Biomechanical analysis of tension band wiring (TBW) of transverse fractures of patella
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Abstract

Purpose: Tension band wiring is commonly used for fixation of simple transverse fractures. The popular configuration is parallel Kirschner wires (K-wires) and a stainless steel wire loop placed in a vertically oriented figure-of-8.

Methods: We used a wooden model of a patella with a midway transverse fracture and compared four different types of fixation. The first construct had a vertical figure-of-eight with one twist of wire. The second contained a vertical figure-of-eight with two twists of wire. The third was a vertical figure-of-eight with two twists of wire placed at adjacent corners while the last one had a horizontal figure-of-eight with two twists of wire placed at adjacent corners. Interfragmentary compression at the point of wire breakage was measured for each construct as well as permanent displacement on cyclic loading.

Results: Placement of the figure-of-eight in a horizontal orientation with two wire twists at the corner improved interfragmentary compression by 63% ($p < 0.05$, Tukey post hoc test). On cyclic loading, all the constructs with vertical figure-of-eight but none with a horizontal construct failed ($p = 0.01$; Fisher’s exact test). Permanent fracture displacement after cyclic loading was 67% lower with horizontal figure-of-eight constructs ($p < 0.05$; t test).

Conclusion: Placing wire twists at the corner and a horizontal placement of figure-of-eight improves stability of the construct.

Introduction

Patella fractures comprise 1% of all fractures encountered in the emergency department, and about 30% of them require surgical intervention.1 Tension band wiring (TBW) of patella is one of the most common and popular methods of fixation, specially for simple mid-pole patella fractures.2 Fixation of patellar fractures is very crucial as it allows early mobilisation of the knee without detrimental displacement at the fracture site.3 Displacement of more than 2 mm in 22% of the fractures after early mobilisation using TBW technique popularised by the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Osteosynthesefragen (AO group) has been reported.4 Some studies reported re-operation rates between 20% and 56% following the use of Kirschner wires (K-wires).5–9 Errors in technique and failure by patients to act in accordance with postoperative mobilisation protocol were reported to be the reasons for these failures. It would be understandable to most surgeons that, in order to reduce the risk of displacement or failure, a construct that produces the greatest interfragmentary compression and has the maximum stiffness to resist cyclic loads should be used. This in turn would allow early mobilisation of the knee after fracture fixation.

TBW technique popularised by the AO group involves the use of two K-wires (1.6 mm) placed parallel to each other and an anterior tension band of stainless steel wire in a vertically oriented figure-of-eight pattern (Fig. 1A and B).10 This configuration resulted in the smallest displacement at the fracture site, when compared with other fixation constructs.11

It has been noticed that the site of placement of the wire twists by the surgeon to tighten the loop is done in an arbitrary manner.
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Hypothesis

1) Compared to one loop of wire, two loops of wire should produce greater interfragmentary compression and resistance to cyclic loading.
2) Compared to a wire loop of smaller diameter, a wire loop of larger diameter should produce greater interfragmentary compression and resistance to cyclic loading.
3) Compared to two arbitrarily placed twists, placing two twists of wires at the corners of the figure-of-8 construct increases interfragmentary compression.
4) Compared to a vertically oriented figure-of-8 configuration, placing the figure-of-8 horizontally increases interfragmentary compression and resistance to cyclic loading.

Materials and methods

A wooden model of patella with a midline transverse fracture was used. Two-mm drill holes were made for placement of 1.6 mm K-wires. These holes were large enough to allow easy gliding of the K-wires and ensured identical placement of the K-wires for each experiment. A 25.4 mm diameter × 3.8 mm thick load transducer (ELW-D1, Entran Ltd, Watford, UK) was placed between the fragments in a slot to ensure that its position would be identical at each experiment. Data from the load cell were read into a personal computer. Stainless steel wire (Aesculap, Tuttlingen, Germany) was used to compress the fracture site. The four configurations tested are represented in Fig. 1.

1) Vertical figure-of-8 with 1 twist of wire (Fig. 1A).
2) Vertical figure-of-8 with 2 twists of wire (Fig. 1B).
3) Vertical figure-of-8 with 2 twists of wire placed at adjacent corners (Fig. 1C).
4) Horizontal figure-of-8 with 2 twists of wire placed at adjacent corners (Fig. 1D). Stainless steel wire of different diameters (0.70 mm, 1.00 mm, 1.20 mm) with either one or two loops were used to compress the fracture site and check for displacement on cyclic loading, using the configuration in Fig. 1D.

Interfragmentary compression

For each of the investigation, K-wires were placed in the pre-drilled holes and appropriate lengths of stainless steel wire were bent around them and twisted, while measuring interfragmentary compression. When two twists were used, they were twisted in an alternating manner to ensure that each wire length was tensioned uniformly and equally. Measurements were stopped at wire failure. For each configuration five samples were tested. Using configuration in Fig. 1D, five samples each were tested for wire diameters of 0.70 mm, 1.00 mm and 1.20 mm respectively. The same was done using 2 strands of 0.70 mm SS wire.

