



Source details

Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal

Open Access ⓘ

Scopus coverage years: from 2015 to 2022

Publisher: Malaysian Orthopaedic Association

ISSN: 1985-2533 E-ISSN: 2232-111X

Subject area: Medicine: Emergency Medicine Medicine: Surgery Medicine: Orthopedics and Sports Medicine

Source type: Journal

CiteScore 2021

1.1 ⓘ

SJR 2021

0.243 ⓘ

SNIP 2021

0.607 ⓘ

[View all documents >](#)

[Set document alert](#)

[Save to source list](#) [Source Homepage](#)


[CiteScore](#) [CiteScore rank & trend](#) [Scopus content coverage](#)

[Export content for category](#)

CiteScore rank ⓘ 2021 In category: Emergency Medicine

☆	Rank	Source title	CiteScore 2021	Percentile
☆	#49	Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal	1.1	46th percentile
☆	#1	World Journal of Emergency Surgery	10.2	99th percentile
☆	#2	Resuscitation	8.5	98th percentile
☆	#3	Advances in Wound Care	7.9	97th percentile
☆	#4	Annals of Emergency Medicine	7.9	96th percentile
☆	#5	Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine	7.0	95th percentile
☆	#6	Shock	6.1	93rd percentile
☆	#7	Academic Emergency Medicine	5.6	92nd percentile
☆	#8	Internal and Emergency Medicine	5.3	91st percentile
☆	#9	Critical care and resuscitation : journal of the Australasian Academy of Critical Care Medicine.	5.2	90th percentile
☆	#10	Archives of Academic Emergency Medicine	4.8	89th percentile
☆	#11	European Journal of Trauma and Emergency Surgery	4.8	88th percentile
☆	#12	Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine	4.3	87th percentile

CiteScore trend



About Scopus

[What is Scopus](#)

[Content coverage](#)

[Scopus blog](#)

[Scopus API](#)

[Privacy matters](#)

Language

[日本語版を表示する](#)

[查看简体中文版本](#)

[查看繁體中文版本](#)

[Просмотр версии на русском языке](#)

Customer Service

[Help](#)

[Tutorials](#)

[Contact us](#)

ELSEVIER

[Terms and conditions](#) ↗ [Privacy policy](#) ↗

Copyright © Elsevier B.V. ↗. All rights reserved. Scopus® is a registered trademark of Elsevier B.V.

We use cookies to help provide and enhance our service and tailor content. By continuing, you agree to the use of cookies ↗.





Submit Your VMI Journal Paper

awi

Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal

COUNTRY

Malaysia

Universities and research
institutions in Malaysia**SUBJECT AREA AND CATEGORY**

Medicine

Emergency Medicine
Orthopedics and
Sports Medicine
Surgery**PUBLISHER**Malaysian Orthopaedic
Association**H-INDEX**

9

PUBLICATION TYPE

Journals

ISSN

19852533, 2232111X

COVERAGE

2015-2021

INFORMATION[Homepage](#)[How to publish in this
journal](#)morthoj@gmail.com**SCOPE**





The Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal is a peer-reviewed journal that publishes original papers and case reports three times a year in both printed and electronic version. The purpose of MOJ is to disseminate new knowledge and provide updates in Orthopaedics, trauma and musculoskeletal research. It is an Open Access journal that does not require processing fee or article processing charge from the authors. The Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal is the official journal of Malaysian Orthopaedic Association (MOA) and ASEAN Orthopaedic Association (AOA).


Join the conversation about this journal

Quartiles


FIND SIMILAR JOURNALS ?

Rank	Journal Name	Country	Similarity
1	Indian Journal of Orthopaedics	IND	76%
2	World Journal of Orthopedics	CHN	76%
3	JBJS Case Connector	USA	74%
4	Journal of Ortho Surgery and Res	GBR	73%






% International Collaboration





Citable documents

Non-citable documents



Cited documents

Uncited documents



Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal

Q3 Emergency Medicine
best quartile

SJR 2021 0.24

powered by scimagojr.com

← Show this widget in your own website

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

```
<a href="https://www.scimagojr.com" style="display: inline-block; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">

```

SCImago Graphica

Explore, visually communicate and make sense of data with our **new data visualization tool**.



Metrics based on Scopus® data as of April 2022

Leave a comment

Name

Email

(will not be published)

Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal (MOJ) Editorial Board

[Home \(index.php\)](#) / [Editorial](#)

f (<https://www.facebook.com/mojorthopaedic-journal-33>)



([sign-up-mailing-list.php](#))



(<http://www.crossref.org/crosscheck/index.html>)



(<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/>)



(<http://www.crossref.org/>)

Indexed by & Member of

- > Pubmed Central (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/>)
- > Pubmed (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>)
- > SCOPUS (<https://www.scopus.com/home.uri>)
- > Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI)
(<http://mjcl.clarivate.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jlresults.cgi?PC=EX>)
- > DOAJ (<https://doaj.org/>)
- > APAMED Central (<http://apamedcentral.org/>)
- > WPRIM (<http://www.wprim.org/>)
- > Asean Citation Index (<http://www.asean-cites.org/>)
- > Google Scholar (<https://scholar.google.com>)
- > Global Index Medicus
(<http://www.globalhealthlibrary.net/php/index.php>)
- > Index Copernicus (<https://journals.indexcopernicus.com/>)
- > MyAis (<http://www.my-ais.org/>)
- > MyCite (<http://www.mycite.my/>)
- > COPE (<http://publicationethics.org>)
- > WAME (<http://www.wame.org/>)
- > APAME (<http://www.wpro.who.int/entity/apame/about/en/>)
- > Council of Science Editors (<http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/>)
- > Malaysia Citation Centre (<http://mycc.my/>)

ISSN Print: 1985-2533
ISSN Electronic: 2232-111X



MOJ Editorial Board

Chief Editor

Saw Aik

Editorial Board

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--|
| 1 | Abdul Hamid Abdul Kadir | Assunta Hospital, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia |
| 2 | Abdul Nawfar Sadagatullah | Universiti Sains Malaysia, Kubang Kerian, Malaysia |
| 3 | Abdul Razak Sulaiman | Universiti Sains Malaysia, Kubang Kerian, Malaysia |
| 4 | Aree Tanavalee | Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand |
| 5 | Asep Santoso | Prof. DR. R. Soeharso Orthopaedic Hospital, Surakarta, Indonesia |
| 6 | Awang Bulgiba Awang Mahmud | University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia |
| 7 | Azlina Amir Abbas | University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia |
| 8 | Chris Chan Yin Wei | University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia |
| 9 | Edward H M Wang | University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines |
| 10 | Emmanuel Pantaleon Estrella | University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines |
| 11 | Francis Wong Keng Lin | Sengkang General Hospital, Singapore |
| 12 | Gregorio Marcelo S Azores | University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines |
| 13 | Ifran Saleh | University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia |
| 14 | Ismail Hadisoebroto Dilogo | University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia |

15	Jose Manuel Fernando Ignacio	University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines
16	Joyce Koh Suang Bee	Singapore General Hospital, Singapore
17	Kamarul Ariffin Khalid	International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia
18	Maung Mg Htwe	University of Medicine, Mandalay, Myanmar
19	Mohamed Razif Mohamed Ali	MAHSA University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
20	Mohd Imran Yusof	Universiti Sains Malaysia, Kubang Kerian, Malaysia
21	Nor Hazla Mohamed Hafiah	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
22	Nazri Mohd Yusof	International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia
23	Ng Kwan Hoong	University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
24	Shalimar Abdullah	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
25	Sharaf Ibrahim	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
26	Sharifah Roohi Syed Waseem Ahmad	Prince Court Medical Centre, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
27	Srijit Das	Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman
28	Tunku Sara Ahmad	University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
29	Vivek Ajit Singh	University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
30	Wan Faisham Nu'man Wan Ismail	Universiti Sains Malaysia, Kubang Kerian, Malaysia

Asean Regional Editorial Board

1	Howe Tet Sen	Singapore General Hospital, Singapore
2	James Hui	National University Health System, Singapore
3	Ketan C Pande	Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha Hospital, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei
4	Luthfi Gatam	University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia
5	Myint Thauung	University of Medicine, Yangon, Myanmar
6	Nathaniel Orillaza	University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines
7	Nguyen Le Bao Tien	Hanoi Medical University, Hanoi, Vietnam
8	Saranatra Waikakul	Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand
9	Vo Van Thanh	University of Pharmacy and Medicine, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

International Editorial Board

1	Aziz Nather	National University Health System, Singapore
2	Benjamin Joseph	Medcare Orthopaedics & Spine Hospital, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
3	Christopher Mow	Stanford University Medical Center, California, United States
4	Kaye E Wilkins	Christus Santa Rosa Children's Hospital, San Antonio, United States
5	Ken N Kuo	Shriners Hospitals for Children, Chicago, USA
6	Lee Eng Hin	National University Health System, Singapore
7	Wilfred Peh	Khoo Teck Puat Hospital, Singapore

Editorial Secretary

Ain Syuhada Kalip

Secretariat

Editorial Assistant

Nursyafeira Nabella Shofian

Administration Secretary

Uma Sundaram

MOJ Webmaster

Teng Kim Teng

Copy Editors

Chan Yoo Kuen

Gracie Ong Siok Yan

Loh Pui San

Nor'azim Mohd Yunus

Rafidah Atan

Ramani Vijayan Sannasi

Roshan Gunalan

Publisher

Malaysian Orthopaedic Association

Printer

Digital Perspective Sdn Bhd

Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal

Unit 2-6, Level 2, Enterprise 3B, Technology Park Malaysia (TPM),

Jalan Innovasi 1, Lebuhraya Puchong-Sg. Besi, 57000 Bukit Jalil,

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Tel: +603 8996 6300

Fax: +603 8996 6400

Email: morthoj@gmail.com (<mailto:morthoj@gmail.com>)

Website: <http://www.morthoj.org>

(<http://www.morthoj.org>)

About Us

The *Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal* is a peer-reviewed journal that is published three times a year in both print and electronic online version. The purpose of this journal is to publish original research studies, evaluation of current practices and case reports in various subspecialties of orthopaedics and traumatology, as well as associated fields like basic science, biomedical engineering, rehabilitation medicine and nursing.

MOJ Menu

- > About MOJ (</about-moj.php>)
- > About ASEAN Edition of MOJ (</about-ASEAN-edition-moj.php>)
- > Editorial Board (</editorial.php>)
- > Editorial Process (</editorial-process.php>)
- > Panel of Reviewers (</panel-reviewers.php>)
- > Links (</links.php>)

Quick Links

- > Manuscript Submission (<http://www.editorialmanager.com/moj/default.aspx>)
- > Reviewers Submission (<http://www.editorialmanager.com/moj/default.aspx>)
- > Instructions for Authors (</instructions-for-authors.php>)
- > Past Issues (</past-issues.php>)
- > Instructions for Advertisers (</instructions-for-advertisers.php>)
- > Search MOJ (</search.php>)

Keep in Touch

f (<https://www.facebook.com/journalofmalaysianorthopaedic-journal-335589108>)



(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>)

© 2023 Malaysian Orthopaedic Association (MOA). All Rights Reserved.

Designed By: Ejireh (<http://www.ejireh.net/>) Sitemap (</sitemap.php>) 

Current Issue – March 2021, Volume 15, Issue No. 1

Official Journal of Malaysian Orthopaedic Association and ASEAN Orthopaedic Association

[Home \(../index.php\)](#)

[Facebook](#) (<https://www.facebook.com/moajournal>) [Twitter](#) (<https://twitter.com/moajournal>) [LinkedIn](#) (<https://www.linkedin.com/company/malaysian-orthopaedic-journal-33>)



[\(../sign-up-mailing-list.php\)](#)



[\(http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/\)](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/)



<http://www.crossref.org/crosscheck/index.html>



<http://www.crossref.org/>

Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal - SCImago Journal Rank (<https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100823138&tip=sid&clean=0>)




<https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100823138&tip=sid&exact=no>

Indexed by & Member of

- > Pubmed Central (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/>)
- > Pubmed (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>)
- > SCOPUS (<https://www.scopus.com/home.uri>)
- > Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI)
(<http://mjl.clarivate.com/cgi-bin/jrnlst/jlresults.cgi?PC=EX>)
- > DOAJ (<https://doaj.org/>)
- > APAMED Central (<http://apamedcentral.org/>)
- > WPRIM (<http://www.wprim.org/>)
- > Asean Citation Index (<http://www.asean-cites.org/>)
- > Google Scholar (<https://scholar.google.com>)
- > Global Index Medicus
(<http://www.globalhealthlibrary.net/php/index.php>)
- > Index Copernicus (<https://journals.indexcopernicus.com/>)
- > MyAis (<http://www.my-ais.org/>)
- > MyCite (<http://www.mycite.my/>)

- > COPE (<http://publicationethics.org>)
- > WAME (<http://www.wame.org/>)
- > APAME (<http://www.wpro.who.int/entity/apame/about/en/>)
- > Council of Science Editors (<http://www.councilscienceeditors.org/>)
- > Malaysia Citation Centre (<http://mycc.my/>)

