



EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF DIFFERENT APPROACHES OF TREATMENT OF INTRAARTICULAR FRACTURE OF THE DISTAL HUMERUS AT A TERTIARY CARE CENTRE IN BIHAR.

Nipendra Kishore*

Senior Resident, Department of Orthopedic, Katihar Medical College, Katihar, Bihar. *Corresponding Author

Ajay Kumar Mahto

Professor, Department of Orthopedic, Katihar Medical College, Katihar, Bihar.

ABSTRACT

Distal humerus intercondylar fractures are intra-articular comminuted fractures of the elbow that involve soft tissue injury. Due to the fact these fractures are fairly rare, a specific management scheme is challenging to devise. **Methodology:** This prospective study was based on a series of 30 consecutive patients who presented with intercondylar intraarticular fracture of distal humerus in the orthopedic OPD of Katihar Medical College, Bihar, during the study period that is from August 2015 to July 2016. **Results:** At final follow up, the mean MEPS was 87.9 points out of 100 (range 55–100) with a mean elbow flexion of 115.8° (range 85°–150°). The mean deficit in extension was 19° (range 5°–35°). **Conclusion:** Open reduction internal fixation still being considered the gold standard for treatment of distal humerus fractures, parallel and perpendicular plating have been showing similar clinical results.

KEYWORDS : Intraarticular fracture, Distal humerus

INTRODUCTION

Distal humerus intercondylar fractures are intra-articular comminuted fractures of the elbow that involve soft tissue injury [1]. These types of fractures are relatively rare (<2%) and are difficult to treat due to their epiphyseal location [2]. Complete fractures result from impaction of the proximal ulna onto the articular part (trochlea, capitellum) of the distal humerus, and can occur with the elbow flexed or extended [2]. Due to the fact these fractures are fairly rare, a specific management scheme is challenging to devise [2].

Treatment consists of assessing the mechanism of the injury, defining the diagnostic modalities, and developing a clinical approach which will allow for recovery of full mobility of the elbow [2]. Any approach should aim at mobilizing the elbow joint to avoid stiffening and heterotopic ossification [3,4]. Immobilization is only feasible in situations in which the fractures are non-displaced or as temporary treatment under specific circumstances [2,4]. Normal function can be difficult to restore if the joint is deformed due to malunion and/or stiffened by capsular and ligament contractures or heterotopic ossifications.

Surgery is the common treatment for this type of fracture [5]. Non-surgical treatment can be performed in cases of hemiplegia sequelae that involve the ipsilateral upper limb, advanced osteoporosis and fractures with extensive bone loss [3]. However, function results are typically less than optimal [3,5]. The primary goal of surgical treatment is to obtain fixation with sufficient stability so that the elbow can be mobilized immediately following surgery [2,3]. The type of treatment depends upon the fracture characteristics, with partial and complete fractures requiring different treatment strategies [2,3]. Techniques range from conservative surgical treatment using internal fixation in young patients to elbow joint replacement in older patients with comminuted fractures [2,3]. Olecranon osteotomy is considered the "gold standard" treatment for distal humerus fractures [2,6]. Fixation for complex fractures can consist of reconstruction plates or locking compression plates, with one plate being placed on each column to neutralize disassembly forces, especially rotational ones. Complication following surgery includes loss of reduction, implant failure, nonunion, malunion, ulnar nerve neuropathy, elbow stiffness and heterotopic ossification [7].

The approach that is most effective for treating this fracture is unclear and may depend upon several factors, such as fracture complexity and patient characteristics. In this study, we evaluated the effectiveness of some of the surgical

approaches on elbow functional outcomes in the treatment of distal humerus fracture.

METHODOLOGY

This prospective study was based on a series of 30 consecutive patients who presented with intercondylar intraarticular fracture of distal humerus in the orthopedic OPD of Katihar Medical College, Bihar, during the study period that is from August 2015 to July 2016.

Data Collection

Preoperative data collection was done by detailed history taking and systematic clinical examination of injured elbow. Preoperative radiographs in two planes (antero-posterior (AP), and lateral views) were obtained to analyze the fracture. Fractures were classified according to the preoperative X-rays and the intraoperative findings. Post-operative data was collected in form of Mayo elbow performance score (MEPS), radiographical assessment and onset of any complication. A score of 90-100 was considered to be excellent, 75-89 as good, 60-74 as fair and less than 60 as poor.

Various Surgical Approach Adopted

1. Olecranon osteotomy

Olecranon osteotomy (Chevron osteotomy) is the traditional standard approach to the distal humerus and elbow joint [8]. A V-shaped olecranon osteotomy is performed, creating a wide exposure of the articular surface of the distal humerus making reduction and internal fixation of complex fractures feasible [9].

2. Triceps-reflecting (elevating) approach (Bryan-Morrey)

Avoiding the abovementioned complications of the olecranon osteotomy, Bryan and Morrey established in 1982 the triceps-reflecting approach. The approach being basically posterior, the triceps mechanism is reflected from medial to lateral from the olecranon and the ulnar periosteum and in the end of the procedure is being resutured transosseously. This approach allows the surgeon a widespread view of the joint without olecranon osteotomy and is used for arthroplasty and internal fixation of intraarticular fractures [10].

