TABLE E-1 Results of Cementless Type-1, 2, and 3 Femoral Stems

Authors	Stem Type	Total No. of Hips	Mean Duration of Follow-up (Range) *(yr)*	Stem Survivorship with Revision for Femoral Failure as End Point *(%)*	Thigh Pain* *(%)*	Radiographic Loosening *(%)*
McLaughlin and Lee[69] 2008	1	65	20 (18 to 22.6)	99	4	1
Parvizi et al.[70] 2004	1	129	11 (6 to 15)	99.1	3.6	0
Purtill et al.[71] 2001	1	50	15 (14.5 to 16.9)	100	2	4
Burt et al.[49] 1998	1	66	10 (8.3 to 11.6)	95	6	4
Sakalkale et al.[72] 1999	1	71	11.5 (10 to 14)	90.8	1.4	5
Teloken et al.[73] 2002	1	49	15 (14.5 to 16.9)	88	2	4
Bourne et al.[5] 2001	1	307	10 (10 to 13)	99	3	0
Aldinger et al.[68] 2009	1	115	17 (15 to 20)	90	0	3
Müller et al.[74] 2009	1	80	17 (15 to 18)	98.8	25	1.5
Capello et al.[6] 2003	2	111	11.3	95.5	3.6	0
Lee et al.[78] 2005	2	85	10.3 (7 to 12)	100	0	0
Epinette and Manley[77] 2008	2	571	17 (15 to 20)	99.2	NR	1.2
Incavo et al.[36] 2008	2	105	6.7 (5 to 10)	100	NR	3
Park et al.[80] 2003	3A	76	10.1 (9 to 13)	98.6	4.4	1.3
Lombardi et al.[3] 2009	3A	1866	10 (2 to 23)	95.5	NR	0.6
Schuh et al.[60] 2009	3B	94	11.5 (10 to 14)	91.5	0	3
Grübl et al.[87] 2006	3C	92	15.5 (15 to 17.25)	100	2	1
Garcia-Cimbrelo et al.[86] 2003	3C	104	11.3 (10 to 13)	100	13.5	0

*NR = not reported.

TABLE E-2 Results of Type-4, 5, and 6 Cementless Femoral Stems

Authors	Stem Type	Total No. of Hips	Mean Duration of Follow-up (Range) *(yr)*	Stem Survivorship with Revision for Femoral Failure as End Point *(%)*	Thigh Pain* *(%)*	Radiographic Loosening* *(%)*
Belmont et al.[90] 2008	4	119	22 (20 to 25)	98.3	NR	0
McAuley et al.[91] 2004	4	293 (<50 yr)	6.9 (0 to 19)	96	NR	NR
	4	256 (<40 yr)	7.25 (0 to 29)	95	NR	NR
Engh et al.[8] 2001	4	129	13.9 (2 to 18)	98	NR	3
Engh et al.[9] 2009	4	1545	15	97.9	3.9	0.6
Moyer et al.[92] 2010	4	115	8.6 (5 to 10)	99.1	8.7	0
Hennessy et al.[96] 2009	4	100	11.4 (10 to 12)	100	2	0
Biant et al.[100] 2008	5	55	10 (5 to 16)	100	NR	0
Cameron et al.[98] 2006	5	795	11 (2 to 17)	99	1.8	0.4
Christie et al.[99] 1999	5	175	5.3 (4 to 7.8)	99	6	1
Adamany et al.[116] 2008	5	40	12 (10 to 14)	100	2.5	NR
Kawamura et al.[117] 2001	6	187	12 (10 to 14)	94.9	36	12
Xenos et al.[105] 1999	6	77	11.6 (10 to 13)	95	12	6
Little et al.[104] 2006	6	91	15.3 (13.4 to 17.2)	97	7	3
Bojescul et al.[4] 2003	6	64	15.6 (15 to 17)	94	12	8
Kim et al.[103] 2003	6	118	9.8 (8 to 11)	99	10	0
Butler et al.[101] 2005	6	99	11 (10 to 12)	99	0	2
Archibeck et al.[108] 2001	6	78	10 (8 to 11)	100	9	0

*NR = not reported.