

CONSERVATIVE TREATMENT OF ISOLATED FRACTURES OF THE MEDIAL MALLEOLUS

Thesis

Submitted for partial fulfillment of Master degree in
Orthopaedic Surgery

By

Ahmed Abd Elhameed Abd Elmoneim
M.B.B.Ch.

Under supervision of

Prof. Dr. Talaat Taher Elhadidi

Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery
Cairo University

Dr. Ahmed Rizk Mohamed

Lecturer of Orthopaedic Surgery
Cairo University

Cairo University

2014

Acknowledgements

It is the faith and belief in almighty Allah that gave me the strength all through that work till it is finished.

*I would like to express my sincere gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Talaat Elhadidi** professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University for his patience, motivation, valuable support and guidance.*

*I would like to thank **Dr. Ahmed Rizk Mohamed** Lecturer of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University for his encouragement, insightful comments, and objective criticism that I really appreciate it so much.*

My deepest thanks to all those who encouraged and supported me throughout the years of my life especially my beloved mother, respectful father, my understanding wife and kids.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. <i>List of figures</i>	<i>i-iii</i>
2. <i>List of tables</i>	<i>iv-v</i>
3. <i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
4. <i>Aim of the work</i>	<i>3</i>
5. <i>Historical review</i>	<i>8</i>
6. <i>Review of Literature</i>	<i>45</i>
7. <i>Material & Methods</i>	<i>44</i>
8. <i>Results</i>	<i>75</i>
9. <i>Discussion</i>	<i>83</i>
10. <i>Summary</i>	<i>87</i>
11. <i>Conclusion</i>	<i>89</i>
12. <i>References</i>	<i>90</i>
<i>Arabic summary</i>	

List of Figures

	Page
Figure 1: Anatomy of the ankle. (A) Anteroposterior view. (B) View of the tibial plafond illustrating the quadrilateral shape of its articular surface and the Posterolateral position of the fibula. (C) The corresponding surface of the talus	9
Figure 2: The ligaments of the medial aspect of the ankle	12
Figure 3: The ligaments of the lateral aspect of the ankle	12
Figure 4: The tibiofibular syndesmosis from the posterior aspect	13
Figure 5: Inter-relations of different axes acting in the ankle and foot	15
Figure 6: Variations of the axes of the subtalar joint. (A) Transverse plane. (B) Horizontal plane	16
Figure 7: The rotation of the ankle and subtalar joints	17
Figure 8: Axes of midtarsal joints	17
Figure 9: A. Posterior compression of the plafond during plantar-flexion. B. Anterior compression of the plafond during dorsiflexion	21
Figure 10: Schematic representation of the mechanism of injury in (A) supination or (B) pronation position	22
Figure 11: Lauge-Hansen Classification	24
Figure 12: The Danis-Weber (AO/ASIF) classification	25
Figure 13: Diagram showing the classification used to describe isolated fractures of the medial malleolus	26
Figure 14: Radiograph showing the type-A fracture pattern with avulsion at the tip of the malleolus	26
Figure 15: Radiograph showing the type-B fracture pattern with a fracture occurring between the tip and the plafond	27
Figure 16: Radiographs of the type-C fracture pattern	27
Figure 17: Radiograph of a type-D fracture with a vertical pattern	28
Figure 18: The anteroposterior x-ray view of the ankle	31
Figure 19: The lateral view of the ankle	31
Figure 20: Mortise view of the ankle	32
Figure 21: Anteroposterior radiograph of open reduction internal	34

fixation of the medial malleolus by two 4-mm cancellous short lag screws	
Figure 22: Vertical fractures of the medial malleolus require horizontally directed screws	34
Figure 23: Fragments that are too small or comminuted for screw fixation can be stabilized with two Kirschner wires and a tension band	35
Figure 24: Age distribution among the studied patients	46
Figure 25: sex distribution among the studied patients	47
Figure 26: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the mechanism of injury	48
Figure 27: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the side affected	49
Figure 28: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the type of fracture	50
Figure 29: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the amount of initial displacement of fracture	51
Figure 30: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the time gap from injury to cast	52
Figure 31: FADI score in the studied patients after follow up	58
Figure 32: American Foot and Ankle Score in the studied patients after follow up	59
Figure 33: Relation between the age of the patients and rate of union	60
Figure 34: Relation between age and FADI score	61
Figure 35: Relation between age and American Foot and Ankle Score	62
Figure 36: Relation between type of fracture and American Foot and Ankle Score	67
Figure 37: Relation between the time gap from injury to cast and rate of union	68
Figure 38: Relation between the displacement measured and rate of union	69
Figure 39: Case (1) A. P. x-ray	72
Figure 40: Case (1) lateral x-ray	72
Figure 41: Case (1) 2 weeks from time of casting	72

