



Functional Outcome of Proximal Femoral Nail (P.F.N) in the Management of Intertrochanteric and Subtrochanteric Fractures Femur

Authors

Dr Rajesh Kapila¹, Dr Partap Singh², Dr Sunil Mahajan³

^{1,2}Professor, Deptt.of Orthopaedics, Govt.Medical College, Amritsar, Punjab

³Junior Resident, Deptt.of Orthopaedics, Govt.Medical College, Amritsar, Punjab

Corresponding Author

Dr.Partap Singh

Email: Singhdr.partap@yahoo.in

Abstract

Background: The study was conducted to analyse the functional outcome of the treatment of stable and unstable Intertrochanteric and Subtrochanteric fractures of femur treated with Proximal Femoral Nail (PFN).

Methods: In this prospective study, 25 patients of either sex and aged above 18 years with intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures admitted to our institution were treated with Proximal Femoral Nail (PFN) from July 2015 to July 2017 and were followed up over a period of 6 months. The fractures were classified as per Boyd-Griffin and Russell-Taylor classifications. Clinical and radiographic analysis was done regularly till fracture union occurs. Assessment of the functional outcome was done by using Harris hip Scoring system at the end of 6 months.

Results: Out of 25 cases, 19 were males and 6 were females, in the age group of 21-78 years with the mean age of 49.24 years. Majority (76%) of the fractures showed radiological union by 20 weeks with the mean union time of 18.52 weeks. Excellent to good results were achieved in 80% of patients as per Harris hip score. Post-operative complications like delayed/non-union were seen in two patients. No case of screw cut-out or 'Z' effect were seen.

Conclusion: Based upon our experience and results we conclude that with good understanding of fracture biomechanics, accurate instrumentation and technique, proximal femoral nail (PFN) gives excellent clinical results in the management of all types of stable and unstable intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures of femur.

Keywords: Intertrochanteric fracture, Subtrochanteric fracture, Proximal femoral nail, Harris hip score.

Introduction

Proximal femoral fractures are a major cause of morbidity and mortality world over in view of

huge population, high road traffic accident rate and increasing age of population¹. Although these fractures can occur in any age group, two subsets

of patients are commonly observed. Either these fractures are seen in more elderly or in the younger age population. On the basis of anatomical location of fracture, proximal femoral fractures can be divided into neck of femur, intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures. Each requires special methods of treatment and has their own set of complications and controversies regarding the optimal method of management². Owing to high complication and mortality rates associated with conservative management³, these fractures are now managed surgically to achieve a stable fixation which allows early mobilization of patients, thus avoiding complications of prolonged immobilization. While both extramedullary and intramedullary implants can be used to treat these fractures, intramedullary implants allow more biological fixation and are load sharing devices. Extramedullary devices are always under stress because of bending strain which is not good for fracture whereas intramedullary devices are under axial strain which cause compression and thus helpful for fracture union. Gamma nail was the earliest version of intramedullary fixation devices. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Osteosynthesefragen (AO/ASIF) introduced the proximal femoral nail (PFN) in 1996.⁴ In view of these considerations, the study of surgical management of intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures with Proximal femoral nail (PFN) was undertaken to analyse the functional outcome and to evaluate the complications associated with proximal femoral nailing in such types of fractures.

Material And Methods:

25 adult patients of intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures of the femur admitted in our institution from July 2015 to July 2017 were prospectively analysed. The fractures were classified as per Boyd-Griffin and Russell-Taylor classifications for intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures respectively^{5,6}

Ethical approval was taken from the Institutional ethical committee prior to the initiation of this study. Informed consent was obtained from all the patients included in the study. Inclusion criteria included all patients above 18 years of age with intertrochanteric subtrochanteric fractures. Pathological fractures, open fractures and peri-prosthetic fractures were excluded from the study. After admission, clinical and radiological evaluation was done and all the patients were given necessary resuscitation and were maintained on skin traction pre-operatively. X-rays in both anteroposterior and lateral views were taken preoperatively and required blood investigations were done. Patients were operated after getting anaesthetic fitness and prophylactic ceftriaxone shot was given to all the patients 30 minutes before surgery.

