Optimal Location of Subtrochanteric Osteotomy in Total Hip Arthroplasty for Crowe Type IV Developmental Dysplasia of Hip
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Abstract

Background

When reconstructing a hip with developmental dysplasia with high dislocation, sub-trochanteric shortening osteotomy is always needed for placing the acetabular component in the anatomical position. However, the procedure can result in some complications, such as the non-union of the osteotomy. We evaluated the contact area and coincidence rate between the proximal and distal fragments at different levels and lengths of femoral osteotomy and determined the optimal location of subtrochanteric femoral shortening transverse osteotomy in patients with unilateral Crowe type IV developmental dysplasia of the hip (DDH). The consistency between the proximal and distal segments was assessed as a possible predictive indicator of the union of the osteotomy site.

Methods

We retrospectively reviewed 57 patients with unilateral Crowe type IV DDH who underwent X-ray imaging of both hip joints. We labelled the inner and outer diameters of the circular ring as N (mm) and M (mm), respectively. We defined the area overlapped between the proximal and distal ring as contact area S (mm²), and the ratio of contact area to distal ring area as coincidence rate R.

Results

N varied from 9.8 to 15.2 and M varied from 20.7 to 24 mm, with both demonstrating a gradually decreasing trend in the proximal to distal direction. At the lengths of osteotomy ranging of 0.5–2 cm, there were no differences in S between the different levels of osteotomy in each group. At lengths of osteotomy ≤ 2.5 cm, a significant higher coincidence rate was noted from the level of 2 cm below the lesser trochanter to other positions below the level. At lengths of osteotomy of 3–5.5 cm, a significantly higher coincidence rate was observed from the level of 1.5 cm below the lesser trochanter to other positions below the level.

Conclusions

Our findings suggest that femoral shortening transverse osteotomy at the optimal subtrochanteric level can predictably increase the contact area and coincidence rate, which may contribute to the union at the osteotomy site. In consideration of the stability of the protheses, it appears appropriate
that the location of osteotomy should be slightly shifted distally.

Introduction

Total hip arthroplasty (THA) is the gold standard treatment in end-stage hip disorders—such as osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, and hip dislocation—that lead to significant pain and loss of function [1]. Performing THA in Crowe type IV developmental dysplasia of the hip (DDH) is technically demanding and presents many challenges to the surgeon on, both, the femoral and acetabular sides. One of the most important steps is transferring the hip into the anatomical center of rotation for durable results and correcting the functions of the abductor muscles [2, 3]. In restoring the anatomical center of hip rotation, the leg may be lengthened by over 4 cm [4], which increases the risk of direct or indirect neurologic injury [5]. Consequently, subtrochanteric femoral shortening osteotomy was introduced to facilitate pulling down of the femur, correct the rotational abnormalities, preserve the proximal femoral metaphysis, and reduce the risk of nerve injury [6]. Various subtrochanteric osteotomy techniques with other cutting shapes—transverse, oblique, double-chevron, and Z-shaped—have been previously described [7–13]. Transverse osteotomy may be recommended because of the technical simplicity in adjusting the anteversion angle and minimal damage of the periosteum at the osteotomy site [14, 15]. However, the risk of non-union remains a major concern in the procedure [16, 17]. Limited bone contact area is a major disadvantage of transverse osteotomy, which may interfere with the bone healing process [18, 19]. The consistency of the interfaces and canal diameters between the proximal and distal segments may contribute to union, and the two osteotomy interfaces should be as smooth as possible to maintain their intactness [20].

In order to assess the consistency between the proximal and distal segments as a potential predictive indicator of the union of the osteotomy site, we evaluated the contact area and coincidence rate between the proximal and distal fragments at different levels and lengths of femoral osteotomy, and determined the optimal location of subtrochanteric femoral shortening transverse osteotomy in patients with Crowe type IV DDH.

Material And Methods
We searched our Medical Image Database using our hospital’s picture archiving and communication system (PACS) and retrospectively reviewed the X-ray data of 102 patients with a high dislocation of the hip between 2010 and 2018. The inclusion criteria for this study were (1) unilateral Crowe type IV DDH with a normal contralateral hip, and (2) the hip radiograph in the anteroposterior (AP) position included a fixed reference, such as a yuan coin. The exclusion criteria included previous surgical history or fractures with deformities. Of the 102 patients, the following patients were excluded: 14 patients due to bilateral hip diseases, 8 patients without DDH of Crowe IV category, 18 patients without images with a fixed reference, and five patients who had undergone a prior ipsilateral hip surgery. Subsequently, we evaluated 57 patients with unilateral Crowe type IV DDH (Fig. 1) and included 46 females and 11 males with an overall mean age of 53 years (range, 20–75).

