

Functional Outcome Following Internal Fixation of Intraarticular Fractures of the Distal Humerus

Harsh Pratap Shishodia¹, Ramji LalSahu², Ajit Jangale³, Sidhartha Samal⁴

¹DNB Orthopaedics, Assistant Professor, Saraswathi Institute of medical science Hapur, Uttar Pradesh, India, ²MS Orthopaedics, Professor, Saraswathi institute of medical science Hapur Uttar Pradesh, India, ³MS Orthopaedics, Flat no 6 Prabhu Prasad Society, Nashik, ⁴DNB Orthopaedics, Associate Professor, IMS and SUM hospital Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India.

How to cite this article: Harsh Pratap Shishodia, Ramji LalSahu, Ajit Jangale et. al. Functional Outcome Following Internal Fixation of Intraarticular Fractures of the Distal Humerus. Indian Journal of Public Health Research and Development/Volume 15 No. 1, January-March 2024.

Abstract

Objectives: To evaluate the functional outcome following internal fixation of intraarticular fractures of the distal humerus (AO Type C) with a minimum follow-up of twelve months.

Materials and Methods: This prospective study was carried out at Orthopaedics department from December 2018 to December 2022. A total of 170 consecutive patients with intraarticular fractures of the distal humerus were recruited from Emergency and outpatient department and treated with open anatomical reduction and internal fixation with plating and lag screw. Functional evaluations of elbow joints were evaluated with Broberg and Morrey functional rating index. All patients were followed for twelve months.

Results: All fractures united in average 3.2 months (range 7-19 weeks). The results were excellent in 66.47% patients and good in 22.35% patients at final follow-up. Complications found in 22.35% patients who had insignificant delayed unions which were united next 3 weeks, 7.05% insignificant malunion, 5.83% ulnar nerve neurapraxia and 5.83% patients developed elbow stiffness.

Conclusions: We conclude that internal fixation of intraarticular fractures of the distal humerus is an effective procedure with an excellent or good functional outcome in majority of the patients. Patients have a high level of satisfaction and the majority returns to their previous level of activity.

Keywords: Intercondylar fracture; Intra-articular; Distal humerus; Double plate fixation; Olecranon osteotomy.

Introduction

The incidence of intraarticular fracture of distal humerus is 0.5%-7% of all fractures and of elbow fractures¹. These fractures are more common in young adults due to high energy trauma and in elderly as a result of low energy trauma¹. Complications are very high following conservative treatment of

these fractures and internal fixation is difficult due to osteoporosis and complexity of fractures². Stable internal fixation and early mobilization can provide good results. Inadequate fixation due to osteoporosis, bone loss and severe comminution can provide unsatisfactory results^{2,3}. Incidence of complications is 30% with distal humerus fractures and needs further

Corresponding Author: Sidhartha Samal, DNB Orthopaedics, Associate Professor, IMS and SUM Hospital Bhubaneswar.

Phone numbers: 8800163178

E-mail: sidhusamal46@gmail.com

surgery⁴. Both column fractures of distal humerus are fixed with a combination of reconstruction plates, locking compression plates, dynamic compression plates, screws and k-wires. Intercondylar fixation is done with a lag screw or intercondylar screw^{5,6,7}. The aim of this study was to evaluate the functional outcome following internal fixation of intraarticular fractures of the distal humerus (AO Type C) with a minimum follow-up of 12 months.

Materials and Methods

This prospective study was carried out at Orthopaedics department from December 2018 to December 2022. Institutional medical ethics committee approved it. A written informed consent was obtained from all the patients. A total of 170 consecutive patients with intraarticular fractures of the distal humerus were recruited from emergency and outpatient department.

Inclusion criteria

- Age between 17 to 62 years.
- Fresh Displaced Intraarticular distal humerus fracture, By using the classification system of AO/ASIF C1, C2 & C3 type.
- We include closed intraarticular fracture, Gustilo grade 1 open intraarticular fracture treated within 12 hours of injury.

