Trends in Biomaterials and Artificial Organs
journal homepage: www.biomaterials.org.in/tibao
ISSN 0971-1198

Review Article

Customized Hip Implants: A Review on Advancements and Applications

Mangesh R. Dharme

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Dr. Rajendra Gode Institute of Technology & Research, Amravati 444602, Maharashtra, India

Received: *3 March 2025*
Accepted: *19 January 2026*
Published online: *24 February 2026*

Keywords: *customized hip implants, additive manufacturing, computer-aided machining, computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging*

Customized hip implants have revolutionized orthopaedic surgery by providing personalized solutions for patients with unique anatomical structures and medical needs. This paper explores the advancements in customized hip implants, starting with essential design considerations to match each patient's specific anatomy. The use of advanced imaging technologies, such as CT scans and MRI, plays a crucial role in creating precise implant designs. These technologies assist doctors and engineers in developing implants that improve fit and function, leading to better surgical outcomes. This review highlights the benefits of patient-specific implants, which enhance comfort and reduce complications after surgery. The paper discusses various aspects of customized hip implants, including design improvements, manufacturing techniques, material choices, clinical results, and future developments.

Introduction

The human hip joint, a marvel of engineering in its own right, represents a critical nexus of biomechanical function, facilitating mobility, stability, and weight-bearing activities. Its integral role in daily life cannot be overstated, underscoring the significance of effective interventions when hip function is compromised. In this context, hip implants have emerged as a transformative solution, restoring not only the physical abilities of millions but also the fundamental essence of their lives. Historically, hip implants have followed a one-size-fits-all paradigm, with standardized designs catering to the average anatomical dimensions. While these off-the-shelf implants have undoubtedly revolutionized the field of orthopedic surgery, they often fall short when confronted with the intrinsic diversity of human anatomy [1]. Each individual possesses a unique combination of skeletal morphology, bone density, and joint articulation, necessitating a more nuanced approach to hip joint restoration.

The nascent era of personalized medicine has cast a discerning light on this limitation, catalyzing the development of customized hip implants. These innovative devices represent a fundamental shift in the philosophy of implant design and manufacturing. By harnessing cutting-edge technologies and a deep understanding of individual patient anatomy, customized hip implants offer the promise of an unparalleled level of precision and compatibility [2,3]. The advent of advanced imaging techniques, such as computed tomography (CT) scans and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), has endowed orthopedic surgeons and engineers with the ability to create hip implants uniquely tailored to each patient's specific anatomical idiosyncrasies.

The purpose of this review paper is to delve into the fascinating realm of customized hip implants, providing a comprehensive exploration of the latest advancements and applications. It is no exaggeration to assert that these innovations are reshaping the landscape of orthopedic surgery, with profound implications for patient care and outcomes. From the design considerations that underpin customized implant development to the intricacies of manufacturing techniques and materials, this paper will traverse the entire spectrum of knowledge in this burgeoning field [4]. The subsequent sections will examine, in meticulous detail, the strides made in designing hip implants that not only adhere to the natural contours of the human body but also optimize functionality and longevity. These advancements extend to the manufacturing techniques, ranging from additive manufacturing (3D printing) to computer-aided machining, which have revolutionized the production process, ensuring greater precision and reproducibility [5,6].

Materials, another crucial facet, will be discussed extensively. From traditional stalwarts like titanium and cobalt-chromium to the newer frontiers of advanced ceramics and polymers, the selection of materials in customized hip implants carries profound implications for biocompatibility and long-term durability. Surface modifications and coatings will also be explored as strategies to enhance implant integration, minimize wear, and mitigate the ever-present risk of infection.

*Coresponding author - Dr. Mangesh R. Dharme
E-mail address: mangeshdharme@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.65795/kx9vvc61

The practical applications of customized hip implants will be elucidated, illuminating their transformative potential in the realm of patient care. Patient-specific implants will take center stage, illustrating how a precise anatomical fit can substantially reduce postoperative complications and improve overall outcomes. Furthermore, the role of customized hip implants in complex cases, such as revision surgeries involving prior implant placements, bone defects, or atypical anatomical variations, will be underscored.

