

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

OUTCOME OF TWO COLUMN ACETABULAR FRACTURES TREATED OPERATIVELY THROUGH SINGLE POSTERIOR APPROACH

Muhammad Naeem Ur Razaq, Muhammad Ayaz Khan*, Abbas Ali*

Department of Orthopaedics, Ayub Teaching Hospital, Abbottabad, *Khyber Teaching Hospital, Peshawar-Pakistan

Background: Involvement of both columns in acetabular fractures is a common presentation; these fractures create a challenging situation for the surgeons in terms of understanding the dimensions of osseous injury and selection of surgical approach. The study was done with an objective to evaluate the efficacy of single posterior approach for acetabular fractures involving both columns directly reducing the posterior wall and column and indirectly reducing the anterior column. **Method:** An evaluation of 25 adult patients 18 male and 7 female presenting in the accident and emergency department of Khyber Teaching Hospital from December 2013 to June 2015 having acetabular fracture involving both the anterior and posterior column were included in this case series study. All patients were operated within 8 days of injury by a single operating team. Exposing and reducing the posterior acetabular column through KockerLengenbeck approach did open reduction and internal fixation with reconstruction plate and cortical screws. Additional lag screw was used to stabilize anterior column after indirect reduction with confirmation through C- arm and digital palpation through the greater sciatic notch. Patients were followed up for 6 months and Harris Hip score was evaluated after the end of the follow up period and the result was analysed. **Result:** Majority of the patients 20 out of 25 had Harris hip score more than 90 after 6 months of the operative management. **Conclusion:** It is suggested that acetabular fractures involving both the acetabular columns in certain situations, may be managed by a single posterior approach as it is associated with good clinical outcome and involves lesser soft tissue complications. **Keywords:** Acetabular fracture; Management; Outcome; Two column acetabular fracture; Posterior approach

J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad 2016;28(4):718–20

INTRODUCTION

Acetabular fractures usually result from high-energy trauma such as road traffic accident or fall from height.¹ Open reduction and internal fixation remains the gold standard treatment as anatomical reduction and stable fixation is the primary goal.^{2,3}

Combined transverse-posterior wall type account for 24–32% of acetabular fractures^{1,4,5} Mal reduction can lead to post-traumatic arthritis and currently no authors denies the benefits of anatomical reduction of the displaced articular fragments.⁶ However, controversy exists regarding the surgical approach for the management of fractures involving both anterior and posterior columns of acetabulum.

The convention method of fixation of both columns separately through combined anterior and posterior approaches or extensile approaches have been reported to have significant intraoperative and postoperative complications.^{7,8} Keeping in view the aggressive nature of combined anterior and posterior approaches and extensile approach the concept of management of these fractures with a single posterior approach emerged.⁴ This study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of a single approach for the management of fractures involving both columns particularly the combined transverse and posterior wall pattern.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

A descriptive case series study was carried out in department of Orthopaedic surgery unit Khyber Teaching Hospital Peshawar. Patients presenting in accident and Emergency department with acetabular fractures involving both columns, from December 2013 to June 2015 were included in the study. Skeletally immature patients, patients with delayed presentation more than four weeks or patients having associated abdominal or head injury, which required intervention, were excluded from the study. Acetabular fractures falling in I and J of Judet classification were also not included in which anterior approach was unavoidable.

All patients were operated within 8 days of injury by a single operating team. Open reduction and internal fixation with reconstruction plate and cortical screws was done by exposing and reducing the posterior acetabular column through KockerLengenbeck approach. Anatomical reduction of posterior wall and column was achieved in all patients as first step of the surgery. It was followed by definitive fixation with plate and screws. Additional lag screw was used in some cases to stabilize anterior column after indirect reduction with confirmation through C – arm and digital palpation through the greater sciatic notch.

AP and Judet radiographic views confirmed maintenance of reduction postoperatively. 3rd generation cephalosporin, as per hospital protocol, were administered postoperatively for five days. The median hospital stay was three days (ranging from two to five days). Wound dressing done on alternate days till the healing of wound and stitches removed on the 10th day. Quadriceps exercises were advised as pain permitted. Patients were brought out of bed as early as possible and were kept non-weight bearing. They were advised to use walker for locomotion until full weight bearing was permitted after evidence of radiological union (on average 12 weeks). No pharmacological prophylaxis against deep-vein thrombosis (DVT) was used; however, mechanical prophylaxis was done beginning on 1st postoperative day.

Patients were followed up regularly up to 6 Months post operatively and clinical assessment done. Harris hip score was evaluated after the end of 6 month follow period and results were analysed. Patients who were unable to come regularly because of poor economic conditions were contacted telephonically and Harris hip score evaluated and documented of analysed. Patients who were unable to come regularly because of poor economic conditions were contacted telephonically and Harris hip score evaluated and documented for analysis.

RESULTS

Out of 25 patients, 18 were male and 7 were female. The mean age was 39.7 ranging from 26 to 57 years. Out of 25 patients 20(80%) the Harris hip score was more than 90 at the end of six month follow up. The basic score was 95 in which case the only limiting factors to patient's pre injury status were that the patients walking ability was limited to six blocks and slightly limited flexion at hip joint. On the other hand the least score in this study was 40 seen in the patient who had comminuted fracture dislocation of the hip joint and proximal femur as well.

