This is a repository copy of *Periprosthetic femoral fracture fixation: A biomechanical comparison between proximal locking screws and cables*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/99557/

Version: Accepted Version

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

Periprosthetic femoral fracture fixation- a biomechanical comparison between proximal locking screws and cables

Abstract

Background: The incidence of periprosthetic femoral fractures (PFF) around a stable stem is increasing. The aim of this biomechanical study is to examine how three different methods of fixation, for Vancouver type B1 PFF, alter the stiffness and strain of a construct under various configurations in order to gain a better insight into the optimal fixation method.

Methods: Three different combinations of proximal screws and Dall–Miles cables were used: (A) proximal unicortical locking screws alone; (B) proximal cables and unicortical locking screws; (C) proximal cable alone, each in combination with distal bicortical locking screws, to fix a stainless steel locking compression plate to five synthetic femora with simulated Vancouver type B1 PFFs. In one synthetic femora there was a 10mm fracture gap, in order to simulate a comminuted injury. The other four femora had no fracture gap, to simulate a stable injury. An axial load was applied to the constructs, at varying degrees of adduction and the overall construct stiffness and surface strain were measured.

Results: With regards to the stiffness, in both the gap and no gap models, method of fixation A was the stiffest form of fixation. The inclusion of the fracture gap reduced the stiffness of the construct quite considerably for all methods of fixation. The strain, across both the femur and the plate, was considerably less for method of fixation C, compared to A and B at the locations considered in this study.

Conclusion: This study highlights that the inclusion of cables appears to damage the screw fixations and does not aid in the construct stability. Furthermore, the degree of fracture reduction affects the whole construct stability and the bending behaviour of the fixation.

1.0 Introduction

The worldwide incidence of intra- and post-operative periprosthetic femoral fractures (PFFs) around hip prostheses is between 0.1% and 6% of all total hip arthroplasties (THAs) [1]. This incidence is likely to increase as more THA are performed. It is estimated that currently more than 800,000 THAs are carried out every year worldwide [2].

There is no single universal classification system used in the management of PFF, although the Vancouver classification is the most commonly used in current orthopaedic practice [4-6]. In this system, fractures are subdivided into Types A, B and C. Type B refers to fractures within the stem length and are subclassified into B1 when the implant is stable, B2 when the implant is unstable and B3 when the bone stock is inadequate.

The application of locking compression plates (LCP) in the treatment of PFFs is a relatively new concept, having been introduced in 2000, with the first results reported in 2003 [7]. LCPs have an advantage over conventional plates that can be applied at a distance over the periosteum, because the screws lock onto the plate, preserving the periosteal blood supply and thus enhancing fracture healing. In addition, the fixation of the locked screw to the plate provides improved angular stability to ensure secure anchoring in osteoporotic bone. Based on these comparative advantages, LCP have become the preferred method of treatment for Vancouver B1 (VB1) PFFs [8], with clinical data reporting overall union rates of 91% [9].

The efficiency of LCPs has been questioned by various researchers, since incorrect surgical application of the plate may produce a very rigid fixation, which prevents bone healing by secondary intention [10-13]. Some authors have advocated less-rigid fixation around the fracture site [10], or the use of cables proximally instead of screws. However, a combination of proximal screws and cables may appeal in the case of unstable fractures. Fracture stability and loading configuration have been thought to play a crucial role in the performance of any type of fracture fixation device [14, 15], yet to best of our knowledge no study has investigated these effects in PFF fixations.

Furthermore, no optimal fixation method has yet been established and there has been limited biomechanical or clinical data comparing various methods of screw and cable attachment [16, 17]. Little is known about the clinical and biomechanical differences between cable and screw fixation using locking plates. Therefore, the aim of this biomechanical study is to compare the performance of (1) proximal unicortical locking screw fixation alone versus (2) proximal cable and unicortical screw fixation versus (3) proximal cable fixation alone in stable and unstable VB1 PFF fixation under three different loading conditions. Overall construct stiffness and strain on the locking plate were compared between the cases to gain a better insight into the optimal fixation method.

2.0 Materials and methods

Five synthetic sawbone femora (Sawbone 4th Generation, Pacific Research Laboratories Inc, USA) were secured in stainless steel modules using polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) cement. After preparation of the proximal femur, an Exeter Stem (Stryker SA, Montreux, Switzerland) was implanted using PMMA cement. A VB1 fracture was simulated by a transverse osteotomy 10 mm distal to the tip of the stem. The VB1 fracture was stabilised by a single surgeon using an eight-hole LCP (Stryker SA, Montreux, Switzerland), Figure 1. The following three methods of fixation were used.

Method A: The LCP was fixed with three proximal unicortical screws (holes 1–3), and three bicortical screws distally (holes 6–8) (Figure 2a).