The AP radiographs were imported into Adobe Photoshop CS6 software v13.0 (Adobe Systems, Inc., San Jose, CA, USA) for image processing and calculating the measurements. First, we magnified or shrunk the radiographs to fit the actual size of the coin. Second, we drew a line to mark the femoral anatomical axis and sixteen vertical lines perpendicular to this axis from 0 to 8 cm below the lesser trochanter at intervals of 0.5 cm (Fig. 2). The reasons we regarded the 8-cm mark below the lesser trochanter as the most distant point are: (1) most osteotomies located at the proximal femur—including just distal to the lesser trochanter [21–25]—are at 1–3 cm below the lesser trochanter [7, 20, 26, 27]; and (2) according to Su et al. [28], the femoral isthmus begins at 8 cm below the lesser trochanter, which influences the stability of the prosthesis and, therefore, osteotomy should not be performed at or beyond this level.

In order to measure the area of cross-section of osteotomy, each section was assumed to be in the shape of a circular ring. We labelled the inner diameter of the circular ring as \( N \) (mm), and the external diameter as \( M \) (mm). We identified the overlapped area between the proximal and distal rings as contact area, \( S \) (mm\(^2\)), and the ratio of contact area to distal ring area as coincidence rate, \( R \)

\[
S = \frac{\pi(M_D^2 - N_P^2)}{4},
\]

\[
R = \frac{M_D^2 - N_P^2}{M_D^2 - N_D^2}.
\]

(Fig. 3). Mathematically, which was simplified to \((M_D^2 - N_P^2)\), and
Overall, 17 sets of data for M and N, ranging from 0 to 8 cm below the lesser trochanter at intervals of 0.5 cm, were measured. We divided the length of osteotomy from 0.5 to 7 cm at intervals of 0.5 cm and named the proximal location of osteotomy as the level of osteotomy. According to the measured data, we obtained 14 groups of data for the contact area S and coincidence rate R for different lengths of osteotomy. We only measured the levels from 0 to 8 cm below the lesser trochanter at intervals of 0.5 cm; therefore, different groups had a different number of the levels of osteotomy, i.e., different groups had a different number of observations for S and R values. With an increase of 0.5 cm in the length of osteotomy, the number of observations decreased by one. As a result, the group with osteotomy at 0.5 cm length (0.5L group) had 16 levels, the group with osteotomy at 1 cm length (1L group) had 15 observations, the group with osteotomy at 1.5 cm length (1.5L) had 14 observations, and so on. We incorporated a simple correction in the data. If \( M_P \geq M_D \), and \( N_P \leq N_D \), or \( M_D \geq M_P \), and \( N_D \leq N_P \), then R was equal to 1. If \( M_D \leq N_P \), then coincidence rate R was equal to 0.

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software v24.0 (IBM Inc., Armonk, NY, USA). In each group, intra-group comparisons of S and R values were performed separately using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Student-Newman-Keuls test (q-test). The level of significance was set at \( p < 0.05 \).

Results
The average N values were 15.2 and 9.8 mm at just below the lesser trochanter and 8 cm below the lesser trochanter, respectively. The average M values were 24 and 20.7 mm at just distal to the lesser trochanter and 8 cm below the lesser trochanter, respectively. Both, average M and N values, demonstrated a gradually decreasing trend distally. The detailed measurements are summarized in Table 1.

In the 0.5L group, the minimum S, 315.4 mm\(^2\), was at the level of just below the lesser trochanter, while the maximum S, 339.9 mm\(^2\), was located at 1 cm below the lesser trochanter. There was no statistical difference in S between the different levels of the 0.5L group (\( p = 1 \)). In groups with osteotomy at 1–2 cm, no statistical difference in S between the levels of osteotomy in the three groups was observed (\( p = 0.807 \) for 1L group, \( p = 0.36 \) for 1.5L group, \( p = 0.071 \) for 2L group). In the
2.5L group, the minimum S, 231.4 mm², appeared at the level of just below the lesser trochanter; the S value of this level was significantly lower than those in the other levels (p = 0.003). In the remaining nine groups, no statistical difference was noted in the levels of osteotomy, except for the level of just below the lesser trochanter, which had the smallest S value in each group. These data are summarized in Table 2, the results of ANOVA and q-test of each group are showed in Additional file1–14 (see Additional file 1-14).

