

# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

### DISTAL FEMUR FRACTURES FIXATION BY LOCKING COMPRESSION PLATE-ASSESSMENT OF **OUTCOME BY RASMUSSEN'S FUNCTIONAL KNEE SCORE**

Dr. Manjeet Singh<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Yogesh Malik<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Dhritobroto Bhattacherjee<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Dhruv Gautam<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Srikant Maheshkumar Pandya<sup>3</sup> and Dr. Rijuta De<sup>4</sup>

- 1. Professor and Head of the Department.
- 2. Senior Resident.
- 3. 3rd year Resident.
- 4. 2nd year Resident, General Surgery.

### ..... Manuscript Info

..... Manuscript History Received: 28 July 2021

Final Accepted: 31 August 2021 Published: September 2021

#### Abstract

..... Background: The choice of distal femur locking plate in distal femur fractures has been a topic of debate. This study was performed to evaluate theresults of distal femur locking plate in distal femur fractures.

Material and Methods: A prospective randomized study of 30 patients with distalfemur fracture was conducted at Department of Orthopaedics, Maharishi Markandeshwar Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Mullana(Ambala), Haryana from January 2020 to July 2021 and followed up from 6months to 18 months for a minimum of 6 months duration.

Implants used: The distal femur locking compression plate. Classification system: AO Classification.

Results & Observations: Clinical and functional outcomes were assessed using Rasmussen's functional knee score. Complications of fractures and operative treatment were assessed. The results of entire study group showed 18 excellent, 10 good, 1 fair and 1 poor.

Conclusion: We observed and recommend that the distal femur LCP is an optimal tool of good fixation for fractures of distal femur.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2021,. All rights reserved.

#### Introduction:-

The distal end of femur traditionally encompasses the lower third ofbone (varying from distal 7.6 cm to distal 15 cm of the femur). Afracture of the distal femur is a grave injury that for years represented an unsolved problem and was considered to result almost always invarying degrees of permanent disabilities. Incident is bimodal with 1peak in young age 18-30 years age group (high energy trauma) withsecond peak in elderly women >60 years of age (low energy trauma).Distal femur fractures have been reported to account for between 4%-7% of all femoral fractures.Fractures in supracondylar area characteristically deform with femoralshortening, posterior angulation and displacement of distal fragment. In the past closed procedures consisting principally of traction and splinting were almost always used. Significant drawbacks likemalunion, knee stiffness, prolonged immobilization andhospitalization leads to development of operative fixation like bladeplate, dynamic condylar screw (DCS) and retrograde intramedullarynailing. Recent advances lead to development of the lockingcompression plate, a single

.....

Corresponding Author:- Dr. Dhritobroto Bhattacherjee Address:- 3rd year Resident.

beam construct. Further when applied viaminimal invasive technique it lowers rate of infection and favoursbiological fixation.

## Aims and Objectives:-

- 1. To assess the effectiveness of locking compression plating in patients having distal femur fractures.
- 2. To evaluate the results of distal femur locking compression plate.
- 3. To evaluate complications related to distal femur lockingcompression plate.

# Material and Methods:-

A prospective randomized study of 30 patients with fractures of distalfemur (distal 15 cm of femur including supra and inter condylar) werestudied. All the cases treated at Department of Orthopaedics, Maharishi Markandeshwar Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Mullana(Ambala), Haryana between January 2020 toJuly 2021 and followed for a minimum of 6 months. The duration offollow up range from 6 months to 18 months. All the fractures in thisseries were post traumatic. No pathological fractures was included in this study.

#### **Inclusion Criteria**

- 1. Distal femur fractures.
- 2. 16 or more years of age,
- 3. regardless of gender.
- 4. Duration of injury <7 days.

#### **Exclusion Criteria**

- 1. Pathological fractures.
- 2. Open fractures (Gustilo- Anderson type 3B, 3C).
- 3. Inability or refusal of giving consent.
- 4. Any other co-morbid illness.

#### Implants used

The distal femur LCP based on the locking compression platingsystem.

