

Intramedullary nailing versus fixed angle blade plating for subtrochanteric femoral fractures: a prospective randomised controlled trial

DM Rahme, IA Harris

St George Hospital and Liverpool Hospital, Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT

Purpose. To compare closed intramedullary nailing to open reduction and internal fixation using a fixed angle blade plate for the management of subtrochanteric femoral fractures.

Methods. 58 patients were equally randomised to undergo either an intramedullary nailing (IN) or fixed angle blade plating (BP).

Results. There were no significant differences between the 2 groups with regard to age, time to surgery, operating time, receipt of blood transfusions, duration of hospital stay, or fracture classification. The revision rate was 28% (8/29) in the BP group and none in the IN group; the difference was statistically significant.

Conclusion. Internal fixation using a fixed angle blade plate for subtrochanteric femoral fractures has higher implant failure and revision rates, compared to closed intramedullary nailing.

Key words: bone plates; hip fractures; internal fixators; prostheses and implants

INTRODUCTION

Subtrochanteric femoral fractures are common and account for 7 to 44% of all proximal femoral fractures, depending on the classification used.¹⁻³ A bimodal age distribution is noted where young patients (usually male) mostly present with high-energy injuries, and the elderly (usually female) present with osteoporotic low-energy fractures.^{4,5} Such fractures are associated with high complication rates, and include non-union and implant failure, which occur regardless of the fixation method, because of the unique anatomical and biomechanical features of the subtrochanter.^{2,3} Its cortex is thinner than the rest of the femoral shaft; it starts with the cancellous bone at the distal end of the intertrochanteric region and extends into the thick cortical bone of the proximal diaphysis.^{6,7} High compressive medial stresses and tensile lateral stresses were placed on fracture fixation devices.^{8,9} A medial buttress is important to minimise implant stress and fatigue failure.¹⁰⁻¹²

In the 1970s and 1980s, internal fixation was the standard treatment for femoral fractures, whereas open anatomic reduction and internal fixation with fixed angle blade plates was recommended for subtrochanteric fractures.¹³⁻¹⁵ Intramedullary nailing

Table 1
Patients' characteristics

Variables	Blade plating group	Intramedullary nailing group
Mean age (years)	67	73
Sex (male:female)	12:17	13:16
Time to surgery (days)	2.9	3.0
Seinsheimer classification (No. of patients)		
Type I	0	1
Type II	8	7
Type III	8	10
Type IV	4	1
Type V	9	10

to incorporate fixation of the femoral neck and head has advantages, namely shorter operating times and less blood loss, as well as lower rates of infection, non-union, and implant failure.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Plating is still recommended for fractures with proximal trochanteric extension, especially when medial cortical contact can be restored.^{3,19,20}

We aimed to compare closed intramedullary nailing without anatomic reduction to open reduction and internal fixation using a fixed angle device for subtrochanteric femoral fractures. The null hypothesis was that there was no difference in treatment outcomes between the 2 methods.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A subtrochanteric fracture was defined as a fracture with its centre between the lower border of the lesser trochanter and a point 5 cm distal to the lesser trochanter. Fractures with intertrochanteric extensions were included. Fractures were classified according to the system proposed by Seinsheimer.¹ Type I fractures are those that are undisplaced or displaced <2 mm. Type II are 2-part fractures, type III are 3-part fractures, and type IV are comminuted with ≥ 4 fragments. Type V include any subtrochanteric fractures with extension through the greater trochanter.

All skeletally mature patients presenting to our hospitals with acute subtrochanteric femoral fractures between August 2001 and August 2003 were included. Those with ipsilateral femoral shaft or neck fractures were excluded. Informed consent was obtained from each patient and the human research ethics committee of each hospital approved the study protocol.

Patients were randomised to intramedullary nailing (IN) or blade plating (BP) treatments (Table 1). The IN group was treated with closed reduction

using a traction table, and percutaneous insertion of a Proximal Femoral Nail (Synthes AG, Chur, Switzerland) without anatomic reduction. The BP group was treated with open anatomic reduction, minimising soft-tissue stripping of fracture fragments, and internal fixation using a 95°-angled blade plate (Synthes AG, Chur, Switzerland) and interfragmentary screws. Bone grafting was at the discretion of the surgeon. Non-weight bearing mobilisation was allowed postoperatively for 12 weeks, or until callus was seen on radiographs.

A sample size of 100 was needed based on an underlying revision rate of 25%, with 80% power to detect a difference of 12.5% with a significance level of 5%. An interim analysis was planned after 50 patients were recruited.

