Role of locking plate in fractures of shaft of humerus in elderly patients
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Abstract
Fractures of humeral diaphysis constitute 3% of all the bony injuries. Operative technique which have been devised for the treatment of humeral diaphyseal fractures include ORIF with plate osteosynthesis, intramedullary nailing and External fixation using ilizarov ring fixators or AO tubular fixators. Open reduction and internal fixation with plate osteosynthesis supplemented with bone grafting has been the gold standard for treatment of the humeral diaphysis when other methods are compared. The key to this new generation of plates is the locking mechanism of the screw to the plate, which provides angular stability and avoids compression of the plate to the periosteum. Loss of screw purchase is an important factor related to the failure of fixation in osteoporotic bone. Fracture plating technology recently has evolved to include locked plating. The main goal is to obtain the most rigid fixation possible. It is a prospective study of 30 elderly patients who attended either the outpatient department or emergency room who had sustained injury to the arm and diagnosed as fracture shaft of humerus in NRI Medical college and general hospital during the period of 2 years (November 2016 to October 2018). All the cases followed at 6 weeks, 3 months and at 12 months. The results are assessed by Constant and Murley’s scoring system. Post-menopausal osteoporotic females accounted for 40% of patients. In our study internal fixation using locking compression plating techniques achieved union in all cases. 95% of fractures united within 16 weeks. The functional outcome was more than 90%. These results are comparable with those obtained by R Vander Griend et al open reduction and internal fixation using AO plating techniques (97%). Treatment of long bone fractures with osteoporosis in elderly patients is technically challenging in terms of fracture fixation, maintenance of reduction and achieving bony union with good clinical outcome. Locking Compression Plate offers higher weight bearing capacity than the conventional plates interns of good fixation and stability. In osteoporosis or poor bone quality, bicortical engagement of screws is recommended.
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Introduction
Fractures of humeral diaphysis constitute 3% of all the bony injuries [1]. Operative technique which have been devised for the treatment of humeral diaphyseal fractures include

- Open reduction and internal fixation with plate osteosynthesis
- Open or closed reduction and internal fixation with intramedullary fixation
- External fixation using ilizarov ring fixators or AO tubular fixators

Some amount of shortening is functionally acceptable. But a rotational deformity is not acceptable. Open reduction and internal fixation with plate osteosynthesis supplemented with bone grafting has been the gold standard for treatment of the humeral diaphysis when other methods are compared [2, 3, 4]. There are several practical advantages to the use of locking compression plates over standard compression plates. The key to this new generation of plates is the locking mechanism of the screw to the plate, which provides angular stability and avoids compression of the plate to the periosteum. Loss of screw purchase is an important factor related to the failure of fixation in osteoporotic bone. Fracture plating technology recently has evolved to include locked plating. The main goal is to obtain the most rigid fixation possible.

Aim and objectives of the study
To evaluate radiological and functional outcome of management of fracture shaft of humerus in elderly patients with locking plate.
Materials and Methods
It is a prospective study of 30 elderly patients who attended either the outpatient department or emergency room who had sustained injury to the arm and diagnosed as fracture shaft of humerus in NRI medical college and general hospital during the period of 2 years (November 2016 to October 2018). The patients are evaluated as per the history, mode of injury. Necessary radiological investigations and hematological profile done on admission. All the cases were followed up at 6 weeks, 12 weeks, and 6 months.

Inclusion criteria
1. Patients above 50 yrs.
2. Polytrauma patients
3. Patients who gave consent for study.

Exclusion criteria
1. Compound humerus fractures
2. Patients with comorbid conditions and medically not fit for anesthesia.
3. Patients who didn’t gave consent for study.

Results
In past two years from November 2016 to November 2018, 30 cases of fracture shaft of humerus treated in NRI academy of medical sciences. The analysis is as follows.

