



CLINICAL GUIDELINES

CMM-313: Hip Replacement/ Arthroplasty

Version 2.0.2019

Effective August 1, 2019



CMM-313: Hip Replacement/Arthroplasty	
CMM-313.1: Definition	3
CMM-313.2: General Guidelines	4
CMM-313.3: Indications and Non-Indications	4
CMM-313.4: Procedure (CPT®)	10
CMM-313.5: References	11

CMM-313.1: Definition

- **Hip arthroplasty** is an orthopaedic surgical procedure during which the articular surface of the hip joint is replaced, remodeled, or realigned.
- **Hip replacement** is a form of arthroplasty that includes the surgical replacement of the hip joint with a prosthesis.
- **Prosthesis** refers to an artificial device used to replace a structural element within a joint to improve and enhance function.
- **Hip resurfacing arthroplasty (HRA)**, also called metal-on-metal (MOM) hip resurfacing and hemiresurfacing arthroplasty, is a surgical technique that involves the removal of diseased cartilage and bone from the head of the femur, and the replacement of the surface of the femoral head with a metal hemisphere that fits into a metal acetabular cup or into the acetabulum respectively. The technique conserves femoral bone and maintains normal femoral loading and stresses. Because of bone conservation, it may not compromise future total hip replacements. Hip resurfacing arthroplasty has been promoted as an alternative to total hip replacement for younger individuals. Hip resurfacing arthroplasty may be either a partial HRA (i.e., hemi-hip resurfacing, hemiresurfacing or femoral head resurfacing arthroplasty [FHRA]) or a total HRA.
- **Partial hip replacement**, also called hip hemiarthroplasty, is a surgical technique where only the femoral head (the ball) of the damaged hip joint is replaced. The acetabulum (the socket) is not replaced.
- **Total hip replacement** is a surgical technique that involves the removal of the damaged hip joint which is then replaced with an artificial prosthesis composed of two or three different components: 1) the head that replaces the original femoral head, 2) the femoral component (a metal stem placed into the femur), and 3) the acetabular component that is implanted into the acetabulum. The stem may be secured using bone cement or press-fit for the bone to grow into it.
- **The Tönnis Classification System** is commonly used to describe the presence of osteoarthritis in the hips with grading as follows:
 - ◆ Grade 0: No signs of osteoarthritis
 - ◆ Grade 1: Sclerosis of the joint with slight joint space narrowing and osteophyte formation, and no or slight loss of femoral head sphericity
 - ◆ Grade 2: Small cysts in the femoral head or acetabulum with moderate joint space narrowing and moderate loss of femoral head sphericity
 - ◆ Grade 3: Large cysts in the femoral head or acetabulum, severe joint space narrowing or obliteration of the joint space, and severe deformity and loss of sphericity of the femoral head.
- **Revision of hip replacement (partial or total)** involves surgical reconstruction or replacement due to failure or complications of previous hip replacement.

- **Non-surgical management**, with regard to the treatment of hip osteoarthritis, is defined as any provider-directed non-surgical treatment, which has been demonstrated in the scientific literature as efficacious and/or is considered reasonable care in the treatment of hip pain from osteoarthritis. The types of treatment involved can include, but are not limited to: relative rest/activity modification, weight loss, supervised physiotherapy modalities and therapeutic exercises, oral prescription and non-prescription medications, assistive devices (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair), and/or intra-articular injections (i.e., steroid).

CMM-313.2: General Guidelines

- The determination of medical necessity for the performance of hip resurfacing and replacement (partial or total) is always made on a case-by-case basis.
- Until the scientific literature is more definitive, the type of bearing surface, such as metal-on-metal, ceramic-on-ceramic, metal-on-polyethylene, should be determined by the treating surgeon and the patient following a frank discussion explaining the pros and cons of each bearing surface.
- For individuals with significant medical conditions or co-morbidities, the risk/benefit of hip arthroplasty procedures should be clearly documented in the medical record.