Cyclic loading

Configurations 3 and 4 (vertical figure-of-8 and transverse figure-of-8, both with two twists placed at adjacent corners) were each subjected to a cyclic loading test. For the cyclic loading test, all the four samples were prepared in the above manner. Wires were twisted until the interfragmentary compression force was half the average maximum interfragmentary compression force of the configuration. The configuration in Fig 1D was then used to prepare samples using the different diameters of SS wire (0.70 mm, 1.00 mm and 1.20 mm). Samples using 2 strands of wires were prepared similarly. The samples were then placed in a material testing machine (ESH Testing Ltd, Brierley Hill, UK) and loaded using a 3-point bending test. Twenty-five cycles were applied of 150 N, 300 N and 450 N (corresponding to bending moments of 7.7 Nm, 15.4 Nm and 23.1 Nm), while measuring applied force and resulting displacement using the testing machine’s built-in transducers.

Statistical analysis

For interfragmentary compression, forces were compared between the four configurations using One-Way ANOVA followed by the Tukey post-hoc test. For the cyclic loading test, permanent displacement after 25 cycles at each load level was compared using Student’s t-test. In all the cases, a p value of 0.05 was assumed to denote statistical significance. All statistical analyses were performed using SYSTAT Version 11 (Systat Software Inc, Point Richmond, USA).

Results

Interfragmentary compression

The pattern of interfragmentary compression (Fig. 2) revealed that the maximum compression achieved for every twist of wire was not maintained; it settled into a lower value (sustained compression) which was higher than the level after the previous twist. The sustained values after each twist are more representative of values achievable in clinical practice. 

Fig. 2. Pattern of interfragmentary compression. Note: IF compression = interfragmentary compression.
1. **Number of twists**: When two twists of wire were used instead of one, the compression increased by nearly 12%. It is important to point out that the second twist was placed at an arbitrary point along the figure-of-8 (Table 1).

2. **Site of wire twists**: There was an additional advantage in placing the two twists at adjacent corners, which increased the compression by a further 18% (Table 1).

3. **Orientation of figure-of-8**: The investigations revealed an improvement in interfragmentary compression when the figure-of-8 was placed horizontally as opposed to vertically (traditional configuration). The placement of the figure-of-8 in a horizontal configuration increased compression by 67%, implying that this configuration (Fig. 1D) was significantly stronger than all other configurations (p < 0.05).

4. **Diameter of stainless steel wire loop**: Increasing the diameter of the figure-of-8 loop improved values for both the maximum and sustained interfragmentary compression. The improvement was statistically significant (p = 0.002, Table 2). Although increasing the diameter of the figure-of-8 loop from 1.0 mm to 1.20 mm resulted in an improvement in interfragmentary compression, this did not reach statistical significance (p > 0.05).

5. **Two strands of wire in the figure-of-8 loop**: On adding an extra strand of 0.7 mm wire loop, the maximum interfragmentary compression achieved improved significantly (p = 0.005).

### Displacement on cyclic loading

1. **Orientation of Figure-of-8**: The cyclic loading tests revealed a difference between the two groups tested, as all the vertical figure-of-8 loop (traditional configuration) specimens failed at 15.4 Nm, while all specimens fixed using the horizontal configuration (Fig. 1D) survived up to 23.1 Nm (Table 3). The average fracture displacement of the samples fixed with the vertical configuration was 64.5% more than that of the samples fixed with the horizontal configuration, a significant difference (p < 0.05).

2. **Diameter of stainless steel wire loop**: Increasing the diameter of the SS wire used to make the figure-of-8 loop decreased the final permanent displacement after cyclic loading at 2.31 Nm significantly (p = 0.002). The difference in displacement between 1.20 mm wire group and 1.00 mm group was marginal (p = 0.06). It was interesting to note that the SD in the 1.20 mm group was larger than the 1.00 mm group, suggesting that the tension through thicker wire loop was not uniform between samples (Table 4).

3. **Two strands of wire in the figure-of-8 loop**: On using a second strand of 0.7 mm SS wire, the permanent displacement at cyclic loads of 2.31 Nm decreased significantly compared to figure-of-8 loop with a single strand (p = 0.02). The 0.7 mm wire loop was used in preference to the thicker wire strands for its ease of handling when the second strand was added.

### Table 1

| Groups                  | Compression | SD |
|-------------------------|-------------|----|
| Vertical 1 twist        | 79.5        | 32.5|
| Vertical 2 twists corner | 104.8       | 27.2|
| Horizontal 2 twists corner | 171.1    | 33.3|

Sustained interfragmentary compression for each group tested. Differences between groups were significant (p < 0.005, One-Way ANOVA), with the horizontal configuration producing greater compression than all other configurations (p < 0.05; Tukey post-hoc test).

