ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Volume-8 | Issue-3 | March-2019 | PRINT ISSN No 2277 - 8179

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

A PROSPECTIVE STUDY OF FUNCTIONAL OUTCOME OF INTERTROCHANTERIC FRACTURES TREATED WITH PROXIMAL FEMORAL NAIL

Orthopedics

Siva Kumar Somu Junior Resident, Dept Of Orthopedics, Katuri Medical College And Hospital, guntur, NTR University Of Health Sciences

S. Narasimha Reddy* Assistant Professor, Department Of Orthopedics, Katuri Medical College And Hospital, Guntur, NTR University Of Health Sciences* Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Intertrochanteric fractures are common in the elderly especially with the increase in the incidence of osteoporosis. Various studies have shown good results when treated with intramedullary devices such as the proximal femoral nail (PFN) while other studies have shown high rates of complications. Aim: To study the outcome of intertrochanteric fractures treated with proximal femoral nailing by using harris hip scoring criteria. Materials and Methods: The study involved sixty cases of intertrochanteric fractures of femur that were treated with PFN. Fractures were classified using Boyd and Griffin classification. Patients were followed up at 4 weeks, 3 months, and 6 months and results were evaluated using Harris hip scoring criteria. Results: The study included sixty patients, 35 females and 25 males of age 42-78 years with an average 62.85 years. Excellent and good results were found in 56 patients (93.33%). Intra- and post-operative complications were found in 12 patients (19.59%). Conclusion: Proximal femoral nailing following good anatomic reduction is an efficient and minimally invasive surgical treatment for intertrochanteric fractures for both stable &unstable fracture patterns probably due to better axial telescoping and rotational stability.In our opinion, PFN may be the better fixation device for most intertrochanteric fractures

KEYWORDS

Intertrochanteric fractures, Harris hip scoring criteria, proximal femoral nail

Introduction

Intertrochanteric fractures are common in old age group[1] . These fractures are three to four times more common in elderly women, and the mechanism of injury is usually due to low energy trauma like simple fall or due to road traffic accidents. These fractures unite readily with conservative treatment, but with the risk of complications such as malunion, coxa vara, medialization of shaft, and external rotation deformity resulting in shortening of limb and limp.The primary goal of the treatment has to be early mobilization to avoid secondary complications. Various operative procedures with different implants have been described for the treatment of intertrochanteric fractures. Treatment options include dynamic hip screw (extramedullary fixation), gamma nail (intramedullary fixation), and proximal femoral nail (PFN) (intramedullary fixation).

The hip screw has been considered the device of choice but has been associated with complications such as collapse of the femoral neck, leading to loss of hip offset, and shortening of the leg.[2] Although some such sliding is expected, too much shortening is detrimental to hip function. With this in mind, the PFN was designed in 1996 which gave an advantage of minimally invasive surgery.[3] Multiple studies have shown the superior stability of intertrochanteric fractures treated with PFN[4-5] while other studies have shown higher complication rates with PFN.[6-7]

We report our results of using PFN in the management of intertrochanteric fractures by analyzing the factors which influence the postoperative mobility using Harris hip scoring criteria.[8]

Materials and methods

A total of sixty cases of intertrochanteric fractures which were treated with PFN were chosen for the study. The study period was for 2 years and done at Katuri medical college ,Guntur, from june 2015 to august 2017. Informed written consent taken from all the patients.Patients with fresh closed intertrochanteric fractures were included in the study while compound and pathological fractures were excluded. All patients were operated within 10 days of the occurrence of fracture.

Patients were examined and investigated with radiographs of pelvis. Skin traction was applied to the affected limb in all cases. Preoperatively, radiographs were reviewed again and fractures classified according to Boyd and Griffin[9] classification. Neck-shaft angle and medullary size were assessed. The reduction was achieved primarily by traction and internal rotation, and adduction or abduction as required. If reduction was not achieved by traction and manipulation, nail reduction was done where the nail was introduced in the proximal fragment and reduction was achieved by rotational movements and compression by the nail. If this failed, reduction was achieved by limited open reduction at the fracture site. Reduction was confirmed under an image intensifier.The PFN we used had a standard configuration with a length of 250 mm, mediolateral angulation of 6° and a neck-shaft angle of 125^0,130^0,135°. The nail had a proximal diameter of 14 mm and distal diameter of 9,10, 11, and 12 mm.We used a proximal derotation screw of 6.4 mm and distal lag screw of 8 mm. Distal locking was done with self-tapping 4.9 mm cortical screws, one of which were applied in static mode and the other in dynamic mode allowing 5 mm dynamization.