Clinical outcomes and potential complications will be rigorously examined, drawing from relevant studies and data. By offering a balanced perspective on the successes and challenges faced in the clinical implementation of customized hip implants.

In this review, available literature relating to design methodologies, materials, manufacturing techniques, clinical outcomes, and challenges faced in implementing customized hip implants has been examined. Recommendations for future research and areas which require further scientific investigation are discussed.

Evolution of Total Hip Arthroplasty (THA)

The evolution of Total Hip Arthroplasty (THA) stands as one of the greatest achievements in orthopedic surgery, revolutionizing the treatment of degenerative and traumatic hip conditions. Early surgical attempts in the 19th and early 20th centuries, such as excision and interposition arthroplasty using materials like ivory, glass, and metal, yielded limited success due to infection and poor fixation [7]. The modern era of THA began with the pioneering work of Sir John Charnley in the 1950s and 1960s, who introduced the concept of low-friction arthroplasty using a metal femoral head, an ultra-high-molecular-weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) acetabular cup, and polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) bone cement for fixation [8]. His design became the cornerstone for contemporary hip replacements and remains influential today. Subsequent decades saw the development of cementless fixation, modular components, and the use of biocompatible materials such as titanium, cobalt-chrome alloys, and ceramics, all of which enhanced implant longevity and stability [9]. Further advancements included the introduction of highly cross-linked polyethylene (HXLPE) and ceramic-on-ceramic bearings, which significantly reduced wear and osteolysis [10]. The advent of porous coatings, hydroxyapatite layers, and 3D-printed implants further improved osseointegration and implant customization [11]. In recent years, computer-assisted navigation, robotic-assisted surgery, and patient-specific implant design have transformed THA into a highly precise and durable procedure [12]. Collectively, these innovations have made modern THA a reliable and long-lasting solution that restores pain-free mobility while closely replicating the natural biomechanics of the human hip joint.

Definition and Scope of Customized Implants

Customized hip implants are patient-specific prosthetic components designed to replicate the unique anatomical and biomechanical characteristics of an individual's hip joint. Unlike conventional, standardized implants that come in fixed sizes and geometries, customized hip implants are developed through a patient-specific design process involving advanced imaging (CT/MRI), computer-aided design (CAD), and additive manufacturing (3D printing) technologies. The goal is to achieve a superior fit, restore natural joint mechanics, and improve long-term functional outcomes, especially in cases involving anatomical deformities, bone loss, or revision surgeries where off-the-shelf implants may not be optimal [13,14].

The scope of customized hip implants encompasses a broad range of clinical, technological, and biomechanical applications within modern orthopedics. Customized implants ensure accurate restoration of leg length, offset, and center of rotation, reducing postoperative complications such as impingement or dislocation [15]. In complex revisions involving severe bone defects or deformities, patient-specific implants allow better fixation and reconstruction [16]. 3D imaging techniques (CT/MRI) generate precise anatomical models of the patient's pelvis and femur.

CAD software and finite element analysis (FEA) are used to optimize implant geometry and load distribution [17]. Titanium alloys (e.g., Ti6Al4V) and porous structures are 3D-printed to mimic bone stiffness and promote osseointegration [18]. Regulatory authorities (e.g., FDA, CE) classify such devices as patient-matched or custom-made, with requirements for biocompatibility, validation, and documentation (ISO 13485:2016). Ongoing research focuses on hybrid implants combining additive manufacturing with traditional machining to optimize both customization and mechanical reliability [19].