ISSN Print: 1985-2533
ISSN Electronic: 2232-111X



Contents for March 2021, Volume 15, Issue No. 1 (contents.pdf)

REVIEW ARTICLE

Fat Embolism Syndrome: A Qualitative Review of its Incidence, Presentation, Pathogenesis and Management 📄 (fat-embolism-syndrome.pdf)

Timon C, Keady C, Murphy CG

Abstract 📄 (fat-embolism-syndrome-abstract.php) | Reference 📖 (fat-embolism-syndrome-reference.php)

SPECIAL ARTICLES

Lessons Learned - Patient Communication During the Pandemic 📄 (patient-communication-pandemic.pdf)

Wang EHM, Real I, David-Wang A, Rubio DA, Gaston CL, Quintos AJ, Dimayuga C, Dacanay E

Abstract 📄 (patient-communication-pandemic-abstract.php) | Reference 📖 (patient-communication-pandemic-reference.php)

Coordinating a Postgraduate Orthopaedic Exam During COVID-19 Pandemic 📄 (postgraduate-exam-pandemic.pdf)

Mohamed-Haflah NH; Abdullah S; Abdul-Rani R

Abstract 📄 (postgraduate-exam-pandemic-abstract.php) | Reference 📖 (postgraduate-exam-pandemic-reference.php)

Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal (MOJ) has participated in the initiative to make publications on COVID-19 and coronavirus related conditions immediately accessible in PubMed Central (PMC) and other public repositories. For further information, please refer to : **Public Health Emergency COVID-19 Initiative** (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/about/covid-19/>)

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

Prevalence and Pattern of Musculoskeletal Injuries Among Malaysian Hockey League Players 📄 (musculoskeletal-injuries-hockey.pdf)

Manaf H; Justine M; Hassan N

Abstract 📄 (musculoskeletal-injuries-hockey-abstract.php) | Reference 📖 (musculoskeletal-injuries-hockey-reference.php)

Role of Primary Autologous Bone Graft at Docking Site in the Treatment of Infected Non-union Tibia Using Rail Fixation System 📄 (autologous-bone-docking.pdf)

Mudiganty S; Austine J

Abstract 📄 (autologous-bone-docking-abstract.php) | Reference 📖 (autologous-bone-docking-reference.php)

Validity and Reliability of the Malay Version of the Identification of Functional Ankle Instability (IdFAI-M) Questionnaire among Malaysian University Athletes 📄 (instability-questionnaire-athletes.pdf)

Omar MK; Abdul-Karim S

Abstract 📄 (instability-questionnaire-athletes-abstract.php) | Reference 📖 (instability-questionnaire-athletes-reference.php)

Prognostic Factors in Recurrent Congenital Muscular Torticollis 📄 (congenital-muscular-torticollis.pdf)

Chotigavanichaya C, Phongprapapan P, Wongcharoenwatana J, Eamsobhana P, Ariyawatkul T, Kaewpornsawan K

Abstract 📄 (congenital-muscular-torticollis-abstract.php) | Reference 📖 (congenital-muscular-torticollis-reference.php)

Evaluation of Functional Outcome Following Hybrid External Fixation in The Management of Schatzkers Type V and VI Tibial Plateau Fractures - A Prospective Study of 30 Patients 📄 (tibial-plateau-schatzkers.pdf)

Subash Y

Abstract 📄 (tibial-plateau-schatzkers-abstract.php) | Reference 📄 (tibial-plateau-schatzkers-reference.php)

Impact of COVID-19 on Clinical Practices during Lockdown: A pan India Survey of Orthopaedic Surgeons 📄 (COVID-19-lockdown-India.pdf)

Jain VK, Upadhyaya GK, Iyengar KP, Patralekh MK, Lal H, Vaishya R

Abstract 📄 (COVID-19-lockdown-India-abstract.php) | Reference 📄 (COVID-19-lockdown-India-reference.php)

Femoral Stem Subsidence and its Associated Factors after Cementless Bipolar Hemiarthroplasty in Geriatric Patients 📄 (cementless-bipolar-hemiarthroplasty.pdf)

Gema A, Irianto KA, Setiawati R

Abstract 📄 (cementless-bipolar-hemiarthroplasty-abstract.php) | Reference 📄 (cementless-bipolar-hemiarthroplasty-reference.php)

Orthopaedic Practices and Surgeries during COVID-19 in Pakistan - A Survey Based Study 📄 (surgeries-COVID-19-Pakistan.pdf)

Saad-Ilyas M, Zehra U, Khan UU, Mohammad I, Muhammad R, Aziz A

Abstract 📄 (surgeries-COVID-19-Pakistan-abstract.php) | Reference 📄 (surgeries-COVID-19-Pakistan-reference.php)

Reliability of Imageless Computer-Assisted Navigation for Femoral Rotational Alignment in Total Knee Arthroplasty 📄 (total-knee-arthroplasty.pdf)

Leelasestaporn C, Thuwapitchayanant M, Sirithanapipat P, Sa-ngasoongsong P, Ruengsilswit P

Abstract 📄 (total-knee-arthroplasty-abstract.php) | Reference 📄 (total-knee-arthroplasty-reference.php)

Predictors of Functional Outcome in Unstable Ankle Fractures Treated Surgically – A Prospective Cohort Study 📄 (unstable-ankle-fractures.pdf)

Balaji G, Bhukya R, Nema S, Rajeswari M, Vellaipandi V

Abstract 📄 (unstable-ankle-fractures-abstract.php) | Reference 📄 (unstable-ankle-fractures-reference.php)

Assessment of Extra-Cortical Bone Bridge Interface in Cemented Mega Endoprosthesis for Limb Salvage Surgery 📄 (bone-bridge-endoprosthesis.pdf)

Murugan K, Faisham WI, Zulmi W

Abstract 📄 (bone-bridge-endoprosthesis-abstract.php) | Reference 📄 (bone-bridge-endoprosthesis-reference.php)

COVID-19 – Changes in Workload and Clinical Practice in Trauma and Orthopaedics in a District General Hospital in the United Kingdom 📄 (COVID-19-workload-trauma.pdf)

Faria G, Virani S, Tadros BJ, Dhinsa BS, Reddy G, Relwani J

Femoral Stem Subsidence and its Associated Factors after Cementless Bipolar Hemiarthroplasty in Geriatric Patients

Gema A¹, MD, Irianto KA¹, PhD, Setiawati R², PhD

¹Department of Orthopaedic and Traumatology, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Department of Radiology, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Date of submission: 07th August 2020

Date of acceptance: 29th January 2021

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Early femoral stem subsidence has been a concern as a predictor of the beginning of implant loosening, especially on cementless hip arthroplasty implants. This study aimed to determine the factors that affect femoral stem subsidence and outcome following hemiarthroplasty in the geriatric population.