Postoperatively, the limb was elevated with a pillow. Intravenous antibiotics were given for first 48 h followed by oral antibiotics for the next 3 days. Static quadriceps exercises were started on the 4th postoperative day. Active quadriceps and hip flexion exercise were started on 6th and 7th postoperative day. Dressing was done on 2nd, 5th and 8th postoperative days. Sutures were removed on 12th postoperative day.

Patients were advised to walk nonweight bearing with axillary crutches as soon as tolerable. Partial weight bearing was started at about 4 weeks postoperatively. Full weight bearing walking was allowed after assessing for the radiological and clinical union. The presence of callus radiologically and absence of tenderness was considered bony union. Patients were evaluated at 4 weeks, 12 weeks, and 24 weeks [figure 1-2]. The patients were assessed using the Harris hip scoring criteria at the follow-ups.



Fig1:pre op radiograph



Fig2: immediate post op radiograph

RESULTS

This study involved sixty cases of intertrochanteric fractures of either sex. All cases were treated by intramedullary fixation with a PFN. The age distribution was from 42-78 years. There were 35females (64%) and 25 males (36%) in the study.54 patients (90%) sustained the fracture due to a fall and 6 patients (10%) due to road traffic accident. Most of the patients who sustained the fracture due to fall were older in age and had osteoporosis.All the fractures were classified as per Boyd and Griffin classification [Table 1]. Fracture pattern, type1 is stable while type2, 3 and 4 are unstable. In our study, 20 patients (33.33%) suffered from fracture pattern type1, 28(46.66%) suffered from type2 and 6 patients (10%) from type3 and 6(10%) patients from type 4. Average operating time was 82.06 min after anesthesia and mean blood loss 197.67ml. Closed reduction was achieved in 54 patients (90%) whereas six patients (10%) required open reduction. The average hospital stay was 10.66 days. It was more in patients with co-morbid conditions and complications with highest being 21days.

Table1: Fracture classified according to Boyd and griffith classification

Fracture pattern		*No of patients*	*percentage*
Type 1	– stable	20	33.33
Type2	– unstable with posteromedial communition	28	46.66
Type 3	-unstable/reverse oblique	6	10
Type 4	-Unstable with subtrochanteric extension	6	10

We encountered over all complications in 12 (19.59%) patients [Table 2]. Early complications include inadequate reduction in one patient (1.6%), failure to put derotation screw in one patient (1.6%), difficulty in distal locking in two patients (3.33%), varus deformity in one patient (1.6%), superficial infection in two patients (3.33%), implant failure in one patients (1.6%), and z effect in one patient (1.6%). Other complications include shortening in one patient (1.6%) and malunion in two patients (3.33%)[figure 3-4]. Breakage of nail and inadequate fixation were considered implant failure .

Table 2: Complications

Complication	*No of patients*	*percentage*
Inadequate reduction	1	1.6
Failure to insert de-rotation screw	1	1.6
Difficulty in distal locking	2	3.33
Varus deformity	1	1.6
Shortening	1	1.6
Superficial infection	2	3.33
Implant failure	1	1.6
Z-effect	1	1.6
Malunion	2	3.33
Total	12	19.59



Fig3: complication, Z-effect



Fig4:complication, failure to put derotation screw

According to Harris hip scoring criteria, we had excellent results in 60% (36) of patients, good results in 33.33% (20) patients, fair results in 3.33% (2) patients, and poor results in 3.33% (2) of patients [Table 3]. Our results were comparable to similar studies done by Pundakar ag etal[10] and Sps gill et al.[11]

Table 3: Results according to Harris hip scoring criteria

Results	No of patients	percentage
Excellent	36	60
good	20	33.33
fair	2	3.33
poor	2	3.33

DISCUSSION

The successful treatment of Intertrochanteric fractures with PFN depends on many factors such as the general health of the patient, time from fracture to treatment, adequacy, and stability of the fixation.