#### Surgical Technique

Patient was given pre-operative antibiotics. All patients were givenproper (spinal / epidural) anaesthesia and before proceeding adequateanaesthesia of the limb was assured. Patient was laid supine on OT table, a tourniquet was applied to the fractured limb, sterile draping wasdone.

#### Approach

The condyles were temporarily held reduced and fixed with K wires inseverely displaced inter condylar fractures. All wounds with type 2(Gustilo-Anderson) fractures were closed either primarily orsecondarily over a drain. The standard lateral para-patellar approach was used.



Condylar reconstruction and temporary holding with K wires

### Assessment of complication

Major complications

- 1. Flexion deformity
- 2. Active ROM less than 90 degree
- 3. Non union
- 4. Mal union
- 5. Deep infections

### Minor complications

- 1. Delayed union
- 2. Superficial infection

## Follow up

The follow up of minimum 6 months was done. The duration of followup ranged from 6 months to 18 months. Follow up X-rays were taken toassess any failure of reduction, failure of fixation and fracture union.Patients were examined for complications.Clinical and functional outcome of all patients were analyzed byRasmussen's functional knee score on the basis of subjectivecomplaints and clinical signs.

## **Results:-**

Overall30 patients were included in study population. The age rangedfrom 18 to 79 years. The mean age was 45.96 years. The maximumincidence was in 2 peaks one 18-30 years and other at >60 years. Out of30 patients, 22 (73.33%) were men and 8 (26.66%) were women. Roadtraffic accident was the most common mechanism of injury with 23(76.66%) patients and trivial trauma was found in 7 (23.33%) patients. There were 14 (46.66%) type A and 16 (53.33%) type C fractures. Thesub division showed A2-7, A3-7, C2-12 and C3-4 fractures.

Of the 30 patients, 22 (73.33%) were closed and 8 (26.66%) were open. Of the 30, 9 (30%) patients had associated bony injuries. The duration between day of injury and day of fixation in openfractures ranged from within 3 days, 3 - 7 days. 21 patients (70%) were operated within 3 days and rest 9 patients (30%) were operated within 7 days.

The average time for union was 16.13 weeks. Radiological union in<16 weeks was seen in 10 (33.33%) patients, in 16-18 weeks in 17(56.66%) patients, 19-20 weeks in 2 (6.67%) patients and delayed union in 1 (3.33%) patient. No non-union was seen. The results of entire study group showed 18 excellent, 10 good, 1fairand 1 poor.

The results AO type A fractures had 10 excellent and 4 good. Theresults of AO type C fractures had 8 excellent, 6 good, 1 fair and 1 poorresults. Results of open fractures showed 3 excellent, 3 good, 1 fair and1 poor. Results of closed fractures showed 15 excellent and 7good. We saw that 3 of 8 (37.50%) open fractures had excellent resultswhereas 15 out of 22 (68.18%) closed fractures had excellent results. The 14 of 14 type A fractures had excellent or good results whereas 14 of 16 (40%) type C fractures had excellent or good results.

The closed fractures united early as compared to open fractures. Of 30 patients that were included in the study 18(60%) had range of motiongreater than 120 degrees. The type A fractures had a better range of movement as compared to type C fractures.

## **Discussion:-**

Fractures of distal femur are serious injuries that have been difficult totreat and frequently results in varying degrees of permanent disability. The literature review shows various different implants and techniquesin the management of these fractures. The use of these devices requires certain amount of bone stock present, which limits their use in somefracture types.

The LCP is a single beam (fixed angle) construct where strength of itsfixation is equal to the sum of all screw-bone interfaces rather than asingle screw's axial stiffness and pull-out resistance as in unlockedplates. It acts as an internal fixator and functions by splinting thefracture rather than compression and hence allows a flexiblestabilization, avoidance of stress shielding and induction of callusformation.

In this study outcome of distal femur fractures which were fixed usingdistal femoral LCP has been assessed.

