trauma*

- 275 2012;26:246–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mporth.2012.05.006>.
- 276 [11] Partridge S, Tipper JL, Al-hajjar M, Isaac GH, Fisher J, Williams S. Evaluation of a new
277 methodology to simulate damage and wear of polyethylene hip replacements
278 subjected to edge loading in hip simulator testing. *J Biomed Mater Res - Part B Appl*
279 *Biomater* 2017;00B:000–000.
- 280 [12] Birman M V., Noble PC, Conditt M a., Li S, Mathis KB. Cracking and impingement in
281 ultra-high-molecular-weight polyethylene acetabular liners. *J Arthroplasty*
282 2005;20:87–92.
- 283 [13] Tower SS, Currier JH, Currier BH, Lyford K a, Van Citters DW, Mayor MB. Rim cracking
284 of the cross-linked longevity polyethylene acetabular liner after total hip arthroplasty.
285 *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2007;89:2212–7.
- 286 [14] Currier BH, Currier JH, Mayor MB, Lyford K a, Collier JP, Van Citters DW. Evaluation of
287 oxidation and fatigue damage of retrieved crossfire polyethylene acetabular cups. *J*
288 *Bone Joint Surg Am* 2007;89:2023–9.
- 289 [15] Moore BKD, Beck PR, Petersen DW, Cuckler JM, Lemons JE, Eberhardt AW. Early Failure
290 of a Cross-Linked Polyethylene Acetabular Liner. *J Bone Jt Surg* 2008;90:2499–504.
- 291 [16] Furmanski J, Anderson M, Bal S, Greenwald a. S, Halley D, Penenberg B, et al. Clinical
292 fracture of cross-linked UHMWPE acetabular liners. *Biomaterials* 2009;30:5572–82.
293 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2009.07.013>.
- 294 [17] Mesko JW. Acute liner disassociation of a Pinnacle acetabular component. *J*
295 *Arthroplasty* 2009;24:815–8. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18555645>.
- 296 [18] Furmanski J, Kraay MJ, Rimnac CM. Crack Initiation in Retrieved Cross-Linked Highly
297 Cross-Linked Ultrahigh-Molecular-Weight Polyethylene Acetabular Liners. *J*
298 *Arthroplasty* 2011;26:796–801.
299 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S088354031000416X>.
- 300 [19] Waewsawangwong W, Goodman SB. Case Report Unexpected Failure of Highly Cross-
301 Linked Polyethylene Acetabular Liner. *J Arthroplasty* 2012;27:323.e1-323.e4.
- 302 [20] Mayer SW, Wellman SS, Bolognesi MP, Attarian DE. Late liner disassociation of a

- 303 Pinnacle system acetabular component. *Orthopedics* 2012;35:e561-5.
304 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22495860>.
- 305 [21] O'Neill CKJ, Napier RJ, Diamond OJ, Brien SO, Beverland DE, Presentation C. Case
306 Report: Acetabular Liner Dissociation following Total Hip Arthroplasty : A Rare but
307 Serious Complication That May Be Easily Misinterpreted in the Emergency Department.
308 *Case Rep Emerg Med* 2015:1–4.
- 309 [22] Yun A, Koli EN, Moreland J, Iorio R, Tilzey JF, Mesko JW, et al. Polyethylene Liner
310 Dissociation Is a Complication of the DePuy Pinnacle Cup: A Report of 23 Cases. *Clin.*
311 *Orthop. Relat. Res. Symp. 2015 Hip Soc. Proc., Springer US*; 2015.
- 312 [23] Sutula LC, Collier JP, Sperling DK, Currier JH, Saum KA, Mayor MB. Impact of gamma
313 sterilization on clinical performance of polyethylene in the hip. *J Arthroplasty*
314 1996;11:377–89. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8792243>.
- 315 [24] Currier BH. Evaluation of Oxidation and Fatigue Damage of Retrieved Crossfire
316 Polyethylene Acetabular Cups. *J Bone Jt Surg* 2007;89:2023.
317 <http://jbjs.org/cgi/doi/10.2106/JBJS.F.00336>.
- 318 [25] Gencur SJ, Rimnac CM, Kurtz SM. Fatigue crack propagation resistance of virgin and
319 highly crosslinked , thermally treated ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene.
320 *Biomaterials* 2006;27:1550–7.
- 321 [26] Kurtz SM, Hozack WJ, Purtill JJ, Marcolongo M, Kraay MJ, Goldberg VM, et al.
322 Significance of In Vivo Degradation for Polyethylene in Total Hip Arthroplasty. *J Clin*
323 *Orthop Relat Res* 2006;453:47–57.
- 324 [27] Shon WY, Baldini T, Peterson MG, Wright TM, Salvati EA. Impingement in Total Hip
325 Arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 2005;20:427–35.
326 [http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0883540304006631%5Cnpapers2://publ](http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0883540304006631%5Cnpapers2://publication/doi/10.1016/j.arth.2004.09.058)
327 [ication/doi/10.1016/j.arth.2004.09.058](http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0883540304006631%5Cnpapers2://publication/doi/10.1016/j.arth.2004.09.058).
- 328 [28] Malik A. Impingement with Total Hip Replacement. *J Bone Jt Surg* 2007;89:1832.
329 <http://jbjs.org/cgi/doi/10.2106/JBJS.F.01313>.
- 330 [29] Jedenmalm A, Noz ME, Olivecrona H, Olivecrona L, Jedenmalm A, Noz ME, et al. A new

- 331 approach for assessment of wear in metal-backed acetabular cups using computed
332 tomography : A phantom study with retrievals A new approach for assessment of wear
333 in metal- backed acetabular cups using computed tomography. *Acta Orthop*
334 2009;3674:218–24.
- 335 [30] Tuke M, Taylor A, Roques A, Maul C. 3D linear and volumetric wear measurement on
336 artificial hip joints — Validation of a new methodology. *Precis Eng* 2010;34:777–83.
337 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.precisioneng.2010.06.001>.
- 338 [31] Uddin MS. Wear Measurement and Assessment of Explanted Cross-Linked PE
339 Acetabular Cups Using a CMM Wear Measurement and Assessment of Explanted Cross-
340 Linked PE Acetabular Cups Using a CMM. *Tribol Trans* 2014;57:5:767–77.
- 341 [32] Ranuša M, Gallo J, Vrbka M, Hobza M, Paloušek D, Hartl M, et al. Wear Analysis of
342 Extracted Polyethylene Acetabular Cups Using a 3D Optical Scanner Wear Analysis of
343 Extracted Polyethylene Acetabular Cups Using a 3D Optical Scanner. *Tribol Trans*
344 2017;60:437–47.
- 345 [33] Hall M, Pinder IM. Wear in Retrieved Acetabular Components Effect of Femoral Head
346 Radius and Patient Parameters. *J Arthroplasty* 1998;13:291–5.
- 347 [34] Usrey MM, Noble PC, Rudner LJ, Conditt M a., Birman M V., Santore RF, et al. Does
348 Neck/Liner Impingement Increase Wear of Ultrahigh-Molecular-Weight Polyethylene
349 Liners? *J Arthroplasty* 2006;21:65–71.
- 350 [35] Hua X, Li J, Wang L, Jin Z, Wilcox R, Fisher J. Contact mechanics of modular metal-on-
351 polyethylene total hip replacement under adverse edge loading conditions. *J Biomech*
352 2014;47:3303–9. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0021929014004394>.

353