

A Comparative Study of Management of Intraarticular Fracture Distal End Of Radius (External Fixator versus ORIF with Buttress Plating)

Debasish Panigrahi¹, Naveen Kumar Singh^{2*}

¹MBBS, MS (Ortho), CMO, Department of Orthopaedics,
North DMC Medical College and Hindurao Hospital, Delhi, India.

^{2*}MBBS, DNB (Ortho), Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics,
North DMC Medical College and Hindurao Hospital, Delhi, India.

ABSTRACT

Background: Intraarticular fracture distal end of the radius is one of the most common fracture of upper extremities. Here is randomised comparative study of the most effective treatment modality to deal with such fracture by external fixator vs buttress plating.

Method: Patients were randomly allocated into two groups of 30 each (group A and group B). Patients treated with external fixator were put in group A while those treated with buttress plating was kept in group B. At the end of 8 months of follow-up final assessment was done for fracture union and patients were assessed for pain, wrist range of motion (ROM), grip strength and activity and scored according to the Modified Green O'Brien Scoring System. The mean duration of treatment and the outcome were comparable.

Results: In group A (external fixator) only 7 patients had excellent and 18 had good results while patient in group B (ORIF with plating) 14 patients had excellent and 11 had good result.

Conclusion: We found that plating predominantly provides more excellent results as long as the radiological parameters are met and fixation achieved as early as possible along with vigorous physiotherapy.


Keywords: ORIF, ROM, DASH, Ex-fix, TFCC, VCA, CRPS, DRUJ.

*Correspondence to:

Dr. Naveen Kumar Singh, MBBS, DNB (Ortho),
Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, North DMC
Medical College and Hindurao Hospital, Delhi, India.

Article History:

Received: 04-08-2018, Revised: 01-09-2018, Accepted: 11-09-2018

Access this article online	
Website: www.ijmrp.com	Quick Response code 
DOI: 10.21276/ijmrp.2018.4.5.079	

INTRODUCTION

Fractures of lower end radius are the most common fractures of the upper extremity, encountered in practice and constitute 17% of all fractures and 75% of all forearm fractures. Three column theory: The distal radius has been conceptualized as a three column model. The wrist is divided into medial intermediate and lateral column. This theory emphasizes that the lateral or radial column is an osseous buttress for the carpus and is an attachment for the intra capsular ligaments.

The primary function of the intermediate column is load transmission and the medial or the ulnar column serves as an axis for forearm and wrist rotation as well as a post for secondary load transmission. Close reduction and cast immobilization has been the mainstay of treatment of these fractures but malunion of fracture and subluxation/ dislocation of distal radioulnar joint and radiocarpal joint resulting in poor functional and cosmetic results is the usual outcome.

The residual deformity of wrist adversely affects wrist motion and hand function by interfering with the mechanical advantage of the extrinsic hand musculature. It may cause pain, limitation of

forearm motion, especially supination and decreased grip strength as a result of arthrosis of the radiocarpal and distal radioulnar joint.

Recently surgical management has been widely recommended and performed to prevent disability. Several studies have shown convincingly that functional outcome is good when the anatomy is restored by obtaining good reduction of fracture fragments maintaining the angulations of the articular surface of radius and radial length, and to minimize those related complications as well. This study evaluates the surgical and functional outcomes of intra-articular fractures of distal end radius in a comparative study between closed reduction using external fixation and distraction osteosynthesis to align fragments versus open reduction internal fixation (ORIF) with buttress plating.

MATERIAL & METHODS

Source of Data

The study was conducted in the department of orthopaedics, North DMC medical college and Hindu Rao Hospital, Malkaganj,

Delhi; between May 2015 to May 2017 on intraarticular fracture distal end of radius.

Study Design

Type of study: randomized comparative study.

Sample Size: Sample size of total 60 patients admitted from OPD as well as in emergency department. Study subject was systematically and randomly allocated into two group of 30 each, (Group A and Group B)

Sampling Method: Random sampling.

