SUPRACONDYLAR FRACTURE OF THE HUMERUS IN CHILDREN
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Humeral supracondylar fractures are the second most common fractures seen in children and young teenagers (16.6%). They represent 60-70% of all the elbow fractures. The maximum incidence is found between the fifth and seventh year of age, slightly more often in boys and on non-dominant hand.

We performed a retrospective study in our clinic which included 105 patients admitted to our facility during the period from January, 2008 to April, 2012. The included patients had humeral supracondylar fracture either type 2 or type 3 (Gartland classification). At the moment of admission the median age was 7.26 years. All the patients were treated during the first 12 hours, with no more than two attempts of closed reposition. Sixteen patients with type 2 fracture were treated by analgosedation, closed reduction followed by cast immobilization. All other patients were treated after induction of general anesthesia. Sixteen patients were treated by percutaneous fixation of the fragments after closed reduction and 73 were treated with open reduction and pinning with different number and positions of „K” wires.

None of the patients had deep tissue infection; four patients had pin site infection. Three patients had cubitus varus deformity, two patients had elbow contracture, five patients had temporary limitation in extension, and one patient had iatrogenic lesion of the ulnar nerve. This makes 14.2% complication rate in our series. All the fractures healed in the expected period (3–4 weeks). Bauman’s angle, carrying angle and functional factor were measured postoperatively.

Closed reposition with pinning, using radiographic control, for the dislocated supracondylar humeral fractures is the safest, as well as the least time consuming and cost-effective method. We also suggest treating these fractures within 12 hours and conversion of closed into open reposition in case of lacking crepitations (possibility of interposition of soft tissues between fragments). Acta Medica Medianae 2012;51(3):5-12.
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Introduction

Humeral supracondylar fractures (Figure 1) are the second most common fractures seen in children and young teenagers (16.6%) (1). They account for 60-70% of all the elbow fractures (2, 3). The maximum incidence is found between the fifth and seventh year, slightly more often in boys and on non-dominant hand (4,5). In 2-5% of cases, an associated fracture on the same side occurs - radial, ulnar or both (6).

By evaluating 4.520 cases of supracondylar fractures of humerus found in 31 series in the literature, Wilkins established the classification regarding the mechanism of trauma and displacement course: 90-98% of all fractures belong to the so-called extension type occurring by falling on the extended arm, and less than 5% belong to the flexion type occurring with direct trauma to the elbow (7).
Gartland established the classification based on the level of dislocation of fragments (Figure 2): type 1 – undislocated fragments, type 2 – dislocated fragments, but with preserved integrity of posterior cortex, and type 3 – complete dislocation without any contact between fragments (the classification determines the surgical approach) (8). The modified Gartland classification is frequently used, consisting of one more type – type 4 – complete dislocation of multidirectional fragments (Leitch et al.) (9).

The goal of the treatment of humeral supracondylar fractures in children still remains a great challenge for the pediatric orthopedic surgeons. A possible association between neurovascular trauma and non-negligible percentage of residual functional deformities categorizes these types of fractures as one of the most difficult entities found in pediatric bone trauma (10,11). Possible modalities for treating these kinds of fractures are: skeletal traction, closed reposition followed by cast immobilization, percutaneous pinning following open/closed reposition, and open reposition followed by inner fixation (12-15).

The treatment of Gartland type 3 fractures has different approaches, but all type 3 fractures have uniform complications including neurovascular injury, cubitus varus, Volkmann’s ischemic contracture and contracture of the elbow (16).

Supracondylar fracture of the humerus (if it is not an open fracture, and if it does not jeopardize the neurovascular structures) should be treated during the same day, with the team of trained surgeons using radioscopic imaging. In some cases, during the night, the fracture cannot be treated in the aforesaid manner; therefore, it is wiser to wait for the next day, since postponing the operation for the next 12 hours does not affect the final result (17,18).

Aim

The aim of this study was to emphasize the importance of treating supracondylar humeral fractures in children at the optimum time, in the right place, under the right conditions (e.g. equipment: a mobile C-shaped X-ray image Intensifier and TV chain) and by specialized team, thus preventing and minimizing possible complications that could lead to permanent functional and cosmetic deficits.

