Functional outcome of operative vs conservative management of 4 part proximal humerus fracture: A prospective comparative study
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Abstract

Background: Proximal humerus fractures are most common injuries involving the shoulder next to clavicle. Most of the injuries are due to high energy impact occurring during RTA, fall from height, fall due to convulsion or epilepsy. Fractures are associated with sever commination and collapse of articular surface leading to dislocation and severe pain, swelling. Generally, these Neers 4-part fractures are managed by surgery with PHILOS plate. However, in our study of 15 patients managed conservatively showed better results compared to patients managed operatively with PHILOS.

Methods: This is a prospective interventional study of 30 cohort cases of proximal humerus fracture – Neers 4 part. Patients willing for operations are treated with PHILOS and those non-willing and who were not fit for surgery were managed conservatively with sling. Early rehabilitation and pendulum exercises started at the beginning of 2-week post op. Patients were admitted and followed at our institution from 2015 to 2017. Outcome analysed at the end taking into consideration of clinical and radiological improvements. Functional outcome will be assessed by Constant Murley score at the end of study.

Results: In our series of 30 patients, majority of the patients were males, with RTA and fall from height in field being the commonest mode of injury in young population and domestic fall being the most common mode of injury in elderly. Fractures managed conservatively showed good range of shoulder movements with less complications compared to operated cases. However early mobilisation and pain management were seeming to be well with PHILOS in immediate post-operative days but shoulder strength and long-term pain controlled better in non-operative cases. Majority of the fractures united with a good to moderate outcome in 50% of the patients. Malunions were the only complications in non-operative cases and in PHILOS there were some incidences of screw perforation, AVN, plate impingement and infection along with malunion.

Conclusions: though many studies conclude Proximal Humerus locking compression plate is an advantageous implant because of its angular stability, particularly in comminuted osteoporotic bones in elderly patients, thus allowing early mobilization. It has many complications. In our study non operated Neers 4-part proximal humerus fractures did well at the end of study without suffering any complications. In fact, non-operated group was more confident in shoulder movements during physiotherapy. Hence, it’s better to manage these fractures conservatively.
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Introduction

Proximal humerus fractures are more common fractures affecting shoulder joint next to clavicle. Approximately 4% of all fractures and 26% of Humerus fractures are fractures of the proximal Humerus \([1]\). Poorly treated fractures result in sever disability of entire arm. Osseous architecture of the humeral head has been compared to egg shell. Central soft cancellous bone, particularly in elderly patients in Part 4 fracture has a reputation of fixation failure with PHILOS and other locking plates. Therefore, it has been a challenge to manage four-part fractures (13-16%) of proximal Humerus fractures \([2]\). There are various methods of fixation of proximal Humerus fractures like Kirschners wire, external fixation, tension band fixation, Rush pins, intramedullary nails and plating \([3]\) but the complications with these methods are high, which include non-union, malunion, avascular necrosis, rotator cuff dysfunction/stiffness \([4]\). The fracture of the proximal Humerus is a debilitating problem since the patient would be
Methods
The proposed comparative study is a prospective study. The subjects for the study will be the patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria admitted in our institution. During the period from November 2015 to November 2017. Operative cases were approached by deltopectoral approach. Fractures were anatomically reduced and fixed with PHILOS. All Patients of both groups were mobilized in the arm pouch and encouraged pendulum exercises in the second week. Sutures were removed on the 10th post-operative day. All patients followed up regularly at 3rd, 6th, 12th and 24th month and the following observations are made. Functional outcome was analysed using constant and Murley scoring system. Rate of occurrence of all complications were noted for each group.

Inclusion Criteria
1. All skeletally mature patients presenting with isolated proximal Humerus fractures according to NEER four-part fracture.
2. Willing for surgery and take part in study for PHILOS.
3. Patients not willing for surgery are followed for results of conservative management.

Exclusion Criteria
1. Patient refusal to take part in study.
2. Pathologic fractures from primary or metastatic tumours
3. Patients age less than 18 years.

Table 1: Age wise distribution of patients

| S. No. | Age in years | No. patients | Percentage |
|--------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| 1      | 20 - 30      | 7            | 23%        |
| 2      | 31 - 40      | 7            | 23%        |
| 3      | 41 - 50      | 6            | 20%        |
| 4      | 51 - 60      | 6            | 20%        |
| 5      | 61 - 70      | 4            | 13%        |

Gender wise distribution: in our study we noticed male predominance. Male to female ratio was around 3:1.

