Study of functional outcome of two, three and four-part proximal humerus fracture fixation with locking compression plate using Neer`s score
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Abstract

Proximal Humerus fractures are one of the commonest fractures occurring in the orthopedics. They comprises of approximately 4-5% of the fractures at the hospital and are secondary only to hip fractures and distal end radius fractures in the elderly group. The incidence is approximately 3 per 1000 persons in a year and is rapidly increasing with age. They are common in elderly patients after cancellous bone of the humeral neck has weakened due to old age, but these fractures can be seen in any age group. The most serious fractures and fracture-dislocations are often seen in active middle aged patients. These fractures can be extremely disabling and their management often demands expertise surgical skills and judgment. 2 Because of increasing incidence of high energy trauma complicated patterns of fracture in proximal humerus are becoming increasingly common. The preferred treatment varies depending on the age of patient, bone quality, expertise surgical team and the patient’s expectations. There is a controversy regarding the best method of treating displaced proximal humerus fractures. Treatment options for displaced fractures include open reduction and internal fixation. Neer recommended Open reduction & internal fixation for 2- and 3-part fractures. Most of the poor results following open reduction and internal fixation of these fractures are due to imperfect surgical techniques. In a three or four-part fracture dislocation when the Humerus head is entirely devoid of any blood supply it can be replaced by prosthesis. This study is about the use of Locking Compression Plate to fix fractures of the proximal humerus in adult patients in whom the duration of hospital stay reflects the earning capacity of the person and in elderly in whom immobilization of upper-limb is associated with stiffness, reflex sympathetic dystrophy, and shoulder-hand syndrome.
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Introduction

Objectives

- To assess patients Outcome with proximal humerus fractures treated with Locking compression plate post-operatively using Neer`s score.
- To Compare patients outcome with proximal humerus fractures treated with locking compression plate post operatively using Neer`s score

Methods

Percutaneous Pins and External Fixation: Percutaneous pinning is done after a closed reduction if the reduction is unstable. It is particularly useful in the treatment of un-impacted 2part fractures of the surgical neck, but can be used with limitation in more complex fracture patterns as well. Multiplanar fixation and increasing the number of cortex purchased increases the fixation stability.

Open reduction and internal fixation: Various techniques and devices are proposed for the treating of proximal humeral fractures. The choice depends on various factors including the fracture type, bone quality, condition of soft tissue, age and reliability of the patient. Open reduction and internal-fixation is commonly recommended for three-part displaced fractures. 47 It is also used in some two-part displaced fractures, and can be used in four part fractures in young patients.
The goal of open reduction and internal fixation is to stabilize the fracture and promote healing while allowing early shoulder movements to reduce the risk of stiffness.

**Prosthetic Replacement:** Primary hemiarthroplasty is sometimes used for the treating of proximal humeral fractures. It is usually recommended for head splitting fracture type, four part fractures and anatomical neck fracture dislocation especially in the elderly. Four- part fractures in patients less than 40 years, and where the head retains its continuity with the glenoid, may be treated by open reduction and internal fixation despite the risk of developing avascular necrosis.

All patients with proximal humerus fractures were admitted to the hospital, all the necessary clinical details were recorded in the trauma sheet comprising of
1. Age of the patient.
2. History of trauma whether injury was due to fall or road traffic accident.
3. Time and place of injury.
4. Time interval between injury and treatment in our casualty department.
5. Occupation of the patient.
6. Associated injuries.
7. Medical history of the patient.

**Inclusion criteria**
- All patients admitted with proximal humerus fracture (Neer’s classification: Part 2, part 3 and part 4) who are medically fit for surgery.
- Patients above 18 years of age. Exclusion criteria:
  - Patients with axillary nerve damage.
  - Patients with fracture dislocations of the head of the humerus.
  - Patients with anatomical neck fractures with dislocation in elderly.
  - Isolated fractures of greater or lesser tuberosity.
  - Cases with previous infection/affection of the shoulder.

**Operative Technique**
Surgical exposure in all cases was delto-pectoral approach to shoulder and humerus.
1. Patients were given a preoperative dose of intravenous first generation cephalosporin antibiotics.
2. Patients were put in supine position.
3. Small sand bags were kept under the affected side of the scapula to elevate the shoulder and allow the arm to fall backward, thereby opening up the front of the shoulder.
4. 10-15 cm incision was taken over the delto-pectoral groove extending from deltoid insertion distally to coracoids process proximally.
5. Inter-nervous avascular plane between deltoid and pectoralis major developed after ligating and retracting cephalic vein.
6. Pectoralis major muscle retracted medially and deltoid retracted laterally. The biceps tendon acts as a guide to the interval between the greater and lesser tuberosities. It also acts as a guide to the rotator interval between the anterior part of the supraspinatus and the superior edge of the subscapularis.
7. The insertion of the pectoralis major were identified distally and periosteum incised laterally and bone was exposed subperiosteally to avoid damage to the radial nerve. The short head of biceps and coracobrachialis were displaced medially and anterior aspect of shoulder was exposed.
8. The arm was kept abducted throughout the surgery to prevent damage to the axillary artery and the brachial plexus. Greater tuberosities were exposed under cover of deltoid muscle
9. Analysis of the fracture geometry was done. If it was associated with dislocation then capsule is incised and head fragment is reduced first. Before the replacement of the tuberosities all the cancellous bone debris and hematoma were removed.
10. After achieving the temporary anatomical reduction with k-wires, it was fixed with proximal humerus Locking Compression Plate under image control guidance.
Table 1: Pain

