

Senate Community Affairs Committee

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HEALTH PORTFOLIO

Budget Estimates 2015-16, 1 - 2 June 2015

Ref No: SQ15-000438

OUTCOME: 7 - Health Infrastructure, Regulation, Safety and Quality

Topic: Birmingham Hip Resurfacing Implants

Type of Question: Hansard Page 62, 2 June 2015

Senator: Xenophon, Nick

Question:

1. In response to SQ14001248, the TGA stated that the AOANJRR reports a low rate of revision for the BHR implant, so it remains available as a surgical option in Australia. However the AOANJRR annual report in 2012 identified the BHR as having a higher than expected revision rate (pp 171,172,173) and that it has been re-identified as such in both the 2013 and 2014 reports. The 2012 annual report (p95) notes that the BHR had a cumulative revision at 11 years of 7.1% while the metal on metal total conversion hip arthroscopy report established by the journal in 2014 identifies a revision rate of 12.1% after 10 years.
 - a) How does the TGA explain these seemingly contradictory statements (what the TGA has advised and what the journal is reporting)?
 - b) Explain the variants for the BHR.

Answer:

1. a) and b)

There are two types of Birmingham Hip Resurfacing (BHR) hip replacements, conventional total hip replacement where all the bone of the femoral head is replaced by the metal implant, and resurfacing total hip replacement (often just called resurfacing hip replacement) where much of the natural bone in the femoral head is retained and a hollow metal cap is placed over it. In both cases a matching metal cup is placed in the acetabulum.

The response provided to Question on Notice SQ14-001248, that the Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry (AOANJRR) reports a low rate of revision for the BHR implant, was in relation to the BHR resurfacing device. The statistics quoted above relate to the BHR conventional total hip replacement device.

The AOANJRR has never raised any concerns about the revision rate of the BHR resurfacing implant. The latest Annual Report of the AOANJRR (Page 119, table HT37) shows that BHR resurfacing has among the lowest rates of revision of implants of its type.