



# **Results of Hip Arthroplasty Versus Fixation in Management of Unstable Intertrochanteric Fractures in the Elderly: A Systematic Review of Literature**

## **Essay**

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

**Presented by**

**Ahmed Saeed Khalil Ahmed Younis**

*(M.B.B.Ch., Ain Shams University)*

**Supervised by:**

**Prof. Dr. Amr Khairy Mahmoud**

*Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery*

*Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

**Dr. Ahmed Salem Eid**

*Lecturer of Orthopaedic Surgery*


*Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

**Orthopaedic Surgery Department**

**Faculty of Medicine**

**Ain Shams University**

**2016**



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم  
"ذلك فضل الله  
يؤتيه من يشاء والله  
ذو الفضل العظيم"

صدق الله العظيم  
(سورة الجمعة)  
"ايه (4) "





*First and forever, thanks to "ALLAH", the Almighty, the Gracious, who give us the knowledge and have given me the strength to achieve my work,*

*I wish to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Amr Khairy Mahmoud**, Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his guidance, support, for introducing me in to this exciting field of research.*

*I hope to express my deepest gratitude to **Dr. Ahmed Salem Eid**, Lecturer of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his beneficial guidance, valuable remarks, keen supervision and moral support throughout this work,*

*Ahmed Saeed Khalil*





# نتائج التبدیل الصناعی لمفاصل الورك مقابل التثبيت الجراحی فی علاج كسور بتن المدورین غیر المستقرة فی كبار السن : مراجعة منهجية لما تم نشره

رسالة

توطئه للحصول على درجة الماجستير فی جراحة العظام

مقدمة من

الطبيب / أحمد سعيد خليل أحمد یونس

بكالوريوس الطب والجراحة

جامعة عين شمس

تحت إشراف

أ.د/ عمرو خیری محمود

أستاذ جراحة العظام

كلية الطب – جامعة عين شمس

د/ أحمد سالم عید

مدرس جراحة العظام

كلية الطب- جامعة عين شمس

قسم جراحة العظام

كلية الطب

جامعة عين شمس

2016

## LIST OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>List of Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>List of Figures .....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Aim of the Work .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Materials and Methods .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Results .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Arabic Summary .....</b>	<b>- -</b>

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>Us</b>	United states
<b>Dhs</b>	Dynamic hip screw
<b>Pfn</b>	Proximal femoral nail
<b>Am</b>	American
<b>Br</b>	British
<b>MeSH</b>	Medical subject headings
<b>PRISMA</b>	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
<b>RD</b>	Risk difference
<b>MD</b>	Mean difference
<b>RCT</b>	Randomized control trial
<b>CI</b>	Confidence interval
<b>IV</b>	Inverse variance
<b>MI</b>	Milliliter
<b>MH</b>	Mantel Hanzel test

## LIST OF TABLES

No.	Table	Page
1-	Risk of bias and scoring of included studies	26
2-	Characteristics of <i>(Chaitanya et al., 2015)</i> .	28
3-	Risk of bias in <i>(Chaitanya et al., 2015)</i> .	28
4-	Characteristics of <i>(Kran et al., 2011)</i>	29
5-	Risk of bias in <i>(Kran et al., 2011)</i> .	29
6-	Characteristics of <i>(Pajarinen et al., 2005)</i>	30
7-	Risk of bias in <i>(Pajarinen et al., 2005)</i> .	30
8-	Characteristics of <i>(Calderón et al., 2013)</i>	31
9-	Risk of bias in <i>(Calderón et al., 2013)</i> .	31
10-	Characteristics of <i>(Giraud et al., 2005)</i> .	32
11-	Risk of bias in <i>(Giraud et al., 2005)</i> .	32
12-	Characteristics of <i>(Papasimos et al., 2004)</i> .	33
13-	Risk of bias in <i>(Papasimos et al., 2004)</i> .	33
14-	Characteristics of <i>(Parker et al., 2011)</i> .	34
15-	Risk of bias in <i>(Parker et al., 2011)</i> .	34
16-	Characteristics of <i>(Porecha et al., 2008)</i> .	35
17-	Risk of bias in <i>(Porecha et al., 2008)</i>	35
18-	Characteristics of <i>(Saudan et al., 2002)</i> .	36
19-	Risk of bias in <i>(Saudan et al., 2002)</i> .	36
20-	Characteristics of <i>(Shivanna et al., 2015)</i> .	37
21-	Risk of bias in <i>(Shivanna et al., 2015)</i>	37
22-	Characteristics of <i>(Kumar et al., 2014)</i>	38
23-	Risk of bias in <i>(Kumar et al., 2014)</i>	38
24-	Characteristics of <i>(YZ XU et al., 2010)</i> .	39



