



# Clinical accuracy and precision of hip resurfacing arthroplasty using computed tomography-based navigation

Ryuichi Sato<sup>1,2</sup> · Masaki Takao<sup>1,3</sup> · Hidetoshi Hamada<sup>3</sup> · Takashi Sakai<sup>3</sup> · Keishi Marumo<sup>2</sup> · Nobuhiko Sugano<sup>1,3</sup>

Received: 11 June 2018 / Accepted: 13 August 2018 / Published online: 22 August 2018  
© SICOT aisbl 2018

## Abstract

**Purpose** To avoid malalignment of components during hip resurfacing arthroplasty (HRA), we used a computed tomography (CT)-based navigation system for guidance. This study aimed to evaluate the clinical accuracy and precision of HRA performed using the CT-based navigation systems.

**Methods** HRA was performed on 17 hips guided by the CT-based navigation systems. We measured cup alignment deviation, deviation of the stem position, and alignment from the plan by image matching between pre-operative and post-operative CT images.

**Results** Cup anteversion was within 5° of that in the plan in all cases. Cup inclination was within 5° of that in the plan in 82.4% and within 10° in all cases. The angular difference of the stem was within 5° in all cases, and the entry point of the stem was within 4 mm in all cases.

**Conclusion** The CT-based navigation system for HRA guided accurate component placement according to the plan.

**Keywords** Hip resurfacing arthroplasty · Computed tomography · Navigation · Computer-assisted orthopaedic surgery · Accuracy

## Introduction

Modern metal-on-metal hip resurfacing arthroplasty (HRA) is an alternative to total hip arthroplasty (THA) for highly active young patients with end-stage osteoarthritis [1]. Advantages of HRA are minimal bone resection, avoidance of stress shielding in the proximal femur, and a low dislocation rate. In addition, higher post-operative activity is enabled, and HRA allows easier revision surgery, if necessary [2–6]. HRA, however, requires high surgical skill, and the surgeon must have sufficient experience because malpositioning the acetabular and femoral components causes serious post-operative complications, including femoral neck fracture, femoral component loosening, and excessive wear of the bearing surface, which in

turn causes an elevated metal ion concentration and an adverse reaction to metal debris (ARMD) [4, 5, 7].

Computer-assisted tools, including navigation, patient-specific guides, and robotic systems, have been reported as useful for eliminating component malpositioning during HRA [4, 8, 9]. Among these aids, computed tomography (CT)-based computer-assisted systems are supposed to be more accurate than imageless navigation, and the size of the components needed can be determined pre-operatively. CT-based pre-operative planning is particularly useful in complex, post-trauma deformity cases or those with osteonecrosis or developmental dysplasia of the hip [10, 11]. Therefore, we introduced the use of CT-based navigation during HRA for more precise execution of an optimised plan. The purpose of the current study was to assess the clinical accuracy and precision of component placement during HRA using CT-based navigation systems.

✉ Nobuhiko Sugano  
n-sugano@umin.net

<sup>1</sup> Department of Orthopaedic Medical Engineering, Osaka University Graduate School of Medicine, 2-2, Yamadaoka, Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

<sup>2</sup> Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, The Jikei University School of Medicine, 3-25-8, Nishishimbashi, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-8461, Japan

<sup>3</sup> Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Osaka University Graduate School of Medicine, 2-2, Yamadaoka, Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

## Materials and methods

### Patients

From January 2011 to January 2017, we performed HRA on 20 hips using two types of CT-based navigation. The objects of this study were 17 hips in 16 patients [12 male patients (13

hips) and four female patients (4 hips)] who had consented to undergo pre-operative and post-operative CT scanning. The pre-operative diagnoses were osteoarthritis in 14 hips and osteonecrosis of the femoral head in three hips.

A standard THA CT-based navigation system (CT-based Hip Navigation System; Stryker, Kalamazoo, MI, USA) was used for acetabular cup placement. A versatile CT-based navigation system (Orthomap 3D; Stryker, Kalamazoo, MI, USA) was used for guidewire insertion of the femoral component. ADEPT® Hip Resurfacing System (Finsbury Orthopaedics, Leatherhead, UK) was used in nine hips and BHR System (Birmingham Hip Resurfacing System; Smith & Nephew, Memphis, TN, USA) in 8 hips. The mean follow-up period was 49.6 months (range 16–83 months).