Table 1: Age Distribution (N=30)

| S. No | Age group | No. of patients | Percentage |
|-------|-----------|-----------------|------------|
| 1     | 51-60     | 10              | 33         |
| 2     | 60-70     | 13              | 43         |
| 3     | >70       | 7               | 22         |

Table 2: Sex distribution (N=30)

| S. No | Sex      | No. of patients | Percentage |
|-------|----------|-----------------|------------|
| 1     | Males    | 12              | 40         |
| 2     | Females  | 18              | 60         |

Table 3: Mode of Injury

| S. No | Mode of Injury | No. of Patients | Percentage |
|-------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1     | Fall at ground level | 14 | 47        |
| 2     | RTA | 10              | 33         |
| 3     | Fall from height | 6   | 20         |

Table 4: Occupation

| S. No | Occupation | No. of patients |
|-------|------------|-----------------|
| 1     | Laborer    | 14              |
| 2     | House wife | 8               |
| 3     | Skilled worker | 6      |
| 4     | Professional | 1              |
| 5     | Business   | 1               |

Table 5: Side

| S. No | Side Involved | No. of patients |
|-------|---------------|-----------------|
| 1     | Dominant(right) | 20             |
| 2     | Non-dominant(left) | 10            |

Table 6: Type of fracture

| S. No | Ao-Type | No. of Patients | Percentage |
|-------|---------|-----------------|------------|
| 1     | A1.2    | 7               | 23         |
| 2     | A2.2    | 8               | 26         |
| 3     | A3.2    | 6               | 20         |
| 4     | B1.2    | 3               | 10         |
| 5     | B2.2    | 3               | 10         |
| 6     | B3.2    | 1               | 3.3        |
| 7     | C1.2    | 1               | 3.3        |
| 8     | C2.2    | 0               | 0          |
| 9     | C3.2    | 1               | 3.3        |

Table 7: Early Complications

| SL No | Complications       | No. of patients |
|-------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 1     | Skin necrosis       | 1               |
| 2     | Wound gaping        | 2               |
| 3     | Radial nerve palsy  | 1               |
| 4     | Infection           | 1               |

Table 8: Late Complications

| SL No | Complications       | No. of patients |
|-------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 1     | Shoulder stiffness  | 2               |
| 2     | Elbow stiffness     | 0               |
| 3     | Delayed union       | 2               |

Table 9: Functional outcome

| S. No | Functional outcome | No. of Patients |
|-------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1     | Good               | 16              |
| 2     | Fair               | 12              |
| 3     | Poor               | 2               |

Table 10: Over All Results

| S. No | Rating   | No. of patients | Percentage |
|-------|----------|-----------------|------------|
| 1     | Excellent | 24              | 80         |
| 2     | Satisfactory | 5              | 16.6       |
| 3     | Unsatisfactory | 1           | 3.3        |
| 4     | Failure   | 0               | 0          |

Discussion
There was female preponderance in our study 18 (60%) A study conducted by R. Ekholm et al involving 401 diaphyseal fractures there was a female preponderance.3 Mc Cormack RG, Brain D et al involving 44 humeral shaft fractures there was a female preponderance. In Rose SH, Melton et al study of 586 humeral fractures there was a female preponderance.

In our study the average age of patients was 67.15 years which was comparable with the reports by R. Ekholm et al [4] and J. Adami, J. Tidermarknd, K. Hansson, H. Tornkvist, S. Ponzer.

The OTA classification is the most widely used classification for humeral diaphyseal fractures. It has gained wide clinical acceptance by orthopaedic surgeons and radiologists is considered to have important implications for both treatment options and outcomes. Several authors have reported low level of inter- and intra-observer reliability for subgroup classification.

In order to properly employ this classification, precise radiographic evaluation is of paramount importance. For the typical humeral shaft fracture it is rarely necessary to obtain further imaging.

