The Emergence of Dual Mobility

Are 2 Bearings Better Than 1?

Erik Schnaser, M.D.



No relevant financial disclosures



Picture of someone pulling their hair out



Total hips

Dislocations

- Primary
 0.2%-7%
 Revision
 10-25%
- New Strategies
 - Approach?
 - Larger heads
 - Dual mobility?...



Why is this the first we have heard of this?

• France – 1970s

- -Bousquet & Rambert
 - Monoblock
 - Increased H:N
 - Low friction concept
- -22.2mm head polyethylene liner stainless steel cup
- Cup porous plasma sprayed alumina
 - 2 pegs
 - Iliac screw
- -Loss of fixation
- Approved by FDA 2009













Unconstrained tripolar







• Jump distance







VS

• Jump distance





• ROM







• ROM







What is available in the US?

- Many globally
- Smith and Nephew – POLARCUP
- Biomet
 - -Active Articulation E1
- Stryker
 - -Anatomic Dual Mobility (ADM)
 - Modular Dual Mobility (MDM)



POLAR CUP – Smith & Nephew

- Stainless steel cup
- Press fit
 - Plasma sprayed titanium
 - –Pegs
 - -Screws
 - -Anti-rotation fins
- Cemented
- Δ 6mm Cup:Poly







Active Articulation E1- Biomet

- Cobalt Chrome Bearing
- Plasma sprayed titanium cup
- Fins on cup
- Δ 6mm Cup:Poly
- Vitamin E poly





ADM- Stryker

- Cobalt Chrome surfa
- Plasma sprayed titan
- Δ 6mm Cup:Poly
- Cut-out for iliopsoas
 - Impingement



MDM- Stryker

Can use with Trident or Tritanium cup

- Screw options
- Cobalt Chrome Liner
 - -MOM
- 36-58mm poly available
- Δ 10-12mm Cup:Poly





What are the advantages?

• ROM

- -22.2 and 28mm
- Greater ROM vs conventional
- No difference in DM
- Many clinical scenarios
 - Primaries
 - Monoblock
 - Cemented
 - Modular
 - Revisions



What are the advantages?

Slides to come on outcomes



What are the disadvantages

- Published basic science? industry
- Theoretical edge loading
- Loss of fixation of cup
 - Monoblock shells failure to ingrow?
- Improved ROM vs 36?- computer modeling
 - Reduction in dislocation?
- Wear and osteolysis
 - -Young active patients
- Intraprosthetic dislocation





Slides to come on outcomes



Intraprosthetic disassociation

Slides to come



- Small published series from same authors
- Costs
- Off label uses
- Cannot visual floor of acetabulum
- Relatively short follow up for current generation
 - Improvements in cup fixation?
 - Reduction in osteolysis?
 - -Younger active patients?
 - Necessary?



• Should be better in instability cases...

- Paucity of data primary THA
- -Few in Revisions
- Many technologies looked good for a few years



Who should get them?

- Standard THAs Do not recommend
- High risk Possible
 - -Acute hip fractures
 - Hyperlaxity
 - E danlos
 - Neuromuscular disorders

Revisions

- Recurrent instability



Conclusions

- Good option for instability
- Limited data
 - Small series
 - Minimal basic science data
 - No comparison to >36mm head
- Limited indications
 - low demand