Materials and Methods: This is a retrospective study of 179 patients who underwent cementless bipolar hemiarthroplasty during the 2011-2019 period at an orthopaedic and traumatology hospital. Data on the patient's demography, pre-operative American Society Anaesthesiologist (ASA) score, body mass index (BMI), canal flare index (CFI), Dorr classification, and stem alignment were obtained. The primary outcomes were post-operative femoral stem subsidence, post-operative pain, and functional outcome using Harris Hip Score (HHS). Statistical analysis was conducted to identify risk factors associated with the primary outcome.

Results: The mean femoral stem subsidence was 2.16 ± 3.4 mm. The mean post-operative Visual Analog Score (VAS) on follow-up was 1.38 ± 1 . Mean HHS on follow-up was 85.28 ± 10.3 . American Society Anaesthesiologist score 3 ($p = 0.011$, OR = 2.77) and varus alignment ($p = 0.039$, OR = 6.963) were related to worse stem subsidence. Otherwise, neutral alignment ($p = 0.045$ and OR = 0.405) gave protection against femoral stem subsidence. The female gender ($p = 0.014$, OR 2.53) was associated with post-operative pain onset. Neutral alignment had significant relationship with functional outcomes ($p = 0.01$; OR 0.33).
Conclusion: A higher ASA score and varus stem alignment were related to a higher risk of femoral stem subsidence. Meanwhile, neutral stem alignment had a protective effect on the femoral stem subsidence and outcome.

Keywords:

harris hip score, hemiarthroplasty, post-operative pain, stem subsidence

INTRODUCTION

Low bone density in geriatric patients with osteoporosis can cause fractures, even with minimal energy¹. The prevalence of femoral neck fractures had increased, owing to the rapidly developing geriatric population and longer life expectancy. It was estimated that by 2030 there would be 300,000 hip fractures cases annually in the USA². A study conducted by Irianto *et al*³ showed that femoral neck fractures were the second most common geriatric fracture, which occurs approximately 24%, followed by fractures in the vertebra (25%). The mortality rate in patients with femoral neck fractures per year is 25-30%⁴.

The femoral neck fracture healing process in the geriatric population is slower^{3,4}. The anatomy of the femoral neck and intracapsular fracture make it difficult for proper bone healing. Hip hemiarthroplasty is one of the most common surgery performed for femoral neck fracture other than total hip arthroplasty. Compared to total hip arthroplasty, the procedure is relatively faster, with less bleeding and earlier weight-bearing mobilisation⁵. There are no significant differences between the advantages of cementless and cemented stem, however a comparison study reported that there are more respiratory or cardiovascular complications and longer duration of surgery in cemented stem⁶.

A study by Iamthanaporn *et al*⁷ found the most common etiology for hemiarthroplasty revision were aseptic loosening (49,6%) followed by infection (22,6%) and acetabular erosion (15%). Early stem migration is a predictive factor for aseptic loosening in the first and second years after hip arthroplasty surgery. Femoral stem subsidence is the distalisation of the stem relative to the major trochanter.

Two previous studies about cementless hemiarthroplasty in femoral neck patients found different results. Kabelitz *et al*⁸ found 12% intra-operative fractures and a low subsidence

rate (5%). Furthermore, a study by Choi *et al* found no subsidence⁶. These conflicting results also support the notion of how studies of femoral stem subsidence in hemiarthroplasty are still limited, especially in developing countries⁹. This study aimed to determine clinical and radiographic risk factors affecting stem subsidence manifestation, post-operative pain, and functional outcome in geriatric patients with femoral neck fractures treated with cementless bipolar hemiarthroplasty.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

This is a retrospective study of femoral neck fracture in geriatric patients undergoing cementless bipolar hemiarthroplasty at an orthopaedic and traumatology hospital between 2011-2019. This study had been reviewed and received ethical clearance from Internal Institutional Review Board (No.292/EC/KEPK/FKUA/2019). All surgeries were performed by the senior author using the posterior approach. The implant used was standardised titanium-niobium Quadra-H stem [Medacta International, Castel San Pietro, Switzerland] with hydroxyapatite coating. The samples were collected from medical records of geriatric patients with femoral neck fractures who underwent cementless bipolar hemiarthroplasty and met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria were (1) patients with displaced femoral neck fractures with age \geq 60 years, (2) pre-operative active condition and independently mobile, and (3) treated with cementless bipolar hemiarthroplasty surgery. Meanwhile, exclusion criteria were: (1) incomplete medical record, (2) pre-operative history of intertrochanter fractures, (3) and the patient had died during the evaluation. Demographic data including age, race, sex, body mass index (BMI), radiological findings, post-operative pain, and functional outcomes were recorded (Fig. 1). In terms of Body Mass Index (based on Asia-Pacific Population) classification, patients were classified as underweight (<18.5), normal ($18.5-22.9$), overweight ($23-27.49$), and obesity (≥ 27.5).

Stem subsidence was evaluated from anteroposterior hip or pelvis plain radiograph (line A in Fig. 2) by measuring the difference in distance from the trochanter major's peak to the stem shoulder perpendicular to the axis of the femur stem at a certain period¹⁰. The anteroposterior pelvic or hip plain radiograph was taken in supine position, centering on the symphysis and 120cm distance of the film focus. The femoral stem subsidence was divided into two groups following the Al-Najjim study: below and ≥ 3 mm¹¹. Stem alignment was the stem's position against the longitudinal axis of the femur (Fig. 2). Alignment degree was carried out by measuring the angle from the axis of the femur stem to the longitudinal axis of the post-operative femur^{12,13}. The alignment was categorised into three groups: neutral, varus, and valgus.

The morphology of the proximal femur was described as the structural quality of the bones divided by three categories based on the Dorr classification: A (<0.5), B ($0.5-0.75$), and C (0.75). The Dorr score was obtained by calculating the ratio between the medulla canal diameter at a distance of 10cm below the trochanter minor and the medulla canal as high as the trochanter minor (Dorr = FW / CW) (Fig. 3). Anatomy of the proximal femur was categorised into three groups by calculating the Canal Flare Index (CFI). Based on Nguyen *et al*'s study¹⁴, CFI was measured by dividing the femur canal diameter at 2cm above the midpoint of the minor trochanter with the femur canal diameter at 10cm below the trochanter minor (CFI = a / b). This measurement is used to classify the medullary canal for femoral component selection in total hip arthroplasty, is also reported to be associated with bone quality and osteoporosis. CFI was classified as stovepipe (< 3), normal ($3 - 4.7$), and champagne-fluted (> 4.7)¹⁴. A femoral stem subsidence evaluation was done shortly after surgery and at the latest follow-up (at least six weeks after surgery) (Fig. 4)¹³. CFI and Dorr were measured pre-operatively. The alignment was measured from the first post-operative plain radiograph (within one week of surgery). Radiological measurements on each photo were calibrated to correct the scale. Radiological measurement was done blindly by two musculoskeletal consultant radiologists. Inter-observer reliability based on Cohen's kappa value was 0.82 (95% CI= 0.74-0.92; $p<0.05$).

