12 ILLUSTRATIONS

12.1 Figures

- **CHAPTER 2**

2.1 *Scanning Electron Beam Microscopy images from healthy and osteoporotic trabecular bone showing reduction in bone thickness and interconnectivity.*

2.2 *Mediolateral cross-section through the human hip joint showing bones, muscles and other tissue.*

2.3 *Polished and tapered chrome-nickel steel Exeter hip stem and ball.*

2.4 *Endo-klinik classification of Grades of bone stock loss.*

2.5 *Intra-operative photos of implant removal (A), removed implant (B) and reaming of the femoral canal (C).*

2.6 *Intra-operative photos of determining plug insertion depth with the guide wire (A), plug insertion (B) and graft milling (C) [32].*

2.7 *Impaction Grafting tool kit and its application[41].*

2.8 *Intra-operative photos of graft charging (A), delivery of impaction hammer blows (B) and distal impaction. (C) [32].*

2.9 *Intra-operative photos of proximal impaction of reconstructed femur (A), handheld impaction (B) and completed impaction with phantom (C) [32].*

2.9 *Intra-operative photos of neo-medullary canal (A), retrograde cementing (B) and stem insertion (C)[32].*

2.10 *Cross-section through impaction grafted hip[41].*

2.12 *Phase triangle of bioglass identifying the biological effects of phase compositions. Area A: Bone Bonding; B: bioinert; C: resorbable; D: unstable; E: bone and tissue bonding; F: bioactive apatite glass ceramic; G: bioactive gels and glasses [132].*

2.13 *Number of patent applications filed between 1980 and 1997 in the USA.*

2.14 *Transversal cross-section of an impaction grafted Sawbone ® femur indicating the geometry of the biomechanical problem.*

2.15 *Norwich® bone mill dismantled to show components (left) and assembled (right).*

2.16 *Morsellising graft with the Howex® bone mill.*

2.17 *The Howex® bone mill blades (Right: coarse; Left: fine)*

2.18 *Hexgonal molecular structure of synthetic stoichiometric hydroxyl-apatite projected into the a,b-plane. The triangles and single and double lined circles represent the ions and the numbers give their height in atomic units [Å] above the a,b-plane [211].*

2.19 *Reference XRD signal intensity versus diffraction angle for stoichiometric HA.*

2.20 *Reference XRD signal intensity versus diffraction angle for stoichiometric TCP.*

2.21 *XRD signal intensity versus diffraction angle for a 20:80 HA/TCP composite ceramic.*

2.22 *CAD-drawing of shear box principle.*

2.23 *Definition of the shear resistance values cohesion* c *and shear angle* φ *using the Mohr-Coulomb circle and failure criterion.*

- **CHAPTER 3**

3.1 *Human femoral heads prior to milling. High variation in size and appearance.*

3.2 *Removal of soft tissue like cartilage from the human femoral heads.*

3.3 *Ovine humeral heads prior to milling.*

3.4 *Comparison of human and ovine bone graft morsellised with a Norwich bone mill. Grafts are compared fresh from mill and washed and dried.*

3.5 *Sectioned bovine humeral heads prior to milling (left). Comparison of human and bovine graft morsellised with the coarse and fine blades of the Howex mill (right).*

3.6 *50cm^3 charge of the experimental ceramic bone graft substitutes in standard property configuration: 80:20 HA/TCP, T_{sint}= 1150°C, 2-4mm.*

3.7 *Experimental ceramic bone graft substitutes (80:20 HA/TCP, T_{sint}= 1150°C, 25% porosity) sieved to three different size intervals.*

3.8 *SEM micrographs showing the typical surface topology of a HA/TCP ceramic sintered without organic additives for porosity creation (0% porosity).*

3.9 *Different volumetric mixes between ovine bone and the standard ceramic.*

- **CHAPTER 4**

4.1 *Schematic drawing of die-plunger device (left) and chart representing the compression test regime with its two compression, relaxation and recoil phases.*

4.2 *Die, plunger capped with porous disk and bottom disk. Die-plunger mounted in a Dartec HC10 test machine with computer-based control and data acquisition.*

4.3 *Derivation of compression secant modulus and relax-ation value.*

4.4 *Typical compression force versus time curves for human bone graft freshly milled with a Norwich bone mill. Black line: 1st compression 0-500N; grey line: 2nd compression 0-1000N.*