### Table 2

| Diameter (mm) | Max IF compression (N) | SD | Sustained IF compression (N) | SD |
|---------------|------------------------|----|-----------------------------|----|
| SS Wire 0.70  | 290.4077               | 35.88125 | 222.9845                   | 23.67119 |
| SS Wire 0.70  | 205.9122               | 20.40038 | 164.3131                   | 33.32085 |
| SS Wire 0.70  | 260.1403               | 24.48924 | 192.5469                   | 28.43786 |

Maximum and sustained interfragmentary compression produced with wire loops of different diameters and 2 wire strands in the figure-of-8 loop.

### Table 3

| Load level (Nm) Sample | No.1 | No.2 | No.3 | No.4 | No.5 | Average | SD |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|----|
| Vertical configuration  |      |      |      |      |      |         |    |
| 7.7                    | 4    | 4    |      |      |      | 4.6     | 0.41|
| 15.4                   | Failed | Failed | Failed | Failed | Failed | 5.4     | 1.23|
| Horizontal configuration |      |      |      |      |      |         |    |
| 7.7                    | 2.1  | 2.7  | 3.2  | 3.5  | 3.1  | 3.0     | 0.79|
| 15.4                   | 4.4  | 5.3  | 4.6  | 4.6  | 4.6  | 4.6     | 1.61|
| 23.1                   | 12.2 | 15.9 | 12.4 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 12.8    | 4.46|

Displacement on cyclic loading tests.

### Table 4

| Diameter (mm) | Count | Average displacement (mm) | SD |
|---------------|-------|---------------------------|----|
| SS Wire 0.70  | 5     | 3.6084                    | 0.69547 |
helps the surgeon achieve better control of both lengths of wire, previous investigations have showed a loss of strength of nearly 25%.[12] Our investigation did not reveal a statistically significant improvement with the double twist technique, but certainly did not show deterioration in fixation strength. The improvement achieved by placing the twists at the corners and placing the figure-of-8 loop horizontally was reported by the authors in a previous paper.[13]

Increasing the diameter of the figure-of-8 wire loop in order to increase the interfragmentary compression is intuitive and is a practice resorted to by many surgeons. The authors have noticed a variation in preference between surgeons in the use of 1.20 mm SS wire or 1.00 mm SS wire. Any wire diameter larger than the 1.2 mm (16 gauge) is perceived to be difficult to handle. The interfragmentary compression and resistance to cyclic loading improved significantly with the increasing diameter of the figure-of-8 loop (0.70 mm, 1.00 mm and 1.20 mm). Interestingly the differences between the 1.00 mm group and 1.2 mm group were not statistically significant both for interfragmentary compression and displacement on cyclic loading at 23.1 Nm. Moreover the final displacements after cyclic loading showed a greater variation for the 1.20 mm group (SD 0.70) as compared to the 1.00 mm group (SD 0.31). This reinforced our experience that it is harder to achieve uniform tension when using the thicker wire prior to cyclic loading. The 1.00 mm wire appears to achieve a similar interfragmentary compression and displacement on cyclic loading as the 1.20 mm wire loop without the problems of non-uniform tension or laxity more reliably.

Increasing the number of strands to increase the interfragmentary compression is intuitive. The potential problem is that achieving uniform and nearly equal tension in both strands is difficult to replicate. The use of 0.70 mm SS wire offset this problem at least for the purposes of this investigation. The interfragmentary compression achieved at wire breakage and the displacement on cyclic loading was significantly improved by the addition of the second strand. The double stranded loop of 0.70 mm wire did not achieve the same level of interfragmentary compression or resistance to cyclic loading when compared to 1.00 mm wire. The use of a double stranded loop of 1.00 mm wire is an attractive proposition at the time of surgery.

It was noticed that during the investigation the stainless steel wire used elongates prior to failure. This elongation has been reported to be approximately 50% prior to fracture. Fatigue failure of stainless steel wire is one aspect that was not investigated. It is well established that notching of wires during handling with instruments harder than 316L stainless steel decreases the fatigue life. It has been shown by previous investigators that a notch of 1% of diameter can reduce fatigue life by 63%.[10] In this investigation we used the same instruments used at the time of surgery and did not have failures for the specific number of cycles tested, which can be attributed to fatigue failure.

Although in this study we used stainless steel wire, the improvements in principle may be used, even when nonmetallic sutures are used. Nonmetallic sutures are in vogue with some surgeons for their obvious advantages of preventing metallic implant-related problems like skin irritation which might necessitate implant removal.[4,13] Increasing the diameter of the material, the number of strands and orientation of the figure-of-8 loop is likely to improve the interfragmentary compression and resistance to cyclic loading regardless of the material used in the fixation construct.