We observed some significant results in the R values as well. In the 0.5L group, the minimum R, 86%, was observed at the level of just below the lesser trochanter. The R values were 90.8%, 94.2%, and 95.2% for the levels of 0.5, 1, and 1.5 cm below the lesser trochanter, respectively. A statistically significant decrease was found in R in the four proximal levels above the level of 2 cm below the lesser trochanter in comparison to those below this level (p < 0.0001). Similar results were observed in 1L, 1.5L, 2L, and 2.5L groups. In the 3L group, the R values were 61%, 73.5%, and 81.5% for the levels of 0, 0.5, and 1 cm below the lesser trochanter, respectively. From the level of 1.5 cm below the lesser trochanter to other levels below this level, there was a significant increase in the R values in comparison to the three proximal levels. With respect to the length of osteotomy ranging from 3.5 to 5.5 cm, the results were similar to those of the 3L group. In the 6L group, the R values were 55.2%, 67.5%, 76.3%, 82.4%, and 86.3% for the levels of 0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, and 2 cm below the lesser trochanter, respectively. According to q-test, there was a significant increase in the R value at the distal three levels in comparison to the two proximal levels. In the 6.5L group, a significant increase was observed in the R value at the level of 1 and 1.5 cm below the lesser trochanter in comparison with the two proximal levels. Finally, in the 7L group, no difference was found at the level of 0.5 and 1 cm below the lesser trochanter, except for the position of just below the lesser trochanter, which had the smallest R value. The results of the one-way ANOVA showed highly significant differences between the different levels in each group (p < 0.0001 for each group). These data are summarized in Table 3, the results of ANOVA and q-test of each group are showed in Additional file1–14 (see Additional file 1-14).

Discussion
In Crowe type IV DDH, the anatomy of the hip joint is markedly distorted due to acetabular and femoral bone stock deficiency, narrower femoral canal, excessive anteversion of the femur, valgus neck-shaft angle, posterior location of the greater trochanter, soft tissue contractures, lower limb length discrepancy, and dysfunctional hip abduction [29, 30]. With these abnormalities, it is difficult to achieve and maintain a reduction in the true acetabulum. Therefore, sub-trochanteric femoral shortening osteotomy was devised to make reduction easier; however, it can be associated with complications, such as limping, sciatic nerve injury, and non-union of the osteotomy, or compromise the long-term survival of the stem.

Non-union of osteotomy may lead to varus angulation, pain, loss of rotational stability, and prosthetic loosening [6, 7, 23]. The incidence of non-union at the osteotomy site ranges from 0% to 22% [18, 29, 31–33], with multiple contributing factors. The most important factor is the instability at the osteotomy site [34], which can be divided into three aspects. The first aspect is the type of the sub-trochanteric femoral shortening osteotomy; a transverse osteotomy was reported to have lower rotational stability than other techniques [6, 34], such as oblique, double-chevron, and Z-shaped. On the contrary, Muratli et al. [34] performed a biomechanical study comparing four different sub-trochanteric osteotomy groups and demonstrated that there was no single inherent feature that increased the stability of the osteotomy designs. A comprehensive meta-analysis by Li et al. [14] reported no significant difference between the transverse and modified methods in terms of complications and survival rates. Transverse osteotomy, however, is a simple technique to adjust the anteversion angle with minimal damage to the periosteum at the osteotomy site [14, 15]. Therefore, we chose this osteotomy technique as a viable mean of shortening the femur. The other two aspects that affect the stability are the morphology of the femoral stem and the fixation method. A cylindrical prosthesis, such as S-ROM stem (Courtesy of DePuy Orthopaedics, Warsaw, IN, USA), was recommended because it has a distal slit and proximal fixation, which provides better distal engagement and facilitates rotational stability [25, 35]. Many authors have also published results of transverse osteotomy with strut grafts and a cable or plate and screws used for fixation [7, 32, 36]. Even cemented fixation of the stem has been used to improve the rotational stability [19, 22]. Other
factors that affect union are the contact area between the proximal and distal segments [18–20], bone stock, and vascularity. However, the limited bone contact area is a major disadvantage of transverse osteotomy, which may interfere with the bone healing process [18, 19]. The consistency of the interfaces and canal diameters between the proximal and distal segments may contribute to union [20].