Dynamic hip screw is considered the gold standard for treatment due to its favorable results and low rate of complications when used in the management of stable fractures.[12] Along with the requirement of a relatively larger exposure, more tissue trauma, it has been associated with intra- and postoperative varus collapse especially when used in unstable and reverse oblique fractures, ultimately leading to medialization of the shaft and deformity.[13] In such cases, an intramedullary fixation with PFN can be advantageous. Intramedullary devices have been shown to be biologically stronger and can withstand higher static and several fold higher cyclical loading than dynamic hip screw.PFN also acts as a buttress in preventing the medialization of the shaft. The implant compensates for the function of the medial column.[14-15]

The nail's position near the weight bearing axis reduces the stress generated on the implant significantly. The entry point of the PFN is at the tip of the greater trochanter, so it reduces the damage to the hip abductors unlike the gamma nail which is inserted through the pyriformis fossa and with a derotation screw reduces the chances of cutout as compared to the gamma nail.[16-17] The hip screw and the anti-rotation cervical screw of the PFN adequately compress the fracture, leaving between them adequate bone block for further revision should the need arise.

The most common mode of injury in our study was low energy trauma due to fall (90%) in elderly. In the young age group, fracture was due to high energy trauma. In our study, 33.33% were stable fracture and 66.66% were unstable. Stable fractures required less radiation exposure than the unstable fractures. Most patients with low energy trauma had osteoporosis. The most common grade of osteoporosis was Singh's Grade 3. Our operating time reduced gradually during the study which reflected the steep learning curve of the proximal femoral nailing.

The anatomical reduction and secure fixation of the patient on the operating table are absolutely vital for easy handling and good surgical result. In our study, 10% of patients required limited open reduction.The entry point of the nail was taken on the tip or the lateral part of the greater trochanter. As the nail has 6 degree angle medial entry point causes more distraction of the fracture. The hip pin was inserted 5 mm away from the subchondral bone in the lower half in the anteroposterior (AP) view and center on the neck in the lateral view.

The cervical screw should be placed parallel to the hip screw in AP view, and they should overlap it in lateral view. Ideally, the cervical crew should be 10 mm shorter than the hip screw. This ensures that the cervical screw does not take the weight load but only fulfill the anti-rotational function. Failure to do this leads to "Z-effect," when the cervical pin backs out, and the hip pin pierces the joint or vice-versa. We observed this complication in one patient. The patient underwent revision surgery and the fracture healed. One patient (1.6%) had an implant breakage this has been addressed with a long PFN. There was no case of nonunion. The overall rate of complication was 19.59%. This is comparable to studies done by Gadegone etal[18] .The mean hospital stay was 10.66 days and mean time for full wt bearing was 11.66 weeks.This is comparable to studies done by Cyrill jones et al[19], and Pajarinen j et al[20]. Although the higher price of PFN is a limiting factor as compared to dynamic hip screw, we believe that treatment of intertrochanteric fractures particularly of unstable pattern with PFN is a good and efficient treatment .[figure 5-6]



Fig 5: standing on effected leg at 6 month follow up



Fig 6: range of movements at 6 month follow up

Using intra-medullary devices, like the PFN have certain advantages. They require a smaller incision, less soft tissue dissection and hence blood loss is less. Being a load-sharing device, they provide more efficient load transfer. The shorter lever arm also helps to decrease the tensile strain on the implant, thus reducing the chances of implant failure. Also PFN creates a short lever arm which translates to lower bending moment and decreased rate of mechanical failure. PFN has shown to be more biomechanically stronger because they can with stand higher static and cyclical loadings. The implant compensates for function of medial column.PFN also acts as a buttress in preventing the medialization of the shaft.[19] A fractured lateral wall is also not a risk factor for failure . However, the procedure is more technically demanding and has a longer learning curve.

CONCLUSION

From our experience with the Proximal Femoral Nail, it was observed that although the method is technically demanding and requires special instrumentation, but the advantage of immediate stability in both stable and unstable fractures, and the relatively few complications serve to recommend it for the method of choice for surgical treatment of intertrochanteric femoral fractures. Even in unstable intertrochanteric fractures the PFN has significantly better outcomes in terms of earlier restoration of walking ability as its advantages of being inserted through small exposure, preservation of hematoma and less blood loss. .Proximal femoral nailing following good anatomic reduction is an efficient and minimally invasive surgical treatment for intertrochanteric fractures for both stable &unstable fracture patterns probably due to better axial telescoping and rotational stability.In our opinion, PFN may be the better fixation device for most intertrochanteric fractures.

