Versafitcup DM Total Conventional Hip Investigation

Note: This analysis compares the Versafitcup DM acetabular prosthesis with all other total conventional hip prostheses.

This prosthesis has been identified as having a significantly higher rate of revision. For a detailed explanation of the process used by the Registry that results in identification of prostheses that have a higher than anticipated rate of revision please refer to the Prostheses with Higher than Anticipated Rates of Revision chapter of the most recent AOANJRR Annual Report, https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com/annual-reports-2026.

Note: Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using prostheses with no recorded use in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 1

Revision Rate of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

The revision rate of the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis is compared to all other total conventional hip prostheses.

Table 1: Revision Rates of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

Component	N Revised	N Total	Obs. Years	Revisions/100 Obs. Yrs (95% CI)
Versafitcup DM	90	2819	12055	0.75 (0.60, 0.92)
Other Total Conventional Hip	19620	565954	3612232	0.54 (0.54, 0.55)
TOTAL	**19710**	**568773**	**3624288**	**0.54 (0.54, 0.55)**

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 2

Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

The yearly cumulative percent revision of the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis is compared to all other total conventional hip prostheses.

Table 2: Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision (95% CI) of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

CPR	1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
Versafitcup DM	2.1 (1.7, 2.8)	2.8 (2.2, 3.5)	3.1 (2.5, 3.9)	3.3 (2.6, 4.1)	3.6 (2.9, 4.5)	3.6 (2.9, 4.5)
Other Total Conventional Hip	1.7 (1.7, 1.8)	2.1 (2.1, 2.2)	2.5 (2.4, 2.5)	2.7 (2.7, 2.8)	3.0 (3.0, 3.1)	3.3 (3.2, 3.3)

CPR	7 Yrs	8 Yrs	9 Yrs	10 Yrs	11 Yrs	12 Yrs
Versafitcup DM	3.7 (3.0, 4.6)	4.4 (3.5, 5.6)	4.4 (3.5, 5.6)	4.4 (3.5, 5.6)		
Other Total Conventional Hip	3.5 (3.5, 3.6)	3.8 (3.7, 3.9)	4.1 (4.0, 4.2)	4.4 (4.3, 4.5)	4.7 (4.6, 4.8)	5.1 (5.0, 5.2)

CPR	13 Yrs	14 Yrs	15 Yrs	16 Yrs	17 Yrs	18 Yrs
Versafitcup DM						
Other Total Conventional Hip	5.4 (5.3, 5.5)	5.8 (5.7, 5.9)	6.2 (6.1, 6.3)	6.6 (6.5, 6.7)	7.0 (6.8, 7.1)	7.3 (7.1, 7.5)

CPR	19 Yrs	20 Yrs	21 Yrs	22 Yrs	23 Yrs	24 Yrs	25 Yrs
Versafitcup DM							
Other Total Conventional Hip	7.7 (7.5, 7.9)	8.0 (7.8, 8.2)	8.6 (8.3, 8.9)	9.0 (8.7, 9.4)	9.6 (9.1, 10.0)	9.6 (9.2, 10.1)	10.3 (9.4, 11.2)

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator.

FIGURE 1

Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

The yearly cumulative percent revision of the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis is compared to all other total conventional hip prostheses. In addition, hazard ratios are reported.

Hazard ratios are reported for specific time periods during which the hazard ratio is constant. This is done to enable more specific and valid comparisons of the risk of revision over time. The pattern of variation in risk has important implications with respect to the underlying reasons for any difference.

Figure 1: Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement



Number at Risk	0 Yr	1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs	7 Yrs
Versafitcup DM	2819	2369	1990	1588	1301	1042	820	640
Other Total Conventional Hip	565954	499390	443596	390125	343235	298454	258834	220434

Number at Risk	8 Yrs	9 Yrs	10 Yrs	11 Yrs	12 Yrs	13 Yrs	14 Yrs	15 Yrs	16 Yrs
Versafitcup DM	468	293	145	31	14	11	3	0	0
Other Total Conventional Hip	185386	153473	124723	99558	79795	63337	49727	38033	28355

Number at Risk	17 Yrs	18 Yrs	19 Yrs	20 Yrs	21 Yrs	22 Yrs	23 Yrs	24 Yrs	25 Yrs
Versafitcup DM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Total Conventional Hip	20437	14638	10400	7396	4859	2863	1455	560	95

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 3

Primary Diagnosis for Revised Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

This table identifies the diagnosis of the primary procedure which was subsequently revised. This information is provided as there is a variation on outcome depending on the primary diagnosis. It is therefore important when considering the reasons for a higher than anticipated rate of revision that there is identification of the primary diagnosis. This information should be compared to the primary diagnosis for the revisions of all other total conventional hip prostheses.