The present study of 30 cases indicates age group 18-79 years withmean age of 45.96 years. Most patients were in age group 21-45 years indicating this is a fracture of young people who are involved in moreactivities. This was the most common age group in similar studies EJYeap and Deepak (Mean age 44 years, range 15-85), Kregor et al (mean age 49 years, range 18-85), M Nayak and MR Koichade (meanage 42 years, range 21-65), Mark Miller et al (Mean age 51 years, range21-80).

The present study of 30 cases indicates RTA as predominant cause of(23.33%). Other studies also documented most common mode of injury in distal femur fractures are high energy RTA and falls. [Epidemiology of distal femur fractures- Marti A, J. Cordey, Mize et al(1982) reported 64% cases due to road traffic accident and 36% due tofall].

Majority of the patients were male (73%) in active age who are more exposed to risks such as vehicular accidents because they are more involved in outdoor activities. Others authors have also noted similartrends [Ravi M Nayak and MR Koichade (male 70%), Yeap& Deepak(male 67%)].

Muller's comprehensive classification system was used to classifyfractures. The most common fractures in our study was C2 (12)followed by A2 (7), A3 (7) and C3 (4) respectively.

The study by MarkWeight and Cory Collinge in a level II trauma centre also had a similar pattern. They had 12 C2, 4 A2, 3 A3 and 3 C3 fractures.

The mean time to radiological union in our study was 16.13 weekscompared with other studies mean time to union was 15 weeks (RaviNayak et al, 13 weeks (Mark Weight et al), 14 weeks (Schandelmaier etal.), 12 weeks (Werner Kolb et al).

The ROM of the affected knee was calculated at the end of the followup period. The average ROM of the affected knee was >1200 in 60% ofour cases.

The mean ROM in our study was 115.63. The ROM in ourstudy is comparable to studies by other authors 0-1040 (Schandelmaieret al), 0-1250 (Ravi Nayak et al), 0-1200 (Werner Kolb et al), 5-1140(Mark Weight et al), 0-1070 (Schutz et al), 0-1090 (Zlowodzki et al).

The Rasmussen's functional knee score calculated at the end of followup period were excellent in 60% of our cases and good in 33.33% in ourcases. There were 18 excellent, 10 good, 1 fair and 1 poor result.

Comparison of present study with the study by Yeap et al and byWesley P et al, total 11 patients with 4 excellent, 4 good, 2 fair and 1 failure.

The mean Rasmussen's functional knee score in our study was 25.13. The pain score was assessed during the evaluation of Rasmussen's functional knee score. It showed that 76% of the patients had mild or nopain at all or occasional ache and bad weather pain. The above parameters indicates that our study had a fairly good outcome.

PARAMETERS	RESULTS	
Time for union	16.13 Weeks	
ROM of affected knee	>120 degree in 60.00%	
Rasmussen functional Knee Score	25.13 (Mean)	
Pain	Mild or none in 76%	
Malunion	None	
Delayed union	One (3.33%)	
Superficial Infection	Three (10%)	

Thefindings in our study have been briefly summarized as follows:

One of the most common complication of distal femoral fracture isknee stiffness. 1 case has delayed union, another complication wassuperficial infection.

There were 3 cases (10%) which had superficialinfection. Other studies also document similar findings.Schandelmaier et al had 1.9%, Werner Kolb et al had 3%, Schutz et alhad 6.25%, Zlowodzki et al had 3% of their patients with infectionfollowing internal fixation.

### **Clinical Pictures**

Figures showing AP & Lateral views of fracture fixation with time duration and range of movement after union.



Immediate post-operative2 months post-operative



3 months post-operativeFinal Union.



## Full flexion



#### **Full extension**



Full range of motion

## **Conclusion:**-

Thus, LCP is an optimal tool of good fixation system for fractures ofdistal femur. It provides rigid fixation in the region of distal femur, where a widening canal, thin cortices and frequently poor bone stockmake fixation difficult. Surgical exposure for plate placement requiressignificantly less periosteal stripping and soft tissue exposure than thatof normal plates. Therefore the distal femoral LCP provides a stable fixation in distal femur fractures.