Exclusion criteria

- Extraarticular or partial articular fractures of distal humerus (AO/OTA classification types 13A and 13B).
- Intraarticular fracture of the distal humerus (type 13 C) that did not require surgical intervention.
- Gustilo grade 1 open fractures that had not had irrigation and debridement within 12 hours of occurrence.
- Gustilo grade II, IIIA, IIIB and IIIC open fractures.
- Associated vascular injury.
- Previous ipsilateral distal humeral fractures.
- Pathological fractures.
- Fractures with diaphyseal extension of 8 cm or more.
- Definitive surgery more than 21 days after injury.

- Pre-existing severe joint disease (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis).

There were 80% (136/170) males and 20% (34/170) females with an average age of 41.4 years (range, 17-62). There were 60.58% (103/170) left-sided and 39.41% (67/170) right-sided fractures. All patients were followed for twelve months. None was lost to follow-up. By using the classification system of AO/ASIF, 56.47% (96/170) fractures were type C1, 31.76% (54/170) were type C2 and 11.76% (20/170) were type C3. 18.82% (32/170) cases had grade 1 open fracture. 60% (102/170) patients injured due to road traffic accident, 27.05% (46/170) from fall and 11.76% (20/170) patients from sports injury. The patients were divided in three groups according to their age for simplicity. Young age group included those patients whose age was less than thirty years. In this group, there were 25.88% (44/170) patients. Middle age group included patients, who were between the ages of 30-50 years. This group included 37.05% (63/170) patients. Old age group included patients older than fifty years. This group consisted of 37.05% (63/170). (Table II) One hundred and three fractures were treated early within 24 hours. Sixty-seven fractures (surgery was postponed until swelling had subsided) had delayed treatment (>24 hrs). Out of 170 (100%) patients, 12.94% (22/170) patients had multiple fractures else-where in the body. 17.05% (29/170) patients had associated fractures in the forearm area. None was lost to follow-up. All the patients were treated with anatomical reduction and a cancellous lag screw fixation of the articular surface of both the condyle of the humerus. The next step was to anatomically reattach the condyles to the humeral shaft. All the fractures were treated with two plates, medially with 1/3rd tubular plate, laterally with reconstruction plate. (Figure 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b) The time of operation ranges from the 1st day of injury to the 8th day of injury with the mean time of operation being 4.6 days.

Operative Techniques

All the patients were operated in lateral position with the involved extremity flexed and hanging off the operating table. The pneumatic tourniquet was used. A straight posterior incision with radial deviation across the tip of the olecranon was made. The ulnar nerve was then identified and carefully

protected. Intra-articular chevron osteotomy was performed approximately two centimeters from the tip of the olecranon with a high-speed micro-oscillating saw to cut up to the subchondral bone. The osteotomy was completed with an osteotome used as a lever to crack through the articular surface. The proximal part of the olecranon was elevated with the triceps, which provides excellent exposure as far as seven centimeters proximal to the joint line before the radial nerve is threatened. The elbow capsule was incised and the fracture fragments were identified by carefully dissecting soft tissue and muscular attachments, as necessary.

Post-Operative Care

Usually by the second postoperative day, active or active-assisted range of elbow motion exercises as pain permitted was started in patients with good bone quality and rigid osteosynthesis. Longer immobilization (>3 weeks) was used when the bone quality was poor and the stability of the osteosynthesis was questionable. No continuous passive motion machines were used. After the postoperative 6th week, resisted exercises were started and normal daily activities resumed. Strenuous physical exercise was only allowed after radiological evidence of union.

