

# Experimental analysis of Implant–cement interfacial behaviour under shear mode loading conditions

Mohamed Mokhtar Bouziane <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Mokhtar Khaldi <sup>a</sup>, Boualem Serier <sup>b</sup>, Nourddine Benseddiq <sup>c</sup>, Mokhtar Zerdali <sup>d</sup>,  
Smaïl Benbarek <sup>b</sup>, Bel Abbes Bachir Bouiadjra <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Technology, BP 305 Route de Mamounia, University of Mustapha Stambouli of Mascara – Mascara 29000 Algeria*

<sup>b</sup> *LMPM, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Sidi Bel Abbès, BP 89, City Ben M'hidi, Sidi Bel Abbès 22000, Algeria.*

<sup>c</sup> *Laboratoire de Mécanique de Lille, IUT-A-2 rue de la recherche, 59653 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex, France.*

<sup>d</sup> *Laboratoire de Microscopie Electronique et des Sciences des Matériaux, Département de Physique, USTO, B.P. 1505, El-Mnaouer, 31000 Oran, Algérie*

**Abstract:** The failure of the bone cement (PMMA) is the most prominent scenario, in a cemented total hip arthroplasty and an eventual implant loosening. Among the many factors influencing the long-term stability of cemented hip prostheses, the interface between the implant and bone cement is considered to be one of the most susceptible to failure. Implant surface roughness is an important parameter affecting the fracture behavior of the implant–cement interface. This study investigated the influence of implant surface roughness on the resistance of the implant–cement interface. Mechanical fixation at the implant–cement interface was evaluated in vitro using shear loading with stainless steel rods with different surface roughness preparations. Increasing surface roughness improved the mechanical properties at the implant–cement interface. Therefore, it increases the long-term stability of the hip prostheses assembly.

**Keywords:** Bone cement, Hip prostheses, Roughness, Mechanical properties, Shear strength.

## 1. Introduction

Total hip replacement (THR) is very successful surgical technique that has become a well established procedure in current orthopedics. Patients with degenerative hip joint diseases, persistent that thigh pain and fractures of the femoral neck, can effectively be treated with an artificial hip joint reconstruction. Generally, THR leads to immediate pain relief and increased freedom of movement in the hip joint. Patients experience a substantial improvement in the quality of life, and needs less support to carry out their daily activities [1]. In total hip arthroplasty (THA), a metal stem should be securely fixed to the femur.

Since the original Charnley system was introduced, PMMA (poly methyl meth acrylate) cement has been used successfully to fix the stem [2]. Implant–cement fixation is generally achieved either by selecting an implant surface texture that creates a mechanical interlock with the bone cement or by an implant with geometry that maintains stability such as polished tapered stems. Implant fixation is thus reliant on a number of design-related factors including geometry, material properties, surface finish, cement properties [3-5]. Metallic implant materials made of stainless steel have found many applications as medical devices [6]. The first metals used for orthopedics was the stainless steels [7], because of their excellent mechanical properties such as fracture toughness,

---

\***Corresponding author:** Mohamed Mokhtar Bouziane  
E-mail: m.bouziane@univ-mascara.dz


fatigue strength and cost effectiveness. The cost of stainless steels is significantly lower than other used metallic biomaterials, even down to one-tenth of the price of other ones [8]. Implant loosening of cemented hip implants is a major cause of late failure of the arthroplasty. It is believed that separation of the stem–cement interface and fractures in the cement may initiate the initial loss of fixation of the implant [9]. One of the special characteristics of this kind of implants and a key factor of controversy in its design, is the surface finishing of the stem. This directly influences the mechanical properties of the interface. Many experimental and computational studies have been performed trying to establish this correlation. In fact, smoother implant surfaces have lower stem–cement interface fixation strength, whereas rougher surfaces have it greater. This implies that in a polished implant, loosening usually happens before than in a rougher one [10]. On the contrary, a rough

mechanisms of the interface associated with this loading. The main motivation of this work was to explore the relationship between the measurable parameters, such as the fracture strength of the interface and the surface roughness of implant, and the operational parameters, such as loading mode and cement penetration, so that the key parameters that dictate the interfacial behaviour may be identified. It is hoped that such a tool might be useful eventually for predictive purposes of cement fixation in hip prosthesis, when the bio-mechanical characteristics of the interface become better understood.