Inclusion Criteria

- 1) Only adult patients were taken for the study (more than 18 and less than 55 years of age)
- 2) All patients selected for the study had intraarticular fracture distal end of radius and the fracture was classified employing Frykman classification system.
- 3) Selection of the patients for operative treatment was random.

Exclusion Criteria

- 1) All those patients whose epiphysis plate has not been fused with diaphysis.
- 2) Extraarticular fracture distal end of radius.
- 3) Open fractures and pathological fractures.

Statistical Method Applied: Sample Size was determined based on the ability to detect the patient satisfaction rate. With 30 patients in each group, there was 80% power at an alpha 0.05 to detect a 30% (assumed difference) between the two groups in the ratio of patient satisfaction during the 8 months follow up period. But we would be taking 30 patients per group.

Formulae Used: The formula for calculated sample size is

$$n = [z_{1-\alpha/2} \cdot \sqrt{2P(1-P)} + z_{1-\beta} \cdot \sqrt{\{P_1(1-P_1) + P_2(1-P_2)\}}] / (P_1 - P_2)^2$$

Where,

P1 = Anticipated proportion of patient satisfaction rate at 8 months in Group A

P2 = Anticipated proportion of patient satisfaction rate at 8 months in Group B

$$P = (P_1 + P_2) / 2$$

Data Management and Statistical Analysis

Statistical testing was conducted with the statistical package for the social science system version SPSS 17.0. Continuous variables were presented as mean SD or median if the data was unevenly distributed. Categorical variables were expressed as frequencies and percentages. The comparison of normally distributed continuous variables between the groups was performed using Student's t test. Nominal categorical data between the groups were compared using Chi-square test. For all statistical tests, p value less than 0.05 was taken to indicate a significant difference.

OBSERVATIONS

In Group A (External Fixator) 7 (11.7%) patients had Excellent, 18 (30%) Good, and 3 (5%) had Fair with 2 (3.3%) patient having Poor results. In Group B (ORIF with plating) 14 (23.3%) patients had Excellent, 11 (18.3%) Good, 4 (6.7%) Fair and 1 (1.7%) patient had Poor results at the final 8 month assessment according to the Modified Green O'Brien Scoring System. A p-value of 0.012, which was significant. Hence suggesting that plating predominantly provides more excellent results as long as the radiological parameters are met and fixation achieved as early as possible along with vigorous physiotherapy.

Acceptable Radiological Criteria for Fracture Reduction

- 1) Radial Length within 2-3 mm of the contra-lateral wrist joint.
2. Palmar tilt: Neutral tilt (0 degrees)
3. Intra-articular step-off of <2mm
4. Radial Angle: <5 degree less
5. Carpal Malalignment: Absent
- 2) Above mentioned are the acceptable radiological criteria kept in mind during the surgical procedures and were assessed intra-operatively after reduction was achieved under image intensifier guidance and on immediate post-operative x-rays. After discharge on the first follow up, patient's check x-rays were also evaluated for any loss of reduction since discharge.

Table 1: Frykman classification

FRYKMAN CLASSIFICATION		GROUP		TOTAL
		GROUP A (EX-FIX)	GROUP B (PLATING)	
III	Count	4	8	12
	% Of Total	6.7%	13.3%	20.0%
IV	Count	6	7	13
	%Of Total	10.0%	11.7%	21.7%
VI	Count	4	0	4
	% Of Total	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%
VII	Count	7	9	16
	% Of Total	11.7%	15.0%	26.7%
VIII	Count	9	6	15
	%Of Total	15.0%	10.0%	25.5%
TOTAL	Count	30	30	60
	% Of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
P-VALUE	0.181			

