

Hanaa Mohammed



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

مركز الشبكات وتكنولوجيا المعلومات

قسم التوثيق الإلكتروني



Safaa Mahmoud



جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكرو فيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها
علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات





Proximal Femoral Nail versus Dynamic Hip Screw in Unstable Intertrochanteric Fractures (Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis)

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

By

Ahmed Mohamed Zahran

M.B.B.Ch.

Under Supervision of

Prof. Ahmed Mohamed Morsi

Assistant Professor of Orthopedics

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Mahmoud Ahmed Ashour

Lecturer of Orthopedics

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Orthopedics Department

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

2022

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سبحانك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العليم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgments

*First of all, all gratitude is 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 would like to express my deep gratitude and sincere thanks to **Ass. Prof. Dr Ahmed Mohamed Morsi**, Assistant Professor of Orthopedics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University who gave me great support not only to finish this work but also to grow my experience in the field of orthopedic surgery and who taught me a lot.*

*I wish also to thank **Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Ashour**, Lecturer of orthopedics, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for the great efforts he had given to me and encouragement in preparing this work and for teaching me.*

Ahmed Mohamed Zahran

Abstract

Objective: To compare the results of operative management using two different kind of internal fixation modality devices either PFN or DHS, to achieve fracture union and to determine the rate of union, complications, operative risks and functional recovery and outcomes. Compare the results obtained and determine the effectiveness of PFN in comparison to DHS in treatment of intertrochanteric fractures.

Introduction: Intertrochanteric fractures form about 50% of all fractures that occur in proximal part of femur. The mean patient age is 66 to 76 years. In United States of America, the rate of intertrochanteric fractures in elderly men is about 34 per 100,000 and in women it is 63 per 100,000 annually. Intertrochanteric fractures mostly unite, provided that reduction and fixation are correctly done. There are large area of bone is involved, mostly consist of cancellous bone and both fragments are richly supplied by blood. Determination of stability is the most important aspect of intertrochanteric fracture classification. Stability is provided by an intact or a reconstructible posteromedial buttress. Reverse obliquity fractures, loss or comminution of the posteromedial buttress and subtrochanteric extension are factors that results in unstable fracture patterns.

Management The treatment goal of intertrochanteric fracture is restoration of early mobility safely and adequately while decreasing the hazard of medical complications and technical failure and to restore the patient to preoperative status of function. Trochanteric femoral fractures have been estimated to occur in more than 200,000 patients annually in the United States, with reported mortality rate from 15 %to 30%.

Study design: Randomized controlled trials and quasi-random studies.

Key words: Unstable/intertrochanteric/DHS/TSP/gamma nail.

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables.....	i
List of Figures	iii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	3
Review of Literature.....	4
Relevant Anatomy.....	4
Biomechanics.....	16
Diagnosis and Classification.....	31
Management.....	42
General Complications.....	61
Materials and Methods.....	67
Results.....	93
Discussion	115
Conclusion.....	118
References	119
Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 1:	Characteristics of (YZ et al., 2010).....	72
Table 2:	Risk of bias in (YZ et al., 2010).	73
Table 3:	Characteristics of (Ranjeetesh Kumar MBBS et al., 2012)	73
Table 4:	Risk of bias in (Ranjeetesh Kumar MBBS et al., 2012).	74
Table 5:	Characteristics of (Zou et al., 2009).	74
Table 6:	Risk of bias in (Zou et al., 2009).....	75
Table 7:	Characteristics of (Guerra et al., 2014).....	75
Table 8:	Risk of bias in (Guerra et al., 2014).	76
Table 9:	Characteristics of (Garg et al., 2011).	77
Table 10:	Risk of bias in (Garg et al., 2011).....	77
Table 11:	Characteristics of (Chaitanya et al., 2015).	78
Table 12:	Risk of bias in (Chaitanya et al., 2015).....	78
Table 13:	Characteristics of (Kran et al., 2011).....	79
Table 14:	Risk of bias in (Kran et al., 2011).....	79
Table 15:	Characteristics of (Pajarinen et al., 2005).	80
Table 16:	Risk of bias in (Pajarinen et al., 2005).....	80
Table 17:	Characteristics of (Papasimos et al., 2004).....	81
Table 18:	Risk of bias in (Papasimos et al., 2004).	81
Table 19:	Characteristics of (Saudan et al., 2002).....	82
Table 20:	Risk of bias in (Saudan et al., 2002).....	83
Table 21:	Characteristics of (Parker et al., 2011).	83
Table 22:	Risk of bias in (Parker et al., 2011).....	84
Table 23:	Characteristics of (Porecha et al., 2008).	85
Table 24:	Risk of bias in (Porecha et al., 2008).....	85
Table 25:	Characteristics of (Shivanna et al., 2015).....	86
Table 26:	Risk of bias in (Shivanna et al., 2015)	86