Table 3: Primary Diagnosis for Revised Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

	Versafitcup DM		Other Total Conventional Hip	
Primary Diagnosis	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Osteoarthritis	74	82.2	16230	82.7
Fractured Neck Of Femur	6	6.7	1515	7.7
Osteonecrosis	4	4.4	840	4.3
Developmental Dysplasia	3	3.3	319	1.6
Rheumatoid Arthritis	1	1.1	200	1.0
Failed Internal Fixation	2	2.2	163	0.8
Tumour			157	0.8
Other Inflammatory Arthritis			102	0.5
Fracture/Dislocation			60	0.3
Other			21	0.1
Arthrodesis Takedown			13	0.1
TOTAL	**90**	**100.0**	**19620**	**100.0**

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 4

Reasons for Revision

This is reported in two ways: a percentage of primary procedures revised and as a percentage of all revision procedures.

% Primaries Revised: This shows the proportional contribution of each revision diagnosis as a percentage of the total number of primary procedures. This percentage can be used to approximate the risk of being revised for that diagnosis. Differing percentages between groups, with the same distribution of follow up time, may identify problems of concern.

% Revisions: The number of revisions for each diagnosis is expressed as a percentage of the total number of revisions. This shows the distribution of reasons for revision within a group but cannot be used as a comparison between groups.

Table 4: Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement - Reason for Revision (Follow-up Limited to 14.6 Years)

	Versafitcup DM			Other Total Conventional Hip		
Revision Diagnosis	Number	% Primaries Revised	% Revisions	Number	% Primaries Revised	% Revisions
Infection	26	0.9	28.9	4926	0.9	25.8
Prosthesis Dislocation/Instability	4	0.1	4.4	4312	0.8	22.6
Fracture	28	1.0	31.1	4186	0.7	21.9
Loosening	18	0.6	20.0	3479	0.6	18.2
Pain	2	0.1	2.2	332	0.1	1.7
Leg Length Discrepancy	1	0.0	1.1	306	0.1	1.6
Malposition	2	0.1	2.2	279	0.0	1.5
Implant Breakage Stem				196	0.0	1.0
Lysis				170	0.0	0.9
Implant Breakage Acetabular Insert				124	0.0	0.6
Incorrect Sizing	2	0.1	2.2	94	0.0	0.5
Wear Acetabular Insert				84	0.0	0.4
Metal Related Pathology				74	0.0	0.4
Implant Breakage Acetabular	1	0.0	1.1	69	0.0	0.4
Tumour				46	0.0	0.2
Wear Head				45	0.0	0.2
Heterotopic Bone				26	0.0	0.1
Implant Breakage Head				23	0.0	0.1
Wear Acetabulum				6	0.0	0.0
Osteonecrosis				4	0.0	0.0
Synovitis				2	0.0	0.0
Progression Of Disease				1	0.0	0.0
Other	6	0.2	6.7	315	0.1	1.6
N Revision	**90**	**3.2**	**100.0**	**19099**	**3.4**	**100.0**
N Primary	**2819**			**565954**		

Note: This table is restricted to revisions within 14.6 years for all groups to allow a time-matched comparison of revisions.
Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator.

FIGURE 2

Cumulative Incidence Revision Diagnosis of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

This figure details the cumulative incidence of the most common reasons for revision. The five most common reasons for revision are included as long as each of these reasons account for more than 10 procedures or at least 5% of all revisions for the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis. A comparative graph is provided of the cumulative incidence for the same reasons for revisions for all other total conventional hip prostheses.

Figure 2: Cumulative Incidence Revision Diagnosis for Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement



TABLE 5

Type of Revision Performed for Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement

This analysis identifies the components used in the revision of the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis and compares it to the components used in the revision of all other total conventional hip prostheses.

The reason this analysis is undertaken is to identify whether there is one or more components which are being replaced that differ from the components replaced for revisions of all other total conventional hip prostheses i.e. is there a difference in the type of revision undertaken for the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis compared to all other total conventional hip prostheses.

Table 5: Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement - Type of Revision (Follow-up Limited to 14.6 Years)

	Versafitcup DM		Other Total Conventional Hip	
Type of Revision	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Femoral Component	35	38.9	6430	33.7
Acetabular Component	13	14.4	3188	16.7
THR (Femoral/Acetabular)	19	21.1	2180	11.4
Cement Spacer	2	2.2	550	2.9
Removal of Prostheses			91	0.5
Reinsertion of Components			27	0.1
Total Femoral			12	0.1
Bipolar Head and Femoral			10	0.1
N Major	**69**	**76.7**	**12488**	**65.4**
Head/Insert	19	21.1	5262	27.6
Head Only			904	4.7
Minor Components	1	1.1	278	1.5
Insert Only	1	1.1	164	0.9
Bipolar Only			1	0.0
Cement Only			1	0.0
Head/Neck/Insert			1	0.0
N Minor	**21**	**23.3**	**6611**	**34.6**
TOTAL	**90**	**100.0**	**19099**	**100.0**

Note: This table is restricted to revisions within 14.6 years for all groups to allow a time-matched comparison of revisions.
Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 6

Revision Rates of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Fixation

This analysis is provided as some prostheses have more than one fixation option. Additionally there are prostheses where an alternative to the recommended approach to fixation was used e.g. a cementless prosthesis that has been cemented or vice-versa.

