Research & Reviews: Orthopedics

# Cementless Fixation in Orthopaedics: Evolution, Principles, and Clinical Perspectives

**Alexander R. Whitmore***

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery St. George Medical University Hospital, United Kingdom

## Commentary

**Received:** 03-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. RRJO-25-189218; **Editor assigned:** 05-Mar-2025, Pre-QC No. RRJO-25-189218 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 19-Mar-2025, QC No RRJO-25-189218; **Revised:** 24-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. RRJO-25-189218 (R); **Published:** 31-Mar-2025, DOI: 10.4172/Orthopedics.8.005

***For Correspondence**

Alexander R. Whitmore, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery St. George Medical University Hospital, United Kingdom

**E-mail:** alex.whitmore@sgmuh.edu

**Citation:** Alexander R. Whitmore, Cementless Fixation in Orthopaedics: Evolution, Principles, and Clinical Perspectives. RRJ Ortho. 2025.8.005.



## ABSTRACT

Cementless fixation has emerged as a significant advancement in modern joint arthroplasty, offering a biologic alternative to traditional cemented fixation techniques. The concept relies on osseointegration, where bone grows onto or into porous implant surfaces, ensuring long-term biological stability. Initially developed as an alternative to cemented implants in younger and more active patients, cementless fixation has now expanded across hip and knee arthroplasty due to improvements in biomaterials, surface coatings, and implant design. Clinical studies demonstrate comparable survivorship between cementless and cemented implants, particularly in total hip arthroplasty, while its role in total knee arthroplasty continues to evolve. Advantages include preservation of bone stock, reduced risk of cement-related complications, and easier revision surgery. However, challenges such as early micromotion, patient selection, and variability in bone quality remain important considerations. This article reviews the principles, indications, outcomes, advantages, limitations, and future directions of cementless fixation in orthopaedics.

## Keywords

Cementless fixation, Osseointegration, Total knee arthroplasty, Total hip arthroplasty, Implant design, Biological fixation, Orthopaedic surgery, Prosthesis stability

## INTRODUCTION

Total joint arthroplasty has revolutionized the treatment of end-stage degenerative joint diseases. Traditionally, cemented fixation has been considered the gold standard due to its predictable early stability and long-term outcomes. However, advances in implant technology have led to the increasing adoption of cementless fixation, which relies on biological bone integration rather than mechanical interlocking with bone cement.

Cementless fixation was initially limited by poor early implant designs and inadequate surface engineering. With the advent of porous coatings, hydroxyapatite layers, and 3D-printed trabecular structures, modern cementless implants now demonstrate improved stability and survivorship. Recent literature suggests comparable outcomes between cemented and cementless techniques in both hip and knee arthroplasty, especially in carefully selected patient populations.

### Principles of Cementless Fixation

The fundamental principle of cementless fixation is osseointegration, a biological process where bone grows directly onto the implant surface.

**Key requirements include:**

- Primary mechanical stability at implantation
- Minimal micromotion (<50–100 microns)
- Biocompatible porous surface for bone ingrowth

- Long-term biological fixation

**Implants are designed with:**

- Porous titanium or tantalum coatings
- Hydroxyapatite surfaces to enhance bone bonding
- Press-fit geometry for initial stability
- Biomechanics and Osseointegration

Initial stability is achieved through a press-fit mechanism between bone and implant. Over time, osteoblast activity leads to bone growth into the porous structure, converting mechanical stability into biological fixation.

**Factors influencing osseointegration include:**

- Bone quality (osteoporosis vs healthy bone)
- Implant surface roughness and porosity
- Patient metabolic status
- Surgical technique accuracy

Successful osseointegration reduces long-term risks of loosening and improves implant longevity.