Table 2: Sex wise distribution of patients

| S. No. | Sex  | No. patients | Percentage |
|--------|------|--------------|------------|
| 1      | Male | 22           | 73.33%     |
| 2      | Female | 08           | 26.66%     |

Mode of injury: In our study RTA is the major cause of injury. Others being fall at work and epileptic convulsions

| S. No. | Mode of injury | No. of patients | Percentage |
|--------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1      | RTA            | 13              | 50%        |
| 2      | Fall           | 13              | 43%        |
| 3      | Seizure        | 02              | 6.6%       |

Shoulder range of movements: Average degree of movements at the end of follow up recorded in both groups. There was no significant difference in Flexion, Extension, Abduction. Abduction of shoulder was more in patients managed conservatively. However internal rotation, external rotation was more in operated cases.

| S. No. | Movements | Patients managed conservatively | Patients managed with PHILOS /Operation |
|--------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 1      | Flexion   | 126°                            | 119°                                   |
| 2      | Extension | 36°                             | 40°                                    |
| 3      | Abduction | 115°                            | 86°                                    |
| 4      | Adduction | 33°                             | 30°                                    |
| 5      | Internal rotation | 44° | 60° |
| 6      | External rotation | 42° | 60° |

Average constant and Murley scoring: In our study patients managed surgically showed no significant difference in the results compared to non-operated patients at the of study. The mean constant score in operated cases was 57.8% and in non-operated cases it is 59.6%. The difference between the group was insignificant.

Table 5: Average Murley constant scoring in each group at the end of follow up

| S. No. | Murley score | Patients managed conservatively | Patients managed with PHILOS /Operation |
|--------|--------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 1      | Excellent    | 2 (6.6%)                        | 2 (6.6%)                               |
| 2      | Good         | 4 (26%)                         | 3 (20.6%)                              |
| 3      | Moderate     | 6 (20%)                         | 7 (23%)                                |
| 4      | Poor         | 3 (20.6%)                       | 3 (20.6%)                              |
Figures: Movements of shoulder after operative management

Fig 3: Flexion

Fig 4: Extension

Fig 5: Abduction

Fig 6: Internal rotation

Fig 7: Fracture union with conservative

Fig 8: United fracture with PHILOS

Complications: more complications are seen in operated cases than with patients managed conservatively. Most of them related directly to the operative procedure itself and with the implant PHILOS plate, screws.

Table 6: Complications

| S. No. | Complications                  | Patients managed conservatively | Patients managed with PHILOS/Operation |
|-------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 1     | Pain – VAS score average       | 3                               | 5                                      |
| 2     | Infection                      | 0                               | 1 (6.6%)                               |
| 3     | AVN & Collapse of head         | 1 (6.6%)                        | 3 (20%)                                |
| 4     | Screw penetration              | 0                               | 2 (13.3%)                              |

Complications of conservatively managed Neers part 4 fracture

Fig 9: Varus collapse
Proximal humerus fractures are more common fractures affecting shoulder joint next to clavicle. 4-5% of all fractures of long bones are constituted by proximal humerus fractures [1]. A study done by Palvanen et al. [1]. Determined that the trend in the fall and osteoporosis related proximal humeral fractures in elderly Finnish population would triple in the next three decades. There is always a controversy regarding conservative versus surgical treatment of type 4 proximal humeral fracture. Where varied results have contributed to the lack of consensus among orthopaedic surgeons. Till today there is no uniform guide line or consensus on treatment indications in 4-part fractures [6] and it is difficult to obtain and maintain an adequate reduction of the fracture in bones that are frequently osteoporotic [7]. Similar dilemma arises when a low demanding elderly patient seen with this fracture [8]. In many research studies it’s been stated that Majority (80-85%) of these fractures can be treated conservatively. The remaining 15-20% are significantly displaced and require some type of internal fixation.

In our study conservative management includes shoulder immobilizer (sling, Velpau) for 2 to 6 weeks with a rehabilitation program that began with passive exercises at 1 or 2 weeks after immobilization. Fracture reduced with holding one hand anteriorly on the fracture site and then forceful flexion of the arm combined with adduction to disimpact the posterior impaction and to relax the pectoralis major muscle. The proximal shaft reduction tried with manipulative manure posteriorly and laterally [9]. Whereas operative management includes deltoid approach and fixation with PHILOS plate of appropriate length. In non-osteoporotic bones, open reduction and internal fixation with non-locking plates and screws for proximal Humerus fractures has shown to provide the strongest fixation as shown by Wijgman et al. [10].