Post-operatively foot end elevation was advised and sutures were removed usually after 10- 12 days. Patients were encouraged for quadriceps strengthening exercises and hip and knee mobilization in the immediate post-operative period as per subjective tolerance to pain. All the patients were called for follow up regularly till fracture union occurs and were analysed clinico-radiologically. The final functional assessment was done using Harris hip scoring system at the end of 6 months.

Results:

In our study we had following observations in preoperative (Table-1) and Postoperative assessment (Table-2)

Table 1

Sr No	Parameters	No of patients	Percentage
1	Type of fractures		
	Intertrochanteric	09	36.0%
	Subtrochanteric	16	64.0%
2	Intertrochanteric fracture (Boyd-Griffin classification)		
	Type 1	01	11.11%
	Type 2	04	44.44%
	Type 3	02	22.22%
	Type 4	02	22.22%
3	Subtrochanteric fractures (Russel-Taylor classification)		
	Type I	11	68.0%
	Type II	05	32.0%
4	Age distribution(Years)		
	21-30	05	20.0%
	31-40	03	12.0%
	41-50	05	20.0%
	51-60	05	20.0%
	61-70	04	16.0%
	71-80	03	12.0%
5	Sex Incidence		
	Male	19	76.0%
	Female	6	24.0%
6	Side affected		
	Right	14	56.0%
	Left	11	44.0%
7	Mechanism of Injury		
	Road traffic accidents	18	72.0%
	Fall from standing height/stairs etc	07	28.0%
8	Associated injuries		
	Head injury	01	4.0%
	Fracture both bone leg	02	8.0%
	Colle's fracture	02	8.0%
9	Post-traumatic time lag		
	Within 2days	07	28.0%
	3-5 days	14	56.0%
	More than 5 days	04	16.0%
10	Average duration of surgery(minutes)		
	<60	09	36.0%
	60-90	14	56.0%
	90-120	02	08.0%

Table 2

Sr.No	Parameters	No. of Patients	Percentage
1	Post-operative complications		
	Early		
	Superficial infection	02	08.0%
	Deep infection	01	04.0%

	Late Malunion with shortening Delayed/Nonunion Knee stiffness	02 02 01	08.0% 08.0% 04.0%
2	Radiological Union time(Weeks) Upto 16 16-20 20-24 More than 24	02 17 04 02	08.0% 68.0% 16.0% 08.0%
3	Harris hip score Excellent(90-100) Good(80-89) Fair(70-79) Poor(<70)	06 14 03 02	24.0% 56.0% 12.0% 08.0%

Discussion:

Intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures of femur are devastating injuries and have been recognized as a major challenge by the Orthopaedic surgeons. The aim of treating these fractures is to achieve stable surgical fixation, promote faster healing, early mobilization, & restore pre-fracture functional status in the shortest possible time.

Majority (76%) of patients in our study were males. RTA was the main cause of fractures in our study. Increasing urbanization, rise of vehicular traffic, non-obedience of traffic rules, rash driving, preponderance of outdoor activities and rash/drunken driving in males explains our observations. Road traffic accidents affect all age groups and all genders, however more than 83% of the victims are males.⁷ In Kumar M et al⁸ series RTA was the major cause of proximal femur fractures(86%). In series of Yadkikar SV et al⁹ 77% of patients were in the age group of 20-60 years. In our series majority of the subtrochanteric fractures were caused by road traffic accidents in the younger age group and low energy trauma like fall from standing height/stairs was the reason for most of the intertrochanteric fractures in elderly which was further enhanced by postmenopausal osteoporotic effects on the bones.

Head injury was managed conservatively. Fractures both bone leg were managed surgically before operating the index

case. Colle's fracture and clavicle fractures were managed conservatively.