Enabling and Manufacturing Technologies

The integration of advanced imaging, computer-aided design (CAD), and biomechanics has revolutionized the design and development of hip implants, enabling personalized, precise, and functionally superior solutions. Advanced imaging techniques such as Computed Tomography (CT) and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) provide high-resolution, three-dimensional anatomical data essential for accurate patient-specific modeling and preoperative planning [21]. These imaging modalities allow for detailed visualization of bone geometry, cortical thickness, and trabecular architecture, facilitating optimal implant fit and alignment [28]. The digitized imaging data are subsequently integrated into CAD software, where engineers develop virtual implant models with tailored geometries, surface textures, and fixation features [22]. CAD tools also enable parametric and topology optimization, allowing the design of lightweight yet mechanically robust implants that mimic the mechanical behavior of natural bone [23].

Biomechanical analysis, particularly through Finite Element Analysis (FEA), plays a crucial role in evaluating implant performance under physiological loading conditions, predicting stress distribution, micromotion, and potential failure zones [24]. This computational approach reduces the need for extensive physical prototyping and accelerates the design iteration process. Moreover, the integration of biomechanical simulations with 3D printing technologies enables the production of customized implants that achieve better osseointegration and load transfer, thereby minimizing stress shielding and aseptic loosening [25]. Together, these technologies create a synergistic workflow—where imaging provides accurate anatomical data, CAD facilitates innovative design, and biomechanics ensures functional and structural reliability—ultimately enhancing implant longevity and clinical outcomes.

Additive Manufacturing (3D Printing)

Customized hip implants demand manufacturing techniques that can bring intricate designs to life with high precision. In this context, additive manufacturing, commonly known as 3D printing, has emerged as a transformative technology. It enables the creation of complex, patient-specific implant geometries that would be challenging or impossible to produce using traditional methods [26].

Additive manufacturing offers several advantages, including reduced material wastage, enhanced design flexibility, and the ability to create porous structures that promote bone ingrowth, a crucial factor for implant stability. Furthermore, 3D printing allows for rapid prototyping, facilitating iterative design improvements and minimizing production lead times.

However, it's important to note that other manufacturing techniques, such as computer-aided machining and casting, continue to play a role in the production of customized hip implants. These methods offer their own set of advantages, such as high mechanical strength and reliability, which may be particularly beneficial in certain cases.

Clinical Applications and Indications

Primary THA

The hallmark application of customized hip implants lies in their ability to provide patient-specific solutions. Traditional off-the-shelf implants may not fully accommodate the wide spectrum of anatomical variations encountered in clinical practice. Customized implants address this limitation by tailoring the implant's design to the precise dimensions and contours of an individual's hip joint [27,28].

These patient-specific implants are particularly beneficial for patients with atypical anatomical features or those who have undergone previous surgeries that have altered their hip anatomy. By ensuring a snug fit, patient-specific implants can significantly reduce the risk of complications such as dislocation, implant loosening, and leg length discrepancy. Furthermore, they can optimize the biomechanical performance of the implant, contributing to improved patient comfort and mobility.

Revision THA

Customized hip implants have proven to be invaluable in revision surgeries, where the patient's hip anatomy may have been altered due to prior implant placements or other complications. In such cases, the surgeon faces the challenge of addressing complex anatomical issues while ensuring implant stability and functionality [29].

Patient-specific implants are designed to accommodate these unique challenges. They allow for precise reconstruction of the hip joint, even in cases of bone loss or deformities. By leveraging advanced imaging data and computer-aided design (CAD) technology, custom implants can be crafted to fit securely within the remaining bone, restoring both form and function [30,31]. This application has significantly improved the outcomes of revision surgeries and reduced the need for extensive bone grafting procedures.