CMM-313.3: Indications and Non-Indications

Partial Hip Resurfacing Arthroplasty

- **Partial hip resurfacing arthroplasty** is considered **medically necessary** when **ALL** of the following criteria have been met:
 - ◆ Function-limiting pain at short distances (e.g., walking less than ¼ mile, limiting activity to two city blocks, the equivalent to walking the length of a shopping mall) for at least three (3) months duration
 - ◆ Loss of hip function which interferes with the ability to carry out age-appropriate activities of daily living and/or demands of employment
 - ◆ Presence of **EITHER** of the following:
 - Degenerative arthritis primarily affecting the femoral head with joint space narrowing on weight-bearing radiographs
 - Osteonecrosis (avascular necrosis) of the femoral head when the disease is detected early and there is less than 50% involvement of the femoral head
 - ◆ Individual is age 64 years or younger
 - ◆ Failure of at least three (3) months of provider-directed non-surgical management
 - For patients with BMI > 40, there must be failure of at least six (6) months of provider-directed non-surgical management

- Provider-directed non-surgical management may be inappropriate. The medical record must clearly document why provider-directed non-surgical management is not appropriate.
- **Partial hip resurfacing arthroplasty** is considered **not medically necessary** for any other indication or condition, including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Degenerative arthritis affecting both the femoral head and the acetabulum with joint space narrowing on weight-bearing radiographs
 - ◆ Inflammatory arthropathy affecting both the femoral head and acetabulum
 - ◆ Osteonecrosis (avascular necrosis) of the femoral head involving more than 50% of the femoral head
 - ◆ Skeletal immaturity
 - ◆ Active local or systemic infection
 - ◆ One or more uncontrolled or unstable medical conditions that would significantly increase the risk of morbidity or mortality (e.g., cardiac, pulmonary, liver, genitourinary, or metabolic disease; hypertension; abnormal serum electrolyte levels)
 - ◆ Vascular insufficiency, significant muscular atrophy of the hip or leg musculature, or neuromuscular disease severe enough to compromise implant stability or post-operative recovery
 - ◆ Osseous abnormalities that cannot be optimally managed prior to surgery which would increase the likelihood of a poor surgical outcome (i.e., inadequate bone stock to support the implant)
 - ◆ Severe immunocompromised state
 - ◆ Charcot joint

Total Hip Resurfacing Arthroplasty

- **Total hip resurfacing arthroplasty** is considered **medically necessary** when **ALL** of the following criteria have been met:
 - ◆ Function-limiting pain at short distances (e.g., walking less than ¼ mile, limiting activity to two city blocks, the equivalent to walking the length of a shopping mall) for at least three (3) months duration
 - ◆ Loss of hip function which interferes with the ability to carry out age-appropriate activities of daily living and/or demands of employment
 - ◆ Presence of **EITHER** of the following:
 - Degenerative arthritis or an inflammatory arthropathy affecting both the femoral head and acetabulum with joint space narrowing on weight-bearing radiographs
 - Osteonecrosis (avascular necrosis) of the femoral head with possible acetabular surface involvement when the disease is detected early and there is less than 50% involvement of the femoral head
 - ◆ Individual is age 64 years or younger
 - ◆ Failure of at least three (3) months of provider-directed non-surgical management
 - For patients with BMI > 40, there must be failure of at least six (6) months of provider-directed non-surgical management

- Provider-directed non-surgical management may be inappropriate. The medical record must clearly document why provider-directed non-surgical management is not appropriate.
- **Total hip resurfacing arthroplasty** is considered **not medically necessary** for any other indication or condition, including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Osteonecrosis (avascular necrosis) of the femoral head involving more than 50% of the femoral head
 - ◆ Skeletal immaturity
 - ◆ Active local or systemic infection
 - ◆ One or more uncontrolled or unstable medical conditions that would significantly increase the risk of morbidity or mortality (e.g., cardiac, pulmonary, liver, genitourinary, or metabolic disease; hypertension; abnormal serum electrolyte levels)
 - ◆ Vascular insufficiency, significant muscular atrophy of the hip or leg musculature, or neuromuscular disease severe enough to compromise implant stability or post-operative recovery
 - ◆ Osseous abnormalities that cannot be optimally managed prior to surgery which would increase the likelihood of a poor surgical outcome (i.e., inadequate bone stock to support the implant)
 - ◆ Severe immunocompromised state
 - ◆ Charcot joint