4.5 *Superimposed force vs. strain curves of a typical bone graft sample during initial 0-500N (black) and secondary 0-1000N compression (grey).*

4.6 *Force-strain curves of human graft compressed with a solid plunger (fresh, dry, standard and low strain rate) and with a porous plunger (fresh).*

4.7 *Force-strain curves of human bone grafts freshly milled with either the Norwich or the Howex (coarse blade) bone mill. Initial compression to 500N peak load.*

4.8 *Force-strain curves of human bone grafts freshly milled with either the Norwich or the Howex (coarse blade) bone mill. 2nd compression to 1000N peak load.*

4.9 *Compression stiffness for differently prepared human bone grafts. Secant moduli calculated during initial 0-500N compression.*

4.10 *Relaxation for differently prepared human bone grafts calculated as the relative drop in reaction force from 500N peak load after a 2min period.*

4.11 *Compression force vs. strain curves for human bone graft plus ovine and bovine xenografts during the initial 0-500N compression.*

4.13 *Representative time-relaxation curves for bone grafts and a typical ceramic graft substitute indicating. Left: linear time scale, Right: logarithmic time scale.*

4.14 *Sets of time-relaxation curves for different bone grafts indicating the variability of results within one sample group and the bandwidth of relaxation values between different groups of graft.*

4.15 *Relaxation after the initial 0-500N compression for human, ovine and bovine bone prepared and stored under different conditions.*

4.16 *Recoil as relative increase in volume over a two minute period after sample un-loading for human bone graft plus ovine and bovine xenografts.*

4.17 *Compression force vs. strain curves for human bone graft plus ovine and bovine xenografts during secondary 0-1000N compression.*

4.19 *Typical compression force vs. time curve for one sample of the standard ceramic configuration tested.*

4.21 *Compression force-strain curves for two HA/TCP ceramic graft configurations with extreme stiffness properties in comparison to typical bone grafts.*

4.22 *Compression force vs. strain curves for two HA/TCP ceramic graft configurations and a highly porous HA with extreme stiffness properties in comparison to human bone graft.*

4.23 *Compression moduli for different ceramic graft materials during the initial 0-500N compression compared to typical bone grafts.*

4.24 *Relaxation for different ceramic graft materials during the initial 0-500N compression compared to typical bone grafts.*

4.25 *Superposition of the force -strain curves of a typical ceramic graft for the initial 0-500N compression and the secondary 0-1000N compression.*

4.26 *Recoil of ceramic samples after initial compression from 0-500N calculated as the relative increase in sample height from maximum deflection after unloading.*

4.27 *Recoil calculated for ceramic and bone grafts with relation to the sample height at maximum compression (left) and with relation to the displacement (right).*

4.28 *Compression force vs. strain curves during secondary compression from 0-1000N for the standard ceramic and the stiffest and least stiff ceramic configuration.*

4.29 *Compression force vs. strain curves during secondary compression from 0-1000N for the stiffest and least stiff HA/TCP configuration, a highly porous HA and typical bone grafts.*

4.30 *Relative modulus increase between the secondary 0-500N compression (left) or the 600-1000N compression phase (right) and the initial 0-500N compression.*

4.31 *Superimposed relative relaxation versus time curves from 500N and 1000N for the standard ceramic. Peak force normalised to 100%, linear (left) and log-scale (right).*

4.32 *Particle size distribution after compression testing as weight-% per size class (left) or accumulated weight-% below size class (right). Varied: Ceramic porosity.*

4.33 *Particle size distribution after compression testing as weight-% per size class (left) or accumulated weight-% below size class (right). Varied: Ceramic sintering temperature.*

4.34 *Particle size distribution after compression testing as weight-% per size class (left) or accumulated weight-% below size class (right). Varied: Particle size prior to testing.*

4.35 *Particle size distribution after compression testing as weight-% per size class (left) or accumulated weight-% below size class (right). Varied ceramic chemical composition.*

4.36 *Density of loosely packed granular ceramics designed as bone graft extenders.*

4.37 *Typical compression force vs. time curve for a 1:1 volumetric bone plus ceramic graft mix.*

4.38 *Compression force vs. time curves for different volume mixes of bone graft with the standard ceramic extender compared to pure bone and pure ceramic for reference.*

4.39 *Time-relaxation curves for a 1:1 b/c mix compared to its pure constituents, ovine bone plus ceramic and human bone. Left: linear time scale, Right: logarithmic time scale.*