List of Tables *cont...*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 27:	Characteristics of (Zehir et al., 2015).....	87
Table 28:	Risk of bias in (Zehir et al., 2015).	87
Table 29:	Characteristics of (Calderón et al., 2013).	88
Table 30:	Risk of bias in (Calderón et al., 2013).	89
Table 31:	Characteristics of (Giraud et al., 2005).....	89
Table 32:	Risk of bias in (Giraud et al., 2005).	90
Table 33:	Characteristics of (Sharma et al., 2016)	90
Table 34:	Risk of bias in (Sharma et al., 2016).	91
Table 35:	Characteristics of (Jonnes et al., 2016).....	91
Table 36:	Risk of bias in (Jonnes et al., 2016).....	92
Table 37:	Mean length of surgery.....	95
Table 38:	Mean blood loss in milliliters	97
Table 39:	Mean time of Fluoroscopy exposure in minutes.	101
Table 40:	Mean time of hospital stay in days	110
Table 41:	Mean Harris hip score at 3 month.	111
Table 42:	Mean Harris hip score at 6 month.	112
Table 43:	Mean Harris hip score at one year.....	112
Table 44:	ASA score in both groups.....	113

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 1:	Proximal end of femur.....	5
Figure 2:	Proximal end of the right femur {Anterior (left) and posterior (right) aspects}.....	8
Figure 3:	Calcar femorale.....	9
Figure 4:	The trabecular pattern of the proximal femur.....	10
Figure 5:	Ligaments of the hip joint.	11
Figure 6:	Blood supply of the proximal femur.	13
Figure 7:	Muscles acting on the proximal femur.	15
Figure 8:	Wolff's law.....	17
Figure 9:	Wards triangle.....	18
Figure 10:	Singh grades.	19
Figure 11:	Reverse obliquity x-ray.	20
Figure 12:	X-ray Rt hip show increased bone radiolucency.	21
Figure 13:	Dynamic hip screw.	22
Figure 14:	Structure of the trochanteric stabilizing plate.....	23
Figure 15:	Biomechanics of gamma nail.	24
Figure 16:	Axial schematic representation of the right femure and of the femoral neck anteversion (FNA).....	26
Figure 17:	Measurement of the Tip-Apex distance (TAD).....	27
Figure 18:	Measurement of the cortical thickness index on AP view	28
Figure 19:	Measurement of lateral wall thickness	29

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 20:	Central positioning of the lag screw Ap (left), lateral (right).	30
Figure 21:	Posteroinferior placement of lag screw Ap (left), Lateral (right).	30
Figure 22:	Shortened, abducted, externally rotated limb (arrow) seen in inter-trochantric fracture.	32
Figure 23:	Unstable trochanteric fracture.	33
Figure 24:	CT of unstable trochanteric fracture AO/OTA 31 A.	34
Figure 25:	Evans classification of intertrochanteric fractures.	36
Figure 26:	Boyd and Griffin Classification.	38
Figure 27:	AO classification of trochanteric Fractures.	39
Figure 28:	New A/O classification of trochanteric fractures.	41
Figure 29:	Skeletal traction in hip fractures.	44
Figure 30:	Dynamic hip screw.	48
Figure 31:	Trochanteric stabilizing plate.	49
Figure 32:	Gotfried plate.	50
Figure 33:	Proximal femur locking compression plate.	51
Figure 34:	Newer version of the Gamma nail.	53
Figure 35:	Proximal femoral nail.	54
Figure 36:	Proximal femoral nail antirotational.	55
Figure 37:	External fixator of Inter-trochanteric fracture.	59

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 38:	Trochanteric fracture managed by hip replacement.	60
Figure 39:	Non-union of trochanteric fracture managed by DHS.....	63
Figure 40:	Varus collapse and medicalization.	64
Figure 41:	Lag screw cut-out.	65
Figure 42:	PRISMA flow diagram of study selection process.....	71
Figure 43:	Forest plot of comparison dynamic hip screws versus proximal femoral nail (in minutes)	95
Figure 44:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.2 Amount of blood loss.....	98
Figure 45:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.3 Number of patients received blood transfusion.	99
Figure 46:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.4 fluoroscopy exposure in minutes [minutes].....	102
Figure 47:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.5 difficult or failure of good reduction.	104
Figure 48:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.6 Pressure sores.....	104
Figure 49:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.7 Chest complications.....	105

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 50:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.8 Thromboembolic complications.	105
Figure 51:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.9 Urinary tract complications.	106
Figure 52:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.10 wound complications.	106
Figure 53:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.11 cut-out and implant failure.....	107
Figure 54:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.12 Non-union.	108
Figure 55:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 DHS versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.13 reoperation during follow up period	109
Figure 56:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.14 Hospital stay (days).....	110
Figure 57:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.15 Harris hip score at 3 month	111
Figure 58:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.16 Harris hip score at 6 month.	112
Figure 59:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.17 Harris hip score at one year.....	112

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 60:	ASA score in both groups	113
Figure 61:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.18 Mobility score.....	114
Figure 62:	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Dynamic hip screw versus Proximal femoral nail, outcome: 1.25 Mortality.	114

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
ASA	American Society of Anesthesiology
CT	Computed tomography
CTI	Cortical thickness index
DHS	Dynamic hip screw
DVT	Deep venous thrombosis
FNA	Femoral neck anteversion
H.H.S	Harris hip score
IM	Intramedullary
PFNA	Proximal Femoral Nail Antirotation
TAD	Tip-Apex distance
TSP	Trochanter Stabilizing Plate
VTE	Venous Thrombo Embolism