### Pre-operative plan

For pre-operative planning of the acetabular component, the targeted alignments were  $40^\circ$  in radiographic inclination and  $15^\circ$  in radiographic anteversion [1], relative to the functional pelvic coordinate system with patient-specific pelvic sagittal inclination in the supine position [10, 12, 13].

For pre-operative planning of the femoral components, the alignment of the femoral component stem was set to be parallel with the medial cortex of the femoral neck in the coronal oblique view through the femoral neck axis and parallel to the femoral neck axis in the sagittal oblique view through the femoral stem axis (Fig. 1). The femoral component position was set so its distal edge of the articular surface came to the femoral head–neck junction.

### Surgical technique

All HRAs were performed by surgeons with experience of more than 100 THAs using standard CT-based navigation, via the posterolateral approach, and with the patient in the lateral position. A pelvic navigation tracker with light-emitting diodes was fixed on the ipsilateral iliac crest. Surface registration of the computer pelvis model and real bone was completed by taking 30 points on the surface of the ilium and ischium [14]. We performed line-to-line reaming or 1-mm under-reaming with a navigated acetabular reamer according to the stiffness of the acetabular bone. Finally, the acetabular cup was implanted, aiming for  $40^\circ$  radiographic




**Fig. 1** Pre-operative planning for femoral component placement was performed using the planning module of the computed tomography (CT)-based navigation system

inclination and  $15^\circ$  radiographic anteversion as viewed on the navigation monitor.

On the femoral side, a tracker with light-emitting diodes was secured to the lateral aspect of the greater trochanter. Surface registration of the femur was then performed by taking 30 points on the surface of the proximal femur [14]. A guidewire was inserted into the femoral head using a navigated drilling sleeve (Fig. 2) [15]. The femur was cylindrically reamed and shaped around the guidewire. After this femoral head preparation, all fragile tissues, including cysts, areas of granulation, and necrotic bones, were removed. Anchoring holes were made over the normal bone in the dome and chamfer areas. Finally, the femoral component was fixed to the femoral head with cement (Surgical Simplex; Stryker, Kalamazoo, MI, USA). During insertion of the femoral component, bone marrow fluid was suctioned via a cannula placed in the lesser trochanter to prevent elevation of the intraosseous pressure and mixture of blood with cement [16].

## Analysis

Using post-operative CT images, we measured cup inclination and anteversion, the deviation of cup alignment from that of



**Fig. 2** **a** Position and direction of a guidewire sleeve are shown on the navigation monitor in real time. **b** The guidewire is inserted from the femoral head surface using the navigated guidewire


the plan, the stem–shaft angle (SSA), stem inclination and version relative to the femoral neck axis, deviation of the stem entry point, and deviation of alignment from the plan. We also looked for the presence of femoral neck notching.

The planning module of the standard THA navigation system was used for measuring cup alignment. The reference pelvic coordinate system of post-operative CT was matched with that of pre-operative CT using the landmark-based matching method previously reported [12, 17, 18]. Cup inclination and anteversion were measured by overlapping the cup model on the implanted cup on the post-operative CT data (Fig. 3) [13]. Any deviations in cup inclination and anteversion from the target were calculated.

The planning module of the versatile CT-based navigation system was used to measure femoral component alignment. The femoral neck coordinate system was created on pre-operative CT images as follows. The centre of the femoral head was defined by fitting a sphere to the normal subchondral bone of the femoral head. The centre of the femoral neck was defined by fitting a sphere to the anteroposterior and superoinferior inner cortexes of the femoral neck at its isthmus. The femoral neck axis was defined as the line passing through the centres of the femoral head and neck. The plane consisting of the femoral neck axis and the centre of the femoral medullary canal 15 cm distal from the tip of the greater trochanter represented the oblique coronal plane of the femoral neck (Fig. 4a). The plane perpendicular to the oblique coronal plane through the neck axis represented the oblique sagittal plane of the femoral neck (Fig. 4b) [19]. The reference femoral coordinate system of the post-operative CT data was matched with that of the pre-operative CT data using the volume registration method previously reported [20].