4.40 *Compression moduli for different mixes of fixed ovine bone and the standard ceramic graft during the initial 0-500N compression.*

4.41 *Relaxation for different mixes of fixed ovine bone and the standard ceramic graft during the initial 0-500N compression.*

4.42 *Recoil calculated for bone/ceramic graft mixes with relation to the sample height at maximum compression (left) and with relation to the maximum displacement (right).*

4.43 *Force-strain curves for different bone/ceramic mixes during secondary compression from 0-1000N in comparison to the pure ceramic and typical bone grafts.*

4.44 *Relative modulus increase between the secondary 0-500N compression (left) or the 600-1000N compression phase (right) and the initial 0-500N compression.*

- **CHAPTER 5**

5.1 *CAD-drawing of shear box principle.*

5.2 *Photograph of working shear box apparatus with the components from left to right: Motor, screw, shear box, loading frame for normal stress and ring spring. The three dial gauges from left to right record dilation, shear displacement and ring deformation.*

5.3 *Shear stress vs. shear deformation curves for different bone graft materials during shear-box testing.*

5.4 *Vertical versus horizontal shear displacement during a shear-box testing of different bone graft materials at a constant medium normal load.*

5.5 *Exemplary derivation of the shear properties shear angle φ and cohesion c by extrapolation of the Mohr-Coulomb failure envelope for the 1:1 bone/ceramic graft mix.*

5.6 *Shear angles φ and cohesion c calculated for pure ovine bone, a 1:1 bone/ceramic mix and a 1:9 bone/ceramic mix.*

- **CHAPTER 6**

6.1 *Illustration of the ovine tube-stem model and the loading geometry.*

6.2 *Accumulated subsidence during cyclic block loading for exemplary samples of pure ovine bone and two bone/ceramic mixes with volume ratios of 1:1 b/c and 1:9 b/c.*

6.3 *Average accumulated stem subsidence during block loading of ovine bone and two bone/ceramic graft mixes at 1:1 and 1:9 volume ratio.*

6.4 *Standard deviations of stem subsidence measurements for different graft materials after completion of different load blocks.*

6.5 *Accumulated stem subsidence during block loading of an ovine bone sample (top), a 1:1 (centre) and a 1:9 bone/ ceramic mix (bottom).*

6.6 *Accumulated stem subsidence during block loading of an ovine bone (left) and a 1:1 b/c mix sample (right). The number of cycles are represented on a logarithmic scale.*

6.7 *Logarithmic trendlines of subsidence accumulated during cyclic block loading superimposed for typical samples of pure ovine bone, a 1:1 and a 1:9 b/c graft mix.*

6.8 *Average accumulated stem subsidence during block loading of ovine bone and two bone/ceramic graft mixes at 1:1 and 1:9 volume ratio.*

- **CHAPTER 7**

7.1 *Proximal cross-section of a Sawbone femur showing a cemented impaction grafting.*

7.2 *Surgical stem alignment template superimposed onto an x-ray image of a typical hip to be revised by impaction grafting*[41].

7.3 *Comparison between a sketch of the human size tube-cone model (left) and a drawing from the surgical instruction manual showing the trial reduction (right)* [41].

7.4 *Tube and cone of the human size impaction grafting model.*

7.5 *Design sketch (left) and photo of the impactometer used for the controlled delivery of impaction energy and momentum.*

7.6 *Preparation of constant graft volumes for controlled charging and impaction with the human tube-cone model by using cup-like containers. container shown: 30cm*^{3} *volume of a 2:1 b/c mix..*

7.7 *Human tube-cone model after graft impaction and cone insertion mounted into Instron 8511 servo-hydraulic testing machine for cyclic block loading.*

7.8 *Pure ovine bone and the standard ceramic prior to mixing (1), 2:1 bone/ceramic mix (2), the standard 1:1 mix (3) and the 1:2 bone/ceramic mix (4).*

7.9 *Accumulated subsidence during cyclic block loading of a large bandwidth of typical samples of different graft materials and impaction energy levels.*

7.10 *Accumulated stem subsidence during block loading of a large bandwidth of typical samples of different graft materials and impaction energy levels (magnified chart section).*

7.11 *Accumulated stem subsidence during block loading of a highly stable 1:1 bone/extender graft mix containing non-porous ceramic granules (magnified chart section).*