Figure 42: Case (1) lateral x-ray in below knee plaster cast	72
Figure 43: Case (1) 6 weeks from time of casting	73
Figure 44: Case (1) after cast removal	73
Figure 45: Case (1) 2 months after cast removal	73
Figure 46: Case (1) 4 months after cast removal	73
Figure 47: Case (1) 6 months after cast removal	74
Figure 48: Case (2) A. P. x-ray	76
Figure 49: Case (2) lateral x-ray	76
Figure 50: Case (2) lateral x-ray in below knee plaster cast	76
Figure 51: Case (2) 4 weeks from time of casting	76
Figure 52: Case (2) after cast removal	77
Figure 53: Case (2) 6 months after cast removal	77
Figure 54: Case(3) A. P. x-ray	79
Figure 55: Case (3) lateral x-ray	79
Figure 56: Case(3) in below knee plaster cast	79
Figure 57: Case(3) after cast removal	79
Figure 58: Case(3) 2 months later	80
Figure 59: Case(3) after 6 months	80
Figure 62: case (4) 6 months after cast removal	82
Figure 60: Case (4) A. P. x-ray	82
Figure 61: case (4) in below knee plaster cast	82

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Lauge-Hansen Classification	23
Table 2: Distribution of patients according to their age	46
Table 3: sex distribution among the studied patients	47
Table 4: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the mechanism of injury	48
Table 5: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the side affected	49
Table 6: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the type of fracture	50
Table 7: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the amount of initial displacement of fracture	51
Table 9: FADI score in the studied patients after 6 months of follow up	52
Table 10: American foot and ankle score in the studied patients after 6 months of follow up	58
Table 11: Relation between the age of the patients and rate of union	59
Table 12: Relation between age and FADI score	60
Table 8: Distribution of the studied patients regarding the time gap from injury to cast	61
Table 13: Relation between age and American foot and ankle score	62
Table 14: Relation between sex and the rate of union	63
Table 15: Relation between sex and FADI	63
Table 16: Relation between sex and American Foot and Ankle Score	64
Table 17: Relation between the mechanism of injury and rate of union	64
Table 18: Relation between mechanism of injury and FADI score	65
Table 19: Relation between mechanism of injury and American Foot and Ankle Score	65
Table 20: Relation between the type of fracture and rate of union	66
Table 21: Relation between type of fracture and FADI score	66

Table 22: Relation between type of fracture and American Foot and Ankle Score	67
Table 23: Relation between the time gap from injury to cast and rate of union	68
Table 24: Correlation between time gap and FADI and American Foot and Ankle scores	69
Table 25: Relation between the displacement measured and rate of union	69
Table 26: Relation between the displacement measured and FADI and American Foot and Ankle scores	70

INTRODUCTION

Fractures of the ankle occur at a rate of 187 per 100 000 person-years. ⁽¹⁾ There is concern that a non-operative approach may fail to produce an anatomical reduction of the mortise, leading to instability and post-traumatic arthritis of the ankle. ⁽²⁾ It is therefore usually recommended that these injuries be treated by operation in order to obtain and maintain an anatomical reduction of the ankle. ^(3, 4)

Although studies have shown good outcomes using non-operative treatment, ⁽⁵⁻⁷⁾ this approach is currently reserved for patients in whom the fractures are not displaced, those whose medical co morbidities preclude surgical intervention, those who refuse surgery or, most often, as an intermediate step, used to stage displaced fractures until the soft-tissue envelope has sufficiently stabilized to allow operation. It has been feared that even if an anatomical reduction of the mortise is achieved without operation, the instability produced from the fracture and its associated soft-tissue injuries will ultimately lead to late subluxation of the ankle and an unacceptable result. ^(3, 8-10)

Instability of the ankle may result from injuries affecting both the medial and lateral columns. However, fractures presenting as isolated injuries to the medial, lateral or posterior malleolus may be associated with no instability on physical examination and an anatomical appearance of the mortise on a radiograph. Even if displacement of the mortise can be shown using stress radiography, these injuries have a good outcome when managed conservatively. ⁽¹¹⁾

Displaced unimalleolar fractures are high-energy injuries and often require surgical management to obtain a good outcome.^(4, 8-10) However, in the absence of displacement of the mortise, operation may not be necessary. The recommendation that a displaced fracture of the medial malleolus should be treated surgically is often related to its presentation in bi- or trimalleolar injuries (International Classification of diseases (ICD-9) codes 824.4 and 824.6).⁽¹²⁾

Since these are articular injuries it is suggested that surgery can produce higher rates of union, an earlier return to work or recreational activities, avoid prolonged periods of immobilization and prevent any residual displacement which may lead to the development of post-traumatic arthritis of the ankle. However, there are no large series which discuss the acute management of isolated injuries to the medial malleolus.

AIM OF THE WORK

To evaluate the outcome of patients with isolated fractures of the medial malleolus who were managed conservatively.

Historical Review

The problem of ankle injuries dates back to ancient times. Evidence of healed ankle fractures has been found in the remains of mummies from ancient Egypt.⁽¹³⁾ Hippocrates (about 400 B.C) stated that the crural bones in the talocrural joint may luxate inward, outward, forward, and backward and recommended that closed fractures can be reduced by traction.⁽¹⁴⁾

Except for the anatomic descriptions of the ankle by Vesalius and a discussion of fractures of the fibula by Ambroise Pare in 1634,⁽¹⁵⁾ there were few advances in the understanding and treatment of ankle injuries until the mid 18th century.