**Indications for Cementless Fixation**

Cementless fixation is commonly indicated in:

**1. Younger patients**

Higher functional demand

Longer life expectancy

Need for future revision ease

**2. Good bone quality**

Adequate cortical and cancellous bone stock

**3. Total Hip Arthroplasty (THA)**

Widely accepted standard in many centers

**4. Selected Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA) cases**

Increasing adoption in modern practice

Contraindications

**Cementless fixation may not be suitable in:**

- Severe osteoporosis
- Poor bone stock (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis with bone loss)
- Elderly frail patients with limited remodeling capacity
- Revision surgeries with major bone defects
- Cementless Fixation in Total Hip Arthroplasty

Cementless THA has become highly successful due to predictable osseointegration and excellent long-term outcomes.

**Advantages include:**

- High survivorship rates
- Reduced aseptic loosening
- Bone preservation
- Easier revision procedures

Modern studies show cementless THA is now preferred in many countries due to superior longevity in younger patients.

**Cementless Fixation in Total Knee Arthroplasty**

The use of cementless fixation in TKA has historically been controversial. Cemented fixation remains the reference standard due

to its long-term reliability. However, newer designs are closing the gap.

**Current evidence shows:**

- Comparable functional outcomes to cemented TKA
- Similar revision rates in selected populations
- Improved outcomes with modern porous-coated implants

Recent systematic reviews suggest no significant difference in survivorship between cemented and cementless TKA in mid-term follow-up.

**Advantages of Cementless Fixation**

- Preservation of bone stock
- Avoidance of cement-related complications
- Shorter operative time in some cases
- Easier revision surgery
- Biological long-term fixation
- Reduced risk of cement debris-related osteolysis

**Limitations and Challenges**

**Despite advances, cementless fixation has limitations:**

- Risk of early implant micromotion
- Delayed weight-bearing in some cases
- Dependence on bone quality
- Higher technical demand during surgery
- Initial cost of implants
- Potential for early failure if osseointegration fails

**Complications**

**Possible complications include:**

- Aseptic loosening (early phase)
- Periprosthetic fractures
- Incomplete osseointegration
- Persistent pain due to micromotion

However, modern implant designs have significantly reduced these risks.

**Comparative Overview: Cemented vs Cementless Fixation**

- Cemented fixation offers immediate stability and long-term predictability
- Cementless fixation offers biological integration and bone preservation
- Outcomes are increasingly comparable with modern implants

Meta-analyses suggest no major differences in infection or revision rates when appropriately indicated.

**Future Directions**

The future of cementless fixation is strongly linked to technological innovation:

- 3D-printed implants with trabecular architecture
- Robotic-assisted surgery for precision placement
- Smart biomaterials promoting faster osseointegration
- Surface bioengineering to enhance bone-implant interaction
- AI-based patient selection tools

These advancements are expected to expand the role of cementless fixation further in orthopaedic practice.

## CONCLUSION

Cementless fixation represents a major evolution in joint arthroplasty, shifting from mechanical to biological stability. While cemented implants remain reliable and widely used, cementless technology is rapidly gaining acceptance due to improved implant design and favorable clinical outcomes. Its role is particularly strong in younger patients and hip arthroplasty, with growing evidence supporting its use in knee arthroplasty. Continued innovation and long-term studies will further define its place as a standard fixation method in orthopaedic surgery.

## REFERENCES


1. Murray CJL, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, Swetschinski L, Aguilar GR, Gray A, et al. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: A systematic analysis. Lancet. 2022;399(10325):629-655.
2. Antimicrobial Resistance Collaborators. Global burden of antimicrobial resistance and implications for policy. Lancet. 2022;399(10325):629-655.
3. World Health Organization. Global antimicrobial resistance and use surveillance system (GLASS) report. Geneva: WHO. 2023.
4. Laxminarayan R, Van Boeckel T, Frost I, Kariuki S, Khan EA, Limmathurotsakul D, et al. The Lancet Infectious Diseases Commission on antimicrobial resistance: 2024 update. Lancet Infect Dis. 2024;24(1):e1-e60.
5. Hutchings MI, Truman AW, Wilkinson B. Antibiotics: Past, present and future. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2021;63:1-8.