There was a predominance of Type-A fractures in our study followed by Type-B and Type-C. The rate of union in Conservative methods (Functional cast bracing) is 97% - 100% 7,8 and the union time is 11.5wks.9 The rate of union in Intra medullary nailing technique is 80%-100% and the union time is 18-24 weeks.5 Although the nailing technique is simpler, lesser exposure and least damage to soft tissues nailing technique is associated with nonunions, delayed union, impingement syndrome, injury to rotator cuff, shoulder instability and pseudarthrosis.

The rate of union in Plate osteosynthesis is 93% -100% and the time of union is 4 ~ 6.7 months, and more than 90% united in 19 weeks. Vander Griend et al reported union in 35 of 36 plated humeral fractures with no shoulder or elbow morbidity and one temporary radial nerve palsy [7]. Bell et al had similar results ie., union in 37 of 39 fractures.
Tingstad et al had union in 78 of 83 fractures. The union rate following open reduction and internal fixation of humeral shaft fractures averages 96% in number of large series \([6]\). Complications are infrequent and include radial nerve palsy (2-5%) usually neuropaxic injuries which usually recover. Infection (1-2%) for closed fractures, 2% to 5% for open fractures and refracture is 1%. We have followed the three phase rehabilitation protocol of Hughes and Neer in all our patients and this has provided good results. We had a full range of motion in shoulder and elbow joint in more than 90% of cases.

Plate fixation according to the Muller’s technique is a reliable osteosynthesis method with few initial failures or malunions as evidenced by data in the literature. Infection is also rare. Although the radial nerve risk makes this technique rather difficult, excellent functional results can be achieved.

In our study internal fixation using locking compression plating techniques achieved union in 28 of 30 fractures (95%) and delayed union in two cases. These results are comparable with those obtained by R Vander Griend et al open reduction and internal fixation using AO plating techniques (97%). The incidence of operative and post-operative complications was low and the return of function was good except in patients with associated injuries.

The functional outcome of the patients were assessed by Constant and Murley’s scoring system. The score was more than 90%.

In summary, management of fracture shaft of humerus in elderly may be extremely demanding. There are many pitfalls for the unwary patient and surgeon to avoid during the course of treatment. Emphasis is placed on complete and accurate diagnosis and preoperative planning for formation of safe and simple techniques for restoration of normal anatomy, fracture healing and patient care, full range of motion and strength.

**Fracture union rate obtained as compared to other studies**

| Series                    | Total no of patients | Delayed union | Non union | Overall results |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Bell MJ et al (1985)      | 34                   |              | 1(3%)     | 33(97%)         |
| Griend RV, Tomasin J, Ward et al (1999) | 36     | 5(14.6%)     | 1(3%)     | 35(97%)         |
| Gongol T, Mracek D (2002) | 32                   |              | 1(3.1%)   | 31(96.9%)       |
| Present study (2018)     | 30                   | 2(6.6%)      | -         | 28(93.3%)       |

**Range of mobility of elbow & shoulder as compared to other studies**

| Study                        | No of patients | Good range of mobility | Percentage |
|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|
| Bell MJ et al (1985)         | 39             | 38                     | 97%        |
| Griend RV, Tomasin J, Ward et al (1986) | 36     | 30                     | 85.4%      |
| McCormack RG et al (2000)    | 44             | 44                     | 100%       |
| Gongol T, Mracek D (2002)    | 32             | 31                     | 97%        |
| Present Study (2018)         | 30             | 28                     | 93.3%      |
Conclusion
Treatment of long bone fractures with osteoporosis in elderly patients is technically challenging in terms of fracture fixation, maintenance of reduction and achieving bony union with good clinical outcome. Locking Compression Plate offers higher weight bearing capacity than the conventional plates in terms of good fixation and stability. In osteoporosis or poor bone quality, bicortical engagement of screws is recommended. In severely comminuted fractures where the anatomy cannot be restored without extensive soft tissue dissection, fixation with LCP will give better fracture union and good functional outcome. Results are best when stable fixation allows early passive mobilization which is possible only with locking compression plate.
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