7.12 *Accumulated subsidence during cyclic block loading for exemplary samples of pure ovine bone and to bone/ceramic mixes with volume ratios of 1:1 and 1:9 bone/ceramic.*

7.13 *Comparison of stem subsidence during block loading of ovine bone graft tested with the ovine model (light blue) and the human model (dark blue).*

7.14 *Comparison of two equivalent chart styles showing the accumulated stem subsidence as continuous curves (left or a connection of load block end positions (right).*

7.15 *Comparison of accumulated stem subsidence during block loading for pure human and ovine bone graft both pre-compacted with the standard 6.2J pre-compaction energy.*

7.16 *Comparison of accumulated stem subsidence during block loading for pure human and ovine bone graft both pre-compacted with the highest pre-compaction energy of 23.3J.*

7.17 *Comparison of accumulated stem subsidence during block loading for pure human and ovine bone graft versus a 1:1 bone/ceramic graft mix (6.2J pre-compaction energy).*

7.18 *Comparison of accumulated stem subsidence during block loading for pure bone grafts, the pure standard ceramic and a 1:1 bone/ceramic graft mix.*

7.19 *Comparison of accumulated stem subsidence during block loading for pure ovine bone and two 1:1 b/c mixes, one containing the standard ceramic and one containing a highly porous HA.*

7.20 *Comparison of accumulated stem subsidence during block loading for pure human and ovine bone graft versus a 1:1 b/c mix (standard ceramic, 23.3J pre-compaction energy).*

7.21 *Comparison of accumulated stem subsidence during block loading for pure human and ovine bone graft versus a 1:1 b/c mix (highly porous HA, 23.3J pre-compaction energy).*

7.22 *The influence of impaction energy levels on the stability against vertical subsidence for human bone graft pre-compacted with 6.2J (orange) and 23.3J (violet) energies.*

7.23 *The influence of impaction energy levels on the stability against vertical subsidence for ovine bone graft pre-compacted at 3.1J (brown), 6.2J (orange), 9.3J (grey) and 23.3J (violet).*

7.24 *The influence of impaction energy levels on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 1:1 b/c mix with the standard ceramic pre-compacted at 3.1J (brown), 6.2J (orange) and 23.3J (violet).*

7.25 *The influence of hammer force or momentum during constant energy impaction on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 1:1 bone/ceramic mix.*

7.26 *The influence of graft mixing ratios on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 2:1, 1:1 and 1:2 b/c mix of ovine bone and the standard ceramic (3.1J pre-compaction energy).*

7.27 *The influence of graft mixing ratios on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 2:1, and a 1:1 mix of ovine bone and the standard ceramic (6.2J pre-compaction energy)..*

7.28 *Comparison of stability against vertical subsidence for 2:1 and 1:1 b/c graft mixes and their pure constituents ovine bone and the standard ceramic.*

7.29 *The influence of graft mixing ratios on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 2:1, 1:1 and 1:2 b/c mix of ovine bone and highly porous HA.*

7.30 *The influence of ceramic porosity on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 1:1 bone/ceramic mix.*

7.31 *The influence of ceramic sintering temperature on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 1:1 b/c mix.*

7.32 *The influence of ceramic granule size on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 1:1 bone/ceramic mix.*

7.33 *The influence of ceramic chemical composition on the stability against vertical subsidence for a 1:1 b/c mix.*

7.34 *Torque required for stem release after test completion versus stability measured as number of cycles to fai1ure for all graft materials tested.*

7.35 *Torque required for stem release after test completion versus stability measured as number of cycles to fai1ure for all graft materials tested excluding the pure ceramic grafts.*

7.36 *Torque required for stem release after test completion versus stability measured as number of cycles to fai1ure for all graft materials tested.*

7.37 *Accumulated set during cone impaction for three samples with very different stability performance under cyclic loading. linear axis (left) and a log.- axis (right).*

7.38 *Accumulated set during cone impaction (left) in comparison with stability during block loading (right, cycles to failure) measured for three typical sample configurations.*

7.39 *Accumulated set during cone impaction (left) in comparison with stability during block loading (right) measured for different b/c mixing ratios.*

7.40 *Set per final hammer blow versus stability measured as number of cycles to failure for bone grafts (left) and various ceramic extenders plus b/c mixes (right).*

7.41 *Set per final hammer blow versus stability measured as number of cycles to fai1ure for all samples. An exponential trendline highlights the set-stability relationship.*

