How to Prevent Distal Femoral Fracture Non-Union? Educational Corner
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Background

Distal femoral fracture (DFF) is a common injury that often has an association with high-energy trauma in young population or low-energy trauma in the elderly. In this fracture, it is an important target to achieve excellent reduction and lower limb alignment. Most of DFFs are currently treated by open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) with devices such as 95° angle-blade plates, condylar screws, locking plates, and retrograde intramedullary nailing (IMN) (1, 2). There are several complications following DFF fixation such as nonunion (NU). NU is a rare complication which can cause some major problems in the patient’s quality of life (QOL) and functions. The etiology and treatment of distal femur NU remain as significant challenge among orthopedic surgeons (3). Some known etiologies of NU include the complex fracture pattern, poor bone quality, poor reduction/fixation techniques, and patients’ comorbidities (4).

Signs of fracture union include pain-free weight bearing and radiological signs such as formation of bridging callus. On the other hand, patients with NU of distal femur have painful weight bearing. Absence of progressive radiological healing in 3-month intervals up to 6 months after the fixation suggests NU of the fracture site (2).

In the present study, the aim is to examine the preventable causes of distance femur NU in four categories including fracture characteristics, fixation characteristics, patient’s characteristics, and medications. This study was also developed to discuss how to prevent NU in DFFs as a significant complication, which affects patient’s QOL and functions.

Choosing Devices

Several devices have been used for fixation of DFFs with good outcomes including condylar buttress plate, retrograde IMN, angle blade plate, and 95-degree dynamic compression plate (DCS) (5, 6). Davison reported higher fixation failure rate and NU for condylar buttress plate and 95-degree DCS (7) compared to the locked plate in DFF (8).

Lateral Locking Plate (LLP) and NU

More recently, LLP has been considered as a standard method for DFF fixation because of some major advantages such as biomechanical properties to resist varus collapse, relative technical ease for implantation, and the opportunity to obtain multiple fixation points in the distal fragment, even in the setting of scant distal bone stock (9, 10). Some previous studies showed that distal femur fixation with LLP has good early outcomes (11, 12), with moderate NU rate and implant failure in later follow-ups (2, 13, 14). In the Southeastern Fracture Consortium in 2016, risk factors for NU and infection in a retrospective analysis on 339 patients fixed with LLP (185 pts) was compared with less invasive stabilization system (LISS) (154 pts). The study uncovered open fracture as a risk factor for NU and infection and reported a NU rate of 20% (more than previous studies). Their study showed no significant difference between LISS and LLP (15). Hoffman et al. reported a NU rate of 18% among 111 patients with DFF who were treated by LLP. They showed no relation between NU and neither the plate’s working length nor the length of comminution (16). Ricci et al. reported a 19% reoperation rate in 335 DDF patients (fixed by LLP) due to NU, infection, or implant failure. They recognized that open fracture (33%), smoking (24%), and diabetes mellitus (DM) (19%) were the major risk factors for NU (17). Moloney et al. reported a 24% NU rate in the geriatric patients with DFF fixed by LLP and they identified that surgical site infection (SSI) was significantly correlated with NU (18).

Association of Plate Design and Material with NUs

Both plate design and materials have significant effects on NU rate following DFF fixation. Besides, some studies identified that the use of stainless steel plates (NU rate: 44%) could increase the risk of NU compared to titanium plates (NU rate: 10%) (19, 20). Rodriguez et al. revealed that a high rigidity score is a predictive factor for NU in DFFs (20).

Double Locked Plating

Some studies have showed a relatively high failure risk for single LLP. There are limited data about using double plates in DFF fixation. Steinberg et al. developed a clinical study on 32 patients with DFF who underwent the double plating approach (lateral and medial plates). Their results revealed that this approach was appropriate for patients with poor bone quality, low periarticular fractures, and comminuted fractures (21).

In a study by Holzman et al. amongst 23 patients with distal femur NU, 16 were treated with single-stage addition of a medial locked plate in addition to a stable lateral plate. 7 cases with failed lateral plates underwent an LLP change followed by a medial locked plate after two months. In 20 out of 23 patients, union was achieved after a mean of 12 months. They recommended double plating...
when NU is associated with fixation failure (22).

**Construct Strength and Resilience**

It is important to emphasize that the most distal locking screws must be parallel to the joint surface as assessed on anteroposterior (AP) image as a guide for restoring limb alignment. Before the operation, the plate length and number as well as placement of screws should be planned by the surgeon. Achieving the good outcomes requires meticulous techniques including minimal soft tissue dissection, longer working length, more screws in each segment, and more locked screws in the patients who had poor bone quality. When selecting the plate length, there should be eight or more screw holes above the most proximal aspect of the fracture if possible. The position of the plate must be referenced to Blumensaat’s line and the subchondral margin of the trochlear groove (17).

**Association of Fracture Patterns with NUs**

It is important to know which fracture patterns are associated with higher rate of NU in DFF. Gardner et al. showed that NU more often occurs following open and/or comminuted fractures possibly due to the disruption of blood supply (3). Ebraheim et al. systematically reviewed the studies about NU in DFFs from September 2000 to June 2012. They concluded that metaphyseal comminution was the most common fracture pattern in DFF that end up with NU (8). The study showed that based on the Orthopaedic Trauma Association (OTA) classification (23), 33 A1 was the most common DFF (80.3% of the closed fractures), followed by metaphyseal comminuted fractures OTA 33A3 (11% of closed fractures), and OTA 33C1 (simple intra-articular fractures) (5.6% of close fractures), respectively (8). In open DFFs, they uncovered that based on the Gustilo-Anderson (GA) classification, the most common open DFF was GA IIIb and then GA IIIC and GA IIla, respectively.