Materials and methods

We performed a retrospective study in the Clinic for Pediatric Surgery in Niš, Serbia. The study included 105 patients admitted to our facility during the period from January, 2008 to April, 2012. The included patients had humeral supracondylar fracture either type 2 or type 3 (Gartland classification). The most common causes of injury include a simple fall, fall from a bicycle, injury during sports activities, and fall from a height. At the time of admission, the median age of patients was 7.26 years (2 to 14-year-old children) and 67.6% of the patients were boys. All the fractures were closed and belonged to the extension type (98%); only one patient had flexion type fracture. Forty three patients (41%) had injury occurring on their left elbow, and 62 patients (59%) had the right elbow injury. The aforesaid ratio (41:59) is also seen in type 2 and type 3 fractures, respectively. Only two patients presented with an associated injury of the same arm; one of them had radial and ulnar fractures, and the other one had distal ulnar fracture. Five patients (4.7%) were presented with neurological deficits on the admission; three patients had median nerve injury, and two patients had radial nerve injury. There were no patients with any vascular injury. All the patients were treated during the first 12 hours, with no more than two attempts of closed reposition.
Sixteen patients (15.2%) with type 2 fracture received sedatives (Amp. Flormidal® - midazolam) enhanced with analgesic (metamizol); these patients were treated only by closed reposition followed by cast immobilization. All the other patients were treated after induction of general anesthesia. In 30 patients (28.8%), we tried to perform a closed reposition initially. This involved hand traction with elbow in extension, followed by fracture correction in the frontal and sagittal areas. Afterwards, we placed the elbow in flexion to keep the corrected position in order to perform the radiographic verification of the fracture site. Adequate position of the fragments was achieved in 16 cases (15%), allowing us to perform percutaneous fixation of the fragments - 7 patients (6.6%) had two parallel “K” wires placed laterally, 5 patients (4.7%) had two crossed „K“ wires, and 4 patients (3.8%) had three wires (two placed laterally and one medially). The other 14 cases were treated with open reposition after two attempts of closed reposition. Fifty-nine patients (56%) were initially treated with open reposition followed by pinning with two, three or four „K“ wires. In 50%, we used the posterior approach, and in 20% the lateral approach.

Table 1. Demographic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n=105 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 7.26 ± 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 34(32.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 71(67.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right 43 (40.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left 62 (59.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant arm 39 (37.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dominant arm 66 (62.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed 16(15.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed + pinning 16(15.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open 73 (70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior approach 52(50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral approach 21 (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average postoperative follow-up was 6.2 months. The follow-up included the first, second, third and sixth postoperative week control examination, and at months 3, 6 and 12 post-operatively. The "K“ wires were extracted 3-4 weeks after surgery, and in most cases the upper arm plaster splint was worn for 3-6 weeks post-operatively. After removing the plaster immobilization the patients were recommended active physical therapy. During postoperative follow-up, all the patient’s results of treatment were estimated according to Flynn criteria (19), which is a proved clinical criterion for follow-up of the patients with supracondylar humeral fractures.

Besides the clinical grading, we also evaluated the carrying angle (20) and functional factor, as well as Bauman’s angle on post-operative radiographs and radiographs made during the last clinical examination.

Table 2. “Flynn criteria”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Cosmetic factor – loss of carrying angle (grades)</th>
<th>Functional factor – loss of flexion / extension (grades)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>&gt; 15</td>
<td>&gt; 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Flynn criteria, based on measuring both factors (carrying angle and functional factor) in the same patient, the worse result was considered as the relevant one. The limiting factor in our study was the inability to follow patients for a longer period of time, because some studies mention the possibility of cubitus varus development up to one year after the fracture. Yet, most studies included a follow-up period of six months.
Results

None of the patients had a deep tissue infection. Four patients (3 open and 1 closed reposition) had a superficial infection around the "K" wires, which was resolved by prescribing the oral antibiotics. Three patients (open reposition) had cubitus varus deformity, 2 patients (open reposition) had elbow contracture, 5 patients (4 open and 1 closed reposition) had temporary limitation in extension, and 1 patient (open reposition of a comminutive fracture) had iatrogenic lesion of the ulnar nerve; this makes 14.2% complication rate in our series. All the fractures healed in the expected period (3–4 weeks). There were no residual vascular deficits. Primarily presented neurological deficit was seen in 5 patients; all the symptoms disappeared during the follow-up period (average: 4.5 months). There were no requests for scar excision.