Method B: The LCP was fixed with three proximal unicortical screws (holes 1–3), three proximal Dall–Miles cables (holes 1–3) and three bicortical screws distally (holes 6–8 - Figure 2b).

Method C: the LCP was fixed with three Dall–Miles cable (holes 1–3) and three bicortical screws distally (holes 6–8 - Figure 2c).

The Dall–Miles cables were applied by resting the cable over a custom cable slot in the screw hole of the plate and tensioned using a custom tensioner to apply a tension of 150 N.

Four of the five specimens (Specimen 1-4) were fixed as if anatomically reduced, referred to here as the 'no gap model' and also represents a stable fracture pattern. To simulate the worst-case scenario, where

there is no bony contact across the fracture, a gap of 10 mm was left across the fracture site in a single specimen (Specimen 5), referred to as the 'gap model'. This represents an unstable fracture pattern.

Eight uniaxial strain gauges (ST 1-8) (GFLA-3-50, Tokyo Sokki Kenkyujo, Tokyo, Japan) were attached using cyanoacrylate adhesive to the gap model (Figure 3). Strain was only measured in the gap model because it was anticipated that the values here would be considerably larger than the no gap model and therefore could be more reliably measured. All gauges were positioned so that their axes were aligned with the longitudinal axis of the femur. Five gauges with a gauge length of 3 mm were attached to the surface of the femur. Four gauges were positioned on the medial length of the femur, at 0, 40, 80, and 200 mm distal to the lesser trochanter, with an additional gauge positioned on the lateral side of the femur, 200 mm distal to the lesser trochanter. This arrangement was used to capture the strain magnitude in the proximal and distal bony fragment. Three strain gauges with a gauge length of 0.3 mm were then positioned on the eight-hole stainless steel LCP, one above hole 4, one above hole 5 and one above hole 6. These gauges were positioned in order to capture the strain around the empty screw holes and below the most proximal screw where there is the highest risk of fixation failure

A material testing machine (Instron 8874, Instron, Norwood, MA, USA) was used to load the femoral constructs. An axial load was applied via a hemispherical cup to the femoral head stem, at varying degrees of adduction, 0°, 10° and 20° in the no gap model and at 10° of adduction in the gap model, being the most anatomical position. Using displacement control, a vertical load was applied at the femoral head at 5 mm/min, to a maximum subclinical level of 500 N, in order to keep the specimens within the linear elastic range and avoid damage. The constructs were preconditioned over 20 loading cycles and were then loaded a further six times during which the appropriate measurements, i.e. stiffness and strain, were taken.

From the original, no load position, the load was applied and the construct reached its maximum deformation, i.e. bending as a result of axial loading, at 500 N. Construct stiffness was calculated as the slope of the linear part of the load-displacement data that was obtained from the material testing machine i.e. the difference between the final loading (500 N) and initial loading (0 N) was divided by the difference between the corresponding displacements. Strain values were measured based on the

signals from stain gauges that were amplified, recorded and converted to microstrain at 500 N using LabVIEW (National Instruments, TX, USA). Both stiffness and strain values were recorded over the six repeated loading cycles and averaged in each case.

3.0 Results

All planned tests were successfully completed and there was no incomplete data. There were no observed failures of the specimens and at no point was fixation lost. A comparison of the mean stiffness of the constructs using the three fixation methods in the no gap model and the stiffness of the construct using three fixation methods in the gap model, are presented in Figure 4. The recorded strain, across the plate and bone, in the fracture gap model for all three methods of fixation is demonstrated in Figure 5a and b.

With regards to the stiffness, the most striking finding was that in the no gap model, method of fixation A was clearly the stiffest form of fixation at all loading angles. Furthermore, the difference in stiffness between method B and C in the no gap model was very small, as is indicated by the relatively small standard deviations. However, in the gap model the differences in stiffness, measured at 10°, between all methods of fixation were very low.

The inclusion of the fracture gap reduced the stiffness of the construct quite considerably at 10° adduction for all methods of fixation. These results suggest that fracture-gap model and the no gap models behave differently, and the results from the gap model are not simply an amplification of those of the no gap model.

Strain was only measured in the gap model, loaded at 10° adduction. The strain recorded on both the femur and the plate was very similar for fixation methods A and B. However, the strain was considerably lower on the plate and the femur for method of fixation C, compared to A and B.

4.1 Discussion

The aim of this biomechanical study was to examine how the three different methods of fixation for stable and unstable PFFs around a stable stem alter the stiffness and strain of the fixation.