Table 2: Duration of Surgery

Duration of Surgery (in Minutes)		GROUP		TOTAL
		GROUP A (EX-FIX)	GROUP B (PLATING)	
30	Count	5	0	5
	% Of Total	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%
45	Count	16	5	21
	%Of Total	26.7%	8.3%	35.0%
60	Count	9	18	27
	% Of Total	15.0%	30.0%	45.0%
75	Count	0	7	7
	% Of Total	0.0%	11.7%	11.7%
TOTAL	Count	30	30	60
	% Of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
P-VALUE		<0.001		

Table 3: Hospital Stay In Days

Hospital Stay in Days		Group		TOTAL
		GROUP A (EX-FIX)	GROUP B (PLATING)	
2	Count	1	0	1
	% Of Total	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%
3	Count	11	2	13
	%Of Total	18.3%	3.3%	21.7%
4	Count	16	21	37
	% Of Total	26.7%	35.0%	61.7%
5	Count	2	6	8
	% Of Total	3.3%	10.0%	13.3%
7	Count	0	1	1
	%Of Total	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
TOTAL	Count	30	30	60
	% Of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
P-VALUE		0.028		

Table 4: Time for fracture union

Time to Union (Weeks)		GROUP		TOTAL
		GROUP A (EX-FIX)	GROUP B (PLATING)	
6-10 Weeks	Count	20	21	41
	% Of Total	33.3%	35.0%	68.3%
11-14 Weeks	Count	9	8	17
	%Of Total	15.0%	13.3%	28.3%
>14 Weeks	Count	1	1	2
	% Of Total	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%
TOTAL	Count	30	30	60
	% Of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
P-VALUE		0.592		

Table 5: Green O'Brien Grading System

Green O'Brien Scoring System		GROUP		TOTAL
		GROUP A	GROUP B	
		(EX-FIX)	(PLATING)	
60	Count	0	1	1
	% Of Total	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
65	Count	0	1	1
	%Of Total	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
70	Count	3	2	5
	% Of Total	5.0%	3.3%	8.3%
75	Count	2	1	3
	% Of Total	3.3%	1.7%	5.0%
80	Count	10	3	13
	%Of Total	16.7%	5.0%	21.7%
85	Count	8	8	16
	% Of Total	13.3%	13.3%	26.7
90	Count	5	9	14
	%Of Total	8.3%	15.0%	23.3%
95	Count	1	2	3
	%Of Total	1.7%	3.3%	5.0%
100	Count	1	3	4
	%Of Total	1.7%	5.0%	6.7%
TOTAL	Count	30	30	60
	%Of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
P-VALUE	0.361			

Table 6: Final Outcome

FINAL OUTCOME		GROUP		TOTAL
		GROUP A	GROUP B	
		(EX-FIX)	(PLATING)	
Excellent	Count	7	14	21
	% Of Total	11.7%	23.3%	35.0%
Good	Count	18	11	29
	%Of Total	30.0%	18.3%	48.3%
Fair	Count	3	4	7
	% Of Total	5.0%	6.7%	11.7%
Poor	Count	2	1	3
	% Of Total	3.3%	1.7%	5.0%
TOTAL	Count	30	30	60
	% Of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
P-VALUE	0.012			

Table 7: Complications

Complication		GROUP		TOTAL
		GROUP A (EX-FIX)	GROUP B (PLATING)	
None	Count	25	25	50
	% Of Total	41.7%	41.7%	83.3%
CRPS	Count	0	1	1
	%Of Total	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
Superficial Infection	Count	0	2	2
	% Of Total	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%
Deep infection, Stiffness	Count	0	1	1
	% Of Total	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
Loosening	Count	1	0	1
	%Of Total	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%
Median nerve Injury	Count	0	1	1
	% Of Total	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
Pin tract infection	Count	1	0	1
	%Of Total	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%
Stiffness of MCP joint, Pintract Infection	Count	1	0	1
	%Of Total	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%
Stiffness of MCP joint, CRPS	Count	1	0	1
	%Of Total	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%
Superficial radial nerve neuropraxia	Count	1	0	1
	%Of Total	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%
Total	Count	30	30	60
	%Of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
P Value		0.350		

