

**Management of Comminuted
Supracondylar Fracture Femur by
Ilizarov External Fixation Versus
Internal Fixation:**

Systematic Review of Literature

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master
Degree in Orthopedic Surgery*

Presented by

Ahmed Salah eldin Ahmed Abdallah
(M.B.B.Ch.)

Under Supervision of

Professor/ Mahmoud Mohamed Fayd (M.D)
*Professor of Orthopedic Surgery
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Professor/ Mohamed Elgebeily (M.D)
*Professor of Orthopedic Surgery
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

*Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University*

2018



*First of all, all gratitude is due to **ALLAH**, the almighty guided and aided me in bringing this work to light which would have never been crowned by success without blessing of **ALLAH**, to whom my faithful loyalty will remain however beyond my compromises.*

*I wish to express my deepest thanks, gratitude and profound respect to my honored professor, **Prof.Dr. Mahmoud fayd**, Professor of orthopedic surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his meticulous supervision, faithful guidance and constant encouragement.*

*I am also deeply grateful and would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to **Dr. Mohammed Elgebeily**, Lecturer orthopedic surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his great help and continuous contributions and for his great support to remove any obstacles.*

Ahmed Salaheldin Ahmed

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قَالَ

لَسْبَحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا
إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ
الْعَلِيمُ الْعَظِيمُ

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	5
List of Figures	6
List of Abbreviations	9
Introduction	- 1 -
Aim of the Work.....	4
Anatomy of the Supracondylar Femur	5
Management.....	16
Systematic Review	49
Results	59
Discussion	64
Summary	76
Limitations	79
Recommendations	80
References	81

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Rating system of Pritchett.....	53
Table (2):	Criteria suggested by Schatzker and Lambert.	53
Table (3):	Papers including the level of evidence for every research, name, no. of centers and no. of patients.	57
Table (4):	Comparison of nonunion rate in both methods.....	59
Table (5):	Comparison of Fixation Failure Rate in both methods	60
Table (6):	Comparison of Secondary surgical procedures Rate in both methods.....	61
Table (7):	Comparison of Deep Infection Rate in both methods.....	62
Table (8):	Comparison of Knee Score in both methods.....	63

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (1):	The distal end of the left femur; lateral aspect.	5
Fig. (2):	Alignment of the lower extremity.	6
Fig. (3):	Lines of weakness marked on the distal end of a femur.....	6
Fig. (4):	Blood supply of the distal femur.....	9
Fig. (5):	Mechanical and anatomical axis of the shaft of the femur.....	10
Fig. (6):	Lateral view showing muscle attachments and resulting deforming forces.	12
Fig. (7):	Neer's classification.	13
Fig. (8):	The AO/OTA Classification of the distal femoral fractures.	15
Fig. (9):	Skeletal traction may be used to treat a displaced supracondylar femoral fracture.	18
Fig. (10):	(a) A 95° angled blade plate. (b) Multifragmentary supracondylar fracture bridged by ABP, with addition of primary anterior bone graft.....	23
Fig. (11):	The center of the blade insertion site is 1.5 to 2 cm from the distal articular surface.	23
Fig. (12):	Displaced comminuted supracondylar fracture of femur fixed with AO supracondylar blade plate and multiple screws.....	24
Fig. (13):	The dynamic condylar screw, a contoured side plate of variable length with a barrel at 95 degree to the long axis of the plate that accepts a lag screw of variable length.....	25
Fig. (14):	Fixation of medial condylar fracture with dynamic condylar screw.....	26
Fig. (15):	The condylar buttress plate allows multiple points of fixation in the distal femur.	27
Fig. (16):	Condylar buttress plate.....	28