Postoperative average of Bauman’s angle was 77.2°±1.1° and 74.5°±0.7° for the injured and healthy elbow, respectively. There was no statistically significant difference in comparing Bauman’s angle after the intervention and on the last control examination (p>0.05).

We also measured the carrying angle of both elbows (the injured and the healthy one) on the last clinical examination. Seventy-five patients (71.4%) had reduction between 0° and 5°, 18 patients (17.1%) had reduction between 6° and 10°, 7 patients (6.6%) had reduction between 11° and 15°, and 5 patients (4.7%) had reduction of carrying angle above 15°.

We also measured the functional factor (flexion and extension in the elbow); 65 patients (62%) had less than 5° loss, 27 patients (25.75%) had loss between 6° and 10°, 10 patients (9.5%) had loss between 11° and 15°, and 3 patients (2.85%) had loss of flexion/extension above 16° (Table 3).

Table 3. Results of reduction of fracture based on Flynn criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final results obtained by evaluation of Flynn criteria showed satisfactory results in 97% of all the patients (100 patients), and in only five cases (4.7%), the outcome was unsatisfactory. Among treated patients with closed reduction and pinning and treated with open reduction, regardless of the method of approach and the number of wires used to stabilize the fracture, there was no significant statistical difference (p>0.05).

Discussion

The aim of the treatment of dislocated supracondylar humeral fractures is to achieve satisfactory functional and cosmetic results and avoid complications (decreasing complication rate). Lately, many people arouse the issue of the cost-benefit effect of the treatment (method of treatment and days of the in-patient care).

Traction is still one of the electoral methods for the treatment, but the length of treatment and high incidence of cubitus varus are certainly pushing this method in the background (22). Closed reposition followed by percutaneous pinning is considered to be the golden standard for the type 2 and 3 fractures (Gartland classification) (23). There is a smaller probability for compartment syndrome development and the risk for secondary fragment dislocation is also lower compared to closed reposition followed only by cast immobilization (24).

Compared to open surgery, it reduces the chances of elbow contracture, infection, myositis ossifican costs decrease (no suture materials, no
prolonged antibiotic prophylaxis and prolonged hospitalization).

Several questions still remain unanswered, even though many authors tried to give the proper guidelines. Is it safe to place the "K" wire medially (25)? Some have proven the injury rate of the ulnar nerve 4-15%, and the rate goes even higher if the surgeon tries to place the pin when elbow maximally flexed (26,27). Therefore, Khurram B et al. suggest obligatory incision above the medial epicondyle and visualizing the ulnar nerve with possible placing the elbow in extension before placing the "K" wire (28), while others believe that all this can be avoided by parallel positioning of the "K" wire, only from the lateral side.

Lateral pinning has many followers (29, 30); there are many articles concerning very good results if one applies this manner of pinning. However, biomechanical studies have shown a better elbow stability if "K" wires are placed in a crossed manner, compared to parallel placing of the "K" wires (31). There is a greater re-dislocation rate and inability to measure full extension of the injured elbow during the operation; therefore, one cannot measure the carrying angle.

The open method of treatment (32) regardless of the approach (which is left to their interests and experience of the surgeon) in the literature is primarily reserved for multidirectional fractures (Type IV by Leitch-in - modified Gartland classification), fractures with neurovascular injury, open fractures, fractures with signs of Volkmann’s ischemia, fractures with a huge edema with no modality for closed reduction, and after unsuccessful attempts of closed reposition.