Table 8: Group Statistics

Group Statistics						
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	P-value
AGE	Group A (ex-fix)	30	40.66	11.80103	2.15456	.930
	Group B (Plating)	30	40.40	11.71383	2.13864	
Duration Of Surgery (Minutes)	Group A (ex-fix)	30	47	10.22168	1.86622	<.001
	Group B (Plating)	30	61	9.59526	1.75185	
Trauma To Surgery Duration (Days)	Group A (ex-fix)	30	2.20	.61026	.11142	0.85
	Group B (Plating)	30	2.56	.97143	.17736	
Hospital Stay (Day)	Group A (ex-fix)	30	3.63	.66868	.12208	.002
	Group B (Plating)	30	4.23	.72793	.13292	
Time Of Union (Weeks)	Group A (ex-fix)	30	10.10	2.29467	.41895	.592
	Group B (Plating)	30	9.76	2.48698	.45406	
Green O "Brien scoring system	Group A (ex-fix)	30	82.83	7.66579	1.39958	.259
	Group B (Plating)	30	85.33	9.79825	1.78891	

DISCUSSION

Age Distribution

In the current study the mean age at presentation for patients treated by external fixator was 40.66 ± 11.80 (range 20-55 years) and patients treated by ORIF with buttress plating was 40.40 ± 11.71 (range 20-55). Shukla et al. reported similar observations.⁹ Rizzo et al. reported average age at presentation as 45 years in the external fixator group and 48 years in the ORIF group.¹²

Sex Distribution

In the current study 40 (66.7%) patients were male and 20 (33.3%) female with a male female ratio of 2:1. Fakoor et al. in a study reported 75.1% Male patients compared to 24.9% female patients suffered from distal and radius intra-articular fractures.¹⁴

Mode of Injury

In our study 39 (65%) patients had a high velocity trauma mostly by Road Traffic Accident 31 (52%) and 21(35 %) had a low

velocity trauma predominantly by fall on outstretched hand, most of which were osteoporotic patients. In a study done on 180 patients by Phadnis et al,²² it was suggested that increasing incidence of these injuries may be attributed to an ageing population (osteoporotic fractures) and the growing participation in outdoor pursuits (higher energy fractures).

Dominant Extremity Affection

In our study 33 (55%) patients had their dominant extremity affected, out of which 17 (28%) patients were in the external fixator group and 16 (27%) patients were in the buttress plating group. In a study conducted by Rizzo et al.³⁰ (54.5%) patients had their dominant extremity affected out of a total of 55 patients.¹²

Frykman's Classification

In our study majority of Frykman type VIII was treated by ex-fix with 9(15%) while plating is done in type VII 9(15%) mainly. In a study conducted by Siripakarn Y et al. reported the same results.² Kapoor et al. In this study 22 (44%) patients suffered an AO classification Type B fracture with 11 (22%) patients being treated by External Fixation + K-wires group and Plating each. In the Type B fracture patients all 11(22%) patients treated by External Fixator + K-wires had Excellent or Good results at the final 8 months assessment whereas in the Plating group 9 (18%) patients had Excellent or Good results and 2 (4%) patients having Fair or Poor results.²⁰

Duration & Precaution During Surgery

In our study the average duration of surgery for Group 1 (External Fixator + K-wires) was 47.00±10.20 minutes, whereas in Group 2 (Plating) was 61.00±9.51 with significant p-value of < 0.001. In a study conducted by Shukla et al. mean surgery time was 35.1±2.5 mins in the external fixation group and 56.5± 2.7 mins in the volar plate fixation group.⁹

Not crossing the watershed line landmark is crucial during the placement of hardware plate during the ORIF and plating procedure with care taken to prevent damage to the neurovascular structures (radial artery and median nerve) around the operative field. Care must be taken not to damage the superficial radial nerve while drilling for and inserting schanz pins in the radius during the procedure of external fixation. Over-distraction should be prevented while using the external fixator and pin tract care is a must.