The proximal femoral bone axis was defined as the line between the centre of the canal at the lesser trochanter and the centre of the femoral medullary canal 15 cm distal from the tip of the greater trochanter [19]. The neck–shaft angle (NSA) was defined as the projected angle between the femoral neck axis and the proximal femoral bone axis in the oblique coronal plane. The stem–shaft angle (SSA) was defined as the projected angle between the stem–shaft axis and the proximal femoral bone axis in the oblique coronal plane. Stem inclination was calculated by subtracting NSA from SSA. We defined the femoral components as valgus or varus when SSA was  $5^\circ$  greater or less than NSA [19]. The stem version was defined as the projected angle between the femoral component axis and the femoral neck axis in the oblique sagittal plane. The angular difference between the pre-operative plan and the stem alignment was measured by projecting the stem axis and the neck axis in both the oblique coronal and oblique sagittal planes, respectively (Fig. 5). The deviation between the planned and actual inserted stem entry point was measured with the original coordinate system of versatile CT-based navigation. The

**Fig. 3** A cup computational model was overlapped on the post-operative CT data to assess the accuracy of cup placement using post-operative CT data. The pelvic reference coordinate was matched with the pre-operative pelvic coordinate using the landmark-matching method



presence of femoral neck notching was sought along the femoral neck axis in the radial reconstructed view.

## Results


The mean cup anteversion was  $16.1^\circ \pm 2.8^\circ$ , and the mean cup inclination was  $37.7^\circ \pm 3.0^\circ$ . The mean deviation of cup anteversion was  $1.1^\circ \pm 2.8^\circ$ , and that of cup inclination was  $-2.3^\circ \pm 3.0^\circ$ . The cup anteversion was within  $5^\circ$  of that in the plan in all cases. The cup inclination was within  $5^\circ$  of that in the plan in 14 of 17 cases (82.4%), and it was within  $10^\circ$  in all cases.

The mean stem inclination of the femoral component was  $4.5^\circ \pm 3.0^\circ$  relative to the neck axis, and the mean stem version was  $7.2^\circ \pm 4.9^\circ$ . There was no case of varus placement of the femoral component relative to the neck axis. There was no femoral neck notching. The mean angular differences between the femoral stem and the pre-operatively planned alignment were  $0.8^\circ \pm 1.9^\circ$  on the oblique coronal plane and  $0.3^\circ \pm 2.5^\circ$  on the oblique sagittal plane. The angular difference in the stem was within  $5^\circ$  of that in the plan in all cases on both

planes. The deviations between that of the plan and the actual inserted stem entry point were 4 mm on both the oblique coronal and oblique sagittal planes. During the follow-up period, no case exhibited femoral neck fracture, femoral component aseptic loosening, or ARMD (Table 1).

## Discussion


HRA is a technically demanding procedure because malalignment of femoral components causes serious post-operative complications. To avoid malalignment, we introduced CT-based navigation systems to HRA. Although some clinical reports suggested that imageless navigation could improve the accuracy of femoral component placement during HRA [9, 21, 22] (Table 2), we found no clinical reports on the accuracy or precision of femoral component placement during HRA using the CT-based navigation system. The current study showed that this system enabled us to place the femoral components accurately and precisely according to the pre-operative CT-based plans. There have been several reports of cup placement in THA or revision THA using navigation systems including



**Fig. 4** Femoral neck axis (purple lines) was defined as the line between the centre of the femoral head (#1) and the centre of the femoral neck (#2). **a** Oblique coronal plane of the femoral neck was defined as the plane consisting of the femoral neck axis and the centre of the femoral medullary canal 15 cm distal from the tip of the greater trochanter (#3). **b** Oblique sagittal plane of the femoral neck was defined as the plane perpendicular to the oblique coronal plane through the femoral neck axis

CT-based navigation and imageless navigation [12, 13, 17, 18, 23–25]. Some studies have reported good accuracy of cup alignment during THA or revision THA using the same CT-based navigation of the current study [12, 13, 17, 18] (Table 3). The current study showed that the CT-based navigation system could provide accurate, precise cup alignment during HRA that was as good as that achieved with standard THA.