Assesment of the Patients

Assessment was done in follow-up clinic for postoperative patients by a surgical team. Results were analyzed using clinical & radiographic evaluation at a final follow-up of 12 months. The clinic-radiological results of our study were based on the criteria of union, non-union delayed union or malunion⁸. Fractures considered to be united normally if union was observed clinically as well as radiologically till 12 weeks of fixation. A delayed union was diagnosed if the fracture healed between 12 and 24 weeks; nonunion was considered to be present if the fracture was not clinically or radiologically united after 24 weeks post injury or sooner if implant failure was associated with displacement of the fracture. The quality of reduction was graded (A to C), based on the postoperative radiographs. Grade A was an anatomical reduction, grade B a step or gap of the articular surface of <2 mm and grade C involved a step or gap of more than 2 mm. The

quality of reduction was based on the immediate post-operative plain radiographs and operative findings. Functional evaluations of elbow joints were evaluated with Broberg and Morrey functional rating index. (Table I)⁹The grading scale was weighted as follows: normal motion, 40 points; no pain, 35 points; normal strength, 20 points; and normal stability, 5 points.

Results

The clinico-radiological results of our study were based on the criteria of union, nonunion⁸, delayed union or malunion. (Table III) The patients were followed according to their clinical status. All fractures united in average 3.2 months (range 7-19 weeks). 66.47% (113/170) patients had union in 45 to 90 days, 22.35% (38/170) patients in 90 to 150 days, in younger age group, union occurred between 4-6 weeks, in middle age group, between 6-8 weeks and in older age group, between 8-12 weeks. The results were graded according to the range of motion, excellent postoperative results (Extension < 15, Flexion 130) were observed in 66.47% (113/170) patients and good results (Extension < 30, Flexion 120) were observed in 22.35% (38/170) patients at final follow-up. 7.05% (12/170) patients had fair results (Extension < 40, Flexion 90-120), and 5.83% (7/170) patients had poor results (Extension < 40, Flexion <90). Non-union was not seen in this study.

Functional evaluations of elbow joints were evaluated with Broberg and Morrey functional rating index. (Table I)⁹The grading scale was weighted as follows: normal motion, 40 points; no pain, 35 points; normal strength, 20 points; and normal stability, 5 points (Table I).

Complications found in 22.35% patients who had insignificant delayed unions (which were united next 3 weeks) and 7.05% insignificant malunion. 5.83% (7/170) patients had symptomatic olecranon wire prominence and created pain during elbow movement. These wires were removed after 3 to 4 weeks when callus formed at the fracture site. 7.05% (12/170) patients developed an early superficial wound infection. This infection subsided spontaneously with three weeks antibiotic treatment. There were seven cases of ulnar nerve neurapraxia, which resolved. 7.05% (12/170) cases developed

moderate osteoarthritic changes at the elbow joint. 5.83% (7/170) patients had only pain with activity, but a “poor” result due to elbow stiffness. During this study, complications like vascular injury, compartment syndrome, myositis ossifications, significant non-union were not red.

The results were excellent in 66.47% (113/170) patients, good in 22.35% (38/170), fair in 7.05% (12/170) and poor in 5.83% (7/170) patients at final follow-up (Table IV). In subjective overall assessment 66.47% (113/170) patients were full satisfied and 22.35% (38/170) patients were satisfied with the result of treatment.

Table 1. Broberg and Morrey functional rating index

Variable	Points value
Motion	
Degree of flexion (0.2 3 arc)	27
Degree of pronation (0.1 3 arc)	6
Degree of supination (0.1 3 arc)	7
Strength	
Normal	20
Mild loss (appreciated but not limiting, 80% of opposite side)	13
Moderate loss (limits some activity, 50% of opposite side)	5
Severe loss (limits everyday tasks, disabling)	0
Stability	
Normal	5
Mild loss (perceived by patient, no limitation)	4
Moderate loss (limits some activity)	2
Severe loss (limits everyday tasks)	0
Pain	
None	35
Mild (with activity, no medication)	28
Moderate (with or after activity)	15
Severe (at rest, constant medication, disabling)	0
Excellent 95-100 points	
Good 80-94 points	
Fair 60-79 points	
Poor 0-59 points	

Table 2. Age and sex variations in study group (n=170)

Age	Male	Female	Total
Less than 30	36	8	44
30-50	49	14	63
More than 50	51	12	63
Total	136	34	170

Table 3: Percentage of cases who had unions, malunions, delayed unions, or non-unions in study group (n=170)

Fracture healing	Total cases	% of cases
Union	113	66.47%
Non-union	0	0%
Delayed union	38	22.35%
Malunion	12	7.05%

Table 4: Outcome of results in study group (n=170)

Out comes	No.	%
Excellent	113	66.47%
Good	38	22.35%
Fair	12	7.05%
Poor	7	5.83%



Figure 1a. Preoperative anteroposterior and lateral radiograph of intraarticular fracture of lower end of humerus of 43 years old man.