REFERENCES

1. Cumming rg, Nevih mc et al; epidemiology of hip fractures. epidemiol rev. 1997;19(2):244-57
2. Doppelt sh.sliding hip screw todays best answer for stabilization of intertrochanteric fractures.ortho.clin north am, 1980:11;507-523
3. Simmermacher RK, Bosch AM, Van der Werken C. The AO/ASIF-proximal femoral nail (PFN): A new device for the treatment of unstable proximal femoral fractures. Injury 1999;30:327-32
4. .Kulkarni GS, Limaye R, Kulkarni M, Kulkarni S. Current concept review Intertrochanteric fractures. Indian J Orthop 2006;40:16-23.
5. Christian carulli, federico p et al; a comparison of two fixation methods for femoral trochanteric fractures : a new generation intra medullary system vs sliding hip screw , clinical cases in mineral and bone metabolism 2017 : 14 (1) :40-47.
6. Hardy DC, Descamps PY, Krallis P, Fabeck L, Smets P, Bertens CL, et al. Use of an intramedullary hip-screw compared with a compression hip-screw with a plate for intertrochanteric femoral fractures. A prospective, randomized study of one hundred patients. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1998;80:618-30.
7. Baumgaertner MR, Curtin SL, Lindskog DM. Intramedullary versus extramedullary fixation for the treatment of intertrochanteric hip fractures. Clin Orthop Relat Res 1998;348:87-94.
8. Harris WH, traumatic arthritis of the hip after dislocation and acetabular fractures: treatment by mold arthroplasty. an end-result study using a new method of result evaluation. J bone joint surg (am) 1969;51((4)):737–55
9. Boyd hb and Griffin ll: Classification and treatment of trochanteric fractures, Arch Surg,1949jun; 58(6): 853-866
10. Pundkar ag, Modi ns et al; evolution of dynamic hip screw plate vs proximal femoral nail for unstable intertrocnanteric fractures; journal of research in medical and dental sciences, vol 4,issue3, july –sep 2016.
11. Sps gill, Ankit mittal et al; dynamic hip screw with locked plate vs proximal femoral nail for the management of intertrochanteric fracture: a comparative study, international journal of orthopaedics sciences 2017; 3(2): 173-180.
12. Doherty jh and Lyden jp : Intertrochanteric fractures of the hip treated with compression screws - Analysis of problems, Clin Ortho 1979; 141:184-187.
13. Murray RC, Frew JF. Trochanteric fractures of the femur; a plea for conservative treatment. J Bone Joint Surg Br 1949;31B:204-1
14. Pavelka T, Houcek P, Linhart M, Matejka J. Osteosynthesis of hip and femoral shaft fractures using the PFN-long. Acta Chir Orthop Traumatol Cech 2007;74:91-8.
15. Curtis MJ, Jinnah RH, Wilson V, Cunningham BW. Proximal femoral fractures: A biomechanical study to compare intramedullary and extramedullary fixation. Injury 1994;25:99-104.
16. Menezes DF, Gamulin A, Noesberger B. Is the proximal femoral nail a suitable implant for treatment of all trochanteric fractures? Clin Orthop Relat Res 2005;439:221-7.
17. Ansari Moein CM, Verhofstad MH, Bleys RL, van der Werken C. Soft tissue injury related to choice of entry point in antegrade femoral nailing: Piriform fossa or greater trochanter tip. Injury 2005;36:1337-42.
18. Gadegone WM, Salphale YS. Proximal femoral nail – An analysis of 100 cases of proximal femoral fractures with an average follow up of 1 year. Int Orthop 2007;31:403-8.
19. Cyril jonnes ms, Shishir sm, type II inter trochanteric fractures PFN vs DHS, arch bone Jt Surg . 2016 : 4 (1) : 23-28
20. Pajarinen j,LindahL et al; Pertrochanteric femoral fractures treated with dynamic hip screws or a proximal femoral nail: A randomized study comparing post-operative rehabilitation. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2005; 87(1):76–81.