

Modern Techniques In Management Of Periprosthetic Femoral Fractures After Total Hip Arthroplasty

Essay

Submitted by

Adel Sayed Sayed

(M.B.,B.CH)

In the fulfillment of Master degree

In

"Orthopedic surgery"

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Ashraf Abd-Elkader Elnahhal

Professor of orthopedic surgery

Faculty of Medicine

Cairo University

Dr.Omar Soliman

Ass.prof. of Orthopedic Surgery

Faculty of Medicine

Cairo University

Faculty of Medicine

Cairo University

2009

الطرق الحديثة لعلاج كسور عظمة الفخذ حول المفاصل الصناعية في مفصل الحوض

لعمود الأخيرة زيادة معدل حالات كسور عظمة الفخذ حول مفاصل الحوض الصناعية، و تعد هذه الكسور من المشكلات التي تواجه المريض و الجراح أثناء و بعد تركيب و هذه الدراسة تستوفى النقاط الهامة التي تهم جراح العظام في التعامل مع هذه المشكلات.

يمكن حدوث كسور عظمة الفخذ حول المفاصل الصناعية أثناء عملية تركيب المفصل أو في فترة ما بعد العملية و هناك العديد من العوامل التي تساعد على حدوث هذه الكسور و تشمل هذه العوامل: هشاشة العظام، لين العظام ، الروماتيزم، العيوب الخلقية في عظمة الفخذ، كسر قديم أو عملية و تزيد خطورة هذه العوامل أثناء العمليات الخاصة بإعادة تركيب المفصل الصناعي .

تختلف حدوث هذه الكسور بين المفصل الأسمنتي و اللاأسمنتي حيث تصل نسبة إحتمال حدوث هذه الكسور في المفصل الغير أسمنتي إلى %
%

تقسيم هذه الكسور يعتبر حلقة الوصل بين الباحثين و الجراحين و ذلك للحصول على ل النتائج في علاج هذه الحالات و قد تم تقسيم كسور عظمة الفخذ حول مفصل الحوض الصناعي بواسطة فانكوفر حيث أن هذا التقسيم يعتمد على ثلاث عوامل و هي:

تختلف طرق علاج هذه الكسور على حسب هذه العوامل و تشمل هذه الطرق: تركيب مسامير لتثبيت الكسر، عمل ترقيع عظمى للكسر، إعادة تركيب جزع مفصل صناعى آخر مع عمل تثبيت للكسر
عظمة الفخذ بجزء آخر أو تركيب مفصل
و ذلك فى الحالات المصاحبة بتفتت عظمى شديد.

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, thanks to *Allah*; to whom I relate any success in achieving any work in my life.

Words stand short when they come to express my gratefulness to my supervisors. I would like to express my deep thanks and extreme gratitude to *Prof. dr. Ashraf Abd Elkader Elnahal. Professor of orthopedic surgery faculty of medicine, Cairo University*, giving me this precious opportunity of working under his supervision, his vast knowledge, wide experience and guidance, added much to this work.

I am gratefully expressing my sincere appreciation to *Dr. Omar Soleiman Ass. Prof. of orthopedic surgery faculty of medicine, Cairo University*, for this utmost supreme guidance and supervision with the kindest encouragement.

Last but not least, my deep appreciation is expressed to all the staff of orthopedic department, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, and for my father, mother and all members of my family for their co-operation and encouragement.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1- Aim of the work..... | III |
| 2- List of tables..... | IV |
| 3- List of figures..... | V |
| 4- Introduction..... | 1 |
| 5- Chapter 1: Incidence and Etiology..... | 4 |
| ➤ Incidence of femoral fractures after THR..... | 5 |
| ➤ Etiology of intraoperative fractures..... | 5 |
| ➤ Etiology of postoperative fractures..... | 8 |
| 6- Chapter 2: Classifications..... | 13 |
| ➤ Vancouver classification..... | 19 |
| 7- Chapter 3: Diagnosis..... | 24 |
| ➤ Intraoperative diagnosis..... | 24 |
| ➤ postoperative diagnosis..... | 24 |
| 8- Chapter 4: Prevention..... | 26 |
| ➤ Preoperative planning..... | 26 |
| ➤ Intraoperative precautions..... | 27 |
| ➤ postoperative precautions..... | 31 |
| 9- Chapter 5: Treatment..... | 32 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ➤ Nonoperative treatment..... | 32 |
| ➤ Operative treatment..... | 32 |
| • Aim of operative treatment..... | 32 |
| • Principles of operative treatment..... | 33 |
| • Options of operative treatment..... | 34 |
| ➤ Selective treatment of periprosthetic fractures..... | 55 |
| • Treatment of intraoperative fractures..... | 55 |
| • Immediate postoperative fractures..... | 62 |
| • Treatment of postoperative fractures..... | 62 |
| 10- Conclusion..... | 68 |
| 11- Summary..... | 70 |
| 12- References..... | 73 |
| 13- Arabic summary..... | 8 |