Duration of Hospital Stay

In our study 14 (23%) patients were discharged after 3 days of hospital stay, 45 (75%) were discharged in 4-6 days, 7 (14%) and 1 (1.7%) in >6 days from the time of admission.

Average duration of stay being 3.94 days. Average duration of the stay for the External Fixator group being 3.63 days, whereas with the plating group 4.23 days. Duration of hospital stay proved to be significant with a p-value of 0.028.

Modified Green O' Brien Scoring System

In our study majority of patients treated by Ex-fix having score of 80 which was n=10(16.7%) while for plating it was score of 90 which was n=9 (15%). P value of this study is 0.361 which is not significant.

Time to Fracture Union

In our study the average time to fracture union for the External Fixator group was 10.10±2.2 weeks, whereas for the Plating group it was 9.76±2.4 weeks, with a p-value of 0.592, which was not significant. This corresponds to a study done by Oliveira et al.²¹

Final Outcome

These results were similar to a study conducted by Shukla et al. on 110 patients where he concluded that 85.5 % of patients treated with external fixation and 73.3% of patients treated with volar plating had an excellent or good result.⁹ Kapoor et al. reported 80% and 63% with good or excellent results in external fixation and volar plating groups respectively and recommend that displaced severely comminuted intra-articular fractures should be treated with an external fixator.²⁰ Gradl et al. Reported 100% and 97.5% with good or excellent results in these two groups respectively.²³

In our study majority of patients treated by Ex-fix n=18(30%) had good final outcome while patient treated by plating n=14(23.3%) had excellent final outcome.

P-value of this study is 0.012 which is significant.

Complication

Complications were seen in 10 (16.66%) patients in the study conducted. 5(8.33%) were in Group A (External fixator) and 5(8.33%) belonged to Group B (Plating). P value for this study is 0.350 which is not significant.

CONCLUSION

Duration of surgery was significantly lesser in the external fixation group with lesser surgical soft tissue trauma. There was a significant difference in the duration of hospital stay in the two study groups with the patients in the external fixation group requiring a shorter hospital stay.

Early post-operative mobilization is possible in the patients treated with ORIF and plating but does not affect the final outcome with rigorous physiotherapy initiated in the patients treated with external fixator once implant is removed. Rigorous physiotherapy is key to avoiding post-operative arthritis and achieving good range of motion in the external Fixator group. Time to fracture union is similar in both study groups as the acceptable radiological criteria are met.

REFERENCES

1. Rekli DA, Regazzoni P, Fractures of the distal end of radius treated by internal fixation and early function. A preliminary report of 20 cases. *J Bone and Joint Surgery (Br)*. 1996;78(4):588-92.
2. Siripakarn Y, Niempong S, Boontanapibul K. The comparative study of reliability and reproducibility of distal radius fracture classification among AO Frykman and Fernandez classification systems. *J Med Association, THAILAND* 2013; 96(1):52-7.
3. Medlone CP. Open treatment for displaced articular fractures of the distal radius. *Clin Orthop*. 1986;202:103-11
4. Cybun TA, Dynamic external fixators for comminuted intra articular fractures of the distal end of the radius, *J Bone and Joint Surgery*, 1987; 2:248.
5. Fitoussi F, Ip WY, Chow SP, Treatment of displaced intraarticular fracture of the distal end of radius with plate. *J Bone Joint Surgery* 1997; 9-A (B):1303-12.
6. Kaempffe F A, Walker KM. External fixation of distal radius fracture. Effect of distraction on outcome. *Clin. Orthop*. 2000;1(380):220-225.
7. Emami K, Mjoberg B, A safer pin position for external fixation of radial fractures. *Orthop Clin N-Am*. 2000; 31(9):749-750.
8. Rogachevsky RA, Scott RL, Applegate BL et al. Treatment of severely comminuted intra articular fractures of the distal end of

the radius by open reduction and combined internal and external fixation. J and B Surgery 2001; 83A(4):504-519.