## 2. Experimental Methods

### 2.1. Implant–cement interface specimens

Round samples of stainless steel with five different surfaces roughness ( $R_a = 0.05, 0.06, 0.07, 0.13$  and  $0.17 \mu\text{m}$ ) were used as a basis for the implant–cement interface specimens (Figure 1).



**Fig. 1** Experimental set-up to determine the shear strength of the implant–cement interface. (a) Tensile test micro-machine. (b) The implant–cement interface strength was tested for pure shear loading condition. (c) steel–cement interface specimens having a varying interface roughness

surface is more abrasive producing other kind of problems that can also accelerate loosening [11]. In this study implant–cement interfacial behaviour under pure shear mode loading conditions has been studied using the experimental approach. Stainless steel rods with different roughness were used to bond with bone cement and mechanically tested under shear mode condition. The samples were tested using tensile testing micro-machine to identify the failure

The surface roughness variations were obtained by waterproof silicon carbide with different grit sizes (1000, 800, 500, 320 and 220). Subsequently, the adherence of bone cement (Figure 2) to the steel specimens is done by the moulds. Prior to testing, the specimens were cleaned with acetone and placed in a Teflon mould. We hand-mixed the cement for 2 min before pouring it into the mould which contained steel sample. The cement was injected in the cylindrical

mould slowly allowing residual bone cement to escape to obtain homogeneous steel–cement specimens.

The dimensions of the steel samples were 8 mm of the length and 6 mm of the diameter and the dimensions for bone cement were 4 mm of the length and 6 mm of the diameter, resulting in an implant–cement interface area of  $28.27 \text{ mm}^2$ . In this study, we have chosen the round samples to avoid the edge effect at the implant–cement interface and consequently, to minimize stress intensities around the edges and to obtain a relatively uniform interface load.



**Fig. 2 Two components of PMMA: powder (polymer) and liquid (monomer)**

## 2.2. Mechanical testing

Shear interface loading experiments (Figure 1.a) were performed using tensile testing micro-machine (Deformation Devices System, Kammrath & Weiss). The top and bottom part of the interface specimens were clamped in a custom-built loading jig (Figure 1.b), which allows to load the specimens at interface implant–cement. The interface specimens were subjected to a pure shear loading. The experiments were performed under displacement control with a loading speed of  $16 \mu\text{m/s}$ . Due to the limited loading range of the machine (max. 10 kN), we have analyzed five roughness surface of the specimens. Four specimens were tested per roughness value. Additionally, the fracture surface cement at the cement-implant interface was examined using an


environmental SEM (Model JEOL, JSM-6610LA, Ltd., Kawasaki, Japan), operated at an acceleration voltage of 20 kV.


## 3. Results and Discussions

In this study, the implant surface roughness were examined to determine a phenomenological level what occurs when the implant–cement interface of the hip prosthesis system is subjected to the pure shear load. The micromechanics analysis of cemented interface under shear load executed by experimental technique provided results that enabled the tracing of the force–displacement curves with different roughness. The interface strengths measured were decomposed into pure shear loading. The effect of the implant surface roughness on the shear fracture strength of the implant/cement interface is displayed in figures 3 and 4.

Figure 3 shows the variation of shear strength of the cement/implant junctions according to the five different roughness of the implant ( $R_a = 0.03, 0.06, 0.09, 0.13$  and  $0.17 \mu\text{m}$ ).

Figure 4 shows the comparison between the implant–cement interface shear strength for different roughness.