Partial Hip Replacement

- **Partial hip replacement** is considered **medically necessary** when **ANY** of the following criteria have been met:
 - ◆ A non-displaced intracapsular fracture is present and surgical fixation is not considered a reasonable option
 - ◆ An impacted fracture, partially displaced fracture, completely displaced or comminuted fracture of the femoral neck or femoral head is present and conservative management or surgical fixation is not considered a reasonable option
 - ◆ Tönnis Grade 3 osteoarthritis **or** avascular necrosis with stage III collapse of the femoral head when **ALL** of the following criteria have been met:
 - Function-limiting pain at short distances (e.g., walking less than ¼ mile, limiting activity to two city blocks, the equivalent to walking the length of a shopping mall) for at least three (3) months duration
 - Loss of hip function secondary to osteoarthritis which interferes with the ability to carry out age-appropriate activities of daily living and/or their demands of employment
 - Failure of at least three (3) months of provider-directed non-surgical management
 - For patients with BMI > 40, there must be failure of at least six (6) months of provider-directed non-surgical management

- Provider-directed non-surgical management may be inappropriate. The medical record must clearly document why provider-directed non-surgical management is not appropriate.
- **Partial hip replacement** is considered **not medically necessary** for any other indication or condition, including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Active local or systemic infection
 - ◆ Osseous abnormalities that cannot be optimally managed prior to surgery which would increase the likelihood of a poor surgical outcome (i.e., inadequate bone stock to support the implant) unless the procedure is being performed for a fracture indication
 - ◆ One or more uncontrolled or unstable medical conditions that would significantly increase the risk of morbidity (e.g., cardiac, pulmonary, liver, genitourinary, or metabolic disease; hypertension; abnormal serum electrolyte levels)
 - ◆ Vascular insufficiency, significant muscular atrophy of the leg, or neuromuscular disease severe enough to compromise implant stability or post-operative recovery
 - ◆ Severe immunocompromised state
 - ◆ Charcot joint
 - ◆ Inflammatory arthropathy affecting both the femoral head and acetabulum

Total Hip Replacement

- **Total hip replacement** is considered **medically necessary** when **ANY** of the following criteria have been met:
 - ◆ An impacted fracture, partially displaced fracture, completely displaced or comminuted fracture of the femoral neck or femoral head is present and conservative management or surgical fixation is not considered a reasonable option
 - ◆ Tönnis Grade 3 osteoarthritis **or** avascular necrosis with stage III collapse of the femoral head **or** inflammatory arthropathy affecting both the femoral head and acetabulum with joint space narrowing when ALL of the following criteria have been met:
 - Function-limiting pain at short distances (e.g., walking less than ¼ mile, limiting activity to two city blocks, the equivalent to walking the length of a shopping mall) for at least three (3) months duration
 - Loss of hip function secondary to osteoarthritis which interferes with the ability to carry out age-appropriate activities of daily living and/or demands of employment
 - Failure of at least three (3) months of provider-directed non-surgical management
 - For patients with BMI > 40, there must be failure of at least six (6) months of provider-directed non-surgical management
 - Provider-directed non-surgical management may be inappropriate. The medical record must clearly document why provider-directed non-surgical management is not appropriate.

- **Total hip replacement** is considered **not medically necessary** for any other indication or condition, including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Active local or systemic infection
 - ◆ Osseous abnormalities that cannot be optimally managed prior to surgery which would increase the likelihood of a poor surgical outcome (i.e., inadequate bone stock to support the implant) unless the procedure is being performed for a fracture indication
 - ◆ One or more uncontrolled or unstable medical conditions that would significantly increase the risk of morbidity (e.g., cardiac, pulmonary, liver, genitourinary, or metabolic disease; hypertension; abnormal serum electrolyte levels)
 - ◆ Vascular insufficiency, significant muscular atrophy of the leg, or neuromuscular disease severe enough to compromise implant stability or post-operative recovery
 - ◆ Severe immunocompromised state
 - ◆ Charcot joint
- Refer to **MS-12: Osteoarthritis** and **MS-24: Hip** for the advanced imaging indications prior to hip resurfacing and hip replacement surgery
- Refer to **CMM-314: Hip Surgery – Arthroscopic & Open Procedures** for non-resurfacing and non-replacement treatment of avascular necrosis of the femoral head