It is necessary to match pre-operative and post-operative CT data to assess the accuracy and precision of osteotomy or implant placement using CT-based navigation. In a study of pelvic osteotomy, the position of the pelvis on the pre-operative and post-operative CT images was matched using a volume-matching method [26]. In our study of HRA, the position of



**Fig. 5** To measure the deviation of the femoral component alignment and position from those of the plan, the preoperative CT-based plan of the femoral component (pink model) was superimposed on the post-operative CT by image volume registration between the pre-operative and post-operative CT images. **a** Oblique coronal plane. **b** Oblique sagittal plane

**Table 1** Radiologic outcomes

Parameters	Value
Neck–shaft angle (NSA) (°)	129.4 ± 4.9 (120.6 to 137.3)
Stem–shaft angle (SSA) (°)	136.1 ± 4.0 (125.4 to 142.6)
Stem inclination (°)	6.8 ± 5.1 (0.4 to 16.7)
Stem version (°)	3.8 ± 4.3 (− 1.8 to 12.0)
Deviation of the stem entry point (mm)	
Oblique coronal plane	0.6 ± 1.9 (− 3.4 to 3.4)
Oblique sagittal plane	0.2 ± 2.2 (− 3.9 to 3.8)
Angular difference in stem alignment (°)	
Oblique coronal plane	1.3 ± 1.6 (− 3.4 to 3.0)
Oblique sagittal plane	1.9 ± 2.1 (− 3.4 to 4.5)
Cup anteversion (°)	16.1 ± 2.8 (10.0 to 19.9)
Cup inclination (°)	37.7 ± 3.0 (31.9 to 42.7)
Deviation of cup anteversion (°)	1.1 ± 2.8 (− 5.0 to 4.9)
Deviation of cup inclination (°)	− 2.3 ± 3.0 (− 8.1 to 3.0)

Data are presented as means and standard deviations (ranges)

the pelvis on the pre-operative and post-operative CT images was matched using a landmark-based matching method [12, 17]. Kyo et al. compared the accuracy of the navigation evaluated using the landmark-based matching method versus that assessed using computational volume registration. They reported that the navigation accuracy of cup placement using a landmark method was similar to that using a volume registration method [27]. Kyo et al. reported that the accuracy of the measurement of stem alignment during THA was worse using a landmark-based matching method than when using a volume-matching method [27]. We used a volume-matching method for the postoperative measurement of stem alignment and position.

It has been reported that acetabular orientation was critical during HRA to avoid excessive wear due to impingement or edge loading [15]. Steep cup alignment can increase the risk of edge loading and impingement, which could cause ARMD [15]. Grammatopoulos et al. recommended that radiographic orientation of the acetabular component should be  $45^\circ \pm 10^\circ$  in inclination and  $20^\circ \pm 10^\circ$  in anteversion to reduce the risk of a pseudotumour developing [15]. McMinn et al. recommended cup inclination of  $40^\circ$  to prevent edge loading [1]. Pre-operatively, we planned for  $40^\circ$  cup inclination and  $15^\circ$  cup anteversion as the optimal alignment. Post-operatively, we achieved a mean cup inclination of  $37.7^\circ \pm 3.0^\circ$  and mean cup anteversion of  $16.1^\circ \pm 2.8^\circ$ . In 14 of 17 cases, the cup inclination was within  $5^\circ$  of the planned inclination. In the remaining three cases, it was in the range of  $30$ – $35^\circ$ . Hence, we avoided steep cup inclination, presumably decreasing the risk of ARMD. In fact, there were no cases of ARMD during the follow-up period (maximum 7.8 years). Cup anteversion was within  $5^\circ$  of the operative plan in all cases. We therefore believe that the acetabular cup could be placed with an acceptable range in all cases.