**Fig. 3 Force–displacement curves of statically tested of the implant–cement interface shear strength with different implant surface roughness**

According of these results, it was seen that the interface shear strength propriety significantly increased with increasing of the surface roughness. For the lowest roughness ( $Ra = 0.03 \mu\text{m}$ ), the interface strength was 20 N whereas this value was 80 N for the highest roughness value ( $Ra = 0.17 \mu\text{m}$ ). Damage to the surfaces of cemented femoral implants has been reported in a number of retrieval studies

involving a range of implant designs and cement formulations [12]. The damage has been attributed to abrasion [13], metallic shedding [14], tribocorrosion [15], originating from micromotion between the implant and cement mantle [16], porosities at the cement surface [17], the radiopacifier, and the cement chemistry [18] with the implant design, cement formulation, location on the implant affecting the


damage mechanisms [19], and implant surface roughness [20]. Stem geometry, material and surface treatment play important roles when choosing an implant in cemented [21]. Different hip design philosophies exist based on the performance at the cement-stem interface as a result of surface finish. Polished tapered stems can tolerate some subsidence of the implant within the cement mantle accounting for the viscoelastic properties of PMMA [22]. The interface failure criterion was derived from the interface strength measurements, describing the risk of failure at the implant–cement interface when subjected to a certain tensile and shear stress using only the interface strength in pure tensile and shear direction [20]. Measures of interface morphology and damage to cement or bone could be quantified and related to the micromechanics data [23].



**Fig. 4 Comparative study between the implant–cement interface shear strength for different implant surface roughness**

The junction cement-implant permits the analyze of the mechanical coupling between the cement and the surface of stainless steel. This steel was used for development of the femoral implants. The adhesion between these two protagonists is purely mechanical. It is based on the incrustation of the cement on the surface defects of the implant. The results clearly

show that the resistance of the interface is increased as the mean roughness of the implant increased. This behaviour can be explained by the junction which is ensured by incrustation of the cement in the stainless steel surface irregularities. A surface corresponding to a low parameter Ra guarantee intimate contact of bone cement with metal, but a bad incrustation and therefore a low interfacial shear strength. This explains the low values of interfacial fracture strength. On the other side, a rough surface with high parameter Ra favors the incrustation the cement on the defects surface of the metal. Therefore, the rough surface of the metal significantly improves the mechanical strength of the cement-implant. The failure surface of the implant-cement specimens from the bone cement was observed in scanning electron micrograph as shown in Fig. 5.



**Fig. 5 SEM image of the fracture surface cement at the cement-implant specimen from the bone cement showing the streaks deformation and porosity**

This figure shows the formation of the deformation streaks resulted from the flow of material during the shear test. These streaks are preferentially oriented in the tangential direction. The presence of porosity is observed in the same figure. The porosities in the orthopaedic cement have positive effects in clinical view since they permit the diffusion of the antibiotics.

However in mechanical view may be negative, because these defects weaken the bone cement by notch effect and promotes the initiation of cracks [24, 25]. There are conflicting results in the current literature regarding the clinical effectiveness using roughened implants in total hip arthroplasty [26]. Several studies point to poor clinical outcomes when roughened implants were used with failure often described to include implant–cement debonding, bone–cement loosening, and focal osteolysis possibly due to debris generation from the debonded rough implant [27]. However, there are several other studies in which failure rates were the same for roughened and smooth implants where difference in surface finish was the only variable [28]. These contradictions are most likely due to the fact that the failure process is multifactorial and that the condition of the cement mantle including mantle thickness and porosity, patient weight, stem geometry, and other surgical factors may all contribute to whether an implant system fails [29].

#### 4. Conclusion

This study shows the influence of implant surface roughness on the mechanical behavior of the implant–cement junction. Increasing surface roughness dramatically improved the shear load carrying capability and strength characteristics of the implant–cement interface. The failure of the cement–metal interface is thought to be the initiating factor in aseptic loosening of cemented orthopedic implants. This behavior is a result of a hydrolytic weakening of the adhesive metal–polymer bond [30]. The surface roughness of the implant plays a determining role on the bond. Moreover, we found that interface failure strength under shear loading conditions is related to the polished surface of the implant. Indeed, the mechanical resistance of the junction of the cement/implant considerably increased

with increasing surface roughness. The contact area between the cement orthopedic and the implant of total hip arthroplasty is key to optimizing the interfacial strength.