The American Society of Anaesthesiologists (ASA) score indicates the patient's pre-operative comorbidity conditions that are divided into five classes: ASA scores 1 (healthy patient), 2 (patient with the mild systemic disease), 3 (patient with the severe systemic disease not incapacitating), 4 (patient with incapacitating systemic disease), and 5 (a moribund patient)¹⁵. Post-operative pain was evaluated using the Visual Analog Score (VAS), which was divided into two groups, no pain (VAS 0) and pain (VAS 1-5), due to the absence of patients who complained of severe pain. In this study, functional outcome measurement used the Harris Hip Score (HHS) was used to measure functional outcome, which was evaluated in patients using four domains: pain, function, range of motion (ROM), and presence or absence of deformity after bipolar hemiarthroplasty procedures. HHS in this study was divided into two groups, namely poor (HHS <80) and good (HHS 80-100). Post-operative pain and HHS were measured at the last follow-up.

Statistical analysis such as Chi square test or Kruskal Wallis test were used as appropriate based on each variables. The variables used in the multivariate logistic analysis were selected from the univariate analysis with p value < 0.25 . Multivariate analysis with logistic regression was performed to determine the risk factors influencing femoral stem subsidence the most, post-operative pain, and HHS. A value of $p < 0.05$ was significant. SPSS 25.0 program was used for all statistical analysis [SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA]

RESULTS

There were 218 patients who underwent bipolar hemiarthroplasty surgery, and 179 patients met the inclusion criteria. The mean follow-up time was 42 months, and the average age was approximately 74.5 ± 8.1 years. One hundred and forty-one (78.8%) patients came on the last follow-up with post-operative pain, and 38 (21.2%) patients came with no post-operative pain. The mean of VAS on follow-up was 1.38 ± 1 . In terms of HHS classification, 138 (77.1%) patients were in good functional outcome, and 41 (22.9%) patients were in poor functional outcome. The mean of HHS on follow-up was 85.28 ± 10.3 . The mean of femoral stem subsidence was 2.16 ± 3.4 mm. There was no revision surgery nor perioperative mortality in this study.

There were significant correlation between patient's age, ASA score, stem alignment and HHS with the subsidence in stem ($p = 0.035$, $p = 0.036$, $p = 0.001$ and $p = 0.001$) (Table I). Besides, there was no significant relationship between sex, BMI, CFI, Dorr Score and post-operative pain with stem subsidence ($p = 0.700$, $p = 0.845$, $p = 0.142$, $p = 0.879$ and $p = 0.313$, respectively). This study showed that female patients associated with more post-operative pain than male

patients ($p = 0.012$) (Table II). There is also significant relationship between HHS and post-operative pain ($p = 0.041$). There were no significant differences between post-operative pain with age, ASA score, BMI, Dorr, CFI, and alignment ($p > 0.05$). There were significant relationships between alignment and femoral stem subsidence with post-operative functional outcome ($p = 0.001$ and <0.001 , respectively) (Table II).

The results of multivariate analysis are listed in (Table III). Alignment and ASA score remained significant risk factors for the subsidence. Neutral alignment gave protective effects from the femoral stem subsidence with $p = 0.045$ and OR 0.405 (CI = 0.16-0.98). Meanwhile, varus alignment associated with higher femoral stem subsidence with $p = 0.039$ and OR = 6.96 (CI = 1.09-44.12). ASA score 3 was associated with higher femoral stem subsidence with $p = 0.011$ and OR = 2.771 (CI = 1.25-6.10). The female population was considered to be associated with post-operative pain with $p = 0.014$ and OR= 2.53 (CI = 1.21-5.29). Neutral alignment was correlated with better functional outcome with $p = 0.01$ and OR 0.329 (CI= 0.142 - 0.764).

Table I: Demographics of patients

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age		
60-74	90	50.27
75-90	87	48.61
>90	2	1.12
Sex		
Male	55	30.7
Female	124	69.3
Race		
Malay	28	15.6
Chinese	151	84.4
ASA Score		
ASA score 1	8	4.46
ASA score 2	103	57.54
ASA score 3	68	37.98
BMI		
<18.5 (Underweight)	32	17.9
18.5 - 22.9 (Normal)	77	43
23 - 27.49 (Overweight)	35	19.6
≥27.5 (Obesity)	35	19.6
Alignment		
Valgus	33	18.4
Normal	139	77.7
Varus	7	3.9
CFI		
Stovepipe	27	15.1
Normal	125	69.8
Champagne fluted	27	15.1
DORR		
A	149	83.24
B	30	16.75
C	0	0

Abbreviations: BMI = Body Mass Index, CFI = Canal Flare Index, ASA = American Society of Anaesthesiologists

Table II: Characteristics of patients and its relationship with stem subsidence, post-operative pain and HHS