The most clear finding from this study was that in the no gap model, simulating a stable injury, method of fixation A was considerably stiffer than methods B and C, when loaded at 0°, 10° and 20°. This suggests that when using proximal unicortical screws, the addition of cables most likely results in the screws being pushed into the bone, as the cables are applied, and subsequently the screws loose their fix onto the bone. The results therefore imply that the unicortical screws become obsolete in the fixation when used in combination with cables. Results from the gap model go some way to reinforcing this theory. Conventional surgical wisdom would suggest that fixation method B would be stiffer than method A. However, the stiffness of the two is almost identical, implying that while the addition of cables increases the overall stiffness, that advantage is lost in equal measure through changes in screw fixation.

Unicortical screws are easier to apply and are an overall a less invasive method of fixation with less soft tissue stripping than cables, therefore provide a more desirable form of fixation. In addition cables may produce fritting corrosion against the plate, may loosen and brake with the time and also could strangulate the periosteal blood supply. Considering stability of fixation only, these results indicate that proximal unicortical screws provide the optimal method of fixation when managing VB1 PPF in both a stable and unstable injury.

With regards to strain, this was only measured in the gap model loaded at 10°, the most anatomical loading position. Common reported sites of fixation failure are the plate in the region close to the fracture and also the distal femur [9-11]. Method of fixation C had considerably lower strains recorded across all three strain gauges on the plate, compared to method A and B, which were very similar. Furthermore, method of fixation C also recorded lower strain readings on the femur, compared to A and B. While these results may suggest that, proximal cables alone place less strain across all areas of the fixation, it must be noted that there might have been a high strain region on the plate in fixation C that our strain gauges did not capture. Therefore, care must be taken in interpretation of these results.

Increasing the fracture gap reduced the stiffness of the construct quite considerably when loading at 10° for the three methods of fixation. Confirming that when unstable injuries are managed in clinical

practice and absolute stability is not achieved by fixation with a LCP, the stiffness of the construct is decreased. It may therefore be wise to use additional fixations such as anterior allografts or at least strongly recommend partial weight bearing for patients with unstable injuries, until union is achieved [14,15,18,19]. If the plate is considered inadequate for achieving safe fixation then a long stem revision is recommended to address both bone healing and stem survival [20-21].

A key limitation of the study was the number of specimens tested. The fracture-gap experiments were undertaken on a single specimen and was undertaken as a feasibility study to evaluate whether the gap made a major difference to the behaviour. The results indicate that this was the case, and the behaviour was altered, rather than just being a multiple of the no-gap model. Therefore, further tests should be undertaken on a larger group, to enable statistical evaluation to be undertaken. Additionally, cyclic loading should also be undertaken to assess the effects of cable and screw loosening over time.

A limitation of all biomechanical studies, including this study, is the difficulty in translating results seen the laboratory to potential results in clinical practice. For example, there are multiple patient and external factors that influence not only the choice of fixation but also the way the fixation is applied. These include the age of the patient, underlying co-morbidities, additional injuries, the skill of the surgeon and the equipment available, to name but a few. Additionally, it is difficult in a laboratory to create the forces that a fixation in a patient would undergo, and the present study only considered axial loading in one plane. Common reasons for failure of fixation in clinical practice are the forces that result from a patient falling, and this has not been taken into account in this study. However, even in the standardized model used here, there were marked differences seen between the fixation methods, indicating that their performance in vivo would be different and that the stability of the construct should be considered in the management of PPF.

It is technically challenging for a surgeon to manage PFF around a stable stem. The results of this study provide two important biomechanical outcomes. First, the inclusion of cables appears to damage the screw fixations and does not aid in the construct stability in locking plates. Second, that the degree of fracture reduction affects the overall stability of the construct. Not only was the construct less stable where a fracture gap was present, but the results showed different trends, indicating that the whole

bending behaviour changed when there was a fracture gap present. Therefore, if concerned about PPF in a patient with poor bone or union of a fracture, proximal fixation with addition fixation such a graft may be considered.

References

1. Berry, D.J. Epidemiology: hip and knee. Orthop Clin North Am, 1999 Apr 30(2): 183-90.

2. Tsiridis E, Pavlou G, Venkatesh, R, Bobak, P, Gie, G Periprosthetic femoral fractures around hip arthroplasty: current concepts in their management. Hip Int, 2009 Apr 19(2): 75-86.

3. Kingdom, N.J.R.U., 2009/2010.

4. Brady, O.H, Garbuz, D. S. Masri, B. A. Duncan, C. P. Classification of the hip. Orthop Clin North Am, 1999 Apr 30(2): 215-20.

5. Duncan, C.P. Masri, B.A. Fractures of the femur after hip replacement. Instr Course Lect, 1995. 44: 293-304.

6. Masri, B.A. Meek, R.M. Duncan, C.P. Periprosthetic fractures evaluation and treatment. Clin Orthop Relat Res, 2004 Mar (420): 80-95.