**Table 2** Clinical studies on evaluation of stem placement in HRA using navigation systems

Study	No. of patients (hips)	Type of navigation	Method				Accuracy			
			Preop. plan	Postop. data	Image matching method	Referenced coordinate system	Stem inclination (°)	Stem version (°)	Entry point error (mm)	
Olsen et al. (2009) [9]	94 (100)	Imageless	Analog 2D template	Plain radiography	None	Radiographic plane	2.8	–	–	
Resubal (2009) [21]	45 (45)	Imageless	Analog 2D template	Plain radiography	None	Radiographic plane	1.4 ± 1.5	–0.4 ± 1.5	–	
Ganapathi (2009) [22]	51 hips	Imageless	Analog 2D template	Plain radiography	None	Radiographic plane	1.3 ± 0.9	–	–	
Current study	16 (17)	CT-based	CT-based 3D template	CT	Volume matching	Femoral neck oblique plane	1.3 ± 1.6	1.9 ± 2.1	Oblique coronal plane: 0.6 ± 1.9 Oblique sagittal plane: 0.2 ± 2.2	

Data are presented as means with standard deviation or numbers. *HRA*, hip resurfacing arthroplasty; *Preop.*, pre-operative; *Postop.*, post-operative

**Table 3** Clinical studies on the accuracy of cup alignment using CT-based navigation

Study	No. of patients (hips)	Operation	Accuracy evaluation method				Accuracy		
			Planning image	Postop. data	Postop. analysis software	Image matching method	Referenced coordinate system	Cup inclination (°)	Cup anteversion (°)
Kitada et al. (2011) [12]	25 (30)	THA	CT	CT	CT-based hip navigation systems (Stryker) 3D viewer software (Virtual Place)	Landmark-based matching	Functional pelvic plane	– 1.5 ± 3.5	1.4 ± 5.6
Iwana et al. (2013) [13]	103 (103)	THA	CT	CT	3D viewer software (Virtual Place)	Volume matching	Functional pelvic plane	1.5 ± 1.5	1.3 ± 1.2
Nakamura et al. (2013) [17]	29 (30)	Revision THA	CT	CT	CT-based hip navigation systems (Stryker)	Landmark-based matching	Functional pelvic plane	– 1.5 ± 3.0	1.4 ± 6.0
Kuroda et al. (2014) [18]	29 (30)	Revision THA	CT	CT	CT-based hip navigation systems (Stryker)	Landmark-based matching	Functional pelvic plane	2.6 ± 1.8	2.2 ± 2.2
Current study	16 (17)	HRA	CT	CT	CT-based hip navigation systems (Stryker)	Landmark-based matching	Functional pelvic plane	– 2.3 ± 3.0	1.1 ± 2.8

Data are presented as means with standard deviation or numbers. *THA*, total hip arthroplasty; *HRA*, hip resurfacing arthroplasty; *Preop.*, preoperative; *Postop.*, postoperative

It has been reported that stem malpositioning causes femoral neck fracture and stem loosening [4, 5, 7]. Excessive valgus positioning and positional errors during guidewire insertion could cause notching of the superior portion of the femoral neck. In turn, notching could expose patients to the risk of femoral neck fracture [4, 5]. In this study, the positional error of the guidewire was within 4 mm, and the alignment deviation from that of the plan was within 3° in the coronal oblique plan, resulting in no femoral neck notching.

It has also been reported that varus positioning could increase the risk of post-operative femoral neck fracture in the case of NSA < 130° [7]. Varus placement of the femoral component causes early aseptic loosening [7]. The optimal range for stem alignment has not been clarified [7, 28]. In the current study, we aimed for stem alignment that was parallel to the medial cortex in the oblique coronal plane and to the neck axis in the oblique sagittal plane. We thereby avoided varus placement, resulting in no femoral loosening or femoral neck fracture.

There are several limitations in this study. First, the number of patients in whom we tested the CT-based navigation system during HRA was small. Second, the follow-up period was short. Whereas femoral neck fracture is reported to occur frequently within one year after surgery [28], ARMD and stem loosening are considered to occur during a longer follow-up. Langton et al. reported that pseudotumours associated with ARMD were found during ten year follow-up periods after metal-on-metal HRA [29]. Hence, we believe that further follow-up is necessary to clarify whether the use of the CT-based navigation lowers the risk of ARMD and stem loosening. Third, there was no control group in whom HRA was performed without CT-based navigation.