The writings during this time show that ankle fractures, often called luxations, resulted in a high incidence of deformity and loss of function, some as Duverney in 1751 even felt that these violent luxation fractures could be cured only by primary amputation.⁽¹⁶⁾ In 1768 Percival Pott described a fracture of the fibula 2-3 inches above the distal tip, with an associated rupture of the deltoid ligament and lateral subluxation of the talus but he did not think that there was any damage to the syndesmotic ligaments that always present in this injury pattern. He recommended that the knee should be flexed to relax the calf muscles allowing reduction with minimal traction.⁽¹⁷⁾

The first trial to explain the mechanism of injury of ankle fractures was by Jean-Pierre David in 1771. He wrote that outward movement of the foot (external rotation) resulted in a fracture of the distal fibula.⁽¹⁸⁾ In 1773 Bromfield emphasized the importance of diagnosis and repositioning of fibular fracture.⁽¹⁹⁾ Later in 1814, Boyer the personal physician of

Napoleon described two different mechanisms of fractures of the fibula. He stated that for subluxation of the joint to occur, there must be either a malleolar fracture, a ligamentous injury or both. ⁽²⁰⁾ In 1819, Baron Duputyren a student of Boyer was the first to use experimental methods in the study of ankle injuries by producing fractures in cadavers. He appreciated the importance of the distal syndesmosis in ankle injuries and the role of abduction and the position of the foot in the mechanism of ankle injuries. He described a fracture carrying his name in which there is a fracture of the fibula that occurs 2.5 inches proximal to the tip of lateral malleolus.

Duputyren believed that the fibular fracture should follow a tear of the deltoid ligament or a fracture of the medial malleolus. He observed that in order for a lateral dislocation of the talus to occur as a part of the injury, there must be a complete rupture of the inferior tibiofibular ligaments. ⁽²¹⁾

Astely Cooper in 1822 was the first to describe fractures of the anterior and posterior tibial margins. It is worth mentioning that in 1912 Cotton drew the attention to fracture of posterior tibial margin as previously undescribed lesion, thus the labeling of a trimalleolar fractures as a “Cotton’s fracture” is rather inappropriate. ⁽²²⁾ In 1840 Maisonneuve a student of Duputyren, although ignored in his own time, was the first to compare the ankle to a mortise and tenon joint and to recognize the importance of both external rotation forces and the syndesmotic ligaments in determining the pattern of fracture. He applied external rotatory forces to the feet of cadavers and then observed the various injuries produced about the ankle.

He concluded that an external rotation force applied to the ankle could rupture the deltoid ligament. The same force could fracture the medial malleolus, with rupture of the tibiofibular ligaments in the absence of fracture of the lateral malleolus; he also noted that external rotation could produce two different types of fractures of the fibula. When the syndesmotic ligaments remained intact, an oblique fracture occurred at the level of the joint, if the anterior tibiofibular ligament ruptured first, a proximal fibular fracture then occurred. Although the distal fibular fracture is more common. Maisonneuve's name is associated with the proximal fractures.⁽²³⁾

Bonnet in 1845, was the first to produce fracture of the medial malleolus experimentally by forced adduction of the ankle,⁽²⁴⁾ while in 1847, Malgaigne described two forms of fractures occurring at the medial malleolus, transverse fractures due to abduction injury and vertical fracture due to adduction injury.⁽²⁵⁾ Later Tillaux in 1848, incompletely described an avulsion fracture of the lateral tibia previously noted by Cooper. The same injury to the posterolateral tibia was also described later by Chaput in 1907, and has been called the fracture of Tillaux-Chaput.^(26, 27)

Wagstaffe in 1875 described an avulsion fracture of the anterior margin of the fibula at the insertion site of the anterior tibiofibular ligament.

This injury was also described by Le fort in 1886, as well as others and has been called the Le fort-Wagstaffe fracture.^(28, 29)

Destot in 1911 was the first to correlate x-ray findings with the previous anatomical experiments, providing the basis for determining the mechanism of injury from the appearance of x-ray.⁽³⁰⁾

In 1922, Ashurst and Bromer presented a classification system based on mechanism and sequence of injury but they did not include injuries to the syndesmosis or the posterior lip of the tibia.⁽³¹⁾ Also in 1939, Henderson presented a classification based on radiographic findings that separated injuries into three groups: isolated, bimalleolar and trimalleolar fractures.⁽³²⁾

Lauge-Hansen in 1948 developed a classification system that correlated the mechanism and sequence of injury and emphasized the relationship between bone and ligament injury.⁽³³⁾

The classification of Denis and Weber in 1966 correlated the level of the fibular fracture with severity of the bone and ligamentous injury.⁽³⁴⁾

The AO group that was formed in 1985 began a systematic study of fracture treatment.⁽³⁵⁾