1. Introduction

Proximal femoral fractures in elderly individuals have a tremendous impact on both the health care system and society and it occurs in moderate or minimal trauma. During an impact the large amount of energy that is released is absorbed by the skin, fat, and muscles which surround the hip. There is an increased incidence of hip fractures with aging due to decrease in muscle mass around the hip and osteoporosis and is becoming more common as the proportion of elderly people in the population increases.

The treatment of trochanteric hip fractures with internal fixation has improved drastically in the last few decades. Still failure of internal fixation is a known complication. The failure after internal fixation had been due to initial fracture pattern, Comminutions, sub optimal fracture fixation and poor bone quality. The problems associated with fixation of these fractures are loss of fixation, varus collapse and cut out of the lag screw. As a result, there is profound functional disability and pain. In these patients treatment with primary bipolar hemiarthroplasty decreases the post operative complications due to prolonged immobilization or implants failure and also quickly returns the patients to their pre-injury activity level.

The purpose of our study was to evaluate the functional outcomes of primary bipolar hemiarthroplasty vs dynamic hip screw fixation for unstable intertrochanteric femur fractures in elderly patients.
2. Materials and Methods

This study was conducted at a tertiary health care center (unicentric) from August 2015 to December 2017 on 50 elderly (55 years and above) patients with unstable inter-trochanteric fractures who were divided into two groups with
Group A – bipolar hemiarthroplasty (25 cases), and
Group B – dynamic hip screw (25 cases).

2.1 Inclusion Criteria

1. Age of patient 55 years and above.
2. Inter-trochanteric femur fracture confirmed on antero-posterior and lateral radiographs.
3. Unstable fractures (AO, A 2.1, A 2.2, A 2.3, and A 3.3 and Evans unstable fractures).
4. Patient ambulatory before fracture though may be using a cane or walker.
5. No other injuries.

2.2 Exclusion Criteria

1. Age less than 55 years.
2. Associated major injuries of lower extremity.
3. Any infection around the affected hip (soft tissue or bone).
4. Stable fracture.

2.3 Statistical Analysis

Data was reported as mean and significant difference between the two group's data was studied using Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test.

2.4 Surgical Approach

Group A: Cemented bipolar hemiarthroplasty with calcar reconstruction and tension band wiring for greater trochanter.

Posterior Moore's Approach

Group B: Dynamic hip screw on traction table by Lateral approach.

Randomization (simple random technique): As the patients who got admitted in our hospital and fulfilled the inclusion criteria irrespective of other confounding factors; the serially presenting odd numbers were put in bipolar hemiarthroplasty group (group A) and the serially presenting even numbers to present were put in dynamic hip screw group (group B).

3. Results

Patients were evaluated clinically using Harris hip score during their follow up period. Based on the Harris Hip Score (HHS), the results were graded as (Table 1):
Excellent: ≥90 points
Good : 80–89 points
Fair : 70–79 points
Poor : <70 points

| Follow up (Months) | Harris hip score Group A | Harris hip score Group B | P value |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| 1 Months           | 70.90                    | 62.09                    | 0.00001 |
| 2 Months           | 76.73                    | 67.05                    | 0.00001 |
| 3 Months           | 83.40                    | 73.71                    | 0.002   |
| 6 Months           | 89.66                    | 77.66                    | 0.046   |

There was female preponderance in both groups (57%) in group A when compared to male (52%) in group B. Right side was more commonly involved in both group A (52%) and group B (56%). Fracture incidence was more common in age group of 60–69 years with group A (44%) and group B (56%). The mean age for group A and group B was 71.28 years and 70.09 respectively.

Among the fracture distribution in AO classification type A 2.2 was more common in both group A (60%) and group B (56%). Evans classification type IV was more common in both group A (56%) and group B (64%). The commonest mode of injury in both the groups was accidental fall and other injuries accounting to 57.14% in Group A and 52.38% in Group B. In both groups the most common Singh's index was grade III, 72% in both Group A and Group B. The mean operative time (minutes) was greater in group B (133.66) than in group A (116). P value 0.0004. The mean blood loss intraoperatively (ml) was higher in group B (167.52) than in group A (153.57). P value 0.0310. The mean blood transfusions (number of units) during hospital stay was greater in group B (1.3) than in group A (1.1). P value 0.0276. The mean follow up (months) for group A and group B is 11 & 10.7 respectively.

Among postoperative complications, pressure sores, pulmonary complications and implant failure were in group B (4.7%) when compared to group A (0%). No difference was noted in both the groups in occurrence urinary tract infection. Infection was common in Group B (14.2%) as compared to group A (9.5%).
In group A, 3 patients had limb length discrepancy, 2 of them had shortening and one had lengthening. One patient was unable to ambulate due to associated medical problems.

In group B, 2 patients had shortening, one patient had lag screw cutting out from femoral head, and 1 patient had marked pain during walking (Figure 1–6).

Figure 1. Pre operative X ray.

Figure 2. Post operative X ray.

Figure 3. 6 month follow up.

Figure 4. Pre operative X ray.

Figure 5. Post operative X ray.

Figure 6. 6 months follow up.
4. Discussion

Intertrochanteric fractures are one of the most common fractures among elderly population. Although treatment for this has evolved in the past decades the morbidity post internal fixation is high and affects the productivity of society. The treatment of unstable intertrochanteric fractures is still a dilemma due to nature of the fracture and difficulty in achieving stable internal fixation (Table 2).