In order to promote union at the osteotomy site, we evaluated the contact area, S, and coincidence rate, R, between the proximal and distal fragments at different levels and lengths of femoral osteotomy, and determined the optimal position of sub-trochanteric femoral shortening transverse osteotomy in patients with high developmental dysplasia.

Our results demonstrate that the dimensions of the femur from 0 to 8 cm below the lesser trochanter decreased gradually. However, the variations were less pronounced in comparison with the normal dimensions of the femur [37, 38]; the differences were 3.3 and 5.4 mm for the external and internal diameters, respectively. These results suggest that patients with Crowe type IV DDH have straighter intramedullary canals [30, 39]. With regards to the contact area and coincidence rate, different lengths of osteotomy presented different results. While the external and inner diameters of the cross-section of osteotomy did not change by a lot by in comparison with normal dimensions of the femur, the coincidence rates were significantly higher at 2 cm below the lesser trochanter and below the level (0.5–2.5L groups); at 1.5 cm below the lesser trochanter and below the level (3–5.5L groups); at 1 cm below the lesser trochanter and below the level (6-6.5L groups); and at 0.5 cm below the lesser trochanter and below the level (7L group). Furthermore, with increasing the size of the resected femoral bone fragment, the contact area and coincidence rate decreased gradually. For example, at levels of 2 cm below the lesser trochanter, the contact area and coincidence rate were 308.6 mm² and 92.2% in the 2.5L group, respectively, 306.5 mm² and 91.4% in the 3L group, respectively, and 305.6 mm² and 90.2% in the 3.5L group, respectively. These results indicate that the proximal femur varied greatly, in both size and shape, relative to the distal femur, and the distal femur had straighter intramedullary canals in patients with Crowe type IV DDH. The findings that the contact area was not
significantly different between the levels in the 0.5L–2L groups except for the level of just below the lesser trochanter with the smallest contact area in the 2.5L–7L groups may be explained by the following two reasons: the dimensions of the proximal femur varied greatly relative to those of the distal femur, and the diameter of the proximal femur was greater than that of the distal femur. Consequently, it was better to perform the osteotomy at the distal femur. However, two aspects should be considered. First, the level of 8 cm below the lesser trochanter always reached the femoral isthmus according to a study of Su et al. [28], which may influence the stability of prosthesis; therefore, osteotomy should not be performed at or below this level. Second, the femoral stem should bridge the osteotomy site by a certain distance. Ozan et al. suggested that the femoral stem should pass from the osteotomy site for at least 4–5 cm [40], while Yang et al. believed that the femoral stem bridged the osteotomy site by at least 3 cm [41]; even a depth of at least 7 cm below the osteotomy site has been previously reported [22]. For primary arthroplasty, the size of the femoral stem is usually slightly more than 10 cm from the distal part of the lesser trochanter to the distal end of the stem; therefore, the osteotomy site should not be too distal to allow the stem to bridge it with sufficient length. Therefore, it seems appropriate that the location of osteotomy should slightly be shifted distally in consideration of these factors. For example, in the 7L group, there were just three levels of osteotomy. The contact area and coincidence rate were 194 mm$^2$ and 54%, respectively, at the level of just below the lesser trochanter, 239.8 mm$^2$ and 66.9% at the level of 0.5 cm below the lesser trochanter, respectively, and 267.9 mm$^2$ and 75.6% at the level of 1 cm below the lesser trochanter, respectively. Conclusively, it is better to choose the level of 1 cm below the lesser trochanter, although there were no significant differences between the levels at 1 and 0.5 cm below the lesser trochanter.

We recognize that there are a number of major limitations to the current study. First, the number of patients was relatively small. However, the incidence of Crowe type IV DDH is relatively low, and it is difficult to obtain a larger data series from a single institution. Second, the method of assessing the radiographic diameter of the femoral canal was imprecise because the femoral canal is not precisely
round; however, other studies [42–44] have used similar approximate methods to assess the diameter of the femoral canal, and, therefore, we believe our final assessments of the contact areas and coincidence rates are valid.