Revision of Hip Replacement – Partial or Total

- **Revision of Hip Replacement** is considered **medically necessary** for an individual who has previously undergone a partial or total hip replacement and when **ANY** of the following criteria have been met:
 - ◆ Presence of **ANY** of the following:
 - Recurrent prosthetic dislocation/[subluxation](#) not responsive to a reasonable course of non-surgical care
 - ~~Instability of the components~~
 - Aseptic loosening
 - Periprosthetic infection
 - [Periprosthetic fracture](#)
 - [Instability of the implant \(e.g., disassembly, modular neck failure\)](#)
 - [Leg length discrepancy](#)
 - [Osteolysis without eccentric wear \(wear of elevated rim liner without wear superiorly\)](#)
 - ◆ Unexplained function-limiting pain at short distances (e.g., walking less than ¼ mile, limiting activity to two city blocks, the equivalent to walking the length of a shopping mall) for greater than six (6) months unresponsive to provider-directed non-surgical management
- ~~Revision of Hip Replacement is considered not medically necessary for any other indication or condition, including Charcot joint.~~

- **Isolated head and polyethylene liner exchange (IPE)** is considered **medically necessary** when **EITHER-ANY** of the following criteria have been met:
 - ◆ Eccentric Polyethylene Wear with or without Osteolysis:
 - Symptomatic individual with well-fixed implants in acceptable position
 - ◆ Periprosthetic joint infection including acute hematogenous infection:
 - Individual is less than four (4) weeks from the index replacement procedure with well-fixed implants
 - ◆ Treatment of dislocation/instability (conversion to a liner with higher offset, larger head size, dual-mobility, constrained liner) and conversion of failed metal-on-metal (MoM) or ceramic-on-ceramic (CoC) bearing surface to metal-on-polyethylene (MoP) or ceramic-on-polyethylene (CoP) bearing surface
- **Isolated head and polyethylene liner exchange (IPE)** is considered **not medically necessary** for any other indication or condition.
- Revision of Hip Replacement is considered not medically necessary for any other indication or condition.
- Refer to **MS-16: Post-Operative Joint Replacement Surgery** and **MS-24: Hip** for advanced imaging indications following hip replacement surgery.

Salvage Procedures

- **Salvage procedures** (e.g., Girdlestone acetabuloplasty, hip joint arthrodesis) may be considered **medically necessary** as a surgical alternative in certain patients for whom primary hip replacement or revision of hip replacement is not a reasonable surgical option including **ANY** of the following:
 - ◆ Chronic infection, osteomyelitis, or persistent periprosthetic infection
 - ◆ Pre-existing ambulatory dysfunction or non-ambulatory patient
 - ◆ Presence of co-morbidities or diseases which would preclude the performance of a successful hip replacement
 - ◆ Inadequate bone stock (e.g., severe osteoporosis or following tumor resection when there is insufficient bone remaining to support a joint replacement)
 - ◆ Recurrent instability/dislocation of the replaced hip
 - ◆ Aseptic loosening of the replaced hip with no other practical surgical options
 - ◆ Inability to pursue a successful reimplantation
- **Salvage procedures** are considered **not medically necessary** for any other indication or condition.

CMM-313.4: Procedure (CPT®)

This guideline relates to the CPT® code set below. Codes are displayed for informational purposes only.

Any given code's inclusion on this list does not necessarily indicate prior authorization is required.

CPT®	Code Description/Definition
27090	Removal of hip prosthesis; (separate procedure)
27091	Removal of hip prosthesis; complicated, including total hip prosthesis, methylmethacrylate with or without insertion of spacer
27122	Acetabuloplasty; resection, femoral head (e.g. Girdlestone procedure)
27125	Hemiarthroplasty, hip, partial (e.g. femoral stem prosthesis, bipolar Arthroplasty)
27130	Arthroplasty, acetabular and proximal femoral prosthetic replacement (total hip Arthroplasty), with or without autograft or allograft
27132	Conversion of previous hip surgery to total hip arthroplasty, with or without autograft or allograft
27134	Revision of total hip arthroplasty; both components, with or without autograft or allograft
27137	Revision of total hip Arthroplasty; acetabular component only, with or without autograft or allograft
27138	Revision of total hip Arthroplasty; femoral component only, with or without allograft
27284	Arthrodesis, hip joint (including obtaining graft);
27286	Arthrodesis, hip joint (including obtaining graft);with subtrochanteric osteotomy
HCPCS S2118	Metal-on-metal total hip resurfacing, including acetabular and femoral components

This list may not be all inclusive and is not intended to be used for coding/billing purposes. The final determination of reimbursement for services is the decision of the health plan and is based on the individual's policy or benefit entitlement structure as well as claims processing rules.

