Reply to the Letter to the Editor

Reply to the Letter to the Editor: Is There a Benefit to Modularity in ‘Simpler’ Femoral Revisions?

James I. Huddleston III MD

To the Editor,

I would like to thank Professor Fink for his thoughtful letter. While our research group found a higher rate of intraoperative fractures with modular stems compared to monoblock stems, our group of investigators agree with his point that the modularity of the stem is not necessarily causative. Numerous fac-

tors, including bone quality, use of an osteotomy, modularity, stem diameter, stem length, stem geometry, taper angle, and amount of mismatch between femoral and stem bows all likely contribute to the risk of fracture and the likelihood of osseointegration. These observations, in part, led us to conclude that both modular and monoblock stems have a role in revi-

sion femoral surgery. We also agree with his point that one should use the shortest stem that allows for appropriate distal and proximal fixation.

(RE: Huddleston JI 3rd, Tetreault MW, Yu M, Bedair H, Hansen VJ, Choi HR, Goodman SB, Sporer S, Della Valle CJ. Is There a Benefit to Modularity in ‘Simpler’ Femoral Revisions? *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2016;474:415–420).

The author certifies that he, or any member of his immediate family, has no funding or commercial associations (eg, consultancies, stock ownership, equity interest, patent/licensing arrangements, etc) that might pose a conflict of interest in connection with the submitted article.

All ICMJE Conflict of Interest Forms for authors and *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*® editors and board members are on file with the publication and can be viewed on request.

The opinions expressed are those of the writers, and do not reflect the opinion or policy of *CORR*® or The Association of Bone and Joint Surgeons®.

J. I. Huddleston III MD (✉)
Department of Orthopaedic Surgery,
Stanford University Medical Center, 300
Pasteur Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94305,
USA
e-mail: jhuddleston@stanford.edu