

Original research article

To determine relationship of the subjective, objective and radiographic method of treatment of fractures of the radius and ulna in adults

Dr. Sushil Kumar Singh¹, Dr. Rakesh Kumar²

¹Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Vardhman Institute of Medical Sciences, Pawapuri, Nalanda, India.

²Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Vardhman Institute of Medical Sciences, Pawapuri, Nalanda, Bihar, India.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Rakesh Kumar

Abstract

Aim: The aim of the study was to determine relationship of the subjective, objective and radiographic method of treatment.

Material and methods: A prospective study was conducted in the Department of Orthopaedics Vardhman Institute of Medical Sciences, Pawapuri, Nalanda, India. from July 2015 to June 2016. Three methods of treatment were utilized: open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF), closed reduction and casting (CR), and external skeletal fixation with pins-in-plaster (PIP). The method of treatment was chosen by the attending surgeon based upon his experience and the type of injury.

Results: Overall, 80 percent of patients reported no pain, with no difference between patients with open and those with closed fractures. While 83 percent of patients treated with ORIF were pain free at their last examination, only 51 percent treated with CR and 49 percent treated with PIP were painless. Patients with isolated fractures were more often pain free than were those with associated injuries. There was no significant difference in the loss of forearm rotation between closed and open fractures: 65 percent of each group lost less than thirty degrees of forearm rotation. 71 percent of patients treated with ORIF lost less than thirty degrees of forearm rotation, while only 50 percent treated by CR and 29 percent by PIP lost less than thirty degrees. Union occurred in 89 percent of radius fractures and 92 percent of ulna fractures, with an average time to union of 16.3 weeks for the radius and 17.7 weeks for the ulna. Union was more frequent after closed than after open fractures. Overall, 60 percent of patients had less than twenty degrees combined malalignment of the radius and ulna on the final radiographs, with no difference between those patients with open and those with closed fractures.

Conclusion: we concluded that the fractures of the shafts of the radius and ulna were good to excellent regardless of the method of treatment chosen. Except for a longer time to union and a higher infection rate, the outcomes of open and closed fractures were very similar. The presence of associated injuries was a strong predictor of a compromised end result. **Keywords:** Fracture radius, ulna, factors affecting, and outcome.

Introduction

Although the incidence of the fractures of the forearm is generally low in adults, these fractures could result in considerable disability if the native forearm geometry is not restored.¹ There are some intramedullary nails that provide control of rotational malalignment at the fracture line but their usage is vulnerable to complications and internal fixation with the plate is still considered as the gold standard.^{2,3} Forearm fractures are one of the most common fractures. Mechanisms of injury of these fractures are generally high energy accidents, direct trauma, fall

from height etc. Open wounds along with neurovascular deficit is not uncommon. Both conservative and surgical approaches are being used depending upon the level and displacement of fractures. Conservative approach is less frequently used as it is difficult to maintain reduction with forearm shaft fractures having rotatory as well as angular motions. Also, it is most commonly associated with cast complications, non-union, malunion, compartment syndrome and Volkmann ischaemic contracture. Hence, surgical approach is the preferred option with final decision resting upon the treating doctor. Union with restoration of normal anatomy is particularly critical to achieve an optimal outcome for diaphyseal fractures of the shafts of the radius and ulna in adults. These goals have most often been met by open reduction and plate fixation.⁴⁻⁶ In previous studies, however, outcome measures other than union have received scant attention⁷⁻⁹, and the inclusion of fractures of a single bone with fractures of both bones has made interpretation of results difficult. This study was to determine the relationship of outcome to modality of treatment, type of fractures and presence of associated injuries in adults who sustained fractures of the shafts of both radius and ulna. Measures of outcome investigated were patient satisfaction (amount of pain), rotation of forearm, radiographic findings and work status.¹⁰

Material and method

A prospective study was conducted in the Department of Orthopedics, Vardhman Institute of Medical Sciences, Pawapuri, Nalanda, India, from July 2015 to June 2016, after taking the approval of the protocol review committee and institutional ethics committee.

Methodology

After taking informed consent detailed history was taken from the patient. The technique, risks, benefits, results and associated complications of the procedure were discussed with all patients. All patients were followed at least until bone union occurred or the diagnosis of nonunion was made. The mean follow-up was 6 months (range 2 to 6 months). 68 patients were male and 32 female, with an average age of 30.5 years (range 18 to 70 years). In 32 patients, the fracture involved the dominant limb. 33 of the fractures were open and 67 were closed. Three methods of treatment were utilized: open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF), closed reduction. Three methods of treatment were utilized: open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF), closed reduction and casting (CR), and external skeletal fixation with pins-in-plaster (PIP). The method of treatment was chosen by the attending surgeon based upon his experience and the type of injury. Minimal displacement of a closed fracture was the most frequent indication for closed reduction, and marked comminution was the primary reason for treatment with pins-in-plaster. All reductions were performed under general anesthesia. The definitive treatment was ORIF in 72 forearms, CR in 19, and PIP in 9 patients in the ORIF group were initially treated unsuccessfully by other methods (eighteen by CR and three by PIP). Union was defined as the presence of bridging bone or trabeculae spanning the fracture site. Nonunion was identified by the absence of union within twenty-eight weeks following injury. Standards for alignment and measurement of radiographs were based on Sage's study, which defined normal as nine degrees of radial and six degrees of dorsal bowing of the radius and zero degrees in both planes for the ulna.¹¹ End result ratings were made on a 14 point scale in four categories: (a) subjective, according the level of pain in the injured limb; (b) objective, by the range of forearm rotation; (c) radiographic, utilizing the criteria of union, synostosis, and malunion; and (d) economic, as reflected by the impact of the injury on the patient's employment status (Table 1).