#### References

- [1] J. Stolk, A computerized pre-clinical test for cemented hip prostheses based on finite element techniques. Thesis University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands With summary in Dutch (2002). 192.
- [2] A.E. Buckwalter, J.J. Callaghan, S.S. Liu, D.R. Pedersen, D.D. Goetz, P.M. Sullivan, J.A. Leinen, R.C. Johnston, Results of Charnley total hip arthroplasty with use of improved femoral cementing techniques. a concise follow-up, at a minimum of twenty-five years, of a previous report. *J. Bone Joint Surg. Am.* 88 (7) (2006) 1481–1485.
- [3] M.F. Shepard, J.M. Kabo, J.R. Lieberman, The Frank Stinchfield Award. Influence of cement technique on the interface strength of femoral components. *Clin Orthop* 381 (2000) 26–35.
- [4] T.L. Norman, G. Thyagarajan, V.C. Saligrama, T.A. Gruen, J.D. Blaha, Stem surface roughness alters creep induced subsidence and ‘taper-lock’ in a cemented femoral hip prosthesis. *J Biomech*;34 (2001) 1325–1333.
- [5] E.W. Morscher, D. Wirz, Current state of cement fixation in THR. *Acta Orthop Belg*; 68 (2002) 1–12.
- [6] M. Kutz, *Biomedical Engineering and Design Hand book*, Vol. 1, McGraw-Hill, New York 2009.
- [7] P.A.Revell, Wood head Publishing Limited, Cambridge 2008.
- [8] M. Sumita, T. Hanawa, S.H. Teoh, Development of nitrogen-containing nickel- free austenitic stainless steels for metallic biomaterials—review, *Materials Science and Engineering C* 24 (2004) 753–760.
- [9] M. Jasty, W.J. Maloney, C.R. Bragdon, D. O’Connor, T. Haire, W.H. Harris, The initiation of failure in cemented femoral components of hip arthroplasties. *Journal of Bone Joint Surgery* 73B, (1991) 551–558.
- [10] N. Verdonschot, R. Huiskes, Subsidence of THA stems due to acrylic cement creep is extremely sensitive to interface friction. *J Biomech*; 29 (12) (1996) 1569–1575.
- [11] T.M. Wright, S.B. Goodman, *Implant wear: the future of total joint replacement*. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons Publications 1996.
- [12] N. Shearwood-Porter, M. Browne, J.A. Milton, M.J. Cooper, M.R. Palmer, J.M. Latham, R.J.K. Wood, R.B. Cook, Damage mechanisms at the cement–implant