**Preventing NUs**

It is important to prevent NU in stable OTA A1 fracture as the most common type of DFF. The fracture should be well reduced and fixed to increase the stability and promote primary bone healing by compression techniques including eccentric drilling, use of tensioner devices, and push-pull screws with a large Verbrugge clamp. Following the surgery, the patient should begin earlier weight bearing to prevent NU. Nevertheless, using plates as load sharing devices presents certain limitations on the time of starting full weight bearing.

In OTA A3 (metaphyseal comminution) as the most common DFF pattern resulting in NU, the plate should act as an internal splint. In this fracture type, the aim is to promote secondary healing by bridge plating and reduce the fracture to the plate. For this purpose, it is necessary to prevent NU by performing a longer plate (8 holes), less soft tissue dissection, more locked screws, and less screw ratios (2:1 or one screw per 2 holes in plate) (17).

**Patients**

Previous studies investigated causes of delay in bone healing and NU. Smoking, DM, high body mass index (BMI), malnutrition, and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are frequently reported to impact bone healing and cause NU. However, effects of nutritional and endocrine optimization on bone healing have not clearly been investigated (8,17,19,24,25).

In a study by Brinker et al., in 17 of 683 patients with delayed healing, there were no clear vascular, mechanical, and infection-related causes for delaying. The patients underwent full endocrine evaluation. All endocrine parameters were corrected, and NUs were treated without any surgical intervention. The study recommended some endocrine tests for the evaluation of NU such as thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH), free thyroxine (free T4), parathyroid hormone (PTH), 25 (OH) D, calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, alkaline phosphatase, testosterone, and hemoglobin A1C (25).

**Malnutrition**

The role of nutritional optimization in the treatment of NU is not clearly identified. Moloney et al. recognized that in hypoalbuminemic geriatric patients with DFF, NU, infection, length of hospital stay (LOS), and 1-year mortality all increased (18). Using the nutritional risk screening (NRS 2002) method, Lilie et al. revealed that 20% of the patients with orthopedic traumas were at risk of malnutrition (26).

There are some typical recommendations including daily administration of proteins (1-2 g/kg). Furthermore, adequate vitamins and minerals such as Zinc, Vit C, Vit D, and iron as well as some immune nutrition including Arginine ± glutamine, Omega 3 fatty acids, and nucleotides are required to be taken (24).

**Role of Medications**

Vitamin D modulation has an impact on other minerals such as calcium and phosphorus (24). However, the effects of Vit D on fracture healing are not clearly understood. It is proposed that correcting Vit D levels in fracture patients may prevent NU (Table 1) (24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25 (OH) D Level (ng/ml)</th>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-32</td>
<td>50000 unit pearl Vit D</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>50000 unit pearl Vit D</td>
<td>Twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>50000 unit pearl Vit D</td>
<td>3 times a week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an attitude among some surgeons that NSAIDs are contraindicated in patients with fracture or NU because of suppressing the inflammatory reaction and prostaglandin synthesis as a stage of bone healing. Bergin et al. reviewed the previous studies on the role of NSAIDs on bone healing following fractures and concluded that short term usage of NSAIDs had no significant effect on the incidence of NU, but in the long term it could increase the risk of NU (24).

Limited studies support the theory that PTH improves fracture healing, but the results are not enough for clinical recommendations. Teriparatide is a recombinant, biologically active form of PTH which has been uncovered to increase bone mass and prevent fractures in osteoporotic bone. The Food and Drug Administration has licensed it for the treatment of osteoporosis. Over the last decade, a growing body of evidence has been accumulated suggesting the role of Teriparatide in the management of fractures. Studies in both normal and delayed healing models have shown improvement in callus volume and mineralization, bone mineral content, rate of successful union, and strength at fracture sites. Huang et al. retrospectively included 189 patients with osteoporotic intertrochanteric fractures in a study. They prescribed teriparatide for a group of patients following surgery for six months and reported significantly shorter time to union than the control group (27). In a controlled randomized study by Johansson, it was shown that there was no radiographic enhancement of union in the group who took teriparatide following proximal humerus fracture (28). In a study by Babu et al., the role of teriparatide in fracture/NU healing was reviewed. They concluded that many physicians use teriparatide as an...
"off-license" drug for fracture healing but there are not enough evidence about using this drug in NU and delayed union. It seems that more trials are required to prove its effects on NU [29].

Many previous studies investigated the risk factors of NU following DFF fixation with LLP. Open fracture (15, 17, 19), smoking (17, 19), DM (17, 19), infection (15, 18, 19), obesity (19), utilizing stainless steel plates (19, 20), and high rigidity score of the construct (20) are significantly associated with distal femur. It might be beneficial to diagnose malnutrition in patients with DFF and prescribe appropriate supplements and minerals. The role of Vit D is not clearly specified, but prescription of Vit D is recommended in fractures as proposed in table 1. NSAIDs in short-term prescription have no significant effect on bone healing, but in long term may delay fracture healing. Finally, evidence to support medical therapy for the treatment of NU is not strong enough to make a clinical recommendation.
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