Characteristic	<3mm	Subsidence ≥ 3mm	P Value	No pain	Post-operative pain Pain	P value	Low	HHS Good	P Value
Age			0.035*			0.471*			0.465*
60-74	77 (43%)	13 (7.3%)		22 (12.3%)	68 (38%)		18 (10%)	72 (40.2%)	
75-90	61 (34.1%)	26 (14.5%)		16 (8.9%)	71 (39.7%)		22 (12.3%)	65 (36.3%)	
>90	2 (1.1%)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	2 (1.1%)		1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	
Sex		0.700*			0.012*			0.818*	
Male	44 (24.6%)	11 (6.2%)		18 (10.1%)	37 (20.6%)		12 (6.7%)	43 (24%)	
Female	96 (53.6%)	28 (15.6%)	0.122*	20 (11.2%)	104 (58.1%)	0.978*	29 (16.2%)	95 (53.1%)	0.774*
Race									
Malay	25 (14%)	3 (1.7%)		6 (3.3%)	22 (12.3%)		7 (3.9%)	21 (11.7%)	
Chinese	115 (64.2%)	36 (20.1%)	0.845*	32 (17.9%)	119 (66.5%)	0.790*	34 (19%)	117 (65.4%)	0.837*
BMI									
<18.5	24 (13.4%)	8 (4.5%)		6 (3.3%)	26 (14.6%)		7 (3.9%)	25 (14%)	
18.5 - 22.9	62 (34.6%)	15 (8.4%)		19 (10.6%)	58 (32.4%)		16 (8.9%)	61 (34%)	
23 - 27.49	28 (15.7%)	7 (3.9%)		6 (3.3%)	29 (16.2%)		8 (4.5%)	27 (15.1%)	
≥27.5	26 (14.5%)	9 (5%)	0.036*	7 (3.9%)	28 (15.7%)	0.051*	10 (5.6%)	25 (14%)	0.712*
ASA score									
1	8 (4.5%)	0 (0%)		4 (2.2%)	4 (2.2%)		1 (0.6%)	7 (3.9%)	
2	85 (47.5%)	18 (10%)		24 (13.4%)	79 (44%)		23 (12.8%)	80 (44.7%)	
3	47 (26.3%)	21 (11.7%)		10 (5.6%)	58 (32.4%)		17 (9.5%)	51 (28.5%)	
CFI		0.142*			0.185*			0.237*	
Stovepipe	20 (11.2%)	7 (3.9%)		3 (1.7%)	24 (13.4%)		8 (4.5%)	19 (10.6%)	
Normal	95 (53.1%)	30 (16.7%)	0.879*	28 (15.6%)	97 (54.2%)	0.757*	30 (16.8%)	95 (53.1%)	0.678*
Champagne fluted	25 (14%)	2 (1.1%)		7 (3.9%)	20 (11.2%)		3 (1.7%)	24 (13.4%)	
Dorr									
A	116 (64.8%)	33 (18.4%)		31 (17.3%)	118 (65.9%)		35 (19.5%)	114 (63.7%)	
B	24 (13.4%)	6 (3.4%)		7 (3.9%)	23 (12.9%)		6 (3.4%)	24 (13.4%)	
C	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Alignment			0.001*			0.778*			0.001*
Valgus	22 (12.3%)	11 (6.2%)		8 (4.5%)	25 (14%)		12 (6.7%)	21 (11.7%)	
Normal	116 (64.8%)	23 (12.8%)		28 (15.6%)	111 (62%)		22 (12.3%)	117 (65.4%)	
Varus	2 (1.1%)	5 (2.8%)	0.001*	2 (1.1%)	5 (2.8%)	0.041*	7 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	n.a
HHS									
Good	120 (67%)	18 (10.1%)		34 (19%)	104 (58.1%)		n.a	n.a	
Low	20 (11.2%)	21 (11.7%)	n.a	4 (2.2%)	37 (20.7%)	0.313*	20 (11.2%)	120 (67%)	<0.001*
Subsidence									
<3mm	n.a	n.a		32 (17.9%)	108 (60.3%)		21 (11.7%)	18 (10.1%)	
≥3mm				6 (3.4%)	33 (18.4%)				

Abbreviations: n.a = not available; HHS = Harris Hip Score; BMI = Body Mass Index, CFI = Canal Flare Index, ASA = American Society of Anaesthesiologists
 * Chi square test
 + Kruskal-Wallis Test

Table III: Multivariate analysis results

Variables	Subsidence		Post-operative pain		HHS	
	Odds (% CI)	P value	Odds (% CI)	P value	Odds (% CI)	P value
Sex						
Male						
Female			2.53 (1.21-5.29)	0.014*		
CFI						
Stovepipe						
Normal	1.344 (0.464-3.890)	0.586				
Champagne fluted	0.284 (0.045-1.808)	0.183				
Alignment						
Valgus	0.405 (0.167-0.980)	0.045*			0.329 (0.142-0.764)	0.01*
Normal	6.963 (1.099-44.122)	0.039*			4.375(0.733-26.116)	0.105
Varus						
ASA score						
ASA 1 and 2						
ASA 3	2.771 (1.258-6.104)	0.011*				

Abbreviations: CFI = Canal Flare Index; ASA = American Society of Anesthesiologists

*, statistically significant




Fig. 1: Flowchart of the patient selection process.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we found that among 179 patients, more than 60% of them are female patients. This is in line with the study by Iglesias *et al*⁴, showing that women suffer more fractures of the femoral neck. This could be related to menopause causing decline in bone density. Decreasing bone density could influence neck-shaft angle and hip axis length resulting in a higher risk of a femoral neck fracture¹⁶. A study conducted by Novicoff and Saleh showed that women also had worse hip degeneration and cartilage loss than men¹⁷.

Moreover, a recent study showed that female patients were significantly associated with post-operative pain. This is in line with the Mannion *et al*¹⁸ research that women had a higher Western Ontario and McMaster Universities

Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) post-operative pain than men, although it was not significant. Women also had lower pain thresholds, making them more sensitive to pain compared to men. Thus, there could be excess pain and poorer functional outcome in women after surgery¹⁷.

Most of the patients in this study experienced <3mm subsidence in stem (78.2%). The mean of subsidence was 2.16mm (SD 3.4), which was lower than what was found in the previous study of 2.9mm (SD 2.7)¹¹ and 3.9mm (SD 2)⁸. This result could be affected by the greater cortical thickness and higher volumetric bone mineral density (BMD) in Asia patients than white patients¹³. This study showed association between patient age and stem subsidence. Furthermore, the number of geriatric patients in the age 75-90 years with femoral stem subsidence ≥ 3 mm (14.5%) was greater than




Fig. 2: Anteroposterior post-operative radiograph of a right hip showing determination of femoral stem subsidence and alignment of the femoral stem.




Fig. 3: Anteroposterior pre-operative radiograph of a right hip showing determination CFI and Dorr score.




Fig. 4: (a) Example of measured femoral stem subsidence in a female, 79 years old. Pre-operative radiograph. (b) Implants that was used in this study. (c) Post-operative radiograph. (d) Radiograph taken during follow-up (three months).

patients with the group of age 60-74 years (7.3%). A study by Song *et al*¹⁹ showed similar results where age showed a significant effect on stem subsidence. Large stem subsidence (7.15-19.38mm) was found at 62-89 years. Bone stock could influence femoral stem subsidence. Nazari-Farsani *et al*²⁰ found that older women with low bone mineral density were at risk of developing femoral stem subsidence (OR=6.7).

Anatomy and the proximal femur morphology may affect femoral stem subsidence in patients who have undergone arthroplasty surgery. A suitable match of a femoral stem with bone will optimise initial torque stability, thereby improve

bone growth and reduce fibrous growth¹³. Dorr type C was associated with a lower T-score than type A, implying that bone density in Dorr C was lower than type A²¹. Other studies said that the Dorr type C was correlated with lower cortical indices, femoral stem subsidence, and higher risk intra-operative fractures^{14,19}. However, this study showed no significant relationship between Dorr type and CFI with femoral stem subsidence in patients.