Aim of the work

This study reviews the literature about incidence, etiology and risk factors of periprosthetic femoral fractures. Moreover, to review the literature about site and pattern of periprosthetic femoral fracture with their grading classifications. In addition, to review guide lines for management of these fractures focusing on modern techniques of fixation.

List of Tables

| Table No. | Name of the Table | Page No. |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| Table I | Risk factors associated with intraoperative and post operative periprosthetic femoral fractures. | 6 |
| Table II | Classification of periprosthetic fractures according to Parrish & Jones | 13 |
| Table III | Periprosthetic fracture classification according to Whittaker et al. | 13 |
| Table IV | Classification of periprosthetic fractures according to Johansson. | 14 |
| Table V | Classification of periprosthetic fractures according to Bethea et al.. | 14 |
| Table VI | Periprosthetic fracture classification according to Cooke & Newman. | 15 |
| Table VII | Periprosthetic fracture classification according to Mont & Maar. | 17 |
| Table VIII | Periprosthetic fracture classification according to Beals & Tower. | 17 |

List of Figures

| Figure No, | Name of the Figure | Page No. |
|------------------|---|----------|
| Figure 1 | Radiograph showing osteolysis around a stable femoral component | 8 |
| Figure 2 | Abnormally widened interfaces surrounding entire cement mantle of femoral component, consistent with loosening. | 9 |
| Figure 3 | Migration of femoral component. | 10 |
| Figure 4 | Heterotopic bone formation fusing greater trochanter to lateral acetabulum. | 11 |
| Figure 5 | Fracture classification according to Johansson. | 14 |
| Figure 6 | Fracture classification according to Bethea et al. | 15 |
| Figure 7 | American Academy of Orthopedic surgeons' classification of fractures associated with hip arthroplasty. | 16 |
| Figure 8 | Fracture classification according to Tower and Beals. | 18 |
| Figure 9 | Intraoperative periprosthetic fractures of the femur. | 20 |
| Figure 10 | Vancouver classification for fractures around the femoral component of a total hip arthroplasty. | 22 |
| Figure 11 | Model of internal fixation by clamp plate on the bone model. | 36 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|----|
| Figure 12 | (A) Vancouver B1 fracture. (B) Treatment consisted of open reduction and plating with a Dall-Miles cable plate | 36 |
| Figure 13 | Type B1 fracture treated with LCP fixation. Fracture healed at 4 months. | 38 |
| Figure 14 | Type B1 periprosthetic fracture around uncemented total hip arthroplasty. | 40 |
| Figure 15 | Unicortical locking screws offer angular stability for optimal purchase. | 41 |
| Figure 16 | Early postoperative radiograph of a left hip revision with cortical strut allograft used for noncircumferential cortical defect. | 46 |
| Figure 17 | (A) Taper Modular Stem. (B) Modular Stem with distal locking screws. | 51 |
| Figure 18 | (A) Anteroposterior radiographs of a patient with a Type-B3 fracture, that was treated (B) with a proximal femoral replacement. | 52 |
| Figure 19 | Successfully treated Type B3 periprosthetic femoral fracture. A long cemented femoral prosthesis. | 54 |
| Figure 20 | Treatment algorithm for intraoperative femoral fractures when they are recognized intraoperatively. | 56 |
| Figure 21 | Treatment algorithm for intraoperative femoral fractures when they are not recognized intraoperatively. | 57 |
| Figure 22 | Intraoperative fracture of the femur at the tip of the femoral stem. | 60 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|----|
| Figure 23 | Femoral shaft fracture fixed with cerclage. | 61 |
| Figure 24 | Treatment algorithm based upon the Vancouver classification of postoperative periprosthetic femur fractures. | 63 |
| Figure 25 | The trochanteric claw-plate (Zimmer), which can be used for fixation of greater trochanteric fractures. | 64 |
| Figure 26 | Anteroposterior radiographs of a seventy two-year-old woman. | 66 |
| Figure 27 | Tumor prosthesis in the treatment of complex B3 fracture. | 67 |