The main outcome measure was revision surgery. Secondary outcome measures were: infection, non-union, mortality, duration of hospital stay, blood loss, operating time, and general health (as measured by the SF-36 general health survey²¹). Infection was considered present with or without evidence of an organism, if antibiotics or debridement were deemed necessary. Non-union was defined as the absence of bridging callus on 2 radiographic views 9 months after injury. Fixation failure was defined as migration or failure of the implant, or loss of reduction deemed to require revision surgery.

Dichotomous outcomes were analysed using the Chi squared and Fisher's exact tests, and Student's *t* test was used for continuous outcomes. A *p* value of <0.05 (2-tailed) was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Due to a significantly higher revision rate in the BP group, recruitment was terminated after an interim analysis of the first 50 patients. By this time, 60 patients had been recruited, 30 in each group. Intention-to-treat analysis was performed. One patient in the IN group was diagnosed with a simple intertrochanteric fracture intra-operatively and treated with a sliding hip screw. One patient in the BP group was treated with a Proximal Femoral Nail, because of the surgeon's non-compliance with the allocation. These 2 patients did not develop any complications.

Eight patients in the BP group required revision for non-union, 7 of which sustained implant failure and loss of reduction. This was significantly higher than that in the IN group, in which no revisions were deemed necessary ($p=0.025$, Table 2). One patient in the IN group had non-union at 9 months without

Table 2
Treatment outcomes

Outcomes	Blade plating group, n=29	Intramedullary nailing group, n=29	p value
Mean operating time (minutes)	171	166	0.8
Mean duration of hospital stay (days)	22	25	0.7
Mean blood transfusion (units)	5.1	3.2	0.4
No. (%) of infection	1 (3%)	3 (10%)	0.6
No. (%) of non-union	8 (28%)	1 (3%)	0.025
No. (%) of revision	8 (28%)	0 (0%)	0.005
No. (%) of mortality	2 (7%)	6 (21%)	0.25

fixation failure, eventually achieving union without surgery or implant failure.

No significant differences were noted between the 2 groups with respect to duration of hospital stay, operating time, receipt of blood transfusions, infections, or mortality; though both infection and mortality rates were higher in the IN group (Table 2). One BP patient received an operative washout, whereas 3 IN patients were treated with antibiotic therapy alone (without debridement). All infections resolved without implant removal.

41 patients (20 IN and 21 BP) were interviewed 12 months after injury using the SF-36 form. Those not interviewed were dead, demential, or uncontactable. Differences between the 2 groups were not significant in each of the 8 domains.

Reduction was anatomic in all BP patients, but not in all IN patients. In some patients, reduction was poor, with major displacement in the lateral view, due to flexion of the proximal fragment (Fig. a). Despite this, patients in the IN group had a low non-union rate of 3%.

Only 2 BP patients were primarily grafted; one of them had a non-union and implant failure. Autologous bone grafting has been advocated for subtrochanteric femoral fractures, especially in high-energy trauma¹² or when medial wall comminution²² or a fracture gap⁵ exists.

DISCUSSION

Comparison between intramedullary nailing and fixed-angle plating for intertrochanteric femoral fractures has been reported.^{23,24} One study specifically looked at transverse and reverse oblique (often classified as subtrochanteric, analogous to a Seinsheimer IIC fracture) intertrochanteric fractures as per the classification of the Orthopaedic Trauma Association, but excluded fractures extending



Figure (a) Postoperative lateral radiograph of the proximal femur demonstrating the mal-reduction following closed intramedullary nailing. (b) Postoperative anteroposterior radiograph of the proximal femur showing plate breakage in the blade plating group.

≥5 cm from the distal lesser trochanter.²⁵ An implant failure rate of 32% in the fixed-angle plating (Dynamic Condylar Screw) group versus zero in the intramedullary nailing group (Proximal Femoral Nail) was reported.²⁵

Despite anatomic reduction, the mode of failure in the BP group was from plate or screw breakage (Fig. b), rather than loss of fixation in osteoporotic bones. The strength of blade plates may not be sufficient for such fractures. The dissection needed for BP also devascularises the bone and the surrounding soft tissues, leading to delay in healing. Our findings were consistent with the trend towards intramedullary nailing over fixed-angle plating for the treatment of subtrochanteric femoral fractures.