Figure 1b. Post operative anteroposterior and lateral radiograph of intraarticular fracture of lower end of humerus treated medially with 1/3rd tubular plate and laterally with reconstruction plate and a lag screw inserted through the articular surface of lower end of humerus.

Discussion

Treatment of intraarticular distal humerus fractures is difficult and needs a great deal of experience with them¹⁰. Displaced intraarticular fractures of the distal humerus can be treated successfully with anatomical reduction, stable fixation, & early elbow mobilization^{11,12}. Several different surgical approaches have been described^{13,14}. The posterior approach through an olecranon osteotomy is most often used^{11,15,16}. This approach provides excellent visualization of the distal articular fragment and exposure for plate fixation¹⁷. In our study, all the intraarticular fractures of the distal humerus were operated by the posterior approach through an olecranon osteotomy. Articular restoration of distal humerus is the most essential step for the stabilization of the two columnar fragments. Several fixation methods have been used for the fixation of humerus condyle to humerus metaphysis such as single plate, Y shaped plate, double K- wire and K-wire with tension band wiring^{18,19}. The objective is to facilitate biomechanical reconstruction of two column structure of the distal humerus. Bilateral plate fixation was done in all 170 cases in our study. Fracture reduction and stable fixation was satisfactory in all cases and post operative mobilization was also satisfactory.

Several complications have been reported following surgical fixation of type c distal humerus fractures. These include joint stiffness, heterotopic ossification, infections, nerve injury, nonunion and delayed union^{20,21}. Kundelet et al. found 49% heterotopic ossification and 33% nerve injuries in their study²⁰. In our study, 5.83% (7/170) cases had elbow pain during movement due to olecranon wire prominence. These wires were removed after 3 to 4 weeks when callus formed at the fracture site. Superficial wound infection was seen in 7.05% (12/170) cases. The infection subsided spontaneously with 3 weeks antibiotic treatment. Ulnar nerve neuropraxia was seen in 7 cases which resolved. Moderate osteoarthritis around elbow joint was seen in 7.05% cases. 5.83% cases had poor result due to elbow stiffness. During this study, complications like vascular injury, compartment syndrome, myositis ossifications, and significant non-union were not seen. On comparison, it is below the rate of reported by Beck et al. this is due to intraoperative protection of ulnar nerve. Saragaglia et al. reported postoperative 13% heterotopic ossification in type c distal humerus fractures²¹. In our study, heterotopic ossification was not seen due to early mobilization. 22.35% insignificant delayed union which was united in next 3 weeks and 7.05% insignificant malunion. We did not encounter nonunion at the olecranon osteotomy and at distal humerus postoperatively. In contrast to the findings of distal humeral nonunion in previous reports^{22,23}, no instances of fixation failure were detected in this study. Presumably this was a reflection of strong bilateral plate fixation and satisfactory fracture reduction. This is due to early mobilization of elbow joint. Healing ensued in all of these patients following decrease in the level of exercise intensity. We achieved bone union in an average of 3.2 months. All the fractures united without implant failure. All our cases achieved union within four months. Nonunion or delayed union is not a problem in these fractures as shown by previous studies [24-28]. The operative treatment in expert hands has yielded 75-85% excellent to good results. In the Singh et al series, they treated 25 adult patients with distal humeral fractures both articular as well as extra articular, age ranging from 22-59 years. They obtained 96% of excellent to good results, 4% of fair and no poor results which are similar results

reported with the use of precontoured LCP by other authors^{29,30,31}. In our series, excellent to good results were seen in 88.82% patients. 88.82% patients were satisfied with the results of treatment.