7. Gautier, E. Sommer, C. Guidelines for the clinical application of the LCP. Injury, 2003 Nov 34 Suppl 2: B63-76.

8. Chakravarthy, J. Bansal, R. Cooper, J. Locking plate osteosynthesis for Vancouver Type B1 and Type C periprosthetic fractures of femur: a report on 12 patients. Injury, 2007 Jun 38(6): 725-33.

9. Graham SM, Moazen M, Leonidou A, Tsiridis E. Locking plate fixation for Vancouver B1 periprosthetic femoral fractures: A critical analysis of 135 cases. J Orth Sci 2013 May 18(3): 426-36.

10. Moazen M, Jones AC, Leonidou A, Jin Z, Wilcox RK, Tsiridis E. Rigid versus flexible plate fixation for periprosthetic femoral fracture - computer modelling of a clinical case. Med Eng Phys. 2012 Oct 34: 1041-8.

11. Buttaro, M.AFarfalli, G. Paredes Nunez, M. Comba, F. Piccaluga, F.Locking compression plate fixation of Vancouver type-B1 periprosthetic femoral fractures. J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2007 Sep 89(9): 1964-9.

12. Bottlang, M. Doornink, J. Lujan, T. J. Fitzpatrick, D. C. Marsh, J. L. Augat, P. von Rechenberg, B. Lesser, M. Madey, S. M.Effects of construct stiffness on healing of fractures stabilized with locking plates. J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2010 Dec 92 Suppl 2: 12-22.

13. Lujan TL, Henderson CE, Madey SM, Fitzpatrick DC, Marsh JL, Bottlang M. Locked plating of distal femur fracture leads to inconsistent and asymmetric callus formation. J Orthop Trauma 2010 Mar 24: 156–62.

14. Augat P, Merk J, Ignatius A, Margevicius K, Bauer G, Rosenbaum D, Claes L. Early, full weight bearing with flexible fixation delays fracture healing. Clin Orthp Relat Res 1996 Jul 328: 194-202.

15. Moazen M, Mak JH, Etchels LW, Jin Z, Wilcox RK, Jones AC, Tsiridis E. The effect of fracture stability on the performance of locking plate fixation in periprosthetic femoral fractures. J Arthroplasty 2013 Oct 28(9): 1589-95.

16. Moazen M, Jones AC, Jin Z, Wilcox RK, Tsiridis E. Periprosthetic fracture fixation of the femur following total hip arthroplasty: a review of biomechanical testing. Clin Biomech. 2011 Jan 26: 13-22.

17. Shah S, Kim SYR, Dubov A, Schemitsch EH, Bougherara H, Zdero R. The biomechanics of plate fixation of periprosthetic femoral fractures near the tip of a total hip implant: cables, screws, or both? Proc Inst Mech Eng Part H 2011 Sep 225: 845-56.

18. Haddad FS, Duncan CP, Berry DJ, Lewallen DG, Gross AE, Chandler HP. Periprosthetic femoral fractures around well-fixed implants: use of cortical onlay allografts with or without a plate. J Bone Joint Surg [Am]. 2002 Jun 84: 945-50.

19. Sariyilmaz K, Dikici F, Dikmen G, Bozdag E, Sunbuloglu E, Bekler B, Yazicioglu O. The effect of strut allograft and its position on Vancouver type B1 periprosthetic femoral fractures: a biomechanical study. J Arthroplasty. 2014 Jul 29(7):1485-90.

20. Moazen M, Mak JH, Etchels LW, Jin Z, Wilcox RK, Jones AC, Tsiridis E. Periprosthetic femoral fracture – a biomechanical comparison between Vancouver type B1 and B2 fixation methods. J Arthroplasty 2014 Mar 29(3): 495–500.

21. Neumann D, Thaler C, Born U. Management of Vancouver B2 and B3 femoral periprosthetic fractures   using a modular cementless stem without allografting. Int Orthop. 2012 May 36: 1045-50.

Conflicts of interests

There are no conflicts of interest

Figure 1. The Stryker eight-hole locking plate showing the numbering of the holes

Figure 2. Method of fixation A - Stryker eight-hole LCP fixed with three proximal unicortical screws (holes 1–3), and three bicortical screws distally (holes 6–8). Method of fixation B - Stryker eight-hole LCP fixed with three proximal unicortical screws (holes 1–3), three proximal Dall–Miles cables (holes 1–3) and three bicortical screws distally (holes 6–8). Methods of fixation C - Stryker eight-hole LCP fixed with three Dall–Miles cable (holes 1–3) and three bicortical screws distally (holes 6– 8)

Figure 3. Position of the strain gauges 1-8 on S5.

Figure 4. The stiffness of the no fracture gap model at three adduction angles and the fracture model at 10 degrees for each of the three fixation methods. For the no fracture gap results, the means are shown (error bars = +/- st. dev.)

1   Figure 5a. The recorded strain on the plate for specimen 5

2

10   Figure 5b. The recorded strain on the bone for specimen 5

15