We only considered 2 implants, for which reason

our findings may not be applicable to other devices or techniques, such as the Dynamic Condylar Screw. New techniques on percutaneous insertion of plates, including Dynamic Condylar Screws and locking plates are being developed. Percutaneous plating

may have advantages similar to those of closed intramedullary nailing, by minimising the disruption to soft tissues around the fracture. Randomised controlled trials on percutaneous plating versus intramedullary nailing are needed.

REFERENCES

1. Seinsheimer F. Subtrochanteric fractures of the femur. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1978;60:300–6.
2. Craig NJ, Sivaji C, Maffulli N. Subtrochanteric fractures. A review of treatment options. *Bull Hosp Jt Dis* 2001;60:35–46.
3. Sims SH. Subtrochanteric femur fractures. *Orthop Clin North Am* 2002;33:113–26.
4. Russell TA, Taylor JC. *Skeletal Trauma*. Vol II. Philadelphia: WB Saunders; 1992:1499–501.
5. Velasco RU, Comfort TH. Analysis of treatment problems in subtrochanteric fractures of the femur. *J Trauma* 1978;18:513–23.
6. Gray H. Osteology. In: Clemente CD, editor. *Gray's anatomy*. Philadelphia: Lea and Febinger; 1985:275–82.
7. Sofield HA. Anatomy of medullary canals. *Instr Course Lect* 1951;8:8–10.
8. Koch JC. The laws of bone architecture. *Am J Anat* 1917;21:177.
9. Rybicki EF, Simonen FA, Weis EB Jr. On the mathematical analysis of stress in the human femur. *J Biomech* 1972;5:203–15.
10. Kinast C, Bolhofner BR, Mast JW, Ganz R. Subtrochanteric fractures of the femur. Results of treatment with the 95 degrees condylar blade-plate. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1989;238:122–30.
11. Waddell JP. Subtrochanteric fractures of the femur: a review of 130 patients. *J Trauma* 1979;19:582–92.
12. Watson HK, Campbell RD Jr, Wade PA. Classification, treatment and complications of the adult subtrochanteric fracture. *J Trauma* 1964;60:457–80.
13. Asher MA, Tippet JW, Rockwood CA, Zilber S. Compression fixation of subtrochanteric fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1976;117:202–8.
14. Schatzker J. Subtrochanteric fractures of the femur. In: Schatzker J, Tile M, editors. *The rationale of operative fracture care*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 1996:387–413.
15. Whatley JR, Garland DE, Whitecloud T 3rd, Whickstrom J. Subtrochanteric fractures of the femur: treatment with ASIF blade plate fixation. *South Med J* 1978;71:1372–5.
16. Barquet A, Francescoli L, Rienzi D, Lopez L. Intertrochanteric-subtrochanteric fractures: treatment with the long Gamma nail. *J Orthop Trauma* 2000;14:324–8.
17. Lahoud JC, Asselineau A, Salengro S, Molina V, Bombart M. Subtrochanteric fractures. A comparative study between gamma nail and angular osteosynthesis with lateral cortical support [in French]. *Rev Chir Orthop Reparatrice Appar Mot* 1997;83:335–42.
18. van Doorn R, Stapert JW. The long gamma nail in the treatment of 329 subtrochanteric fractures with major extension into the femoral shaft. *Eur J Surg* 2000;166:240–6.
19. Winqvist RA. Locked femoral nailing. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 1993;1:95–105.
20. Pugh KJ, Morgan RA, Gorczyca JT, Pienkowski D. A mechanical comparison of subtrochanteric femur fracture fixation. *J Orthop Trauma* 1998;12:324–9.
21. Ware JE Jr. SF-36 health survey manual: appendix C. SF-36 health survey manual and interpretation guide. Boston: Nimrod Press; 1993.
22. Malkawi H. Bone grafting in subtrochanteric fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1982;168:69–72.
23. Hardy DC, Descamps PY, Krallis P, Fabeck L, Smets P, Bertens CL, et al. Use of an intramedullary hip-screw compared with a compression hip-screw with a plate for intertrochanteric femoral fractures. A prospective, randomized study of one hundred patients. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1998;80:618–30.
24. Bridle SH, Patel AD, Bircher M, Calvert PT. Fixation of intertrochanteric fractures of the femur. A randomised prospective comparison of the gamma nail and the dynamic hip screw. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1991;73:330–4.
25. Sadowski C, Lubbeke A, Saudan M, Riand N, Stern R, Hoffmeyer P. Treatment of reverse oblique and transverse intertrochanteric fractures with use of an intramedullary nail or a 95 degrees screw-plate: a prospective, randomized study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2002;84:372–81.