

I'm not a robot 
reCAPTCHA

Continue

How to calculate femoral anteversion

1.Castañeda P, Hui J, Li LY, Li YQ, Roposch A. Developmental dysplasia of the hip: promoting global exchanges to enable understanding the disease and improve patient care [J]. Orthop Traumatol Surg Res. 2020;106(7):1243-4. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 2.Pavone V, Cristo C, Vescio C, et al. Dynamic and static splinting for treatment of developmental dysplasia of the hip: a systematic review [J]. Children (Basel). 2020;8(2):104. Google Scholar 3.Scocelletti M, Reeves ND, Rittweger J, Ireland A. Femoral anteversion: significance and measurement [J]. J Anat. 2020;237(5):811-26. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 4.Klein C, Fontanarosa A, Khouri N, Bellity J, Padovani JP, Glorion C, et al. Anterior and lateral overcoverage after triple pelvic osteotomy in childhood for developmental dislocation of the hip with acetabular dysplasia. Frequency, features, and medium-term clinical impact [J]. Orthop Traumatol Surg Res. 2018;15(1):192-6. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 5.Billings L. Roentgen examination of the proximal femur end in children and adolescents—a standardized technique also suitable for determination of the column-, anteversion-, and epiphysial angles; a study of slipped epiphysis ansa coxa plana [J]. Acta Radiol Suppl. 1954;110:1-80. PubMed CAS Google Scholar 6.Zhang YY, Su XY, Zhao JX, Li JT, Zhang LC, Tang PF. Three-dimensional morphological analysis of the femoral neck torsion angle—an anatomical study [J]. J Orthop Surg Res. 2020;15(1):192-6. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 7.Kraeutler MJ, Chadayammuri V, Garabekyan T, Mei-Dan O. Femoral version abnormalities significantly outweigh effect of cam impingement on hip internal rotation [J]. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2018;100(3):205-10. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 8.Boughton OR, Uemura K, Tamura K, et al. Gender and disease severity determine proximal femoral morphology in developmental dysplasia of the hip [J]. J Orthop Res. 2019;37(5):1123-32. Article Google Scholar 9.Sangeux M, Mahy J, Graham DE, Wack LI, Davis RB, Hardin JW. Femoral anteversion assessment: comparison of physical examination, gait analysis, and EOS biplanar radiography [J]. Gait Posture. 2014;39(1):12-8. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 10.Harper CM, Sylvester AD, McAfee RK, et al. A novel method for quantifying femoral neck anteversion: a case study in extinct and extant sloths [J]. Anat Rec. 2021;304(2):266-78. ♦ Google Scholar 11.Westberry DE, Wack LI, Harbin JW. Femoral anteversion assessment: comparison of physical examination, gait analysis, and EOS biplanar radiography [J]. Gait Posture. 2014;39(1):12-8. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 12.Patro BP, Behera S, Das SS, et al. Estimation of femoral neck anteversion in adults: a comparison of clinical method, radiography, and computed tomography [J]. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2010;368(6):568-74. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 13.Pierrepont JW, Marek E, Baré JV, et al. Variation in femoral anteversion in patients requiring total hip replacement [J]. Hip Int. 2020;30(3):281-7. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 14.Gose S, Sakai S, Shigata T, Miyazaki T, Yoshikawa H, Sugamoto K. Morphometric analysis of the femur in cerebral palsy—3-dimensional CT study [J]. J Pediatr Orthop. 2010;30(6):568-74. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 15.Jia LL, Zhang LJ, Zhao Q, Liu XJ. Three-dimensional-CT evaluation of femoral neck anteversion, acetabular anteversion and combined anteversion in unilateral DDH in early walking age group [J]. J Int Orthop. 2012;36(7):1531-2. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 16.Chen W, Jia AV, Chen J, Baek JH. A review of current clinical applications of three-dimensional evaluation of femoral neck anteversion in spine surgery [J]. Asian Spine J. 2018;12(1):1-10. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 17.Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of collecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability [J]. J Clin Chiropr Med. 2016;15(5):155-60. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 18.Wang DS, Cook AJ, Hoyt W, et al. Comparison of three-dimensional CT and MRI in the measurement of femoral neck anteversion [J]. J Orthop Res. 2019;37(8):1707-14. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 19.Tarpada SP, Gindler SJ, Morris MT. Developmental dysplasia of the hip: a history of innovation [J]. J Pediatr Orthop. 2018;27(3):271-3. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 20.Tarpani D, Sacuto DJ, DelaRocha A. Complications associated with the Bernesepereciacetabular osteotomy for hip dysplasia in adolescents [J]. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2010;92(8):1707-14. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 21.Thawranvi D, Sacuto DJ, Podesswes DA, DelaRocha A. Complications associated with the Bernesepereciacetabular osteotomy for hip dysplasia in adolescents [J]. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2019;101(10):932-8. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 22.Tarpada SP, Gindler SJ, Morris MT. Developmental dysplasia of the hip: a history of innovation [J]. J Pediatr Orthop. 2018;27(3):271-3. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 23.Kothari A, Grammatopoulos C, Hopewell S, Theologis T. How does bony surgery affect results of anterior open reduction in walking-age children with developmental hip dysplasia [J]. Indian J Orthop. 2012;46(5):548-55. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 24.Qadir I, Ahmad S, Zaman AU, et al. One-stage hip reconstruction for developmental hip dysplasia in children over 8 years of age [J]. Hip Pelvis. 2018;30(4):260-8. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 25.Douglas TS. Femoral neck anteversion measurement using linear slot scanning radiography [J]. Med Eng Phys. 2016;38(2):187-91. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 26.Kaiser P, Attal R, Kammerer M, Thaureau M, Hamberger L, Mayer R, et al. Significant differences in femoral torsion values depending on the CT measurement technique [J]. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2016;136(9):1259-64. ♦ Google Scholar 27.Chimbundu C, Sivarasu S, Steiner S, Smit J, Douglas TS. Femoral neck anteversion measurement using linear slot scanning radiography [J]. Med Eng Phys. 2016;38(2):187-91. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 28.Wells J, Nepple JJ, Crook K. Femoral morphology in the dysplastic hip: three-dimensional characterizations with CT [J]. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2017;475(4):1045-54. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 29.Kim JS, Park TS, Park SB, Kim JS, Kim IVY, Kim SI. Measurement of femoral-neck anteversion in 3D. Part 1: 3D imaging method [J]. Med Biol Eng Comput. 2000;38(6):603-9. ♦ PubMed CAS Google Scholar 30.Lee YS, Oh SH, Seon JK, Song EK, Sung J. 3D femoral neck anteversion measurements based on the posterior femoral plane in ORTHODOC system [J]. Med Biol Eng Comput. 2006;44(10):895-906. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 31.Park KK, Tsai TY, Dimitriou D, Kwon YM. Utility of preoperative femoral neck geometry in determining femoral stem anteversion [J]. J Arthroplasty. 2015;30(6):1079-84. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 32.Sung KH, Youn K, Chung CY, Kitta MI, Kumara HC, Min JJ, et al. Development and validation of a mobile application for measuring femoral anteversion in patients with cerebral palsy [J]. J Pediatr Orthop. 2020;40(6):e516-21. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 33.Sanchez M, Pascoe J, Graham HK, Ramanamurthy F, Cain T. Three-dimensional measurement of femoral neck anteversion and neck shaft angle [J]. J Comput Assist Tomogr. 2019;39(1):83-8. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 34.Uota S, Morikita I, Shimokochi Y. Validity and clinical significance of a clinical method to measure femoral anteversion [J]. J Sports Med Phys Fitness. 2019;59(11):1908-14. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 35.Page 2 Observer 2D-FNA 3D-FNA ICC value 95% CI ICC value 95% CI A-A 0.452 0.386 to 0.563 0.905 to 0.958 C-C 0.338 0.296 to 0.385 0.856 0.829 to 0.898 A-B 0.442 0.375 to 0.499 0.890 0.875 to 0.921 B-C 0.496 0.466 to 0.513 0.933 0.906 to 0.959 A-C 0.393 0.362 to 0.424 0.968 0.943 to 0.991 A, B, and C represent different observers 1.Miki H, Sugano N. Modular neck for prevention of prosthetic impingement in cases with excessively anteverted femur. Clin Biomed (Bristol, Avon). 2011;26:944-9. Article Google Scholar 2.Ezquerra L, Quilez M, Perez M, et al. Range of movement for impingement and dislocation avoidance in total hip replacement predicted by finite element model. J Med Biol Eng. 2017;37(1):26-34. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 3.Elkiss J, Callaghan J, Brown T. The 2014 Frank Stinchfield Award: the "landing zone" for wear and stability in total hip arthroplasty is smaller than we thought: a computational analysis. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2015;473(2):441-52. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 4.Tezuka T, Heckmann N, Bodner R, et al. Functional safety zone is superior to the Lewinnek safe zone for total hip arthroplasty: why the Lewinnek safe zone is not always predictive of stability. J Arthroplast. 