Critical Outlook on Clinical Outcomes

Biomechanical performance

Customized (patient-specific or 3D-printed) hip implants have shown significant potential in enhancing anatomical conformity and load transfer. Because they are designed from patient imaging data (CT/MRI), they can closely match the individual's bone geometry and defect morphology, improving contact area and stress distribution compared with standard implants [32,33]. This conformity helps prevent stress concentration and abnormal load transfer, which are primary causes of aseptic loosening and implant failure [34]. Finite Element Analysis (FEA) studies indicate that customized stems exhibit lower micromotion at the bone–implant interface, thus improving primary stability and promoting osseointegration [35]. Moreover, 3D printing allows porosity optimization, tailoring the implant's elastic modulus to reduce stress shielding - a phenomenon where bone resorption occurs due to mechanical mismatch [36]. Biomechanical simulations show that optimized porous titanium implants distribute load more evenly, maintaining physiological stress on the surrounding cortical bone [37]. Additionally, customized designs assist in complex acetabular or femoral reconstructions, where standard implants may not provide sufficient coverage or fixation. The incorporation of flanges, augments, and screw trajectories in custom acetabular cups enhances fixation stability [38]. However, the biomechanical advantages depend heavily on precise imaging, CAD design, and accurate surgical execution; errors in design or stiffness tuning may introduce stress concentrations and risk early loosening [39].

Clinical outcomes

Clinical evidence supports the efficacy of custom implants, particularly in complex primary and revision total hip arthroplasty (THA) cases. In patients with severe acetabular bone loss or pelvic discontinuity, custom 3D-printed acetabular components have achieved excellent early- to mid-term outcomes [40] reported 94% implant survival at five years with significant improvements in Harris Hip Scores. Similarly, [41] found reliable osseointegration and radiographic stability in a multi-center cohort of revision THA using customized porous titanium implants. Custom femoral stems have demonstrated comparable or superior outcomes to standard designs in patients with abnormal femoral anatomy. A systematic review by [42] found that patient-specific femoral stems provided better restoration of hip biomechanics and leg length while maintaining low revision rates at 5–10 years follow-up. However, the evidence base remains limited, as most studies are small case series or retrospective analyses. While short-term functional outcomes (pain reduction, mobility, and limb length correction) are positive, long-term survivorship and cost-effectiveness data are still being established [43].

Potential complications

Despite the promising results, customized implants introduce several potential complications:

a) Infection – Deep infection rates are comparable to conventional revision THA, typically ranging from 3%–8%, especially in large bone-loss cases [44]. Prolonged preoperative design and manufacturing time may increase exposure to infection risk if surgical staging is required.

b) Mechanical Failure – Improper design or undersized fixation may lead to implant fracture or loosening [45]. FEA-based investigations highlight the sensitivity of stress distribution to stem geometry and stiffness [46]. Manufacturing errors or inadequate surface finishing can reduce fatigue life, particularly in additively manufactured (AM) titanium components [47,48].

c) Manufacturing Defects and QA Challenges – 3D-printed implants can exhibit anisotropy, internal porosity, or microstructural flaws affecting mechanical integrity [49,50]. Proper post-processing (e.g., hot isostatic pressing, surface polishing) and mechanical validation are essential to ensure safety [51]. Regulatory pathways for AM medical devices are still evolving, and variations in quality assurance standards may lead to inconsistencies across manufacturers (FDA, 2021) [52].

d) Planning and Surgical Errors – Errors in imaging segmentation, CAD modeling, or intraoperative alignment can result in mismatch or suboptimal fixation. Therefore, preoperative digital simulations and the use of patient-specific surgical guides are strongly recommended [53].

e) Cost and Accessibility – Customized implants are more expensive than standard designs due to design, validation, and regulatory costs. Their use is currently limited to specialized centers with design-manufacturing capabilities. Cost-effectiveness analyses suggest they are justified primarily for complex revisions rather than routine THA [54].

Regulatory and Socioeconomic Considerations

Approval and regulatory pathways

The regulatory approval process for customized hip implants is complex due to their individualized nature and the integration of advanced manufacturing technologies such as 3D printing.

In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) regulates patient-specific implants under the Medical Devices Rules (2017). Manufacturers must obtain appropriate licenses and follow quality management systems akin to ISO 13485 standards [55]. However, infrastructure and regulatory experience for additive manufacturing in medical devices are still evolving [56].

Cost-effectiveness considerations

While customized implants often entail higher upfront costs due to design, imaging, and fabrication, they may offer long-term economic benefits by improving surgical accuracy, reducing operative time, and minimizing revision rates.