Studies done by Van Den Broek et al. noticed better findings during evaluation with constant score in group of patients which had started physiotherapy and patient controlled passive mobilisation within 2 weeks of injury [11] we have observed similar benefits of early mobilisation in our study too.

It is a customary practice to consider conservative treatment for minimally displaced fractures according to the Neer criteria (< 1 cm displacement or < 45° angulation) [12]. One of the review studies done by Soler – Piero et al. Discussed about which type of displaced fractures are considered for surgical treatment and which fracture types benefit more from conservative approach [13] which has comparatively low inherent complications and risks [14]. They conclude in this review study that a significative difference between the outcomes for the three-part fractures compared with the four-part fractures seen with operative management. However, failed to see any significant difference among part 4 fracture managed operative vs non-operatively.

The average age in our series of 30 patients, ranging between 20 to 70 years was 41.1 years. Which is lower than the average age in other studies. The average age incidence in Gerber et al. Was 44.9 years [15]. Regarding sex incidence,
according to literature fracture of proximal humeres occurs more in males. Studies also reveal that male to female ratio being 1:0.8. In our series the male to female ratio is 3:2. Which goes with the above study.

The mode of injury observed in our series was road traffic accidents accounting for 50% (15 cases), 43% (13 cases) patients having a slip and fall and 6.6% (2 cases) occurred after seizures. These observations were found to be not in consistent with the studies in literature which revealed 45% road traffic accidents and 50% history of slip and fall [10]. This can be attributed to the living style. In this study RTA is the major cause mainly two wheelers accident. This is followed by fall because most of the laborers work in field, climb tree and has fall.

The pooled rate of consolidation following conservative treatment in the review studies conducted by Soler – Piero et al. was 92.5% [13]. This high percentage shows that PHFs tend to consolidate, even in patients with poor bone quality [16]. The average time taken to unite in operated patients was 18 week and in conservative group it is 15 week.it is in par with the study conducted by Emrah Caliskan and Ozgur Dogan [17]. Our study also shows range of movements at the end of follow up in comparison to the study conducted by above authors. In our study there was no significant difference in Flexion, Extension, Adduction between the two group. Abduction of shoulder was more in patients managed conservatively. This could be due to well preserved deltoid strength in non-operated cases. However internal rotation, external rotation was more in operated cases. This can be explained with release of soft tissues around proximal humerus during exposure at operation.

The average Constant and Murley score in our study was found to be 59.6 for patients managed conservatively compared to patients managed with PHILOS which is 57.8%. Review Study with meta-analysis done by soler – perio et al. [13] documented a mean constant score of 54.9. which is in par with the above study. This also supports the conclusion given by Iyengar JJ et al., stating there is no significant outcome difference at average constant score between the two group [16].

Complications: Although the outcome achieved with conservative treatment for four-part fractures were worse than those obtained for minimally displaced and two-part fractures [18], the surgical alternative is not risk-free. More complications such as incision infection, AVN and screw penetration were observed with operative treatment. Nonoperative treatment does not critically impair the blood supply of the humeral head, so the risk of avascular necrosis may be less. The rate of complications is high in part 4 fractures with locking plate [19] and it can rise to 70% in non-locking plates [20]. Rangan et al. reported that 28.8% of patients treated surgically experienced complications, compared with 18.4% of those treated conservatively [21] the rate of malunion in the series of Okike et al. [22] stood at 40% following surgery. In our study we noticed Deep infection in 1 case (6.6%). which was managed with debridement and antibiotic. 2 cases (13.3%) progressed to AVN at the end of study with subsequent collapse and screw penetration. Studies conducted by Lee C K et al. Have documented the manifestation of necrosis up to 3.5 years after the fracture [23]. Kristiansen et al. in their study of 20 patients with proximal Humerus fracture treated with T-buttress plate, found that only nine reported a satisfactory or excellent result and all four-part fractures resulted in poor outcomes [24]. In 4-part fractures, similar to our results, both Tamimi et al. and Lange et al. found no difference in the functional outcome between two groups, but they determined better radiological results in the operative group and fewer complications in the nonoperative group [25, 26].

Limitations of study: we think Relatively small number of samples. Lack of age specific comparison is a significant drawback of this study. It could give clearer results if the age specific comparison of geriatric and younger patient were compared within themselves.

Conclusion
Nonoperative treatment in Neers 4-part proximal humeral fractures, particularly in elderly patients and osteoporotic fractures seems beneficial over surgery. Desired functional results can be achieved without obtaining radiological anatomical reduction in non-operative patients. Relatively less risk of complications makes conservative modality of treatment a wise option.
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