Abstract

Periprosthetic fractures are increasing in number and complexity. Appropriate precautions should be taken to prevent these fractures. A systematic approach is needed in the form of detailed assessment of the fracture, stability of the implant and the available bone stock for planning an appropriate treatment. The treatment options described in this article can be used as a framework for making the right surgical decision regarding appropriate method of reconstruction to ensure optimum result.

Key words:

Total hip arthroplasty, periprosthetic fracture, femur.

INTRODUCTION

Total hip arthroplasty (THA) is one of the most successful orthopedic procedures performed today. For patients with hip pain due to a variety of conditions, THA can relieve pain, restore function, and improve quality of life. The outcome of an otherwise successful total hip arthroplasty is occasionally compromised by complications. Fracture around the femoral stem is a rare but potentially problematic complication of total hip arthroplasty. Such fractures can range from being minor, with minimal or no effect on the outcome, to being catastrophic and possibly creating an unreconstructable problem with an immense effect on the patient's function. [32]

As the number of patients undergoing primary and revision total hip arthroplasty (THA) continues to increase the incidence of periprosthetic femoral fracture is increasing proportionately as well. Intraoperative fractures occur mostly due to technical errors in about 1% of cemented and 3% to 18% of uncemented primary hip operations. The estimated incidence of postoperative periprosthetic fractures ranges from 1% after primary arthroplasty to 4% after revisions. [54]

Such fractures usually occur around the tip of the femoral stem, a site of stress concentration. Regional cortical defects such as screw holes, cortical windows or perforations, osteolysis and associated aseptic loosening of the femoral component are the main causes, while pathological processes that result in weakening of the bone, such as osteoporosis or rheumatoid arthritis, are contributory factors. [39]

Periprosthetic femoral fractures classification is important to allow communication among researchers and clinicians to guide treatment and to provide insight into outcomes. **Vancouver classification** is becoming the standard system in periprosthetic femoral fractures. It is based on fracture configuration, quality of bone, quality of fixation of stem and site of the fracture either trochanteric, around stem, at tip of stem or below stem tip. [6]

Management of these fractures can be challenging. If the femoral component is loosened, revision operation is recommended involving the insertion of a longer stem, to provide intramedullary stabilization, with or without extramedullary allograft strut supplementation. [43]

If the stem is firmly fixed, a variety of treatment options are available. Closed treatment (traction or application of a spica cast or cast brace) is often associated with complications of prosthetic loosening, malunion, nonunion, skin ulceration, loss of knee motion, and medical problems related to long-term immobilization. It is only indicated in undisplaced trochanteric fractures or when the patient's medical condition precludes surgery. In all other cases open reduction and internal fixation is the treatment of choice. Several methods of extramedullary fixation of periprosthetic fractures have been described, such as cerclage wires, cortical onlay allografts, dynamic compression plates, Mennen plates, Ogden plates, Partridge nylon plates and straps, and the Dall-Miles cable and plate system. [39]

Modern techniques to treat periprosthetic fractures focus on ways to avoid the fracture and new implants for improved fixation. New designs of

replacement prosthesis include changes in the shape of stems to better share load with the bone and avoid the osteoporosis of stress shielding, which weakens the bone and predisposes for fracture. New plate designs, such as the low contact dynamic compression plate, decrease the contact area of plates and decrease the osteoporosis of stress shielding. Changes in materials decrease bone destruction from osteolysis. Less rigid metals (e.g., such as titanium vs. stainless steel) share the load better. Less Invasive Stabilization system (LISS Plates), allow more stable fixation with minimally invasive techniques. ^[62]

There are many ways to prevent and avoid periprosthetic fracture by preoperative good assessment of the patient at risk, careful intra-operative technique with early interfering with any intra-operative problem and strict post-operative follow up of the patient. ^[41]