CMM-313.5: References

1. Adhikary SD, Liu W, Memtsoudis SG, et al. Body Mass Index More Than 45 kg/m² as a Cutoff Point Is Associated With Dramatically Increased Postoperative Complications in Total Knee Arthroplasty and Total Hip Arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2016;31:749-753.
2. Adili A, Trousdale R. Femoral head resurfacing for the treatment of osteonecrosis in the young patient. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2003 Dec;(417):93-101.
3. Allison C. Minimally invasive hip resurfacing. *Issues Emerg Health Technol*. 2005;(65):1-4.
4. Alvi HM, Mednick RE, Krishnan V, et al. The Effect of BMI on 30 Day Outcomes Following Total Joint Arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2015;30:1113-1117.
5. Amstutz H, Ball S, Le Duff M, Dorey F. Resurfacing THA for Patients Younger Than 50 Years: Results of 2- to 9-year Follow-up. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2007 Jul;460:159-64.
6. Amstutz H, Su E, Le Duff M. Surface arthroplasty in young patients with hip arthritis secondary to childhood disorders. *Orthop Clin North Am*. 2005 Apr;36(2):223-30.
7. Andrew J, Palan J, Kurup H, et al. Obesity in total hip replacement. *Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - British Volume*. 90(4):424-9, 2008 Apr.
8. Back D, Dalziel R, Young D, Shimmin A. Early results of primary Birmingham hip resurfacings. An independent prospective study of the first 230 hips. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2005 Mar;87(3):324-9.
9. Basu I, Howes M, Jowett C, et al. Girdlestones excision arthroplasty: Current update. *International Journal of Surgery*. 2011; 9(4):310-313.
10. Beaulé P, Antoniadou J. Patient selection and surgical technique for surface arthroplasty of the hip. *Orthop Clin North Am*. 2005 Apr;36(2):177-85, viii-ix
11. Beaulé PE, Matta JM, Mast JW. Hip arthrodesis: current indications and techniques. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2002; 10(4):249-58.
12. Beaulé P, Schmalzried T, Campbell P, et al. Duration of symptoms and outcome of hemiresurfacing for hip osteonecrosis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2001 Apr;(385):104-17.
13. [Bene N, Li X, Nandi S. Factors affecting failure of irrigation and debridement with liner exchange in total knee arthroplasty infection. *The Knee*. 2018;25:932-38. doi: 10.1016/j.knee.2018.07.003.](#)
- ~~13.~~14. Biring G, Masri B, Greidanus N, et al. Predictors of quality of life outcomes after revision total hip replacement. *Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - British Volume*. 89(11):1446-51, 2007 Nov.
- ~~14.~~15. Boraiah S, Ragsdale M, Achor T, et al. Open reduction internal fixation and primary total hip arthroplasty of selected acetabular fractures. *Journal of Orthopaedic Trauma*. 23(4):243-8, 2009 Apr.
- ~~15.~~16. Boyd H, Ulrich S, Seyler T, et al. Resurfacing for Perthes disease: an alternative to standard hip arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2007 Dec;465:80-5.
17. [Brooks PJ. Dislocation following total hip replacement. *Bone Joint J*. 2013;95-B\(10\):67-9. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.95B11.](#)
- ~~16.~~18. Busato A, Roder C, Herren S, Egli S. Influence of high BMI on functional outcome after total hip arthroplasty. *Obesity Surgery*. 18(5):595-600, 2008 May.
- ~~17.~~19. California Technology Assessment Forum (CTAF). Metal-on-metal total hip resurfacing as an alternative to total hip arthroplasty. A Technology Assessment. San Francisco, CA: CTAF; October 17, 2007.
20. [Chughtai M, Piuze NS, Khlopas A, et al. An evidence-based guide to the treatment of osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *Bone Joint J*. 2017;99-B\(10\):1267-79. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.99B10.](#)
21. [Cohen JS, Gu A, Lopez NS, et al. Efficacy of revision surgery for the treatment of stiffness after total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review. *The Journal of Arthroplasty*. 2018;33:3049-3055. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2018.04.036.](#)
- ~~18.~~22. Dumbleton J, Manley M. Metal-on-Metal total hip replacement: What does the literature say? *J Arthroplasty*. 2005;20(2):174-188.
- ~~19.~~23. Ferrara P, Rabini A, Aprile I, et al. Effect of pre-operative physiotherapy in patients with end-stage osteoarthritis undergoing hip arthroplasty. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 22(10-11):977-86, 2008 Oct-Nov.
- ~~20.~~24. Friedman RJ, Hess S, Berkowitz SD, et al. Complication Rates After Hip or Knee Arthroplasty in Morbidly Obese Patients. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2013;471:3358-3366.
- ~~24.~~25. Gaulton TG, Fleisher LA, Neuman MD. The association between obesity and disability in survivors of joint surgery: analysis of the health and retirement study. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2018;120(1):109-116.