- interface of polished cemented femoral stems. *J Biomed Mater Res Part B* (2016) 2027-2033.
- [13] P. Ellison, G. Hallan, P.J. Høl, N.R. Gjerdet, L.I. Havelin, Coordinating retrieval and register studies improves postmarket surveillance. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; 470 (11) (2012) 2995–3002.
- [14] A.G.D. Valle, A. Rana, B. Nestor, M. Bostrom, G. Westrich, EA. Salvati, Metallic shedding, surface finish changes, and extensive femoral osteolysis in the loose spectron EF stem. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 442 (2006) 165–170.
- [15] M. Bryant, M. Ward, R. Farrar, R. Freeman, K. Brummitt, J. Nolan, A. Neville, Failure analysis of cemented metal-on-metal total hip replacements from a single centre cohort. *Wear* 301(1–2) (2013) 226–233.
- [16] X.Q. Jiang, L. Blunt, S. Barrans, L. Brown, H.Y. Zhang, Investigation of relative micromotion at the stem–cement interface in total hip replacement. *Proc Inst Mech Eng H: J Eng Med* 223(8) (2009) 955–964.
- [17] H.Y. Zhang, L. Brown, L. Blunt, X.Q. Jiang, S. Barrans, The contribution of the micropores in bone cement surface to generation of femoral stem wear in total hip replacement. *Tribol Int* 44 (11) (2011) 1476–1482.
- [18] M. Bryant, M. Ward, R. Farrar, R. Freeman, K. Brummitt, J. Nolan, A. Neville, Characterisation of the surface topography, tomography and chemistry of fretting corrosion product found on retrieved polished femoral stems. *J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater* (2013) 321-334.
- [19] H.Y. Zhang, L.A. Blunt, X.Q. Jiang, L.T. Fleming, S.M. Barrans, The influence of bone cement type on production of fretting wear on the femoral stem surface: A preliminary study. *Clin Biomech* 27 (7) (2012) 666–672.
- [20] J. Zelle, D. Janssen, S. Peeters, C. Brouwer, N. Verdonshot, Mixed-mode failure strength of implant–cement interface specimens with varying surface roughness. *Journal of Biomechanics* (2011) 780–783.
- [21] T.L. Norman, G. Thyagarajan, V.C. Saligrama, T.A. Gruen, J.D. Blaha, Stem surface roughness alters creep induced subsidence and ‘taper-lock’ in a cemented femoral hip prosthesis. *J Biomech*; 34 (2001) 1325–33.
- [22] W.R. Walsh, M.J. Svehla, J. Russell, M. Saito, T. Nakashima, R.M. Gillies, W. Bruce, R. Hori, Cemented fixation with PMMA or Bis-GMA resin hydroxyapatite cement: effect of implant surface roughness. *Biomaterials* 25 (2004) 4929–4934.
- [23] A. Race, M.A. Miller, K.A. Mann, Novel methods to study functional loading micromechanics at the stem–cement and cement–bone interface in cemented femoral hip replacements. *Journal of Biomechanics*. (2010) 788–791.
- [24] S. Benbarek, B.B. Bouiadjra, M.M. Bouziane, T. Achour, B. Serier, Numerical analysis of the crack growth path in the cement mantle of the reconstructed acetabulum. *Materials Science and Engineering: C*. 33 (2013) 1543-1549.
- [25] M.M. Bouziane, B.B. Bouiadjra, S. Benbarek, M.S.H, Tabeti, T. Achour, Finite element analysis of the behaviour of microvoids in the cement mantle of cemented hip stem: Static and dynamic analysis, *Materials and Design*. 31 (2010) 545-550.
- [26] A.D. Leatha, D. Kim, A.M. Kenneth, Fatigue Debonding of the Roughened Stem–Cement Interface: Effects of Surface Roughness and Stem Heating Conditions. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater*. 78 (1) (2006) 181–188.
- [27] A.M.G. Della Valle, A. Zoppi, M.G.E. Peterson, E.A. Salvati, Surface finish affects the clinical and radiographic performance of a modern cemented femoral stem. In: Surgeons AAoO., editor. Annual Meeting. Washington, D.C: American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons; 2005.
- [28] V.J. Rasquinha, C.S. Ranawat, V. Dua, A.S. Ranawat, J.A. Rodriguez, A prospective, randomized, double-blind study of smooth versus rough stems using cement fixation: Minimum 5-year follow-up. *J Arthroplasty*, 19 Suppl 2 (2004) 2–9.
- [29] V.P. Cannestra, R.A. Berger, L.R. Quigley, J.J. Jacobs, A.G. Rosenberg, J.O. Galante, Hybrid total hip arthroplasty with a precoated offset stem. Four to nine-year results. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 82 (2000) 1291–1299.
- [30] U. Gbureck, S. Grübel, R. Thull, J.E. Barralet, Modified PMMA cements for a hydrolysis resistant metal–polymer interface in orthopaedic applications. *Acta Biomaterialia* 1 (2005) 671–676.