The comorbidity assessment using ASA scores showed a correlation to various factors, including the length of stay, the severity of complications, and the treatment's total cost.

A higher ASA score was associated with a higher risk of post-operative complications and mortality rates^{15,22}. This study showed a significant relationship between ASA score 3 with the stem subsidence ($p = 0.011$, $OR = 2.77$). Kinjo *et al*²³ found a similar result in their cohort study that pre-operative pain, pre-operative opioids, higher ASA scores, and female patients were associated with higher post-operative pain. The patient's pre-operative comorbidity could be cardiac disease, respiratory disease, obesity, liver disease, or other systemic diseases. A recent study found that among 68 patients with ASA score 3, 60.3% had comorbid hypertension, 20.5% had diabetes mellitus, 14.7% had obesity, and 14.7% had chronic renal disease. Bone condition changes associated with hyperglycemia or chronic renal disease could affect bone quality, delaying bone-ingrowth fixation at the bone-implant interface, the bone healing process, vascularisation, and subsequent mechanical stability²⁴. In their study, Chen *et al*²² found that a higher ASA score was associated with older patients that had low bone density (79.39 ± 7.85 years old). Those results might explain our finding that the ASA score affected femoral stem subsidence.

Multivariate analysis results showed that the neutral alignment had a protective effect on femoral stem subsidence and functional outcome. Meanwhile, the varus alignment group showed a significant effect on stem subsidence. This result is in line with the study conducted by de Beer and Zang, where the majority of patients had neutral stem alignment²⁵. A study by Ries *et al*¹³ showed no significant relationship between stem alignment and stem subsidence. However, Kutzner *et al*²⁶ mentioned that stem valgus alignment increased the number of stem subsidence but did not affect clinical outcomes. The alignment that was too varus increase the offset and increase the lever arm²⁶. This could escalate strain and stress on the medial side of the proximal femur and the area at the distal end of the stem, so that it initiated periprosthetic fracture both during and post-operatively²⁵. Therefore, we proposed that femoral alignment should be placed properly intra-operative.

The functional outcomes of most patients in this study after cementless bipolar hemiarthroplasty showed a good result (HHS 80-100) at 77,1%. Moreover, there was a significant relationship between stem subsidence and HHS. Femoral stem subsidence could lead to a decline in functional outcomes like dislocation, leg length discrepancy, and pain. Early stem subsidence was associated with a higher risk of inadequate secondary integration resulting in micromotion and fibrous fixation¹³. Most osteointegration is achieved in early 4-12 weeks, and cementless implants are highly dependent on bone osteointegration with this implant's surface. During walking exercise, the load was transferred from the implant to the bone, pushing the bone further and cause subsidence in the stem through mechanical stability¹¹. According to Al-Najjim *et al*¹¹ and Song *et al*¹⁹ stem subsidence of more than 3mm was associated with poor outcomes and complications such as loosening and fracture

of the stem. The radiological signs of loosening or failure in the implant include stem subsidence, osteolysis, bone resorption in femoral calcar, osteopenia, and radiolucent lines around the implant²⁷.

De Nies and Malcolm's research supports this study result. They found a significant correlation between HHS and pain levels as measured by VAS28. This can be explained that patients with minimum or zero pain can carry out their daily activities to gain better quality of life. Among the 141 patients who complained of post-operative pain, 33 (23.4%) experienced subsidence of more than 3mm. Of these 33 patients, 5 (15.1%) had stovepipe morphology, 2 (6.06%) had champagne-fluted morphology, 12 (36.3%) with a BMI of >23 , and 15 (45.4%) patients had ASA score 3. Early weight-bearing in patients with poor proximal femur morphology, bone density, pre-operative conditions, overweight, and intra-operative factors could trigger early migration. In addition, the cause of post-operative pain with implant loosening was considered the presence of micromotion on the bone and implant interfaces, stress transfer imbalance, and irritation in endosteum periosteum²⁷.

A previous study by Nishi *et al*⁹, reported a lower rate of revision surgery after cementless hemiarthroplasty. Another study by Kabelitz *et al*⁸ supported this suggestion with the low rate of early subsidence. Despite that, some articles also reported about higher volume of blood loss after surgery⁶. Another concern about cementless hemiarthroplasty is a higher rate of complications, namely intra-operative fractures in osteoporotic bone⁸ which didn't occur in this study.

This study has limitations. The design of this study is retrospective, which subjects to biases and confounding which can influence the result. The other limitations are relatively small number of patients, and the duration of the patient's observation was not long enough. Further studies are needed to assess the evidence of aseptic loosening; more comprehensive study follow-up and multiple examination to see early and late-onset subsidence and its outcome. Nevertheless, this study highlights the importance of preventing femoral stem subsidence by achieving good stem fixation in the femoral diaphysis during the intra-operative period. Post-operative functional outcomes are closely related to intra-operative management, post-operative rehabilitation, and pre-operative comorbid factors.

CONCLUSION

Higher ASA scores and varus alignment of the stem were associated with a higher risk of femoral stem. Neutral stem alignment of the femoral stem gave the protective effect of stem subsidence and better functional outcome. The use of cementless femoral stem is not recommended in elderly patients in treating the femur neck fracture.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no potential conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the Medical Record staff and the Radiology staff of Orthopaedics and Traumatology Hospital for giving the data necessary for research.