**Conclusions**

Subtrochanteric femoral shortening transverse osteotomy is a preferred technique over THA in patients with high DDH. The optimal location of osteotomy varied according to the size of the resected femoral bone fragment. Our findings may provide a reference for surgeons in performing shortening transverse osteotomy. Further studies are needed to identify the perfect location of osteotomy and improve the union at the osteotomy site.
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Tables

Table 1. The mean inner and external diameters at different levels of osteotomy

| Level (cm) | Inner Diameter (mm) | External Diameter (mm) |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 0         | 15.2                | 24.0                   |
| 0.5       | 13.8                | 23.3                   |
| 1         | 12.8                | 22.7                   |
| 1.5       | 12.1                | 22.3                   |
| 2         | 11.5                | 21.9                   |
| 2.5       | 11.1                | 21.5                   |
| 3         | 11.0                | 21.3                   |
| 3.5       | 10.8                | 21.1                   |
| 4         | 10.7                | 20.9                   |
| 4.5       | 10.7                | 20.9                   |
| 5         | 10.6                | 20.8                   |
| 5.5       | 10.4                | 20.8                   |
| 6         | 10.3                | 20.7                   |
| 6.5       | 10.2                | 20.7                   |
| 7         | 10.0                | 20.7                   |
| 7.5       | 9.9                 | 20.7                   |
| 8         | 9.8                 | 20.7                   |
### Table 2. Contact Area at different levels and lengths of femoral osteotomy

| Level (cm) | 0.5  | 1   | 1.5 | 2   | 2.5  | 3   | 3.5 | 4   | 4   |
|------------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 0          | 315.40 | 286.26 | 266.63 | 248.11 | 231.41 | 222.98 | 215.45 | 206.18 | 203.14 |
| 0.5        | 329.72 | 310.09 | 291.57 | 274.87 | 266.44 | 258.91 | 249.64 | 246.46 | 244.01 |
| 1          | 339.95 | 321.43 | 304.73 | 296.30 | 288.77 | 279.51 | 276.32 | 274.21 | 273.02 |
| 1.5        | 339.82 | 323.12 | 314.68 | 307.16 | 297.89 | 294.71 | 292.60 | 291.65 | 289.70 |
| 2          | 337.05 | 328.62 | 321.09 | 311.83 | 308.64 | 306.54 | 305.59 | 303.43 | 302.09 |
| 2.5        | 337.96 | 330.43 | 321.16 | 317.98 | 315.87 | 314.92 | 312.77 | 312.14 | 309.00 |
| 3          | 334.22 | 324.96 | 321.77 | 319.66 | 318.71 | 316.56 | 315.93 | 312.80 | 315.00 |
| 3.5        | 329.11 | 325.93 | 323.82 | 322.87 | 320.72 | 320.09 | 316.96 | 319.29 | 317.00 |
| 4          | 329.62 | 327.52 | 326.57 | 324.41 | 323.78 | 320.66 | 322.99 | 321.25 | N   |
| 4.5        | 327.73 | 326.77 | 324.62 | 323.99 | 320.87 | 323.20 | 321.46 | N   | N   |
| 5          | 329.59 | 327.44 | 326.81 | 323.68 | 326.01 | 324.28 | NA   | NA   | N   |
| 5.5        | 330.95 | 330.32 | 327.20 | 329.53 | 327.79 | NA   | NA   | NA   | N   |
| 6          | 332.95 | 329.82 | 332.15 | 330.42 | NA   | NA   | NA   | N   | N   |
| 6.5        | 331.94 | 334.27 | 332.54 | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | N   | N   |
| 7          | 338.91 | 337.17 | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | N   | N   |
| 7.5        | 337.64 | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | N   | N   |
| 8          | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | N   | N   |