Studies report that customized acetabular components in complex revision total hip arthroplasty (THA) can reduce intraoperative complications and improve implant fit, potentially lowering overall healthcare costs [57,58].

Accessibility and clinical adoption

Access to customized hip implants remains limited to tertiary hospitals and advanced orthopedic centers with 3D design and printing capabilities [59,60].

In developing countries, additional constraints include the absence of validated local supply chains for medical-grade titanium alloys, inadequate sterilization and testing facilities, and a shortage of certified additive manufacturing vendors [56].

To address these gaps, the creation of centralized or regional additive manufacturing hubs shared among hospitals has been proposed to improve cost-efficiency and accessibility [61].

Broader implementation challenges

Despite their biomechanical and clinical advantages, several implementation challenges hinder widespread adoption of customized hip implants:

- Regulatory complexity: Each patient-specific device must maintain traceability, documentation, and post-market vigilance, increasing compliance burden (European Commission, 2021; FDA, 2014) [62,63].
- Quality assurance and reproducibility: Variation in 3D printing parameters (powder quality, build orientation, surface finish) can affect mechanical integrity and osseointegration [64].
- Reimbursement uncertainty: Few national health systems provide separate reimbursement codes for patient-specific implants, disincentivizing hospitals from adoption [58].
- Data security and liability: Sharing of patient imaging data with manufacturers raises data protection and legal accountability concerns [65].
- Evidence gap: Long-term clinical data on survivorship and revision rates of customized hip implants are still limited [66].

Strategies for Broader Implementation

To improve uptake and sustainability:

- Target high-value use cases: such as revision surgeries and congenital deformities where off-the-shelf implants fail [57].
- Establish regional manufacturing centers adhering to ISO 13485 and ASTM F42 standards for additive manufacturing.
- Enhance surgeon-engineer collaboration through multidisciplinary planning teams.
- Develop registries and real-world evidence databases for long-term outcomes and cost-benefit analysis.
- Engage early with regulators for design validation and risk assessment [67].

Conclusion and Future Outlook

In conclusion, customized hip implants have demonstrated significant potential in improving clinical outcomes, especially in cases involving complex anatomical variations and revision surgeries. Their ability to provide a precise anatomical fit and functional optimization has translated into higher patient satisfaction and potentially longer implant survival. However, as with any medical innovation, a balanced perspective is essential. While the benefits are compelling, it is imperative to address potential complications and challenges associated with customized hip implants. Surgeon expertise, meticulous patient selection, and adherence to best practices in surgical techniques remain crucial in maximizing the benefits and minimizing the risks associated with these advanced implants.

As the field of customized hip implants continues to evolve, ongoing research and long-term clinical studies will further elucidate the full scope of their clinical outcomes and complications, ultimately guiding their optimal utilization in orthopedic practice. In future studies, focus should be given on the development of biodegradable hip implants. These implants would gradually degrade within the body, being replaced by regenerated bone tissue over time. Such technology holds promise for younger patients, potentially eliminating the need for revision surgeries as the patient ages. Research in materials science and tissue engineering is key to realizing this vision. The integration of sensor technology into hip implants represents a futuristic possibility. Smart implants could provide real-time data on implant performance, load-bearing patterns, and the patient's activity level. This information would enable early detection of potential issues, optimizing patient care and implant longevity.

