# Lower Risk of Revision with 36 mm Femoral Heads Compared with 28 mm or $\mathbf{3 2 m m}$ in Primary 

 Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Comparative Single-Centre Study (10,371 Hips)Hosam Matar ${ }^{1}$, Benjamin Bloch², Reshid Berber, Peter John James, Andrew Manktelow
${ }^{1}$ Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, ${ }^{2}$ Nottingham University Hospitals
INTRODUCTION:
we aimed to compare the clinical outcomes of $28 \mathrm{~mm}, 32 \mathrm{~mm}$ and 36 mm heads in primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) at long-term follow up.
METHODS:
retrospective consecutive single-institution study of primary THA (2003-2019). Demographic and surgical data were collected. The primary outcome measure was 'any cause revision'. Differences in patients' characteristics were assessed using the Pearson-chi-square test for categorical variables and ANOVA for continuous variables; Kaplan-
Meier survival curves to estimate time to revision.
RESULTS:
10,371 primary THAs were included [ $3,464 \mathrm{hips} / 28 \mathrm{~mm}$ heads ( $33.40 \%$ ), $4,932 \mathrm{hips} / 32 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( $47.55 \%$ ); 1,975 hips $36 \mathrm{~mm}(19.05 \%)$ ]. Median age 70 years with $\sim 61 \%$ females., a posterior approach performed in $71.65 \%$. Overall rate of revision was $1.69 \%$ with the lowest rate recorded for the 36 mm group ( $2.56 \%$ vs. $1.31 \%$ vs. $1.16 \%$ ), this difference was statistically significant ( $\mathrm{P}<0.00001$ ). Implant survivorship at 17 -years was $97.3 \%$ for $28 \mathrm{~mm}, 98.7 \%$ for 32 mm and $98.8 \%$ for 36 mm hips ( $\mathrm{P}<0.005$ Log-Rank test). There were no differences in the rates of infection, periprosthetic fractures or other indications for revision. However, there was a statistically significant difference in rate of revision due to dislocation in favour of 36 mm group ( $0.92 \%$ vs. $0.44 \%$ vs. $0.15 \% ; \mathrm{P}<0.0004$ ).
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:
we found a significantly reduced risk of revision for all causes, but particularly revision for dislocation with 36 mm heads. There was no significant difference between 32 mm and 36 mm . We have not demonstrated any clinical concerns or additional revisions for aseptic loosening, polyethylene wear or taper corrosion with 36 mm heads at up to 17 years' follow up.
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