3. Triceps-sparing approach

After a posterior midline incision, a window on the lateral side of the triceps is created by elevating it off the posterior border of the intermuscular septum and posterior humerus. The radial nerve is being identified and mobilized for its protection. Not detaching the triceps from its insertion, the view of the distal articular surface is relatively impaired.

Indication is open reduction internal fixation (ORIF) in extra-articular or simple articular fractures [11].

Inclusion And Exclusion Criteria

The criteria for inclusion were: patients aged more than 18 years, with close and open grade 1 (according to Gustilo-Anderson classification) intraarticular distal humerus fractures and fracture dislocations classified intercondylar type B and C according to the AO classification system. Exclusion criteria were: patient below age of 18 years, open grade 2 & 3 fracture, supracondylar extraarticular fractures (AO type A), previous operative treatment because of the fracture (external fixation excluded), history of primary or metastatic tumors with pathologic fracture and those who were unfit for major surgery. Mean follow-up up to the final interview was 10 months (from 6 to 20 months). All patients were available at the time of last followup.

Post-operative Care

Patients were instructed to keep the limb elevated and move their fingers and elbow joint. Early controlled passive mobilization of the elbow was started 48 h postoperatively after removal of the drainage. After discharge, patients completed a physical therapy program with passive and active mobilization of the joint in full range of motion. Suture/staples were removed within the 9th to 16th postoperative day and check X-ray in anteroposterior and lateral views were obtained.

RESULTS

At final follow up, the mean MEPS was 87.9 points out of 100 (range 55–100) with a mean elbow flexion of 115.8° (range 85°–150°). The mean deficit in extension was 19° (range 5°–35°). There were no final limitations in pronation and supination in any cases. All elbows were stable at followup with no difference in radial or ulnar stress opening in comparison to the contralateral side, a negative pivot shift test and a negative moving valgus stress test.

The mean functional result of the MEPS was 22.74 points of 25. Majority of patient (22 out of 30) were able to do all 5 functions included in mayo elbow performance score (daily hygiene work by themselves, comb their hair by themselves, feed by their own, put on their shirts by their own and put on their shoes by their own). The majority of patients (20/30) reported no pain at all, eleven patients reported mild pain over 24 h and usual activities of daily living and working. Based upon Mayo Elbow Performance Score, there were 19 patients (61%) with a mean excellent result (90–100), 8 patients (29%) with good (75–89), 1 patient with a fair result (60–74) and 2 patients with poor result. (below 60).

Radiographic Assessment

Union was achieved completely in 29 patients (93.5%) at final follow up. Average time required for union was 16 weeks (range 12–24). 1 fracture remained as painless nonunion. The patients did not require reoperation in either of these cases. There were no cases of primary malposition or secondary dislocation. All osteotomy of the olecranon underwent consolidation as well.



Complications

There have been no complications with respect to the fixation of the implants and the retention of the fragments in anatomical position. Apart from 1 fracture nonunion, other complication was 1 ulnar neuropathias with altered sensation in fourth & fifth finger. These recovered fully during followup without any associated sequelae. Four patients had superficial infection over surgical wound, all were treated successfully by oral antibiotics & local dressing wound care. In 3 patients, implants were clinically prominent without causing any discomfort.

Comparison Of Three Surgical Approach

The outcome from the various three surgical approach adopted during the course of the study was done using Kruskal Wallis method. The outcome considered for this comparison of surgical approaches was their MEPS post-operative. There was no significant difference found between the three methods. This may be attributed to a very limited sample size.

DISCUSSION

Olecranon osteotomy has been considered the gold standard, providing excellent exposure and avoiding problems associated with triceps-splitting techniques, including disruption of the extensor mechanism, fibrosis, and intramuscular nerve injuries [10, 12, 13]. On the other hand, osteotomies can be complicated with delayed union, nonunion, and prominent hardware, thereby necessitating further surgery [12, 14]. In our study, we found 3 patients having clinically prominent & palpable implant without causing any discomfort.

Reising K et al [15] carried out a study of 40 patients with mean age of 60.5 years with distal humerus intraarticular fractures treated by open reduction & internal fixation using a novel, perpendicular, fixed-angle distal Humerus Plate (DHP, Synthes) system with a mean follow-up of 11 months. 'Good' or 'excellent' results were observed in 29/40 patients. Mean MEPS was 84 and Mean ROM was 100°. Complications comprised two superficial wound infections, two cases of heterotopic ossification, one case of delayed union and five cases of transient ulnar neuropathy. Implant failure was observed twice in one patient.

S. Greiner et al [16] published the results of open reduction and internal fixation of 14 distal humerus intraarticular fracture using anatomically preshaped angular distal humerus plate (12C types and 2B type according to AO CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM) with mean age of 55.2 years. Clinical MEPS results were good to excellent with a mean of 91 +/- 11.7 points. Mean flexion was 121 +/- 20.9, mean extension deficit was 17.9° +/- 10.3. Radiographically, complete union was achieved in all patients. There were no

cases of primary malposition or secondary dislocation. Complications were 1 delayed union after olecranon osteotomy and 2 transient ulnar nerve irritations.