## LIST OF TABLES

No.	Table	Page
25-	Risk of bias in <i>(YZ XU et al., 2010)</i>	39
26-	Characteristics of <i>(MBBS et al., 2012)</i>	40
27-	Risk of bias in <i>(Ranjeetesh Kumar MBBS et al., 2012)</i>	40
28-	Characteristics of <i>(Zou et al., 2009).</i>	41
29-	Risk of bias in <i>(Zou et al., 2009).</i>	41
30-	Characteristics of <i>(Guerra et al., 2014).</i>	42
31-	Risk of bias in <i>(Guerra et al., 2014).</i>	42
32-	Characteristics of <i>(Garg et al., 2011)</i>	43
33-	Risk of bias in <i>(Garg et al., 2011).</i>	43
34-	Characteristics of <i>(Zehir et al., 2015).</i>	44
35-	Risk of bias in <i>(Zehir et al., 2015).</i>	44
36-	Characteristics of <i>(Jonnes et al., 2016).</i>	45
37-	Risk of bias in <i>(Jonnes et al., 2016)</i>	45
38-	Characteristics of <i>(Sharma et al., 2016).</i>	46
39-	Risk of bias in <i>(Sharma et al., 2016).</i>	46
40-	Characteristics of <i>(Emami et al., 2013)</i>	47
41-	Risk of bias in <i>(Emami et al., 2013).</i>	47
42-	Characteristics of <i>(Hassankhani et al., 2014).</i>	48
43-	Risk of bias in <i>(Hassankhani et al., 2014).</i>	48
44-	Characteristics of <i>(Kayali et al., 2006).</i>	49
45-	Risk of bias in <i>(Kayali et al., 2006).</i>	49
46-	Characteristics of <i>(Kim et al., 2005).</i>	50
47-	Risk of bias in <i>(Kim et al., 2005).</i>	50
48-	Characteristics of <i>(Ozkayin et al., 2015).</i>	51

## LIST OF TABLES

No.	Table	Page
49-	Risk of bias in <i>(Ozkayin et al., 2015)</i> .	51
50-	Characteristics of <i>(Choksey et al., 2014)</i> .	52
51-	Risk of bias in <i>(Choksey et al., 2014)</i> .	52
52-	Characteristics of <i>(Kassem et al., 2014)</i> .	53
53-	Risk of bias in <i>(Kassem et al., 2014)</i> .	53
54-	Characteristics of <i>(Sahoo et al., 2015)</i> .	54
55-	Risk of bias in <i>(Sahoo et al., 2015)</i> .	54
56-	Mean length of surgery	60
57-	Mean blood loss in milliliters	62
58-	Mean time of Fluoroscopy exposure in minutes	66
59-	Mean of hospital stay in days	81
60-	Mean Harris hip score at 3 month	83
61-	Mean Harris hip score at 6 month	84
62-	Mean Harris hip score at one year	84
63-	Mean operative length in minutes	91
64-	Mean intraoperative blood loss I milliliters.	92
65-	Mean hospitalization time in days.	106
66-	Mean Harris hip score at three month follow up	107
67-	Mean Harris hip score at six month follow up	108
68-	Mean Harris hip score at one year follow up	109

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Figure	Page
1-	<i>PRISMA flow diagram of study selection process</i>	7
2-	<b><u>Risk of bias summary:</u></b> <i>Review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study comparing DHS and proximal femoral nail</i>	55
3-	<b><u>Risk of bias summary:</u></b> <i>review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study comparing arthroplasty and internal fixation</i>	56
4-	<b><u>Risk of bias graph:</u></b> <i>Review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies comparing DHS and proximal femoral nail</i>	57
5-	<b><u>Risk of bias graph:</u></b> <i>Review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies comparing arthroplasty and internal fixation</i>	57
6-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> <i>1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.1 length of operation (in minutes)</i>	60
7-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> <i>1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.2 Amount of blood loss</i>	63
8-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> <i>1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.3 Number of patients received blood transfusion</i>	64
9-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> <i>1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.4 fluoroscopy exposure in minutes [minutes]</i>	66
10-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> <i>1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.5 difficult or failure of good reduction</i>	68
11-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> <i>1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.6 Pressure sores</i>	69

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Figure	Page
12-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.7 Chest complications	70
13-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.8 Thromboembolic complications	71
14-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.9 Urinary tract complications	72
15-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.10 wound complications	74
16-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.11 cut-out and implant failure	76
17-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.12 Non-union	77
18-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.13 reoperation during follow up period	79
19-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.14 Hospital stay (days).	81
20-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.15 Harris hip score at 3 month	83
21-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.16 Harris hip score at 6 month	84
22-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.17 Harris hip score at one year	84
23-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.18 Mobility score	85

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Figure	Page
24-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.19 Excellent Salvati Wilson score	86
25-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.20 Zuckerman function recovery score at three months follow up	87
26-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.21 Zuckerman function recovery score at six months follow up	87
27-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.22 Zuckerman function recovery score at one year follow up	87
28-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.23 Recovery of walking abilities to the preoperative status	88
29-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.24 Recovery of independent walking ability	89
30-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.25 Mortality	90
31-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.1 Length of operation in minutes	91
32-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.2 Intraoperative blood loss	93
33-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.3 Number of patients required blood transfusion	93
34-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.4 · Difficult or failure of good reduction	94

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Figure	Page
35-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.5 Pressure sores	95
36-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.5 Chest complications	96
37-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.7 Thromboembolic complications	97
38-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.8 urinary tract complications	98
39-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.9 Wound infection	99
40-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.10 prothesis dislocation	100
41-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.11 acetabular wear	101
42-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.12 Prothesis loosening	102
43-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.13 Cut-out and implant failure	103
44-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.14 Non- union	104
45-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.15 Reoperation	105
46-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.16 length of hospital stay.	106
47-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.17 Cost of treatment	107
48-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.18 Harris hip score at three month follow up	108

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Figure	Page
49-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.19 Harris hip score at six month follow up	108
50-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.20 Harris hip score at one year follow up	109
51-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.21 Harris hip score at the end of follow up	110
52-	<b><u>Forest plot of comparison:</u></b> 2 Arthroplasty versus internal fixation, outcome: 2.22 Mortality	111