## Conclusion

The CT-based navigation system for HRA showed accurate component placement according to the pre-operative plan, with a mean deviation of  $1.1^\circ \pm 2.8^\circ$  cup anteversion and  $-2.3^\circ \pm 3.0^\circ$  cup inclination. Also, the mean stem angular deviation was  $0.8^\circ \pm 1.9^\circ$  in the oblique coronal plane and  $0.3^\circ \pm 2.5^\circ$  in the oblique sagittal plane.

**Acknowledgments** We thank Prof. Hideki Yoshikawa from Osaka University for his advice and criticism.

## Compliance with ethical standards

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

**Ethical approval** All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

**Informed consent** Formal consent is not required for this type of retrospective cohort study.

## References

- McMinn DJ, Daniel J, Ziaee H, Pradhan C (2011) Indications and results of hip resurfacing. *Int Orthop* 35(2):231–237. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-010-1148-8>
- Kishida Y, Sugano N, Nishii T, Miki H, Yamaguchi K, Yoshikawa H (2004) Preservation of the bone mineral density of the femur after surface replacement of the hip. *J Bone Joint Surg* 86-B:185–189. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.86B2>
- Uemura K, Takao M, Hamada H, Sakai T, Ohzono K, Sugano N (2017) Long-term results of Birmingham hip resurfacing arthroplasty in Asian patients. *J Artif Organs*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10047-017-0981-6>
- Cobb JP, Kannan V, Dandachli W, Iranpour F, Brust KU, Hart AJ (2008) Learning how to resurface cam-type femoral heads with acceptable accuracy and precision: the role of computed tomography-based navigation. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 90(Suppl 3):57–64. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.H.00606>
- Kohan L, Field CJ, Kerr DR (2012) Early complications of hip resurfacing. *J Arthroplast* 27(6):997–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2012.01.030>
- Abe H, Sakai T, Nishii T, Takao M, Nakamura N, Sugano N (2014) Jogging after total hip arthroplasty. *Am J Sports Med* 42(1):131–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546513506866>
- Beaulé PE, Lee JL, Le Duff MJ, Amstutz HC, Ebramzadeh E (2004) Orientation of the femoral component in surface arthroplasty of the hip. A biomechanical and clinical analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg* 86-A(9):2015–2021
- Kitada M, Sakai T, Murase T, Hanada T, Nakamura N, Sugano N (2013) Validation of the femoral component placement during hip resurfacing: a comparison between the conventional jig, patient-specific template, and CT-based navigation. *Int J Med Robot* 9(2):223–229. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rcs.1490>
- Olsen M, Davis ET, Waddell JP, Schemitsch EH (2009) Imageless computer navigation for placement of the femoral component in resurfacing arthroplasty of the hip. *J Bone Joint Surg (Br)* 91(B):310–315
- Sugano N, Ochi T, Noble PC, Kamaric E, Salama JK, Tullos HS (1998) The morphology of the femur in developmental dysplasia of the hip. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 80-B:711–719
- Noble PC, Kamaric E, Sugano N, Matsubara M, Harada Y, Ohzono K, Paravic V (2003) The three-dimensional shape of the dysplastic femur. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 417:27–40
- Kitada M, Nakamura N, Iwana D, Kakimoto A, Nishii T, Sugano N (2011) Evaluation of the accuracy of computed tomography-based navigation for femoral stem orientation and leg length discrepancy. *J Arthroplast* 26(5):674–679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2010.08.001>
- Iwana D, Nakamura N, Miki H, Kitada M, Hananouchi T, Sugano N (2013) Accuracy of angle and position of the cup using computed tomography-based navigation systems in total hip arthroplasty. *Comput Aided Surg* 18(5–6):187–194. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10929088.2013.818713>
- Sugano N, Sasama T, Sato Y, Nakajima Y, Nishii T, Yonenobu K, Tamura S, Ochi T (2010) Accuracy evaluation of surface-based registration methods in a computer navigation system for hip surgery performed through a posterolateral approach. *Comput Aided Surg* 6(4):195–203. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10929080109146083>
- Grammatopoulos G, Pandit H, Glyn-Jones S, McLardy-Smith P, Gundle R, Whitwell D, Gill HS, Murray DW (2010) Optimal

