# A comparative study of in-vivo wear between 28mm and 40mm metal heads with highly crosslinked (X3) acetabular polyethylene inserts in the hemispherical Trident cup.

Published: 07-10-2008 Last updated: 07-05-2024

This study investigates if there are differences in function and wear between total hip arthroplasty with standard or large diameter femoral heads.

**Ethical review** Approved WMO **Status** Recruitment stopped

**Health condition type** Bone and joint therapeutic procedures

**Study type** Observational non invasive

## **Summary**

#### ID

NL-OMON31891

#### Source

ToetsingOnline

#### **Brief title**

Large vs small femoral heads.

## **Condition**

Bone and joint therapeutic procedures

## **Synonym**

Hip arthrosis

## **Research involving**

Human

## **Sponsors and support**

**Primary sponsor:** Stryker Howmedica

Source(s) of monetary or material Support: Stryker SA

## Intervention

**Keyword:** function, head diameter, total hip arthroplasty, wear

#### **Outcome measures**

#### **Primary outcome**

Clinical outcome with focus on function using standard questionnaires and a motion analysis measuring simple movements of daily living (e.g. gait).

Wear as femoral head penetration measured on conventional radiographs taken as part of the clinical procedure anyway.

## **Secondary outcome**

n.a.

# **Study description**

## **Background summary**

In total hip arthroplasty (THR) a metal femoral head runs in a polyethylene (PE) insert. Crosslinked PE has been proven to significantly reduce wear in-vivo. New generations of highly crosslinked PE (e.g. Stryker X3) have shown to reduce wear by >95% in simulator studies even independent femoral head diameter. Clinical studies have shown no measurable wear at 2 years.

Femoral heads with diameters larger than the standard size (28mm) restore more closely the natural anatomy and thus promise to reduce the luxation risk and in theory to improve post-op function or accelerate recovery.

## Study objective

This study investigates if there are differences in function and wear between total hip arthroplasty with standard or large diameter femoral heads.

## Study design

Multi-center prospective randomised comparison between patients receiving primary uncemented total hip arthroplasty either with a standard diameter or a large diameter metal femoral head. Randomization is performed using a designated computer software to assign patients to the study group (large heads) and control group (small, standard heads).

#### Intervention

n.a.

## Study burden and risks

There is no known risk associated with study participation due to intervention as patients receive primary THR at state-of-the-art quality anyway. There is no known risk associated with study participation due to measurements as the motion analysis only measures movements of daily living which are assessed by the doctor and physiotherapists as part of clinical follow-up anyway (e.g. gait). Wear measurement is performed on radiographs taken as part of clinical routine anyway.

Large diameter femoral heads promise benefits which require the clinical investigation as in this study.

## **Contacts**

## **Public**

Stryker Howmedica

Cite-Centre Grand-Rue 92, P.O. Box 1568 Montreux

CH

#### Scientific

Stryker Howmedica

Cite-Centre Grand-Rue 92, P.O. Box 1568 Montreux CH

## **Trial sites**

## **Listed location countries**

**Netherlands** 

# **Eligibility criteria**

## Age

Adults (18-64 years) Elderly (65 years and older)

## Inclusion criteria

Patients indicated for uncemented primary total hip arthroplasty

## **Exclusion criteria**

Patients who had a total hip arthroplasty on the contra-lateral side within the last year.

# Study design

## Design

Study type: Observational non invasive

Intervention model: Parallel

Allocation: Randomized controlled trial

Masking: Single blinded (masking used)

Control: Active

Primary purpose: Treatment

## Recruitment

NL

Recruitment status: Recruitment stopped

Start date (anticipated): 10-11-2010

Enrollment: 40

Type: Actual

# **Ethics review**

Approved WMO

Date: 07-10-2008

Application type: First submission

Review commission: METC Z: Zuyderland-Zuyd (Heerlen)

# **Study registrations**

## Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

## Other (possibly less up-to-date) registrations in this register

No registrations found.

## In other registers

Register ID

CCMO NL22378.096.08