A potential limitation of our study was the absence of a control group treated by a different modality. Thus, we cannot actually determine if any other method of treatment would have led to different results. Nevertheless, our results are better than those of the previous studies in which other plates have been used.

We suggest locking recon plate and locking compression plate technology can be useful to get better results for articular fractures with osteoporotic bone.

Conclusion

We found that the olecranon osteotomy approach with double plate fixation was efficacious for the treatment of type C distal humerus fractures. Early mobilization was possible in the majority of cases, which may be a prerequisite for satisfying functional results. Complications were minimal and healing satisfactory.

Funding: None

Acknowledgement: None

Conflict of interest: None

References

1. McAlister I, Sems SA. Arthrofibrosis After Periarticular Fracture Fixation. *Orthopedic Clinics of North America*. 2016;47(2):345-5.
2. Fu EC, Ring D. Distal Humerus Fractures. *Encyclopedia of Trauma Care*. 2015;476-85.
3. Sørensen BW, Brorson S, Olsen BS. Primary total elbow arthroplasty in complex fractures of the distal humerus. *World J Orthop*. 2014 Jul 18;5(3):368-72.
4. Phadnis J, Banerjee S, Watts AC, Little N, Hearnden A, Patel VR. Elbow hemiarthroplasty using a "triceps-on" approach for the management of acute distal humeral fractures. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery*. 2015;24(8):1178-86.
5. Azboy İ, Bulut M, Ancar C, Demirtaş A, Özkul E, Gem M, Karadeniz H, Arslan H. The comparison of triceps-reflecting anconeus pedicle and olecranon osteotomy approaches in the treatment of intercondylar fractures of the humerus. *Ulus Travma Acil Cerrahi Derg*. 2016 Jan;22(1):58-65.
6. M A, B JR. Treatment of closed tibial pilon fractures with open reduction, internal fixation and bone grafting. A study of 22 cases comparing the objective and subjective evaluation. *Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences*. 2015;4(12):2058-66.
7. Ganesan G, Patel K, Thamadharan B, Varthi V. Management of distal humerus fracture is not always a surgeon's nightmare. *African Journal of Trauma*. 2015;4(1):11-5.
8. Sahu RL, Ranjan R. Fracture union in percutaneous Kirschner wire fixation in paediatric tibial shaft fractures. *Chinese Journal of Traumatology*. 2016;19(6):353-7.
9. Blonna D, Bellato E. Principles of Fixation for Distal Humerus Fractures. In *Simple and Complex Fractures of the Humerus*. Springer Milan. 2015; 279-292.
10. Serrano-Mateo L, Lopiz Y, León-Serrano C, García-Fernández C, López-Durán-Stern L, Marco F. Results after internal fixation of humerus distal fractures in patients aged over 65 years. *Revista Española de Cirugía Ortopédica y Traumatología (English Edition)*. 2014;58(1):31-7.
11. Leigey DF, Farrell DJ, Siska PA, Tarkin IS. Bicolumnar 90-90 Plating of Low-Energy Distal Humeral Fractures in the Elderly Patient. *Geriatric Orthopaedic Surgery & Rehabilitation*. 2014;5(3):122-6.
12. Babhulkar S, Babhulkar S. Controversies in the management of intra-articular fractures of distal humerus in adults. *Indian Journal of Orthopaedics*. 2011;45(3):216-25.
13. Mardanpour K, Rahbar M. Open reduction and internal fixation of intraarticular fractures of the humerus: evaluation of 33 cases. *Trauma Mon*. 2013 Winter;17(4):396-400.
14. Mellema JJ, Lindenhovius ALC, Jupiter JB. The posttraumatic stiff elbow: an update. *Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine*. 2016;9(2):190-8.
15. Marinelli A, Guerra E, Bettelli G, Cavaciocchi M, Rotini R (2015) Surgical Approaches Based on Fracture Patterns. In *Simple and Complex Fractures of the Humerus*. Springer Milan. 2015; 269-277.
16. Nourozi M, Naderi M, Mahdavi S, Jaafari D, Khosravi A. Study of the Surgical Treatment Outcomes of Distal Intra-articular Humerus Fractures: Evaluation of 46 cases. *Razi J Med Sci*. 2009;16(64):45-52
17. Nalbantođlu, Ufuk et al. "The functional outcome of intraarticular distal humeral fractures treated with surgery." *Hand and Microsurgery* 2 (2013): 28-34.