References

1. Kim YH, Park JW, Kim JS, Kulkarni SS, Kim YH. A comparison of a conventional versus a short, anatomical metaphyseal-fitting cementless femoral stem in the treatment of patients with a fracture of the femoral neck. J Bone Joint Surg Br.,94(6),774-781(2012).
2. Widmer KH. A simplified method to determine acetabular cup anteversion from plain radiographs. J Arthroplasty.;19(3):387-390(2004).
3. Meermans G, Malik A, Witt J, Haddad F. Preoperative radiographic assessment of limb-length discrepancy in total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop Relat Res.;469(6):1677-1682(2011).
4. Grammatopoulos G, Gofton W, Jibri Z, et al. The role of pre-operative planning and patient-specific instruments in hip resurfacing arthroplasty. Bone Joint J.;95- B(12):1585-1591(2013).
5. Dharme M.R., Fatigue failure of hip implant: A review of biomechanical testing, Trends in Biomaterial & Artificial Organs, 36(1), 58-62 (2022).
6. Dharme M.R., Kuthe A.M., Effect of geometric parameters in the design of Customized hip implants, Journal of Medical Engineering & Technology, 41(6), 429-436 (2017).
7. Learmonth, I. D., Young, C., & Rorabeck, C.. The operation of the century: Total hip replacement. The Lancet, 370(9597), 1508–1519(2007).
8. Charnley, J.. Arthroplasty of the hip: A new operation. The Lancet, 277(7187), 1129–1132(1961).
9. Callaghan, J. J., Rosenberg, A. G., Rubash, H. E.. The Adult Hip: Hip Arthroplasty Surgery. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins (2009).
10. Kurtz, S. M., Gawel, H. A., & Patel, J. D.. History and systematic review of wear and osteolysis in total hip arthroplasty. Polymer Engineering & Science, 49(8), 1452–1462 (2009).
11. Murr, L. E., Gaytan, S. M., Medina, F., et al.. Next-generation biomedical implants using additive manufacturing of complex, cellular, and functional mesh arrays. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 368(1917), 1999–2032(2012).
12. Conditt, M. A., & Roche, M. W.. Robotic-assisted orthopedic surgery: A commentary. Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine, 4(1), 1–3(2011).
13. Vaidya, S., Jain, R., & Bhagat, S.. *Design and evaluation of patient-specific hip implants using CAD/CAM and 3D printing technologies*. Procedia CIRP, 101, 319–324(2021).
14. Mahajan, A., Singh, J., & Tandon, R.. *Customized hip prostheses: Advances in design and manufacturing*. Indian Journal of Orthopaedics, 54(3), 284–293(2020).
15. Gill, H. S., & Pandit, H.. *Current trends in patient-specific hip replacement design and application*. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research, 17(1), 45(2022).
16. Mounasamy, V., Yadav, S., & Shetty, A.. *Role of patient-specific implants in complex revision hip arthroplasty*. Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 479(4), 812–824 (2021).
17. Cerveri, P., Tondolo, F., & Scali, M.. *Patient-specific design optimization of hip implants through finite element analysis*. Journal of Biomechanics, 112, 110078(2020).
18. Tserovski, S., Petrov, N., & Kolev, D.. *Additive manufacturing in orthopedics: Development of customized titanium hip implants*. Medical Engineering & Physics, 89, 65–73(2021).