- **CHAPTER 8**

8.1 *Comparison between shear angles and cohesion (left) and stability against vertical subsidence (right) for ovine bone, a ceramic graft extender and bone/ceramic mixes .*

8.2 *Comparison between compression performance (left) and stability against vertical subsidence (right) for human and ovine bone .*

8.3 *Comparison between compression performance (left) and stability against vertical subsidence (right) for bone/ceramic graft mixes with standard ceramic.*

8.4 *Comparison between compression behaviour of bone and ceramic extenders (left) and stability against vertical subsidence (right) for b/c mixes with a highly 68% porous HA.*

8.5 *Compression stiffness of pure bone and pure ceramic graft extenders during initial compression (left) and re-compression (right).*

8.6 *Comparison between particle size distribution of ceramics after compression (left) and stability against subsidence for 1:1 b/c mixes. Varied parameter: Ceramic porosity.*

8.7 *Comparison between particle size distribution of ceramics after compression (left) and stability against subsidence for 1:1 b/c mixes. Varied parameter: Ceramic* T_{Sint}.

8.8 *Comparison between particle size distribution of ceramics after compression (left) and stability against subsidence for 1:1 b/c mixes. Varied parameter: Ceramic composition.*

12.2 Tables

- **CHAPTER 2**

2.1 *Design and material alternatives used in THA. Not all combinations are viable or currently in clinical use.*

2.2 *Comparison of different revision techniques for total hip arthroplasty.*

2.3 *Impaction Grafting surgical procedure.*

2.4 *Correlation between fracture rates (max. blue) and subsidence rates (max. orange) for clinical follow-up studies. Subs. levels considered critical varied between 3 and 10mm.*

2.5 *Problems occurring with impaction grafting when using human allograft bone.*

2.6 *Requirements list for a synthetic bone graft extender or full alternative.*

2.7 *Synthetic bone graft alternatives available or in investigation.*

2.7 *List of commercial or developmental synthetic bone graft materials.*

2.8 *Peak forces on femoral head recorded for different activities in-vivo via an implantable multi-channel telemetry system*[196-201].

2.9 *Characteristic cortical and cancellous bone properties for different species. Values compiled from a range of publications*[208, 209].

2.10 *Characteristic mechanical properties for cortical bone of different species loaded in two perpendicular directions*[207].

2.11 *Comparison of chemical composition of synthetic stoichiometric hydroxyapatite versus the biological hydroxyapatite in the human body (weight percentages* [4].

2.12 *Physical and mechanical properties of hydroxyapatite [213-216].*

2.13 *Compressive and bending strength of β-TCP as a function of porosity [217].*

2.14 *Normalised solubility rates in vitro in aqueous solution at 37°C and pH=7.3 for various calcium phosphates and applications[218].*

2.15 *Different reactions of hydroxyapatite and tri-calciumphosphate as bone replacement material in the human body [219].*

- **CHAPTER 4**

4.1 *Graft materials compression tested using the die-plunger experimental protocol. All bone grafts were morsellised with the Norwich® unless stated otherwise.*

4.2 *Secant compression moduli, relaxation and recoil values for different bone grafts.*

4.3 *Secant compression moduli, relaxation and recoil values for different bone grafts.*

4.4 *Secant compression moduli, relaxation and recoil values for different ceramic grafts.*

4.5 *Secant compression moduli, relaxation and recoil values for various bone/ceramic mixes.*

4.6 *Summary of results from compression testing of bone, ceramic and graft mixes.*

4.7 *Summary of discussion points after die-plunger compression testing.*

4.8 *Summary of conclusion drawn from die-plunger compression testing.*

- **CHAPTER 5**

5.1 *Summary of main findings derived from shear testing.*

- **CHAPTER 6**

6.1 *Stem subsidence in the ovine tube-stem model for different graft compositions.*

6.2 *Statistical significance levels for comparisons of stem subsidence between different graft materials using the unpaired one-tailed student t-tests.*

6.3 *Stem subsidence rates for different graft materials after during different load blocks.*

6.4 *Summary of results from endurance testing with the ovine model.*

6.5 *Summary of conclusion drawn from endurance testing with the ovine model.*

- **CHAPTER 7**

7.1 *Correlation between cone impaction rate λ and stability measured as average subsidence after the 0.6kN load block or as the average number of cycles to failure.*