In conclusion, the LCP represents an evolutionary approach to thesurgical management of distal femur fracture. LCP is an importantarmamentarium in treatment of fracture of distal end femur, especiallywhen fracture is severely comminuted and in situations ofosteoporosis.

## **References:-**

- 1. Kiran kumar GN, Sharma G, Farooque K, Sharma V. Locking compression plate indistal femoral intra articular fractures: our experience. International scholarly research,
- 2. 2014. Article in 372916.
- 3. Hoffmann MF, Jones CB, Sietsema DL. Clinical outcomes of locked plating of distalfemoral fractures in a retrospective cohort. Journal of orthopedic surgery and research.
- 4. 2013; 8:43.
- 5. Yeap EJ, Deepak AS. Distal Femoral Locking Compression Plate Fixation in Distal.
- 6. Femoral Fractures. Early Results Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal. Parker DA, Lautenschlager EP, Caravelli ML, Flanigan DC, Merk BR. A BiomechanicalComparison of Distal Femoral Fracture Fixation: The Dynamic Condylar Screw, DistalFemoral Nail, Locking Condylar Plate, and Less Invasive Stabilization System. OTA.
- 7. 2005, 2007; 1(1):5.
- 8. Krettek C, Muller M, Miclau T. Evolution of Minimally Invasive Plate Osteosynthesis(MIPO) in the femur. Injury. 2001; 3:14-23.
- 9. Krettek C, Schandelmaier P, Miclau T. Minimally invasive percutaneous plateosteosynthesis (MIPPO) using the DCS in proximal and distal femoral fractures. Injury.

- 10. 1997; 28:20-30.
- 11. Kubiak EN, Fulkerson E, Strauss E, Egol KA. Evolution of Locked Plates. The Journalof Bone and Joint Surgery. 2006; 88:189-200.
- 12. Giles JB, Delee JC, Heckman JD. Supracondylar-intercondylar fractures of the femurtreated with a supracondylar plate and lag screw. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 1982; 64:864-70.
- 13. Brown A, D'Arcy JC. Internal fixation for supracondylar fractures of the femur in theelderly patient. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 1971; 53420-4.
- Ahmad M, Nanda R, Bajwa AS, Candal-Couto J, Green S, Hui AC. Biomechanicaltesting of the locking compression plate: when does the distance between bone and implant significantly reduce construct stability? Injury. 2007; 38(3):358-64.
- 15. Parker DA, Lautenschlager EP, Caravelli ML, Flanigan DC, Merk BR. A BiomechanicalComparison of Distal Femoral Fracture Fixation: The Dynamic Condylar Screw, DistalFemoral Nail, Locking Condylar Plate, and Less Invasive Stabilization System. OTA,2005.
- Egol KA, Kubiak EN, Fulkerson E, Kummer FJ, Koval KJ. Biomechanics of lockedplates and screws. J Orthop Trauma. 2004; 18(8):488-93.
- 17. Bell KM, Johnstone AJ, Court Brown CM, Hughes SP. J Bone Joint surg Br. 1992;74:400-02.
- Healy WL, Siliski JM, Incavo SJ. Operative treatment of distal femoral fractures n proximal to total knee replacements. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 1993; 75:27-34.
- 19. Seinsheimer F. Fractures of the distal femur. Clin OrthopRelat Res. 1980; 153:169-79.
- 20. Neer CS, Grantham SA, Shelton ML. Supracondylar fracture of the adult femur. J BoneJoint Surg Am. 1967; 49:591-613.
- 21. Siliski JM, Mahring M, Hofer HP. Supracondylar-Intercondylar fractures of femurJBJS. 1989; 71A:95-104.
- 22. Phipatanakul WP, Mayo KA, Mast JW, Bolhofner BR. Reconstruction of the DistalFemur with Use of a New Device: The Locking Condylar Plate. OTA. 2001. 20.