- [22-26.](#) Girard J, Lavigne M, Vendittoli P, Roy A. Biomechanical reconstruction of the hip: a randomised study comparing total hip resurfacing and total hip arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2006 Jun;88(6):721-6.
- [23-27.](#) Gjertsen J, Lie S, Fevang J, et al. Total hip replacement after femoral neck fractures in elderly patients : results of 8,577 fractures reported to the Norwegian Arthroplasty Register. *Acta Orthopaedica.* 78(4):491-7, 2007 Aug.
- [24-28.](#) Grecula M. Resurfacing arthroplasty in osteonecrosis of the hip. *Orthop Clin North Am.* 2005 Apr;36(2):231-42.
- [25-29.](#) Grigoris P, Roberts P, Panousis K, Bosch H. The evolution of hip resurfacing arthroplasty. *Orthop Clin North Am.* 2005 Apr;36(2):125-34, vii.
- [26-30.](#) Hamel M, Toth M, Legedza A, Rosen M. Joint replacement surgery in elderly patients with severe osteoarthritis of the hip or knee: decision making, postoperative recovery, and clinical outcomes. *Archives of Internal Medicine.* 168(13):1430-40, 2008 Jul 14.
- [27-31.](#) Le Duff M, Amstutz H, Dorey F. Metal-on-metal hip resurfacing for obese patients. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2007 Dec;89(12):2705-11.
- [28-32.](#) Lubbeke A, Katz J, Perneger T, Hoffmeyer P. Primary and revision hip arthroplasty: 5-year outcomes and influence of age and comorbidity. *Journal of Rheumatology.* 34(2):394-400, 2007 Feb.
- [29-33.](#) Lubbeke A, Moons K, Garavaglia G, Hoffmeyer P. Outcomes of obese and nonobese patients undergoing revision total hip arthroplasty. *Arthritis & Rheumatism.* 59(5):738-45, 2008 May 15.
- [30-34.](#) Malhotra R, Kannan A, Kumar V, et al. Hip Resurfacing Arthroplasty in Inflammatory Arthritis: A 3- to 5-Year Follow-up Study. *J Arthroplasty.* 2012; 27(1):15-20.
- [31-35.](#) Marker D, Seyler T, Jinnah H, et al. Femoral neck fractures after metal-on-metal total hip resurfacing: a prospective cohort study. *J Arthroplasty.* 2007 Oct;22(7 Suppl 3):66-71.
- [32-36.](#) McLaughlin J, Lee K. The outcome of total hip replacement in obese and non-obese patients at 10- to 18-years. *Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - British Volume.* 88(10):1286-92, 2006 Oct.
- [33-37.](#) Mont M, Rajadhyaksha A, Hungerford D. Outcomes of limited femoral resurfacing arthroplasty compared with total hip arthroplasty for osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *J Arthroplasty.* 2001 Dec;16(8 Suppl 1):134-9.
- [34-38.](#) Mont M, Seyler T, Marker D, et al. Use of metal-on-metal total hip resurfacing for the treatment of osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2006 Nov;88 Suppl 3:90-7.
- [35-39.](#) Moroni A, Cadossi M, Bellenghi C, et al. Resurrection of hip resurfacing: what is the evidence? *Expert Rev Med Devices.* 2006 Nov;3(6):755-62.
- [36-40.](#) Morse KW, Su EP. Hip resurfacing arthroplasty for patients with inflammatory arthritis: a systematic review. *Hip Int.* 2017. DOI:10.5301/hipint.5000558
- [38-42.](#) Naal F, Schmied M, Munzinger U, et al. Outcome of hip resurfacing arthroplasty in patients with developmental hip dysplasia. *Clinical Orthopaedics & Related Research.* 467(6):1516-21, 2009 Jun.
- [39-43.](#) O'Brien S, Bennett D, Doran E, Beverland D. Comparison of hip and knee arthroplasty outcomes at early and intermediate follow-up. *Orthopedics.* 32(3):168, 2009 Mar.
- [40-44.](#) Parker M, Gurusamy K, Azegami S. Arthroplasties (with and without bone cement) for proximal femoral fractures in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2010, Issue 6. Art. No.: CD001706. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001706.pub4.
- [41-45.](#) Parker M, Gurusamy K. Internal fixation versus arthroplasty for intracapsular proximal femoral fractures in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2006;(4):CD001708.
- [42-46.](#) Parvizi J, Pour A, Keshavarzi N, et al. Revision total hip arthroplasty in octogenarians. A case-control study. *Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - American Volume.* 89(12):2612-8, 2007 Dec.
- [43-47.](#) Quintana J, Azkarate J, Goenaga J, et al. Evaluation of the appropriateness of the hip joint replacement techniques. *Intl J Tech Assess Health Care.* 2000;16(1):165-177.
- [44-48.](#) Revell M, McBryde C, Bhatnagar S, et al. Metal-on-metal hip resurfacing in osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2006 Nov;88 Suppl 3:98-103.
- [45-49.](#) Santaguida P, Hawker G, Hudak P, et al. Patient characteristics affecting the prognosis of total hip and knee joint arthroplasty: a systematic review. *Canadian Journal of Surgery.* 51(6):428-36, 2008 Dec.
- [50.](#) [Scheerlinck T, Dezillie M, Monsaert A, et al. Bipolar versus total hip arthroplasty in the treatment of avascular necrosis of the femoral head in young patients. *Hip International.* 2002;12\(2\):142-149.](#)
- [46-51.](#) Sermon A, Broos P, Vanderschot P. Total hip replacement for acetabular fractures. Results in 121 patients operated between 1983 and 2003. *Injury.* 39(8):914-21, 2008 Aug.