9. Shukla R, Jain RK, al. External fixation vs locking plate for displaced Sharma NK, et intra articular fracture of distal end of radius, a perspective randomized comparative study of the functional outcomes. J Orthop traumatol.2014;15(4):265-270.

10. In the treatment of unstable intra articular fracture of distal end of radius. Hand (New York).2008;3(2):111-117.

11. Hudak PL, AmDIO pc, Bombardir C. Development of an uppr extremity outcome measure. The DASH (disabilities of the arm, shoulder and hand) Am. J. Indust Med.1996;29:602-608.

12. Rizzo M, Katt Ba, C Arothers JT. Comparison of locked Volar PINNING AND External Fixation in the treatment of Unstable Intraarticular Distal Radius Fractures. Hand (New York).2008;3(2); 111-17.

13. Richard MJ, WartJin B DA, Riboh J. Analysis of the complications of the palmar plating vs external fixation for fractures of the distal end of the radius. J Hand Surg.Am.2011;36:1614-20.

14. Fakoor M, Mohammad hoseini P, Displaced fractures of the distal radius; open reduction with external fixation vs bridging external fixation. Trauma Mon.2015;20(3);17631.

15. Obert L. Anatomy and biomechanics of distal radius fractures, a literature review. Chir Main .2012;31(6);287-297'

16. Imatanij, Akia K, Yamaguchi K, et al. An anatomical study of the watershed line on the volar distal aspect of radius, implications of plate placement and avoidance of tendon ruptures. The Journal Of hand surgery,2012;31:37(8); 1550-4.

17. Augal P, Lida H, Jiang Y et al. Distal radius fractures mechanisms of injury and strength prediction by bone mineral assessment. Journal Of Orthopedic research.1998;16(5):629-35..

18. Jupiter JB, Fernandez DL, Tob CL, Operative treatment of volar intra articular fractures of the distal end of the radius. J Bone and Joint surgery (Am);1997;22:777- 84.

19. Carter PR, Freidrich HA, Laseler GF, Open reduction and internal fixation unstable distal radius fractures with a low profile plate. A multicentre study of 73 fractures. J Hand Surgery (Am). 1998;23:300-307.

20. Kapoor H, Agarwal A, Dhaon BK, Displaced intra articular fractures of distal radius, a comparative study of results following closed reduction, external fixation, and open education with internal fixation. Injury,2000;31(2):75-79

21. de Oliveria RK, Binz Ma, Ferreira Mt , et al, Osteotomy of the distal radius using fixed angle volar plate. Rev Bras Ortho. 2015;47(2):173-185.

22. Phadnis J, Trompeter A, Gallagher K, et al. Mid term functional outcome after the internal fixation of distal radius fractures, Journal of orthopaedic surgery and research.

23. Gradi G, Wendt M, Mittmeier T et al . Non- bridging external fixation employing multiplanar K –wires versus volar locked plating for dorsally displaced fractures of the distal radius. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.2013;133(5);595-602.

Source of Support: Nil. **Conflict of Interest:** None Declared.

Copyright: © the author(s) and publisher. IJMRP is an official publication of Ibn Sina Academy of Medieval Medicine & Sciences, registered in 2001 under Indian Trusts Act, 1882.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Cite this article as: Debasish Panigrahi, Naveen Kumar Singh. A Comparative Study of Management of Intraarticular Fracture Distal End Of Radius (External Fixator versus ORIF with Buttress Plating). Int J Med Res Prof. 2018 Sept; 4(5):341-47. DOI:10.21276/ijmrp.2018.4.5.079