DISCUSSION

Acetabular fractures are high-energy trauma fractures in which involvement of both of the columns is usually seen. This happens because in a dash board injury for instance, force applied along the long axis of the femur is transmitted to the hip joint and head of the femur acts as hammer and disrupts the cavity in which it is contained.¹ The displaced fragments if not reduced back to their anatomical position can alter the forces acting uniformly in the acetabular cavity and this can therefore lead to cartilage degeneration and post traumatic arthritis.

In the management of acetabular fractures there are two basic questions, which need answer. Firstly, what is the classification of the acetabular fracture and secondly which surgical approach is needed for accurate reduction of the fracture fragments. In complex acetabular fractures, combined or extensile or combined approaches affect the functional outcome. The idea of plating of the anterior and the posterior column via two different surgical approaches is considered to be very aggressive as remarkable complications have been reported, like massive haemorrhage, deep wound infection, and functional heterotopic ossification.^{7,8}

The study by Griffin *et al.* reported the outcome of extended Iliofemoral approach for the management of one hundred and six patients with fracture acetabulum with associated fracture pattern. Most of the patients had a both column fracture. Moderate to severe heterotopic ossification developed in thirty-two patients (30%), with 8.5% of the patients requiring an operation for excision.⁹

Keeping in view the hazards of combined approaches such fractures may be reduced by a single posterior approach. Posterior approach is adopted because posterior column is the major weight-bearing component of the acetabulum and hence no compromise is expected in its anatomical reduction. In certain complex acetabular fractures like transverse posterior column fracture, the adequate posterior column reduction implies adequate anterior column fracture as well.^{1,5} However, intraoperative verification with fluoroscopic images is mandatory in this regard. Keeping this point in consideration this study was conducted and the acetabular fractures with T pattern and two column displaced fractures with spur sign were not included in the study as it was not possible to achieve their adequate reduction through single posterior approach.

The functional outcome of the operative procedure was done by evaluation of Harris Hip Score after 6 months of surgery. This is a time tested scoring system for the evaluation of hip function, which is based on best response form the patient regarding different aspects of life.¹⁰ Operative management through single posterior approach yield good. Harris Hip score in majority of the patients, i.e., 80%.

Good Harris Hip score was also observed in a couple of cases in which reduction of the anterior column was not accurate as revealed in the immediate postoperative radiographs. However, by the end of follow up period in the study not only the end of follow up period in the study not only the functional hip score was found to be good but the radiographs also showed union of anterior column in progress.

The authors therefore feel that in certain cases if there is adequate indirect reduction of anterior column, we feel that it is not necessary to fix the anterior column.

CONCLUSION

Acetabular fractures involving both the acetabular columns, in selected patients, can manage by a single posterior approach as it is associated with good clinical outcome and involves lesser soft tissue complications.

AUTHORS'S CONTRIBUTION

All authors contributed equally.

REFERENCES

1. Letournel E. Acetabular fractures: classification and treatment. Clin Orthop Relat Res 1980;(151):81–106.
2. Matta JM. Operative treatment of acetabular fractures through the ilioinguinal approach: a 10- year perspective. J Orthop Trauma 2006;20(1 Suppl):S20–9.
3. Ponsen KJ, Joosse P, Schigt A, Goslings JC, Luitse JS. Internal fracture fixation using the stoppa approach in pelvic ring and acetabular fractures: technical aspects and operative results. J Trauma 2006;61(3):662–7.
4. Giordano V, Pecegueiro do Amaral N, Franklin CE, Pallottino A, Pires E Albuquerque R, Giordano M. Functional outcome after operative treatment of displaced fractures of the acetabulum: a 12 – month to 5-year follow – up investigation. Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg 2007;33(5):520–7.
5. Judet R, Judet J, Letournel E. Fractures of the acetabulum: classification and surgical approaches for open reduction: preliminary report. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1964;46:1615–46.
6. Giordano V, do Amaral NP, Pallottino A, Pires e Albuquerque R, Franklin CE, Labronici PJ. Operative treatment of transverse acetabular fractures: is it really necessary to fix both columns? Int J Med Sci 2009;6(4):192–9.
7. Kaempfe FA, Bone LB, Border JR. Open Reduction and internal fixation of acetabular fractures: Heterotopic ossification and other complications of treatment. J Orthop Trauma 1991;5(4):439–45.
8. Oh CW, Kim PT, Park BC, Kim SY, Kyung HS, Jeon IH, *et al.* Results after operative treatment of transverse acetabular fractures. J Orthop Sci 2006;11(5):478–84.
9. Griffin DB, Beaulé PE, Matta JM. Safety and efficacy of the extended iliofemoral approach in the treatment of complex fracture of the acetabulum. J Bone Joint Surg Br 2005;87(10):1391–6.
10. Harris WH. Traumatic arthritis of the hip after dislocation and acetabular fractures: Treatment by mold arthroplasty. An end-result study using a new method of result evaluation. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1969;51(4):737–55.

Received: 11 May, 2016

Revised: 24 June, 2016

Accepted: 27 June, 2016

Address for Correspondence:

Dr. Muhammad Naeem ur Razzaq, Department of Orthopaedics, Ayub Teaching Hospital, Abbottabad-Pakistan

Cell: +92 314-9051883; 03365662746

Email: nrzaq@hotmail.com