We achieved 92% union rate by 24 weeks with overall mean of 18.52 weeks. The mean union time was 17.6 weeks and 19.07 weeks for intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures respectively. The early union of intertrochanteric fractures as compared to subtrochanteric fractures may be explained by the cancellous architecture and high vascular supply of intertrochanteric region. In Kumar M et al⁸ series the average union time for intertrochanteric fracture was 3.8 months (3.4-4.5 months) and 4 months (3.7-5.6 months) in subtrochanteric fractures.

The two patients with superficial infection responded well to the short course of antibiotics and sterile dressings. The patient with deep infection was treated with repeated debridement and courses of antibiotics as per culture sensitivity reports. This patient went into delayed/nonunion. Another patient who was very old and with associated medical comorbidities did not show union by 24 weeks. Two patients with varus malunion had a shortening of 1 cm. One patient developed knee stiffness due to associated osteoarthritis of knee joint. Complications like Z effect, reverse Z effect, cut-out or breakage of antirotational screw has been reported by Himanshu et al.¹⁰ We did not encounter any case of screw cut-out or 'Z' effect which compares well in studies of Kumar M et al⁸ and Reddy KR

et al¹¹ who reported no case of screw cut-out or 'Z' effect.

Patients with associated injuries had delayed partial weight bearing. We had excellent to good results in 80% of cases with average Harris hip score of 84.3. Results of our study compares well with various studies mentioned in the literature like Gowda PR et al¹² and Gulia AK¹³ et al¹⁰ which reported excellent to good scores in 83.33% of cases.



Conclusion:

Based on our experience and results we conclude that, with good understanding of fracture biomechanics, good preoperative planning, accurate instrumentation and surgical technique, proximal femoral nail (PFN) is an excellent implant in the management of all types of stable and unstable intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fracture patterns.

References:

1. Babhulkar S. Proximal femur fractures. Indian J Orthop. 2013;47(3):322
2. Mittal R, Banerjee S. Proximal femoral fractures: Principles of management and review of literature. J Clin Orthop Trauma. 2012 Jun;3(1):15-23
3. Jewett EL. One piece angle nail for trochanteric fractures. J Bone Joint Surg. 1941; 23: 803-10.
4. Gadegone Wm, Salphale YS. Proximal femoral nail-an analysis of 100 cases of proximal femoral fractures with an average follow up of 1 year. Int Orthop Jun 2007;31(3):403-408
5. Boyd HB, Griffin LL. Classification and treatment of trochanteric fractures. Archives of Surgery 1949;58(6):853-66.
6. Leung KS. Subtrochanteric fractures. Rockwood & Green's textbook of fractures in adults: 6th edition: Vol. 2: 1827-44.
7. Sharma SM. Road traffic accidents in India. Int J Adv Integ Med Sci 2016;1(2):57-64
8. Kumar M, Krishna Murthy T, Ankith N.V, Somashekar D. A prospective study of clinicoradiological outcome assessment in proximal femoral fractures treated with proximal femoral nail. International Journal of Contemporary Medical Research 2016;3(5):1343-1346
9. Yadkikar SV, Yadkikar VS, Prasad DV, and Marawar A. Prospective study of proximal femoral nail in management of trochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures of femur. Internat J of Biomedical and Advance Research 2015;6:4
10. Himanshu H, Prasad MB, Verma AK. Proximal femoral nail: A boon for pertrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures. IOSR J of dental and Med Sci. 2016;15(7):53-59.
11. Reddy KR, Dasaraiah CV, Shaik M, Ramesh kumar CK. A study on management of extracapsular trochanteric fractures by proximal femoral nail. J Orthop allied Sci 2016;4:58-64.
12. Gowda PR, Manjunath J. A prospective comparative study in the clinical outcome of trochanteric and subtrochanteric and subtrochanteric fractures femur with proximal femoral nail versus dynamic hip screw. Int J Res Orthop. 2017 Sep;3(5):986-990.
13. Gulia AK, Munde SL, Chaudhary V, Lamba D, Siwach K, Kumar S, Baheti S, Sheoran U. Functional outcome of Peritrochanteric fractures fixed with Proximal Femoral Nail in a Tertiary Rural Centre. Int J of Enhanced Res in Med & Dental Care. Jul 2015;2(7):19-2.