A number of authors report a lack of mobile C-shaped X-ray image Intensifier as an important detail in an attempt to solve this fracture by closed method.

Figure 7. Open reduced and fixed fracture with two laterally and one medially placed "K" wires

Figure 8. Closed reduced and percutaneously fixed fracture laterally by two placed "K" wires
Our specimen included all the treating modalities, except for traction. Apart from five unsatisfactory results, all the other results were satisfactory judging by the world-wide accepted standards.

Equally good results were achieved by treating patients both with open and closed reposition, both of which were followed by pinning, which correlates to accepted standards. The decision of positioning pins in a crossed way or parallel placement of them depends only on the decision of a surgeon and his/her affinity. Besides one case of comminutive fracture, we had no cases of ulnar nerve injury, even in cases with very swollen elbow, with having subsequent difficulties to identify the medial epicondyle. Percentage of related complications (14.2%) completely corresponds to the percentage in the literature, up to 16% (33, 34). The complications are classified as a local pin site infection, ulnar nerve injury, temporary elbow contracture, non-union, and permanent functional disorders. It is also of great importance that there are no significant changes between injured and healthy side at the end of the follow-up.

Unfortunately, for the inability to use C-shaped X-ray image intensifier in the operation room all the time (period: 2008-2010), one group of fractures that could have been successfully treated by closed reposition was treated by the open one. Almost all the closed fractures in these situations were accessed by posterior approach, with no postoperative complications.

Conclusion

Closed reposition with pinning, under radiographic control, for dislocated supracondylar fractures of the elbow is the safest, as well as the least time consuming and cost-effective method, that provides stable fixation and excellent results. The alternative manner is small incision above the medial epicondyle and identification of the ulnar nerve. Trying to avoid damage of the zone of growth, further comminution and elbow contracture, we recommend maximum two attempts of closed reduction. We also suggest treating these fractures within twelve hours and conversion of closed into open reposition in case of lacking crepitations (possibility of interposition of soft tissues between fragments).

Open reposition should be reserved for complicated cases, and cases where more than 12 hours after sustaining the injury have elapsed. Length of exposure to ionizing radiation, the patient and the whole operating staff, the definitive effect of the chosen operative treatment directly depends on the surgeon's experience and knowledge (35,36).
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SUPRAKONDILARNI PRELOM HUMERUSA KOD DECE

Nikola Bojović, Zoran Marjanović, Dragoljub Živanović, Nina Đorđević, Miroslav Stojanović, Goran Janković i Nikola Vacić

Suprakondilarni prelom humerusa je drugi najčešći prelom kostiju kod dece i mladih tinejdžera (16,6%). Čini između 60 i 70% svih preloma lakta. Njegov pik je između pete i sedme godine života, nešto češće na nedominantnoj ruci i kod dečaka.


Nijedan od povređenih nije imao infekciju dubokih tkiva, ali je njih četvoro imalo superficijalnu infekciju oko „K” igala. Cubitus varus deformitet imala su tri povređena, dva kontrakturu u laktu, pet privremenu limitiranost ekstenzije i jedan jatrogenu povredu n. ulnaris-a. Ukupna komplikacija bilo je kod 14,2%. Sve frakture su zasle u očekivanom periodu (3-4 nedelje). Baumanov ugao, noseći ugao i funkcionalni faktor mereni su postoperativno.

Zatvorena repozicija i perkutano pinovanje "K" iglama, uz Rtg kontrolu, za dislocirane suprakondilarne frakture lakta predstavlja najbezbedniju i vremenski i ekonomski najefektivniju metodu, koja daje stabilnu fiksaciju i odlične rezultate. Preporučujemo rešavanje frakture u okviru 12 časa od prijema i konverziju u otvorenu repoziciju ukoliko ne dođe do senzacije kreptizacija u toku zatvorene repozicije, jer se onda najčešće radi o umetanju mekih tkiva između fragmenata. Acta Medica Medianae 2012;51(3):5-12.

Ključne reči: suprakondilarni prelom, lakat, repozicija, fiksacija