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (17):	Combination hole of the new locked compression plate (LCP) provides the possibility of treating fractures with conventional standard screws, angular-stable locking head screws, or both.....	30
Fig. (18):	Postoperative AP (A) and lateral (B) x-rays with LCP.....	31
Fig. (19):	The implant system illustrates the concept of Combining the DCP with the locked internal fixator.....	32
Fig. (20):	No tactile feedback as regard the quality of the bony grip when tightening the screws the locking compression plate in distal femur.	33
Fig. (21):	Less invasive stabilization system (LISS) achieves high angular stability between the screw and the force carrier by an interlocking thread connection between screw head and internal fixator hole.....	34
Fig. (22):	Left LISS-DF with a mounted insertion guide that, together with the trocar assembly, serves also as an aiming instrument. Right Implant has been inserted and aligned over the insertion guide with the lateral femur.....	34
Fig. (23):	Early postoperative X-ray showing good reduction and satisfactory alignment in MIPO.....	35
Fig. (24):	Supracondylar Nail.....	36
Fig. (25):	Solid union of this extra-articular fracture has been achieved using a supracondylar nail but the distal tip of the nail is protruded.....	37
Fig. (26):	Radiographs showed good bone union 3 months postoperatively with Huckstep nailing.	39
Fig. (27):	Ilizarov configuration and a Small Single Pin Clamp 4.0 x 2.5mm.....	40

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (28):	Lateral view of the distal end of the femur	41
Fig. (29):	A. The tapered pin, B. drill-type pin tip, C. Cancellous pin, D. cortical pin and E. Hydroxyapatite-coated pin.....	42
Fig. (30):	Photograph of the wire insertion into the distal femur	44
Fig. (31):	Ilizarov external fixator in sever comminuted supracondylar fracture.....	47
Fig. (32):	Ilizarov in multiply-injured patient.....	48
Fig. (33):	PRISMA flow diagram.....	56
Fig. (34):	Diagram showing incidence of nonunion in both methods.....	59
Fig. (35):	Diagram showing incidence of Fixation Failure in both methods.....	60
Fig. (36):	Diagram showing incidence of Secondary surgical procedures in both methods.....	61
Fig. (37):	Diagram showing incidence of Deep Infection in both methods.....	62
Fig. (38):	Diagram showing incidence of Knee Score according to Criteria suggested by Schatzker and Lambert in both methods.....	63

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
ABP	<i>Angled blade plate</i>
ADR	<i>The AO Development Institute</i>
AO	<i>The Arbeitsgemeinschaft fur Osteosynthese</i>
AO-ASIF	<i>AO Association for the Study of Internal Fixation</i>
AP	<i>Anteroposterior</i>
ARI	<i>AO Research Institute</i>
CT	<i>Computed tomography</i>
DCS	<i>Dynamic condylar screw</i>
HA-coated p	<i>Hydroxyapatite-coated</i>
IM	<i>Intramedullary</i>
LC-DCP	<i>Limited contact dynamic compression plate</i>
LCP	<i>Locking compression plate</i>
LISS	<i>Less invasive stabilization system</i>
LISS-DF	<i>Less invasive stabilization system to the distal femur</i>
MIPO	<i>Minimally invasive plate osteosynthesis</i>
ORIF	<i>Open reduction and internal fixation</i>
PC-Fix	<i>Point contact fixator</i>
PMMA	<i>Polymethylmethacrylate</i>
CBP	<i>Condylar buttress plate.</i>
RCT	<i>Randomized control trail</i>

ABSTRACT

Background: An estimated 6% of all fractures of the femur account for the distal part of the bone about 0.4% of all adult fractures[1]. A wide variety of treatment modalities have been used for distal femoral fractures yet there is disagreement on the optimal choice of treatment. The management of patients with closed comminuted supracondylar femoral fracture with intact soft tissue and neurovascular state is challenging. It is important to use a technique that can provide secure fixation with minimum handling of tissues, while allowing early knee mobilization and early partial weight bearing. Treatment options for fractures range from the various types of Internal to Ilizarov external fixation for displaced or unstable comminuted fractures. The fixation chosen significantly impacts the outcomes of fracture healing. Although rigid fixation is preferable in the treatment of select fracture types, the process of plate fixation can create its own complications. Achieving a rigid plate/bone construct necessitates some degree of soft-tissue stripping and devitalization of the underlying bone. Closed reduction and external fixation by Ilizarov type external fixators import minimum surgical trauma and allow early mobilization of the knee joint in addition to treatment of fractures with severe comminution, an open wound, poor skin or osteoporotic bone. On the other hand complications associated with the use of external fixation for definitive treatment of distal femoral fractures involve osteomyelitis, pin tract infection, septic arthritis, loss of reduction, delayed union or non-union requiring bone grafting and limited knee motion through arthrofibrosis[2].