Table 6: Revised Number of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Fixation

Fixation	N Revised	N Total
Cemented	0	2
Cementless	79	2187
Hybrid (Femur Cemented)	11	630
TOTAL	**90**	**2819**

TABLE 7

Revision Rates of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Bearing Surface

This analysis is provided as some prostheses are combined with a variety of bearing surfaces. All bearing surfaces used with this prosthesis are listed.

Table 7: Revised Number of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Bearing Surface

Bearing Surface	N Revised	N Total
Ceramic/Non XLPE	80	2414
Metal/Non XLPE	10	404
Ceramicised Metal/Non XLPE	0	1
TOTAL	**90**	**2819**

TABLE 8

Revision Rates of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Approach

This analysis is provided as some prostheses are used with a variety of surgical approaches. All surgical approaches used with this prosthesis are listed.

Table 8: Revised Number of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Approach

Approach	N Revised	N Total
Anterior	51	1704
Lateral	2	92
Posterior	35	965
TOTAL	**88**	**2761**

Note: Excludes 58 procedures with no approach recorded

TABLE 9

Revision Rates of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by State

This enables a state by state variation to be identified for the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis and provides the comparative data for each of the states for all other total conventional hip prostheses.

The purpose of this analysis is to determine if the higher than anticipated rate of revision has widespread distribution between states. If there is widespread distribution then the reason for the higher than anticipated rate of revision is unlikely to be surgeon specific. If the prosthesis has been used in only a small number of states it is not possible to distinguish if the higher than anticipated rate of revision is related to the prosthesis, surgeon, technique or patient.

Table 9: Revised Number of Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by State

Component	State	N Revised	N Total
Versafitcup DM	NSW	29	468
	VIC	50	1824
	QLD	10	403
	WA	0	3
	SA	0	54
	TAS	1	67
Other Total Conventional Hip	NSW	5482	166566
	VIC	4808	144861
	QLD	3958	103957
	WA	2510	64943
	SA	1887	52031
	TAS	438	18202
	ACT/NT	537	15394
TOTAL		**19710**	**568773**

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator. Procedures using metal/metal prostheses with head size larger than 32mm are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 10

Number of Revisions of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Year of Implant

This analysis details the number of prostheses reported each year to the Registry for the Versafitcup DM total conventional hip prosthesis. It also provides the subsequent number of revisions of the primaries reported in that year.

Primary procedures performed in later years have had less follow up time therefore the number revised is expected to be less than the number revised in earlier years. For example, a primary procedure performed in 2025 has a maximum of one year to be revised, whereas a primary procedure performed in 2023 has a maximum of three years to be revised.

Table 10: Number of Revisions of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Year of Implant

Year of Implant	Number Revised	Total Number
2011	0	10
2012	0	12
2013	0	4
2014	1	19
2015	11	146
2016	13	193
2017	13	199
2018	11	194
2019	10	188
2020	4	229
2021	3	249
2022	4	271
2023	10	382
2024	8	353
2025	2	370
TOTAL	**90**	**2819**

TABLE 11

Revision Rates of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Catalogue Number Range

Many prostheses have a number of catalogue ranges. The catalogue range is specific to particular design features; more than one catalogue range usually indicates a minor difference in design in a particular Versafitcup DM prosthesis.

This analysis has been undertaken to determine if the revision rate varies according to the catalogue number range.

Model	Catalogue Range	Catalogue Description	Cement	Material	Coating
Acetabular					
Versafitcup DM	012646MB-012664MB	DUAL MOBILITY ACETABULAR SHELL WITHOUT HOLES	NO	METAL	HA COATED

Table 11: Revised Number of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Catalogue Number Range

Acetabular Range	N Revised	N Total
012646MB-012664MB	90	2819
TOTAL	**90**	**2819**

TABLE 12

Revision Rates of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Component

A prosthesis may be combined with multiple components. This analysis has been undertaken to determine if the revision rate varies according to the component with which it is combined.

Table 12: Revised Number of Versafitcup DM Primary Total Conventional Hip Replacement by Femoral Stem Component

Femoral Stem Component	N Revised	N Total
AMIStem C	2	82
AMIStem H	9	274
AMIStem-P	0	89
CORAIL	0	6
CPCS	0	9
CPT	0	1
Collo-MIS	1	1
Cone	0	4
Exeter V40	0	1
GHE	3	14
LPS	0	2
M/L Taper	0	4
MasterLoc	3	172
MiniMax	5	125
Mistral	0	1
Modulus	0	1
Mutars	0	1
Polarstem	0	4
Quadra-C	8	409
Quadra-H	55	1302
Quadra-P	2	224
Quadra-R	1	3
Redapt	0	1
Revision Hip	0	7
S-Rom	0	2
Taperloc	0	19
Wagner	0	6
X-Acta	1	55
TOTAL	**90**	**2819**