NA: Not Available

### Table 3. Coincidence Rate at different levels and lengths of femoral osteotomy

| Level (cm) | 0.5  | 1   | 1.5 | 2   | 2.5  | 3   | 3.5 | 4   | 4   |
|------------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 0          | 86.02% | 77.04% | 71.09% | 66.59% | 62.85% | 61.06% | 59.33% | 57.31% | 57.31% |
| 0.5        | 90.79% | 84.98% | 80.05% | 76.61% | 74.88% | 73.47% | 71.42% | 71.27% | 71.27% |
| 1          | 94.24% | 89.60% | 86.09% | 84.56% | 83.30% | 81.50% | 81.32% | 80.30% | 80.30% |
| 1.5        | 95.18% | 91.74% | 90.23% | 89.06% | 87.52% | 87.21% | 91.40% | 90.24% | 89.20% |
| 2          | 96.53% | 95.01% | 93.87% | 92.44% | 92.21% | 91.40% | 90.24% | 90.24% | 89.20% |
| 2.5        | 98.06% | 96.80% | 95.67% | 95.28% | 94.55% | 93.36% | 92.43% | 91.66% | 91.66% |
| 3          | 98.13% | 96.89% | 96.58% | 95.81% | 94.72% | 93.81% | 93.06% | 91.74% | 91.74% |
| 3.5        | 98.23% | 97.84% | 96.93% | 95.88% | 94.96% | 94.09% | 92.90% | 92.69% | 92.69% |
| 4          | 98.90% | 98.06% | 97.09% | 96.16% | 95.06% | 94.03% | 93.85% | 92.99% | 92.99% |
| 4.5        | 98.49% | 97.31% | 96.67% | 95.54% | 94.41% | 94.22% | 93.35% | NA   | NA   |
| 5          | 98.21% | 97.41% | 96.42% | 95.09% | 94.98% | 94.98% | 93.99% | NA   | NA   |
| 5.5        | 98.69% | 97.86% | 96.52% | 96.20% | 95.21% | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   |
| 6          | 98.49% | 97.35% | 97.01% | 96.20% | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   |
| 6.5        | 98.22% | 97.86% | 96.87% | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   |
| 7          | 98.99% | 98.16% | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   |
| 7.5        | 98.36% | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   |
| 8          | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   |

NA: Not Available
Additional File Legend

Additional file 1. Table 1A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 0.5L group. Table 1B that shows the result of q-test of 0.5L group for contact area. Table 1C that shows the q-test of q-test of 0.5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 2. Table 2A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 1L group. Table 2B that shows the result of q-test of 1L group for contact area. Table 2C that shows the q-test of q-test of 1L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 3. Table 3A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 1.5L group. Table 3B that shows the result of q-test of 1.5L group for contact area. Table 3C that shows the q-test of q-test of 1.5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 4. Table 4A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 2L group. Table 4B that shows the result of q-test of 2L group for contact area. Table 4C that shows the q-test of q-test of 2L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 5. Table 5A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 2.5L group. Table 5B that shows the result of q-test of 2.5L group for contact area. Table 5C that shows the q-test of q-test of 2.5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 6. Table 6A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 3L group. Table 6B that shows the result of q-test of 3L group for contact area. Table 6C that shows the q-test of q-test of 3L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 7. Table 7A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 3.5L group. Table 7B that shows the result of q-test of 3.5L group for contact area. Table 7C that shows the q-test of q-test of 3.5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 8. Table 8A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 4L group. Table 8B that shows the result of q-test of 4L group for contact area. Table 8C that shows the q-test of q-test of 4L group for coincidence rate.
Additional file 9. Table 9A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 4.5L group. Table 9B that shows the result of q-test of 4.5L group for contact area. Table 9C that shows the q-test of q-test of 4.5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 10. Table 10A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 5L group. Table 10B that shows the result of q-test of 5L group for contact area. Table 10C that shows the q-test of q-test of 5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 11. Table 11A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 5.5L group. Table 11B that shows the result of q-test of 5.5L group for contact area. Table 11C that shows the q-test of q-test of 5.5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 12. Table 12A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 6L group. Table 12B that shows the result of q-test of 6L group for contact area. Table 12C that shows the q-test of q-test of 6L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 13. Table 13A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 6.5L group. Table 13B that shows the result of q-test of 6.5L group for contact area. Table 13C that shows the q-test of q-test of 6.5L group for coincidence rate.

Additional file 14. Table 14A that shows the result of one-way ANOVA of 7L group. Table 14B that shows the result of q-test of 7L group for contact area. Table 14C that shows the q-test of q-test of 7L group for coincidence rate.

Figures
Figure 1

Flowchart depicting the selection of hips to be evaluated.
Figure 2

The inner and external diameters of each level of osteotomy on anteroposterior view on the radiograph. * A fixed reference, one-yuan coin.
Figure 3

A) The segment is resected. (B) Coupling of the proximal and distal femurs. (C) Axis view of the interfaces: a: external diameter of the proximal segment; b: inner diameter of the proximal segment; c: external diameter of the distal segment; d: inner diameter of the distal segment; e: the overlapped area between the proximal and distal segments (contact area, S); f: area of the distal segment; and g: area of the proximal segment.
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