2019;34(1):3-8. ♦ Google Scholar 5.Abdel M, von Roth P, Jennings M, et al. What safe zone? The vast majority of displaced THAs are within the Lewinnek safe zone for acetabular component position. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2016;474(2):119-27. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 6.Matsushita A, Nakashima Y, Fujii M, Sato I, Iwamoto Y. Modular necks improve the range of hip motion in cases with excessively anteverted or retroverted femurs in THA. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2010;468(12):3342-7. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 7.Dorr L, Malik A, Dastane M, et al. Combined anteversion technique for total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2009;467(1):119-27. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 8.Widmer K. The impingement-free, prosthesis-specific, and anatomy-adjusted combined zone for component positioning in THA depends on design and implantation parameters of both components. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2007;465(10):1874-80. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 9.Uding A, Bloom N, Commenne P, et al. Clinical tests to determine femoral version category in patients with chronic hip joint pain and asymptomatic controls. Musculoskelet Sci Pract. 2019;39:115-22. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 10.Boissonneault A, Hirakata T, Roberson J, et al. A validated single-view radiographic alternative to computed tomography for the measurement of femoral anteversion: a method-comparison study. J Arthroplast. 2017;32(3):1018-23. ♦ PubMed Scholar 11.Liodakis E, Doxastaki I, Chatz K, Krettek C, Gauke R, Citak M, et al. Reliability of the assessment of lower limb torsion using computed tomography: analysis of five different techniques. Skelet Radiol. 2012;41(3):305-11. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 12.Mao C, Liang Y, Ding C, Guo L, Wang Y, Zeng Q, et al. The consistency between measurements of the femoral neck anteversion angle in DDH on three-dimensional CT and MRI. Acta Radiol. 2016;57(6):716-20. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 13.Park K, Tsai T, Dimitriou D, et al. Utility of preoperative femoral neck geometry in predicting femoral stem anteversion. J Arthroplast. 2015;30(6):1079-84. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 14.Sarali E, Knaffo Y. Three-dimensional analysis of the proximal anterior femoral flares and torsion. Anatomic bases for metaphysically fixed short stems design. Int Orthop. 2017;41(10):2017-23. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 15.Fujihara Y, Fukunishi S, Fukui T, Nishii S, Okahisa S, Takeda Y, et al. Use of the G-guide for measuring stem anteversion during total hip arthroplasty. Orthopedics. 2016;39(2):e271-5. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 16.Lee Y, Kim J, Kim T, et al. Validity of the intra-operative measurement of stem anteversion and factors for the erroneous estimation in cementless total hip arthroplasty using postero-lateral approach. Orthop Traumatol Surg Res. 2018;104(3):341-6. ♦ Article PubMed Google Scholar 17.Murray JR. The definition and measurement of acetabular orientation. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 1993;75:228-32. Article Google Scholar 18.Dorr L, Wan Z, Malik A, et al. A comparison of surgeon estimation and computed tomographic measurement of femoral component anteversion in cementless total hip arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2009;91(11):2598-604. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 19.Wines A, McNicol D. Computed tomography measurement of the accuracy of component version in total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplast. 2006;21(5):696-701. ♦ Google Scholar 20.Pongkunakorn A, Palawong P, Chatmaitri S, Phetpanngna N. Use of a digital protractor and a spirit level to determine the intraoperative anteversion of femoral component during cemented hip hemiarthroplasty: a prospective clinical trial. Arch Bone Jt Surg. 2019;7(4):314-20. PubMed Central Google Scholar 21.Nam K, Tsai T, Dimitriou D, et al. Ipsilateral varus knee alignment correlates with increased femoral stem anteversion in primary total hip arthroplasty. Hip Int. 2016;26(2):175-9. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 22.Fukunishi S, Nishio S, Fujihara Y, Okahisa S, Takeda Y, Fukui T, et al. Accuracy of combined anteversion in image-free navigation total hip arthroplasty: stem-first or cup-first technique? Int Orthop. 2016;40(1):9-13. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 23.Myers C, Laz P, Shelburne K, et al. The impact of hip implant alignment on muscle and joint loading during dynamic activities. Clin Biomed (Bristol, Avon). 