Most reports in the literature, except a previous report by the authors[15] have used cadaveric patellae. The confounding influences that may arise from the variation in the trabecular architecture of the cadaveric patellae[35] can be considerable and probably explain why previous investigations of patellar fixation on cadaveric patellae have reported wide variations to the extent of drawing opposite conclusions.[19–21] The advantages of the wooden model of a patella used in this investigation were highlighted in our previous report.[15] It did not deform around the load transducer and allowed accurate measurement of the interfragmentary compression, both of which would have been difficult with cadaveric patellae.

In conclusion, the TBW construct for transverse fractures of the patellae may be improved by

1) Placing two twists at corners rather than in an arbitrary fashion.
2) Placing the figure-of-8 loop in transverse orientation.
3) Increasing the diameter of the wire used to make the figure-of-8 loop. Our investigation revealed 1.00 mm SS wire to be ideal as it achieves comparable compression and resistance to cyclic loading as the 1.2 mm wire, without suffering from the problems of nonuniform tension.
4) Increasing the number of strands in the figure-of-8 loop. Additional strand significantly increased the compression and resistance to cyclic loads.

References

1. Scilaris TA, Grantham JL, Pryson MJ, et al. Biomechanical comparison of fixation methods in transverse patella fractures. J Orthop Trauma. 1998;12:356–359.
2. Egel K, Howard D, Monroy A, et al. Patella fracture fixation with suture and wire: you reap what you sew. Iowa Orthop J. 2014;34:63–67.
3. Lutke PA, Ecker ML. Transverse fractures of the patella. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1981;158:180–184.
4. Smith ST, Cramer KE, Karges DE, et al. Early complications in the operative treatment of patella fractures. J Orthop Trauma. 1997;11:183–187.
5. Gosal HS, Singh P, Field RE. Clinical experience of patellar fracture fixation using metal wire or non-absorbable polyester—a study of 37 cases. Injury. 2001;32:129–133.
6. Tian Y, Zhou F, Ji H, et al. Cannulated screw and cable are superior to modified tension band in the treatment of transverse patella fractures. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2011;469:3429–3435. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11999-011-1913-z.
7. Hung LC, Lee SY, Leung KS, et al. Partial patellotomy for patellar fracture: tension band wiring and early mobilization. J Orthop Trauma. 1993;7:252–260.
8. Hung LC, Chan KM, Chow YN, et al. Fractured patella: operative treatment using the tension band principle. Injury. 1985;16:343–347.
9. LeBrun CT, Langford JR, Sags HC. Functional outcomes after operatively treated patella fractures. J Orthop Trauma. 2012;26:422–426.
10. Muller ME, Algower M, Schneider R, et al. Manual of Internal Fixation. 3rd ed. Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 1990.
11. Weber MJ, Janecki CJ, McLeod P, et al. Efficacy of various forms of fixation for transverse fractures of the patella. J Bone Jt Surg Am. 1980;62:215–220.
12. Guadagni JR, Drummond DS. Strength of surgical wire fixation. A laboratory study. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1986;209:176–181.
13. Melvin JS, Karunakar MA. Patella fractures and extensor mechanism injuries. AAOS Annu Meet. 2015;54:2–1.
14. Patel VR, Parks BG, Wang Y, et al. Fixation of patella fractures with braided polyester suture: a biomechanical study. Injury. 2000;31:1–6.
15. John J, Wagner WW, Kuiper JH. Tension-band wiring of patella. The effect of site of wire twists and orientation of stainless steel wire loop: a biomechanical investigation. Int Orthop. 2007;31:703–707.
16. Oh I, Sander TW, Trehanie RW. The fatigue resistance of orthopaedic wire. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1985;192:228–236.
17. Chen A, Hou C, Bao J, et al. Comparison of biodegradable and metallic tension-band fixation for patella fractures. 38 patients followed for 2 years. Acta Orthop Scand. 1998;69:39–42.
18. Touni H, Higashiyama I, Suzuki D, et al. Regional variations in human patellar trabecular architecture and the structure of the proximal patellar enthesis. J Anat. 2006;208:47–57.
19. Benjamin J, Bried J, Dohm M, et al. Biomechanical evaluation of various forms of fixation of patella. J Orthop Trauma. 1987;1:219–222.
20. Carpenter JE, Kasman RA, Patel N, et al. Biomechanical evaluation of current patella fracture fixation techniques. J Orthop Trauma. 1997;11:351–356.
21. Weber MJ, Janecki CJ, McLeod P, et al. Efficacy of various forms of fixation of transverse fractures of the patella. J Bone Jt Surg Am. 1980;62:215–220.