18. Li S- hua, Li Z- hua, Cai Z- dong, Zhu Y- chang, Shi Y- zhen, Liou J, Tao K, Wang J- guang. Bilateral plate fixation for type C distal humerus fractures: experience at a single institution. *International Orthopaedics*. 2010;35(3):433-8.
19. Githens M, Yao J, Sox AHS, Bishop J. Open Reduction and Internal Fixation Versus Total Elbow Arthroplasty for the Treatment of Geriatric Distal Humerus Fractures. *Journal of Orthopaedic Trauma*. 2014;28(8):481-8.
20. Beck NA, Ganley TJ, McKay S, Tomlinson L, Ahn J, Flynn JM, Baldwin K. T-condylar fractures of the distal humerus in children: Does early motion affect final range of motion? *Journal of Children*. 2014;8(2):161-5.
21. Saragaglia D, Rouchy R-C, Mercier N. Fractures of the distal humerus operated on using the Lambda® plate: Report of 75 cases at 9.5 years follow-up. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research*. 2013;99(6):707-12.
22. Barthel P, Mansat P, Sirveaux F, Dap F, Molé D, Dautel G. Is total elbow arthroplasty indicated in the treatment of traumatic sequelae? 19 cases of Coonrad-Morrey® reviewed at a mean follow-up of 5.2years. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research*. 2014;100(1):113-8.
23. Giannicola G, Sacchetti FM, Antonietti G, Piccioli A, Postacchini R, Cinotti G. Radial head, radiocapitellar and total elbow arthroplasties: A review of recent literature. *Injury*. 2014;45(2):428-36.
24. Lee SK, Kim KJ, Park KH, Choy WS. A comparison between orthogonal and parallel plating methods for distal humerus fractures: a prospective randomized trial. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery & Traumatology*. 2013;24(7):1123-31.
25. Lan X, Zhang LH, Tao S, Zhang Q, Liang XD, Yuan BT, Xu WP, Yin P, Tang PF. Comparative study of perpendicular versus parallel double plating methods for type C distal humeral fractures. *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2013 Jun;126(12):2337-42. PMID: 23786950.
26. Kumar S, Singh S, Kumar D, Kumar N, Verma R. Intercondylar Humerus Fracture - Parallel Plating and Its Results. *Journal of Clinical Diagnostics and Research*. 2015; 9(1):RC01-RC04.
27. TIAN D, JING J, QIAN J, LI J. Comparison of two different double-plate fixation methods with olecranon osteotomy for intercondylar fractures of the distal humeri of young adults. *Experimental and Therapeutic Medicine*. 2013;6(1):147-51.
28. Leigey DF, Farrell DJ, Siska PA, Tarkin IS. Bicolunar 90-90 Plating of Low-Energy Distal Humeral Fractures in the Elderly Patient. *Geriatric Orthopaedic Surgery & Rehabilitation*. 2014;5(3):122-6.
29. Singh G, Sohal H, Sharma R, Banal J, Dhake J. Outcome of precontoured locking plate fixation in distal humerus fractures. *International Journal of Orthopaedics Sciences*. 2017;3(1):145-8.
30. Imran M, Intikhab T, Najjad M. Functional Outcome of Elbow Reconstruction after Using Precontoured Locking Compression Plate. *The Journal of Pakistan Orthopaedic Association*. 2014; 1:35-8.
31. Aggarwal S, Kumar V, Bhagwat KR, Behera P. AO extra-articular distal humerus locking plate: extended spectrum of usage in intra-articular distal fractures with metaphyseal extension—our experience with 20 cases. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery & Traumatology*. 2013;24(4):505-11.