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Functional outcome evaluation of distal humerus fracture fixation
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ABSTRACT

Background: Distal humerus fracture are complex, difficult to reduce and fix, cumbersome post-operative mobilization, and yet functional outcome is doubtful. Though various treatment modalities available for past many decades ranging from conservative management, K wire fixation to plate and screws, but still treatment remains difficult. The objective of the study was to assess functional outcome of operative fixation of distal humerus with locking plate and screws.

Methods: Prospective study was done in during November 2015 to June 2016 in Vydehi Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Bengaluru. Patients with distal humerus fractures who were admitted into hospital for operative treatment after fulfilling inclusion and exclusion criteria were included into study. They were followed up to 6 months post-operatively. Functional outcome evaluation was done with Mayo’s elbow performance score.

Results: 30 patients were included into study with full data. We had excellent, good, fair and poor outcome in 17, 8, 3, 2 patients respectively. Except for infection in one, elbow stiffness in two and non-union in two patients, we had no other complications.

Conclusions: Management of distal humerus fractures with preoperative evaluation, pre-operative planning, use of locking plate and screws, early mobilization can result in good functional outcome.
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INTRODUCTION

Though uncommon, 2-6% of all fractures, distal humerus fractures account for 30% of all elbow fractures. Elderly person fall, sports injuries, road traffic accidents are common causes of distal humerus fractures. Classification of these fractures not only differentiates, but also guides them towards standardized treatment protocols. A.O Muller classification is widely accepted in the literature for its description, reproducibility and treatment directed to that particular type of fracture. Difficulty in achieving the goal of good fracture reduction and fixation are due to complex joint anatomy, forces acting across elbow, osteoporosis and decreased primary stability. This can result in 35% complications and poor results.

Non operative treatment traditionally results in doubtful functional outcome with limitation of elbow range of movements. Ideal implant should provide adequate stability under physiological loads and the bone implant interface should not be alternated under cyclic stress. It should be easily applicable, controllable with anatomical variations of the distal humerus.

Fracture fixations by K wires and distal one third semi tubular plate have resulted in a high percentage of implant failures, in presence of metaphyseal comminution. In osteoporotic bone and in very distal fractures, screw placement becomes difficult because of limited space...
available, which makes stable anchorage of each screw crucial.

In this preview we made an attempt to evaluate the results of surgical management of fractures of distal end humerus using distal humeral locking plates.

The objective of the study was to assess reduction, stability of fixation of distal humerus fractures with plate, screws and to assess maintenance of reduction, and range of movements post-operatively.

METHODS

A prospective study was carried out in department of orthopedics, Vydehi Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Bengaluru, from January, 2015 to June 2016. All the patients with distal end humerus were included into the study after fulfilling inclusion and exclusion criteria.

**Inclusion criteria**

Patients between 18-65 years of age group, patients with consent for surgery, all patients with closed fractures, open fractures with gustilo anderson classification type I and II, patients who had given consent for surgery, were included.

**Exclusion criteria**

Any other patients with age less than 18 years and greater than 65 years. Any other fractures other than distal end humerus fractures. Patients with cardiovascular diseases, open fractures with Gustilo Anderson classification type III were excluded.

Routine haemotological and radiological investigation were carried out. Fitness for surgery from respective departments were sought in terms of risk. Pre-operative evaluation of X-rays, pre-operative planning of surgery (regarding surgical steps and choice of implants) were done. Surgery was performed under brachial block for good per, post-operative pain relief. Tourniquet applied, patient was positioned lateral decubitus position with affected side up, shoulder at 90° abduction and flexion of elbow at 90° over bolsters. Posterior approach, with olearanon osteotomy for better visualization of fracture, and better implantation of humerus.

Patients were followed up to 6 months post-operatively. Functional evaluation was done with Mayo’s elbow performance score.

**Statistics**

Simple average and standard deviation was used in this study.

**RESULTS**

30 patients were included into the study with complete data available. Average age of patients in our study was 37.5 (SD±14) years. 50% of patients were in the age group of 18-35 years. There were 19 males and 11 females in the study. 13 patients with right side, and 17 with left side involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complications encountered in the study</th>
<th>No. of patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non union</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non union with bone grafting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non union with revision surgery due to implant failure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection (superficial)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow stiffness which recovered with physiotherapy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Complication occurred in study and no of patients presenting with them.**

**Figure 1: No. of patient in the study.**

**Figure 2: Mayo elbow performance score in terms of excellent, good, fair, poor in study population.**

No patients with bilateral involvement were recorded into the study. Mode of injury with road traffic accident was 16, while remaining had history of fall. 93% (28) patients had full union with 24 weeks of study, which remaining two patients who had reported non-union required bone
grafting(one) and revision surgery (other one, due to implant failure). We had infection in one patient, elbow stiffness reported in two patients. Overall 25 patients had no complications reported during the period of the study. 77% (23) patients had range of motions greater than 100°, while 13% (4) patients 50°-100°. Remaining 3 (10%) of patients had range of motion less than 50°.

Figure 3: No. of patient with range of motion.

Stable fixation was found in 28 patients, while remaining 2 had moderately unstable fixation. Post-operative pain 15 days after surgery which represents early mobilization and better return to activities of daily living was better in our study. We had 22 patients with no pain after 15 days post-operatively. 20% of patients had mild pain which two had moderate pain. None reported severe pain. 83% of patients had excellent and good scores in mayo elbow grading. We had 2 patients with poor score i.e., less has 59. Average mayo elbow grading score in our study was 83.83 (SD±13.98).

DISCUSSION

Distal humerus fractures being complex were treated conservatively, long back. Now a days, early surgical intervention, anatomical reduction, stable internal fixation, locking plates, early physiotherapy and mobilization have resulted in good functional outcome in these cases.

Average age of patients in our study was 37.5 years which is comparable with other studies 36 years by Mishra et al, 37.5 years by Singh et al, and 38.4 by Gupta et al years. The results were same and consistent with other studies like 66.7% by Atalar et al and 60% by Lakhey et al. Mode of injury in our study was road traffic accident which differs from other studies like fall in Li et al and Muzaffar et al studies.

Time of union was found to be higher in our studies i.e., 24 weeks which is high on comparison with other studies 10-16 weeks by Singh et al and Muzaffar et al. The reason might be due to urban population, road traffic accident, complexity of fracture patterns, and longer operation time in our study when compared to probable rural population and history of fall in other studies.

In our study we had one patient, presented with superficial infection, subsided with regular dressings. In two patients we had elbow stiffness which improved with physiotherapy and mobilization exercises. Nonunion occurred in two patients, where one was treated with bone grafting which united later. Other patient had nonunion with implant failure which required revision surgery. These finding were consistent with other studies. We had no ulnar neuropraxia, and heterotrophic ossification complication which were reported in other studies by Mishra et al, Singh et al, Kaiser et al.

Functional evaluation was done with mayo elbow performance score in our study. Results were excellent and good in 83% of patients, fair (10%) and poor (7%). These results were different when compared to Singh et al where excellent and good were 62.9%, fair (26%), and poor (11.1%). The results were same and consistent with Mishra et al, Jung et al with excellent and good 90% and 81.6%, fair (5%, 13.2%) and poor (5%, 5.3%) respectively.

CONCLUSION

Distal humerus fractures are complicated and difficult to treat and manage. From our study for better management of these fracture we infer: careful pre-operative evaluation and planning, early operative intervention with pre-contoured distal humerus plates for anatomical reduction and stable fixation, followed by early mobilization. Early mobilization in turn provides good functional outcome and decreases elbow stiffness.
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