- acetabular orientation for hip resurfacing. *J Bone Joint Surg* 92(B): 1072–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.92B8>
16. Hagio K, Sugano N, Takashina M, Nishii T, Yoshikawa H, Ochi T (2003) Embolic events during total hip arthroplasty: an echocardiographic study. *J Arthroplast* 18(2):186–192. <https://doi.org/10.1054/arth.2003.50027>
  17. Nakamura N, Nishii T, Kitada M, Iwana D, Sugano N (2013) Application of computed tomography-based navigation for revision total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplast* 28(10):1806–1810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2012.11.015>
  18. Kuroda K, Kabata T, Maeda T, Kajino Y, Watanabe S, Iwai S, Kenji F, Hasegawa K, Inoue D, Tsuchiya H (2014) The value of computed tomography based navigation in revision total hip arthroplasty. *Int Orthop* 38(4):711–716. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-013-2166-0>
  19. Nakasone S, Takao M, Sakai T, Nishii T, Sugano N (2013) Does the extent of osteonecrosis affect the survival of hip resurfacing? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 471(6):1926–1934. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-013-2833-x>
  20. Takao M, Nishii T, Sakai T, Yoshikawa H, Sugano N (2014) Iliosacral screw insertion using CT-3D-fluoroscopy matching navigation. *Injury* 45(6):988–994. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2014.01.015>
  21. Resubal JR, Morgan DA (2009) Computer-assisted vs conventional mechanical jig technique in hip resurfacing arthroplasty. *J Arthroplast* 24(3):341–350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2007.12.013>
  22. Ganapathi M, Vendittoli PA, Lavigne M, Gunther KP (2009) Femoral component positioning in hip resurfacing with and without navigation. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 467(5):1341–1347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-008-0299-z>
  23. Fukunishi S, Nishio S, Fujihara Y, Okahisa S, Takeda Y, Fukui T, Yoshiya S (2016) Accuracy of combined anteversion in image-free navigated total hip arthroplasty: stem-first or cup-first technique? *Int Orthop* 40(1):9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-015-2784-9>
  24. Woerner M, Weber M, Sendtner E, Springorum R, Worlicek M, Craiovan B, Grifka J, Renkawitz T (2017) Soft tissue restricts impingement-free mobility in total hip arthroplasty. *Int Orthop* 41(2):277–282. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-016-3216-1>
  25. Tsuda K, Haraguchi K, Koyanagi J, Takahashi S, Sugama R, Fujiwara K (2016) A forty millimetre head significantly improves range of motion compared with a twenty eight millimetre head in total hip arthroplasty using a computed tomography-based navigation system. *Int Orthop* 40(10):2031–2039. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-015-3095-x>
  26. Hayashi S, Hashimoto S, Matsumoto T, Takayama K, Shibanuma N, Ishida K, Nishida K, Kuroda R (2018) Computer-assisted surgery prevents complications during peri-acetabular osteotomy. *Int Orthop*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-018-3906-y>
  27. Kyo T, Nakahara I, Kuroda Y, Miki H (2015) Effects of coordinate-system construction methods on postoperative computed tomography evaluation of implant orientation after total hip arthroplasty. *Comput Aided Surg* 20(1):52–60. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10929088.2015.1076047>
  28. Shimmin AJ, Back D (2005) Femoral neck fractures following Birmingham hip resurfacing a national review of 50 cases. *J Bone Joint Surg* 87-B(3):463–464. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.87B4>
  29. Langton DJ, Joyce TJ, Jameson SS, Lord J, Orsouw MV, Holland JP, Nargol AVF, Smet KAD (2011) Adverse reaction to metal debris following hip resurfacing the influence of component type, orientation and volumetric wear. *J Bone Joint Surg* 93(B):164–171. <https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.93B2>