REFERENCES

1. Sandhu HS, Dhillon MS, Jain AK. Femoral neck fractures. *Indian J Orthop.* 2008; 42(1): 1-2. doi: 10.4103/0019-5413.38573
2. Brox WT, Roberts KC, Taksali S, Wright DG, Wixted JJ, Tubb CC, et al. The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons Evidence-Based Guideline on Management of Hip Fractures in the Elderly. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2015; 97(14): 1196-9. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.O.00229
3. Irianto KA, Rianto D, Sukmajaya WP, Alina O. Geriatric fractures in single Orthopedic Hospital: The role of domestic fall and comprehensive geriatric assessment. *Bali Med J.* 2019; 8(2): 689-94. doi: 10.15562/bmj.v8i2.1432
4. Iglesias SL, Gentile L, Vanoli F, Mangupli MM, Pioli I, Nomides REK, et al. Femoral neck fractures in the elderly: from risk factors to prognostic features for survival. *J Trauma Crit Care.* 2017; 1(1): 16-21.
5. Prokop A, Chmielnicki M. Hemiprosthesis for femoral neck fractures in the elderly: A retrospective study of 319 patients. *Arch Trauma Res.* 2016; 5(3): e33335. doi: 10.5812/at.33335
6. Choi JY, Sung YB, Kim JH. Comparative Study of Bipolar Hemiarthroplasty for Femur Neck Fractures Treated with Cemented versus Cementless Stem. *Hip Pelvis.* 2016; 28(4): 208-16. doi: 10.5371/hp.2016.28.4.208
7. Iamthanaporn K, Chareancholvanich K, Pornrattanamaneewong C. Reasons for revision of failed hemiarthroplasty: Are there any differences between unipolar and bipolar? *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol.* 2018; 28(6): 1117-23. doi: 10.1007/s00590-018-2176-0
8. Kabelitz M, Fritz Y, Grueninger P, Meier C, Fries P, Dietrich M. Cementless Stem for Femoral Neck Fractures in a Patient's 10th Decade of Life: High Rate of Periprosthetic Fractures. *Geriatr Orthop Surg Rehabil.* 2018; 29; 9: 2151459318765381. doi: 10.1177/2151459318765381
9. Nishi M, Okano I, Sawada T, Midorikawa N, Inagaki K. Cementless Bipolar Hemiarthroplasty for Low-energy Intracapsular Proximal Femoral Fracture in Elderly East-Asian Patients: A Longitudinal 10-year Follow-up Study. *Hip Pelvis.* 2019; 31(4): 206-15. doi: 10.5371/hp.2019.31.4.206
10. Siepen W, Zwicky L, Stoffel KK, Ilchmann T, Clauss M. Prospective two-year subsidence analysis of 100 cemented polished straight stems - A short-term clinical and radiological observation. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2016; 17: 395. doi: 10.1186/s12891-016-1247-9
11. Al-Najjim M, Khattak U, Sim J, Chambers I. Differences in subsidence rate between alternative designs of a commonly used uncemented femoral stem. *J Orthop.* 2016; 13(4): 322-6. doi: 10.1016/j.jor.2016.06.026
12. Morgenstern R, Denova TA, Khan I, Carroll KM, Su EP. Total hip arthroplasty utilizing an uncemented, flat, tapered stem with a reduced distal profile. *Arthroplast Today.* 2019; 5(4): 503-8. doi: 10.1016/j.artd.2019.08.009
13. Ries C, Boese CK, Dietrich F, Miehle W, Heisel C. Femoral stem subsidence in cementless total hip arthroplasty: a retrospective single-centre study. *Int Orthop.* 2019; 43(2): 307-14. doi: 10.1007/s00264-018-4020-x
14. Nguyen BN, Hoshino H, Togawa D, Matsuyama Y. Cortical thickness index of the proximal femur: A radiographic parameter for preliminary assessment of bone mineral density and osteoporosis status in the age 50 years and over population. *Clin Orthop Surg.* 2018; 10(2): 149-56. doi: 10.4055/cios.2018.10.2.149
15. Kastanis G, Topalidou A, Alpantaki K, Rosiadis M, Balalis K. Is the ASA Score in Geriatric Hip Fractures a Predictive Factor for Complications and Readmission? *Scientifica (Cairo).* 2016; 2016: 7096245. doi: 1155/2016/7096245
16. Gnudi S, Sitta E, Pignotti E. Prediction of incident hip fracture by femoral neck bone mineral density and neck-shaft angle: A 5-year longitudinal study in post-menopausal females. *Br J Radiol.* 2012; 85(1016): 467-73. doi: 10.1259/bjr/57130600

17. Novicoff WM, Saleh KJ. Examining sex and gender disparities in total joint arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2011; 469(7): 1824-8. doi: 10.1007/s11999-010-1765-y
18. Mannion AF, Impellizzeri FM, Naal FD, Leunig M. Women demonstrate more pain and worse function before THA but comparable results 12 months after surgery. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2015; 473(12): 3849-57. doi: 10.1007/s11999-015-4479-3
19. Song JH, Jo WL, Lee KH, Cho YJ, Park J, Oh S. Subsidence and perioperative periprosthetic fractures using collarless hydroxyapatite-coated stem for displaced femoral neck fractures according to Dorr type. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong).* 2019; 27(3): 2309499019877530. doi: 10.1177/2309499019877530
20. Nazari-Farsani S, Vuopio ME, Aro HT. Bone Mineral Density and Cortical-Bone Thickness of the Distal Radius Predict Femoral Stem Subsidence in Postmenopausal Women. *J Arthroplasty.* 2020; 35(7): 1877-84.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.arth.2020.02.062
21. Glowacki J, Thornhill TS. Osteoporosis and Osteopenia in Patients with Osteoarthritis. *Ortho & Rheum Open Access J.* 2016; 2(3): 555590. doi: 10.19080/oroaj.2016.02.555590
22. Chen LH, Liang J, Chen MC, Wu CC, Cheng HS, Wang HH, *et al.* The relationship between preoperative American Society of Anesthesiologists Physical Status Classification scores and functional recovery following hip-fracture surgery. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2017; 18(1): 410. doi: 10.1186/s12891-017-1768-x
23. Kinjo S, Sands LP, Lim E, Paul S, Leung JM. Prediction of postoperative pain using path analysis in older patients. *J Anesth.* 2012; 26(1): 1-8. doi: 10.1007/s00540-011-1249-6
24. Tornero E, Cofan F, Reategui D, Gracia-Toledo M, Campistol JM, Riba J, *et al.* Outcomes of hip arthroplasty in patients with end-stage renal disease : a retrospective, controlled study. *Int J Adv Jt Reconstr.* 2015; 1: 11-8.
25. Zang J, Uchiyama K, Moriya M, Li Z, Fukushima K, Yamamoto T, *et al.* Long-term clinical and radiographic results of the cementless spotorno stem in japanese patients: A more than 15-year follow-up. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong).* 2018; 26(1): 2309499017750310. doi: 10.1177/2309499017750310
26. Kutzner KP, Freitag T, Donner S, Kovacevic MP, Bieger R. Outcome of extensive varus and valgus stem alignment in short-stem THA: clinical and radiological analysis using EBRA-FCA. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2017; 137(3): 431-9. doi: 10.1007/s00402-017-2640-z
27. Clauss M, Van Der Straeten C, Goossens M. Prospective five-year subsidence analysis of a cementless fully hydroxyapatite-coated femoral hip arthroplasty component. *HIP Int.* 2014; 24(1): 91-7. doi: 10.5301/hipint.5000082
28. de Nies F, Fidler MW. Visual analog scale for the assessment of total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* 1997; 12(4): 416-9. doi: 10.1016/S0883-5403(97)90197-2