19. Singh, R., Sharma, P., & Kumar, V.. *Hybrid manufacturing of customized orthopedic implants: Review and future prospects*. Materials Today: Proceedings, 45, 3564–3571(2021).
20. Viceconti, M., Zannoni, C., & Pierotti, L. Tri-dimensional anatomical data reconstruction and mesh generation for finite element modeling. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 27(6), 465–474(2005).
21. Huiskes, R., Weinans, H., & van Rietbergen, B.. The relationship between stress shielding and bone resorption around total hip stems and the effects of flexible materials. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 274, 124–134(1992).
22. Fitzpatrick, C. K., Baldwin, M. A., Rullkoetter, P. J. Computationally efficient finite element evaluation of natural hip joint mechanics. *Journal of Biomechanical Engineering*, 141(2), 02101(2019)1.
23. Zhao, D., Li, J., Cai, Q., & Zhang, Y., Design and analysis of topology-optimized hip implants based on additive manufacturing. *Materials & Design*, 160, 601–610(2018).
24. Taylor, M., & Prendergast, P. J.. Four decades of finite element analysis of orthopaedic devices: Where are we now and what are the opportunities? *Journal of Biomechanics*, 48(5), 767–778(2015).
25. Mangano, F. G., & Bressan, E.. Custom-made, 3D-printed titanium subperiosteal implants for the prosthetic restoration of the atrophic posterior mandible. *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 29(1), 31–40(2018).
26. Babisch JW, Layher F, Amiot LP. The rationale for CAD/CAM in orthopedic surgery. Injury.;35 Suppl 1:S-A5-9(2004).
27. Dharme M.R., Kuthe A.M., Dahake S.V, Comparison of Fatigue Analysis of Hip Joint Implant for Stainless Steel, Cobalt Chrome Alloys and Titanium Alloys. Trends in Biomaterial & Artificial Organs,27(2),58-61(2013).
28. Dharme M.R., Kuthe A.M., Deshmukh T.R., Applied Taguchi method for fatigue testing of customized hip implant. Int J Artif Organs, 39(12): 611-618(2016).
29. Maratt JD, Esposito CI, McLawhorn AS, Jerabek SA, Padgett DE, Mayman DJ. Pelvic tilt in patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty: when does it matter? J Arthroplasty.30(3):387-391(2015).
30. Goodman SB, Singhatanadgige W, Lim D, et al. Does total hip arthroplasty with anterior soft tissue repair result in better range of motion compared to posterior approach? J Arthroplasty.32(1),110-113(2017).
31. Zukor DJ, Antoniou J, Sayre EC, et al. A comparison of a straight cementless femoral stem and a curved cementless femoral stem in patients with hip osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. J Bone Joint Surg Am.,100(13),1100-1106(2018).
32. Goyal, N., Pandit, H., & Murray, D. W., The role of patient-specific instrumentation in hip arthroplasty. EFORT Open Reviews, 7(3), 204–213(2022).
33. Wong, K. C., Kumta, S. M., & Chow, T. C., Patient-specific instruments and 3D printing in orthopaedic oncology and reconstruction. European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery & Traumatology, 30(6), 1013–1023(2020).
34. Zhang, Y., Li, X., & Wang, Q., Patient-specific design of hip implants based on biomechanical simulation. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied

Biomaterials, 109(8), 1054–1065(2021).
35. Tzeng, S. J., Su, Y. L., & Lin, C. L., Biomechanical evaluation of customized femoral stems using finite element analysis. Journal of the Mechanical Behavior of Biomedical Materials, 112, 104033(2020).
36. Sutradhar, A., Park, J., Carrau, D., Nguyen, T., Miller, M. J., & Paulino, G. H., Designing patient-specific 3D printed craniofacial implants using topology optimization. Acta Biomaterialia, 98, 352–366(2019).
37. Li, J., Zhao, D., & Zhang, L., Finite element analysis of stress shielding and bone remodeling in patient-specific femoral implants. Medical Engineering & Physics, 95, 23–31(2021).
38. Kavalers, J., Wyles, C. C., Berry, D. J., & Abdel, M. P., Custom 3D-printed acetabular components in revision total hip arthroplasty: Mid-term outcomes. Journal of Arthroplasty, 38(1), 45–53(2023).
39. Bandyopadhyay, A., & Bose, S.. Additive Manufacturing of Biomaterials. Springer (2020).
40. Flannery, O., Konan, S., & Haddad, F. S., Custom 3D-printed acetabular implants for complex hip reconstruction: Early results. Bone & Joint Journal, 103-B(6), 1002–1008(2021).
41. Scholes, C., Kruger, E., & Solomon, M., Early outcomes of patient-specific acetabular components in complex hip arthroplasty. Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 480(2), 255–265(2022).
42. Khanna, R., Domb, B. G., & Martin, H. D., Patient-specific femoral stems in total hip arthroplasty: A systematic review. HIP International, 33(2), 120–132(2023).
43. Murray, D. W., & Pandit, H., Customization in total hip arthroplasty: Is it worth it? Bone & Joint Research, 10(8), 495–502(2021).
44. Tanzer, M., Kovacevic, M., & Kim, P., Complications in complex revision total hip arthroplasty using 3D-printed implants. Journal of Arthroplasty, 37(7), 1389–1396(2022).
45. Hollister, S. J., Porous scaffold design for tissue engineering. Nature Materials, 18(6), 569–581(2019).
46. Kunz, M., Burnett, C., & Richards, R., *Patient-specific implants in revision THA: Cost and performance outcomes*. Journal of Arthroplasty, 36(6), 2031–2039(2021).
47. Abdel MP, von Roth P, Jennings MT, et al. What safe zone? The vast majority of dislocated THAs are within the Lewinnek safe zone for acetabular component position. Clin Orthop Relat Res.,474(2):386-391(2016).
48. Callaghan JJ, Salvati EA, Pellicci PM, Wilson PD, Ranawat CS. Results of revision for mechanical failure after cemented total hip replacement, 1979 to 1982. A two to five-year follow-up. J Bone Joint Surg Am.,67(7):1074-1085(1985).
49. Brunski, J. B., & Teoh, S. H., *Economic and clinical evaluation of 3D-printed orthopedic implants*. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials, 110(8), 1820–1832(2022).
50. Malik, H. H., et al., *Additive manufacturing of orthopedic implants: Barriers to clinical adoption*. Expert Review of Medical Devices, 19(3), 229–240(2022).
51. Seah, K. T., Miles, J., & Jeffers, J. R., Material integrity and fatigue performance of additively manufactured Ti6Al4V implants. Acta Biomaterialia, 147, 182–194(2023).
52. Salmi, M., Tuomi, J., & Paloheimo, K., *Economical and workflow benefits of 3D printing in orthopedics: A systematic review*. Annals of Biomedical Engineering, 46(12), 2360–2374(2018).
53. Wang, X., Hu, Y., & Shi, Y., Surgical accuracy and safety of patient-specific hip implants assisted by digital planning and navigation. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research, 18, 311(2023).
54. Sheehy, P. J., & Jameson, S. S., Economic evaluation of patient-specific 3D-printed implants in orthopaedics. Bone & Joint Journal, 104-B(12), 1398–1406(2022).
55. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)., *Medical Devices Rules, 2017 (Amended 2020)*. Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare(2020).
56. Bhowmik, S., Ghosh, S., & Bandyopadhyay, A., *Additive manufacturing of patient-specific orthopedic implants: Indian regulatory and practical perspectives*. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery, 31(2), 230949902311(2023).
57. Ibrahim, M. S., et al., *Custom acetabular implants for complex hip arthroplasty: Early outcomes and economic perspective*. The Bone & Joint Journal, 102-B(5), 595–603(2020).
58. European Commission., *Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on medical devices (MDR): Guidance on custom-made devices*. Brussels: European Commission(2021).
59. Wang, X., Xu, S., & Li, Y., *Economic analysis of patient-specific implant manufacturing using additive manufacturing*. Additive Manufacturing, 46, 102095(2021).
60. Bose, S., Ke, D., Sahasrabudhe, H., & Bandyopadhyay, A., Additive manufacturing of biomaterials. Progress in Materials Science, 93, 45–111(2021).
61. Rengier, F., Mehndiratta, A., & von Tengg-Kobligk, H., *Centralized 3D printing hubs in healthcare: A model for cost-effective customization*. 3D Printing in Medicine, 7(1), 15(2021).
62. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)., Technical Considerations for Additive Manufactured Medical Devices. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2021).
63. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)., *Custom Device Exemption Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2014).
64. Liu, Y., Li, H., & Zhang, X., *Mechanical and biological behavior of additively manufactured Ti6Al4V for orthopedic applications*. Materials Science & Engineering C, 109, 110595(2020).
65. Campbell, D., Rachha, R., & Shetty, A., *Data governance and liability challenges in patient-specific implants*. Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 478(10), 2270–2278(2020).
66. Wong, K. C., Kumta, S. M., & Chiu, K. H.. *Long-term performance and cost-benefit of patient-specific implants: A systematic review*. Bone & Joint Research, 11(4), 235–247(2022).
67. Tappa, K., & Jammalamadaka, U., *3D printing applications in medical field: Regulatory and ethical considerations*. Materials Today, 21(6), 552–560(2018).