Objective: This systematic review aims to cover this lack in comparing management of comminuted supracondylar fracture femur by Ilizarov external fixation versus internal fixation.

Material and Method: Systematic review will be done on comminuted supracondylar fracture femur and its management by Ilizarov external fixation versus internal fixation. We used Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and key words to generate sets for the following themes: comminuted supracondylar fracture femur and its management. We then used the term “AND” to find their intersection. No limits were used, except for language (non English excluded). This basic approach was modified as necessary to search each electronic database.

Results: In our review we included fifteen studies to compare 361 participants who underwent internal fixation and 48 participants. We found Ilizarov external fixation to be superior to Internal fixation in terms of union and good overall knee lambert score with a significant P-value.

Conclusion: Based on currently available evidence comparing outcomes of both fixation techniques we conclude that in the presence of a compliant patient and a skilled surgeon Ilizarov external fixation found to be superior to Internal fixation in terms of union and good overall knee lambert score with a significant P-value while found to have similar results to internal fixation in terms of fixation failure rate, secondary surgical procedures and deep infection rate with insignificant P-value.

Keywords: Fracture - Distal Femur - Supracondylar - Femoral.

Introduction

INTRODUCTION

An estimated 6% of all fractures of the femur account for the distal part of the bone about 0.4% of all adult fractures.[1]

The fractures occur in a bimodal distribution. One group including patients below 40 years of age predominantly males sustaining high energy trauma such as traffic accident or a fall from height. The other group is consisting of patients >50 years predominantly females with osteoporosis who sustain relatively low energy trauma.[2]

No promising definition of what constitutes the femoral "supracondyle" it may be taken as fractures from articular surface to 5cm above metaphyseal flare. The characteristics of this zone include a widening canal, thin cortex and poor bone stock.

Comminuted fractures of the distal femur are difficult to treat because of the problems arising from anatomical reconstruction of the articular surfaces and good stabilization of the fragments must be achieved.[3] However, conservative treatment often produces poor results, so the trend of treatment has shifted to surgical management.[4]

A wide variety of treatment modalities have been used for distal femoral fractures yet there is disagreement on the optimal choice of treatment.

A few authors have suggested that best results can be obtained with [5], initial skeletal traction followed by cast immobilization, the use of a condylar buttress plate with or without medial plating [6], locked plate [7] and external fixation.

Bone grafting rates in the treatment of supracondylar femur fractures have been reported to range between 23% and 87%.[8]

Plating fixation produces many disadvantages: it requires open reduction with extensive soft tissue dissection making cancellous bone grafting imperative in order to promote the healing but on the other hand it significantly reduces malunion rate.[9]

Closed reduction and external fixation by Ilizarov type external fixators import minimum surgical trauma and allow early mobilization of the knee joint in addition to treatment of fractures with severe comminution, an open wound, poor skin or osteoporotic bone.[10]on the other hand complications associated with the use of external fixation for definitive treatment of distal femoral fractures involve osteomyelitis, pin tract infection, septic arthritis, loss of reduction, delayed union or non-union requiring bone grafting and limited knee motion through arthrofibrosis.[11]

There has been a gradual shift away from open reduction of fractures with large internal fixation devices to a more biological approach aiming to preserve the osteogenic tissues, reduce the amount of bone removed and stabilize the fracture by means of external fixation. The use of such surgical techniques has substantially reduced the risk of infection, delayed union and pseudo arthrosis. Open and closed supracondylar femoral fractures in polytraumatized patients with multiple fractures are at a risk for anesthesia complications. Internal fixation with plates and screws implies major surgery with blood loss and consequent hemodynamic imbalance.[12]

To the best of the authors' knowledge no published systematic review exists comparing the qualities of the two techniques in the acute treatment of comminuted supracondylar fractures of the distal femur.

This systematic review aims to cover this lack in comparing management of comminuted supracondylar fracture femur by Ilizarov external fixation versus internal fixation.

AIM OF THE WORK