| Degree of pain                                      | Points |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| No pain                                            | 35     |
| Slight or occasional pain                          | 30     |
| Mild not affecting daily life                       | 25     |
| Moderate, tolerable, affects daily activity         | 15     |
| Marked, serious limitation of activity             | 05     |
| Total disablement                                   | 00     |

Table 2: Functional Ability

| Strength | Reaching  | Stability |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Normal   | 10        | Below head| Lifting 02 |
| Good     | 08        | Mouth     | Throwing 02 |
| Fair     | 06        | Belt buckle| carrying 02 |
| Poor     | 04        | Opposite  | Pushing 02 |
| Trace    | 02        | Brassiere hook| Hold over head 02 |
| Zero     | 00        |           |           |

Table 3: Range

| Flexion | Extension | Abduction | External rotation | Internal rotation |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 180     | 6         | 45        | 3                 | 180               | 60     | 5     | 90    | 5     |
| 130     | 4         | 30        | 2                 | 170               | 5     | 30    | 70    | 3     |
| 100     | 2         | 15        | 1                 | 140               | 4     | 10    | 50    | 1     |
| 80      | 1         | 15        | 1                 | <10               | 0     | 0     | 30    | 2     |
| <80     | 0         | 0         | 0                 | <30               | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |

Table 4: Degree of Deformity (Anatomy)

| None                     | 10 |
|--------------------------|----|
| Miki                     | 08 |
| Moderate                 | 04 |
| Severe                   | 02 |

Maximum points using Neer's criteria 1s 100 units on overall scores, the patient are grouped into

Results

Table 5: Outcome

| Outcome  |                   |
|----------|-------------------|
| Excellent| >89 units         |
| Satisfactory | 80-89 units |
| Unsatisfactory | 70-79 units |
| Failure  | <70 units         |
Discussion
Proximal humerus fractures are one of the commonest fractures occurring in the orthopedics. They comprises of approximately 4-5% of the fractures at the hospital and are secondary only to hip fractures and distal end radius fractures in the elderly group. The incidence is approximately 3 per 1000 persons in a year and is rapidly increasing with age \(^1\), \(^2\), \(^3\). Proximal humerus fractures comprises of 2 to 3% of upper limb fractures. 75 percent of these fractures are seen in elderly group. 80 to 85% of these fractures can be managed by conservative treatment and the remaining 15 to 20% are displaced significantly and require some kind of internal fixation. \(^6\), \(^7\), \(^1\).

The Neer 33, 40 classification system, published in 1970, is based on displacement of the parts and prognosis determined by head viability. He published results from the observation of 300 randomly selected proximal humerus fractures, focusing on the pattern of displacement rather than the location of the fracture lines. In outcome analysis, he focused on humeral head viability and the glenohumeral relationship. Fractures are classified by evaluating the displacement of the parts (head, shaft, greater tuberosity and lesser tuberosity) from each other.

To meet the criteria of a part displacement
- The fracture must be rotated more than 45 degrees or
- Displaced more than 1cm from another fragment.

A proximal humerus with multiple fracture lines may be considered as one part fracture if there is no significant displacement
Two-part fracture is typically a surgical neck fracture in which the head with attached tuberosities is displaced from the shaft, a displaced greater tuberosity fracture, lesser tuberosity fracture or anatomic neck fracture is less common.

Three part fracture which may include head include head dislocation, involve the surgical neck and one of the tuberosities, the greater tuberosity displaces more commonly than the lesser tuberosity. \(^8\) In four part fracture all the parts are displaced and the articular head fragment is devoid of soft tissue attachments. The exception to this is the valgus-impacted proximal humerus fracture in which the head is displaced from the glenoid and rotated upward. The head may retain capsular and periosteal attachments along the medial calcar, which might account for the decreased rate of osteonecrosis in this fracture pattern.

Neer’s criteria is based on

Neer’s criteria
1. Pain
2. Functional ability
3. Range of motion
4. Degree of deformity total score is 100

Neer’s Score: >89 units
Excellent
Satisfactory 80-89 units
Unsatisfactory 70-79 units
Failure <70 units

Conclusion
Locking Compression plate fixation for proximal humeral fracture of all types without dislocation is a very good alternative to conservative management which provides good result with careful planning and execution
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