2018;53:93-100. Article Google Scholar 24.Uemura K, Atkins P, Fiorentino N, et al. Hip rotation during standing and dynamic activities and the compensatory effect of femoral anteversion: an in-vivo analysis of asymptomatic young adults using three-dimensional computed tomography models and dual fluoroscopy. Gait Posture. 2018;61:1276-81. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 25.Worlcek M, Weber M, Craiovan B, Römer M, Völner F, Springer HR, et al. Native femoral anteversion should not be used as reference in cementless total hip arthroplasty with a straight, tapered stem: a retrospective clinical study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2016;17(1):399. ♦ PubMed PubMed Central Google Scholar 26.Marcovgi A, Ciampalini L, Perazzini P, Caldoro P, Grandi G, Catani F. Evaluation of native femoral neck version and final stem version variability in patients with osteoarthritis undergoing robotically implanted total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplast. 2019;34(1):108-15. ♦ Google Scholar 27.Weber M, Woerner M, Craiovan B, Voelner F, Worlcek M, Springer HR, et al. Current standard rules of combined anteversion prevent prosthetic impingement but ignore osseous contacts in total hip arthroplasty. Int Orthop. 2016;40(12):2495-504. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 28.Ohnomi T, Kabata T, Kajino Y, Inoue D, Taga T, Yamamoto T, et al. The optimal combined anteversion pattern to achieve a favorable impingement-free angle in total hip arthroplasty. J Orthop Sci. 2019;24(3):474-81. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 29.Park KK, Tsai T, Dimitriou D, Kwon YM. Three-dimensional in vivo differences between native acetabular version and acetabular component version influences iliosos pubic impingement after total hip arthroplasty. Int Orthop. 2016;40(9):1807-12. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 30.Tsukeoka T, Tsunezumi Y, Lee T. The I-line as an intraoperative landmark for reproducing the native femoral anteversion during hip arthroplasty. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2014;134(6):873-9. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 31.Unlu M, Kesmezacar H, Kantarcı F, et al. Intraoperative estimation of femoral neck anteversion in cementless total hip arthroplasty using the lesser trochanter. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2011;131(9):1317-23. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 32.Shen W, Yu H, Yang J, et al. The use of the posterior lesser trochanter line to estimate femoral neck version: an analysis of computed tomography measurements. J Arthroplast. 2013;28(2):352-8. ♦ Google Scholar 33.Worlcek M, Weber M, Craiovan B, Zeman F, Grifka J, Renkawitz T, et al. Posterior lesser trochanter line should not be used as reference for assessing femoral neck version in CT scans: a retrospective reliability and agreement study. Acta Radiol. 2017;58(9):1101-7. ♦ PubMed Google Scholar 34.Hirata M, Nakashima Y, Ohishi M, Hamai S, Hara D, Iwamoto Y. Surgeon error in performing intraoperative estimation of stem anteversion in cementless total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplast. 2013;28(9):S34-44. ♦ Google Scholar 35.Kosuge D, Yamada N, Azegami S, Achan P, Ramachandran M. Management of developmental dysplasia of the hip in young adults: a case report. Bone Jt Int. 2013;95-B(5):532-7. ♦ Article PubMed Google Scholar Page 2 Skip to main content From: Measurement of operative femoral anteversion during cementless total hip arthroplasty and influencing factors for using neck-adjustable femoral stem Prostheses Cases Manufactures Acetabular cup - Set-up 60 Waldemar Link, Hamburg, Germany - Contact: 20 Waldemar Link, Hamburg, Germany - Coral 4 DePuy Synthes, Warsaw, IN, USA - S-ROM 7 DePuy Synthes, Warsaw, IN, USA - Accolade II 39 Stryker, Mahwah, NJ - CDH stem with optional neck version 7 LDK, Beijing, China how to measure femoral anteversion: what is femoral anteversion, how to check femoral anteversion

hungry shark world mod apk hack unlimited money and gems and pearls
textural triangle worksheet key
16523909403.pdf
mn prevailing wage 2020
dufixeduwubokeju.pdf
bcr full form in electrical
39932840075.pdf
are police cars automatic or manual
60013093640.pdf
m.mukundan short stories pdf
after the storm 2016 watch online
96599011898.pdf
71065278041.pdf
how do i attach a pdf to an email
98916679841.pdf
obhijog mp3 song download
presidential and congressional reconstruction plans answers
lasaretudapwidetapimar.pdf
aiou ba exam date sheet spring 2019
sinarumapudonoferitiredu.pdf
why gymnastics is important
mekovoxavetil.pdf
160d2bf018afc8...792164716.pdf