Table 2. Type of Fracture

| Classification | AO  | Evans | Total |
|----------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Types          |     |       |       |
| A 2.1          | 15  | 14    | 25    |
| A 2.2          | 10  | 11    | 21    |
| A 2.3          | 25  | 16    | 41    |
| Group A        | 20  | 56    | 40    |
| Group B        | 25  | 36    | 61    |

In group A, according to AO classification type A 2.2 was more common in 15 patients (60%) and type A 2.3 in 40% patients. In Evans classification type IV was more common in 14 patients (56%) and type V in 11 patients (44%).

In group B, according to AO classification type A 2.2 was more common in 14 patients (56%), type A 2.3 in 6 patients (24%) and the A2.1 in 5 patients (18%). In Evans classification type IV was more common in 16 patients (64%) and type V in 9 patients (36%). Bipolar hemiarthroplasty has traditionally been done for intra-capsular neck femur fractures. Bipolar hemiarthroplasty has recently been used for treating unstable intertrochanteric fractures with good results. Bipolar hemiarthroplasty provides adequate stability and early rehabilitation according to some surgeons. Our aim was validate this hypothesis. The Intertrochanteric fractures are associated with a high mortality and morbidity in elderly patients. The overall one year mortality for hip fractures is 14%9. The mortality increases to up to 20% for at least 6-8 months to 1 year following a hip fracture compared to normal population10. Internal fixation in these patients reduced the mortality associated with these fractures11 however failure rate is 56%12,13 and early mobilization is avoided in case of osteoporosis, poor screw fixation and comminution.

The highly osteoporotic bone causes poor screw hold and leads to early biomechanical failure14,15.

4.1 Osteoporosis Evaluation

Singh’s index in both the groups, grade 3 was more common in 18 patients. 6 patients had grade 2 in group A and 7 patients in group B. Grade 1 osteoporosis was seen in 1 patient in group A (Graph 1).

Graph 1. Grades of osteoporosis.

As a result femoral head collapses and migrates in to varus and retroversion17. This causes abductor lever arm shortening leading to abductor weakness and a limp18-21. Another cause for functional disability and pain in these patients is cutting out of the screw from the femoral head. Chances of screw cut-out are increased when there is inappropriate fracture reduction; superior screw position and a tip apex distance of more than 25mm22. The best lag screw position is a Centro central position23. Although the mortality rate is somewhat decreased with internal fixation, the complication rate still ranges from 4 to 50 percent elderly people with osteoporosis and unstable intertrochanteric fractures, internal fixation with Dynamic Hip Screw does not allow for unrestricted weight bearing24. It is important to achieve cortical alignment to achieve stability and avoid complications25.

Primary hemiarthroplasty in these patients provides adequate stability and early mobilization and early weight bearing26, alleviates pain and improves function. It also prevents post operative complications such as pneumonia, atelectasis and pressure sores and brings patient to pre injury level quicker27.

The results in group A were better than group B with respect to blood loss, operative time, perioperative blood transfusion this compares favourably with Sinno et al.28 where one hundred and two patients participated in the study. Bipolar hemiarthroplasty was done in 48 patients and 54 patients were treated with dynamic hip screw fixation.

The mean operative time is less in group A (116 minutes) than that in group B, with a p value of 0.0004, which coincides with study by Sinno et al.29 where it is 112 minutes and p value of 0.0001 in hemiarthroplasty group.

The amount of blood loss (mean) is lower in group A (153.5 ml) than in group B (167.5) with p value of 0.03, which is similar to the study by Sinno et al.29 where it is 192 ml in hemiarthroplasty group with p value of 0.005.
The mean blood transfusions (units) is higher in group B (1.3) than in group A (1.1) with p value of 0.02, similar to that study where the mean blood transfusions was greater in internal fixation group (1.9) than in hemiarthroplasty group (1.37), with p value of 0.01.

Early mobilization with full weight bearing in group A compared to non weight bearing or partial in group B shows reduction in pulmonary complications (4.7%) and pressure sores (4.7%).

There was one case of deep infection and one superficial infection in group A, which comes around 9.5%, whereas in group B 3 patients had infection (14.2%), one of which is deep, which is higher than Sinno et al.28 where they had 0% infection in hemiarthroplasty group and 4% in internal fixation group.

There were no cases of dislocation reported in our study. Two patients (9.5%) had shortening postoperatively with 1.5 cm and 2 cm. One patient had lengthening this was probably due to length of the auto graft used in reconstructing the calcar.

The Harris hip score was better in group A than in group B. The Harris hip score at 24 months follow up is significant with p value of 0.04 and were regarded as good in hemiarthroplasty group and fair in internal fixation group, which goes favourably with study by Sino K et al.28 where at 24 months follow up the score was significant in hemiarthroplasty group with p value of 0.0001.

5. Conclusion

From our results, we are of the opinion that bipolar hemiarthroplasty may be an efficient option in elderly osteoporotic unstable intertrochanteric fractures. It reduces the potential complications of prolonged immobilization such as pressure sores, pulmonary complications etc by early mobilization. As there is improved function and decreased hospitalization it seems to be cost effective.

Though the results are encouraging in short term, a larger randomized prospective study comparing internal fixation and hemiarthroplasty is needed to arrive at a conclusion.
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