In present study, we prospectively evaluated a series of 30 consecutive patients with the mean age of 41.2 years who were operated for distal intercondylar humerus fracture including (26C and 5B types according to AO CLASSIFICATION) using the 3.5 mm pre-contoured distal humerus medial and lateral anatomical locking plate (90:90 orthogonal) system through a posterior trans-olecranon approach. At mean followup of 10 months (range 6–20 months), the mean MEPS was 87.9 points out of 100 (range 55–100) with a mean elbow flexion of 115.8° (range 85°–150°). The mean deficit in extension was 19° (range 5°–35°). Based upon Mayo Elbow Performance Score, there were 19 patients (61%) with a mean excellent result (90–100), 9 patients (29%) with good (75–89), 1 patient with a fair result (60–74) and 2 patients with poor result (below 60). Union was achieved completely in 29 patients (93.5%) at investigation 3 months postoperatively. Average time required for union was 16 weeks (range 12–24). Fractures remained as painless nonunion. There have been no complications with respect to the fixation of the implants and the retention of the fragments in anatomical position. Apart from 1 fracture nonunion, other complications were one ulnar neuropraxia, four superficial infections and three clinically prominent hardware without causing any discomfort. Revision surgery was not required in any of above complications.

CONCLUSION

Open reduction internal fixation still being considered the gold standard for treatment of distal humerus fractures, parallel and perpendicular plating have been showing similar clinical results. Total elbow arthroplasty has proven itself to be an adequate option for treatment in older patients especially when suffering from low bone density. More recently established less invasive approaches to the elbow joint like the triceps-reflecting and triceps-sparing approach have successfully challenged the traditional olecranon osteotomy with low complication rates and good overview of the articular surface.

Evaluation of literature showed high complication rates for internal fixation in patients with osteoporosis highlighting the need of supplemental systemic antiosteoporotic treatment. Future studies will have to further evaluate the correlation between the bone healing process and such treatment.

Conflict of interest – None of the authors declared any conflict of interest

Funding – Self funded

Ethical clearance – obtained from the institutional ethics committee and detailed Informed consent of the patient or relatives was taken prior to the surgery.

REFERENCES

1. Sanchez-Sotelo J, Torchia ME, O'Driscoll SW. Complex distal humeral fractures: internal fixation with a principle-based parallel-plate technique. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2007;89:961–969.
2. Begue T. Articular fractures of the distal humerus. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res.* 2014;100:S55–S63.
3. Miller AN, Beingsessner DM. Intra-articular distal humerus fractures. *Orthop Clin N Am.* 2013;44:35–45.
4. Hausman M, Panozzo A. Treatment of distal humerus fractures in the elderly. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2004;(425):55–63.
5. Jung SW, Kang SH, Jeong M, et al. Triangular fixation technique for bicolonn restoration in treatment of distal humerus intercondylar fracture. *Clin Orthop Surg.* 2016;8:9–18.
6. Nauth A, McKee MD, Ristevski B, et al. Distal humeral fractures in adults. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2011;93:686–700.
7. Lakhey S, Sharma S, Pradhan RL, et al. Osteosynthesis of intercondylar humerus fracture using Bryan and Morrey approach. *Kathmandu Univ Med J.* 2010;8:154–157.
8. Ring D, Gulotta L, Chin K, Jupiter JB. Olecranon osteotomy for exposure of fractures and nonunions of the distal humerus. *J Orthop Trauma.*

- 2004;18(7):446–9. doi: 10.1097/00005131-200408000-00010.
9. Elmadag M, Erdil M, Bilsel K. The olecranon osteotomy provides better outcome than the triceps-lifting approach for the treatment of distal humerus fractures. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol.* 2014;24(1):43–50. doi: 10.1007/s00590-012-1149-y.
10. Bryan RS, Morrey BF. Extensive posterior exposure of the elbow. A triceps-sparing approach. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1982;166:188–92.
11. Schildhauer TA, Nork SE, Mills WJ, Henley MB. Extensor mechanism-sparing paratricipital posterior approach to the distal humerus. *J Orthop Trauma.* 2003;17(5):374–8. doi: 10.1097/00005131-200305000-00009.
12. Gofton WT, MacDermid J.C., Patterson S.D., Faber K.J., King G.J. Functional outcome of AO Type C distal humeral fractures. *J Hand Surg.* 2003;28:294–308.
13. Jupiter J.B., Neff U., Holzach P, Allgower M. Intercondylar fractures of the humerus. An operative approach. *J Bone Joint Surg.* 1985;67A:226–239.
14. Home G. Supracondylar fractures of the humerus in adults. *J Trauma.* 1980;20:71–74.
15. Reising K., Hauschild O., Strohm P.C., Suedkamp N.P. Stabilisation of articular fractures of the distal humerus: early experience with a novel perpendicular plate system. *Injury.* 2009;40(6):611–617.
16. Greiner S. Outcome after open reduction and angular stable internal fixation for supra-intercondylar fractures of the distal humerus: preliminary results with the LCP distal humerus system. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2007;128:723–729.