- ~~47~~.~~52~~. Sharma H, Dreghorn CR, Gardner ER. Girdlestone resection arthroplasty of the hip: Current perspectives. *Current Orthopaedics*. 2005; 19(5):385-392.
- ~~48~~.~~53~~. Shimmin A, Bare J, Back L. Complications associated with hip resurfacing arthroplasty. *Orthop Clin North Am*. 2005 Apr;36(2):187-93, ix.
- ~~49~~.~~54~~. Shimmin A, Beaulé PE, Campbell P. Metal-on-metal hip resurfacing arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*, 2008; 90(3): 637-654.
- ~~50~~.~~55~~. Steinberg M, Steinberg D. Classification systems for osteonecrosis: an overview. *Orthop Clin North Am*. 2004 Jul;35(3):273-83, vii-viii.
- ~~51~~.~~56~~. Stevenson C, Ogonda L, Blaney J, et al. Minimal Incision Total Hip Arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2017;99:1715-20.
- ~~52~~.~~57~~. Treacy R, McBryde C, Pynsent P. Birmingham hip resurfacing arthroplasty. A minimum follow-up of five years. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2005 Feb;87(2):167-70.
- ~~53~~.~~58~~. Walmsley DW, Waddell JP, Schemitsch EH. Isolated Head and Liner Exchange in Revision Hip Arthroplasty. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2017;25:288-296.
- ~~54~~.~~59~~. Ward DT, Metz LN, Horst PK, Kim HT, Kuo AC. Complications of morbid obesity in total joint arthroplasty: risk stratification based on BMI. *J Arthroplasty*. 2015 Sep;30(9)(Suppl):42-6. Epub 2015 Jun 3.
- ~~55~~.~~60~~. Watson D, Bostrom M, Salvati E. et al. Primary total hip arthroplasty for displaced femoral neck fracture. *Orthopedics*. 31(10), 2008 Oct.
- ~~56~~.~~61~~. Wylde V, Blom A, Whitehouse S. et al. Patient-reported outcomes after total hip and knee arthroplasty: comparison of midterm results. *Journal of Arthroplasty*. 24(2):210-6, 2009 Feb.
- ~~57~~.~~62~~. Zusmanovich M, Kester BS, Schwarzkopf R. Postoperative Complications of Total Joint Arthroplasty in Obese Patients Stratified by BMI. *J Arthroplasty*. 2018;33:856-864.