Table 1:

Rating	subjective	Objective	Radiographic
--------	------------	-----------	--------------

4	No pain	Combined loss of forearm rotation <300	Fracture united. combined malalignment (radius and ulna) <200
3	Mild pain, present with overuse	Combined loss of forearm rotation 31-600	Union, with combined malalignment 21-400
2	Moderate pain present with routine activities	Combined loss of forearm rotation 61-900	Union, with combined malalignment >400
1	Severe pain prevent routine activities	Combined loss of forearm rotation >900	Non-union, synostosis or osteomyelitis

Results

Overall, 80 percent of patients reported no pain, with no difference between patients with open and those with closed fractures. While 83 percent of patients treated with ORIF were pain free at their last examination, only 51 percent treated with CR and 49 percent treated with PIP were painless. Patients with isolated fractures were more often pain free than were those with associated injuries (Table 2).

Table 2: Subjective Outcomes (Percent of patients achieving each subjective rating)

Rating	Overall	Open Fractures	Close Fractures	ORIF	CR	PPI	Multiple Injuries	Isolated Fractures
4	80	79	79	83	51	49	72	80
3	13	16	15	13	44	43	25	15
2	7	5	6	4	5	8	3	5
1	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0

Objective Outcomes

No patient had significant loss of wrist or elbow motion compared to the uninjured side. The average total decrease in forearm rotation, however, was less than 30 degrees, with loss of slightly more supination than pronation. There was no significant difference in the loss of forearm rotation between closed and open fractures: 65 percent of each group lost less than thirty degrees of forearm rotation. The method of treatment had a significant effect on the loss of forearm rotation. 71 percent of patients treated with ORIF lost less than thirty degrees of forearm rotation, while only 50 percent treated by CR and 29 percent by PIP lost less than thirty degrees. Patients with multiple injuries lost more forearm rotation than did those with isolated fractures (Table 3).

Table 3: Objective Outcomes (Percent of patients achieving each objective rating)

Rating	Overall	Open Fractures	Close Fractures	ORIF	CR	PPI	Multiple Injuries	Isolated Fractures
4	65	65	65	71	50	29	57	71
3	14	9	15	12	13	26	16	9
2	12	12	8	12	21	0	11	11
1	9	14	12	5	16	45	20	9

Radiographic Outcomes Union occurred in 89 percent of radius fractures and 92 percent of ulna fractures, with an average time to union of 16.3 weeks for the radius and 17.7 weeks for the ulna. Union was more frequent after closed than after open fractures. This difference was most apparent in radius fractures where 13 percent of open fractures developed nonunions, compared to only 3 percent of closed injuries ($p = 0.159$). Also, the average time to union was

21 percent longer for open than for closed fractures of the radius ($p = 0.044$), and 29 percent longer for open fractures of the ulna ($p = 0.021$). Neither the frequency of nor the time to union varied significantly with the method of treatment. The amount of forearm rotation lost was directly proportional to the loss of normal alignment, reaching a mean of 38 degrees when the combined malalignment of the radius and ulna exceeded thirty degrees ($p = 0.03$) (Table 4).

Table 4: Effect of Malalignment on Loss of Forearm Rotation

N=100	Combined Malalignment (radius and ulna)	Mean Loss of Forearm Rotation
51	0-15	24
26	16-30	22
23	>30	38

Overall, 60 percent of patients had less than twenty degrees combined malalignment of the radius and ulna on the final radiographs, with no difference between those patients with open and those with closed fractures. The method of treatment, however, had a significant effect on the final radiographic alignment: 79 percent of patients treated with ORIF had less than twenty-degrees combined malalignment of the radius and ulna on the final radiographs, a result seen in only 57 percent and 12 percent of patients treated with CR and PIP respectively (Table 5).

Table 5: Radiographic Outcomes (Percent of patients achieving each radiographic rating)

Rating	overall	Open fracture	Closed fracture	orif	CR	PIP	Multiple injuries
4	60	63	66	79	57	12	52
3	15	13	9	9	6	54	30
2	13	9	16	7	33	30	10
1	12	15	9	5	4	4	8

Complications

Restoration of the radial bow is important to the functional outcome.⁷ Failure to restore the radial bow to within 6% of the contralateral side results in a 21% loss of forearm rotation, as well as loss of grip strength. Complications of forearm fractures include the following:

Refracture after plate removal

Non-union

Malunion

Infection

Neurovascular injury

Compartment syndrome

Radioulnarsynostosis⁸

The incidence of refracture of the forearm after plate removal is unknown but is reportedly 4-28%. Factors contributing to refracture include premature plate removal at less than 1 year, delayed union, nonunion, the use of 4.7-mm dynamic compression plates, and poor surgical technique. Plate removal can be considered when cortical remodeling under the plate is radiographically present, typically after 12 months. Forearm protection after plate removal is recommended for 6 weeks, and a return to sports or other activities is delayed for 2-3 months. Forearm plate removal is not without risk, including infection and nerve injury.⁹ The incidence of these complications is 10-15%, and plate removal is not routinely recommended.

Discussion

Full rotation of the forearm following fractures of the diaphyses of the adult radius and ulna is infrequent because of the difficulty in obtaining and maintaining anatomical reduction. Although numerous methods of treatment have been described for these injuries.^{4-6,9,11-18} the results are difficult to analyze because of many fracture and treatment variables, lack of precise definitions, and pooling of results for fractures of both bones with those in which only one bone was fractured. Other studies have reported rates of non-union, malunion, and other complications comparable to those in this investigation.¹⁸⁻²³

The present study adds outcome measures based on the patients' impressions of their results and their ability to return to work following injury. Hadden et al.⁸ reported on 109 patients with fractures of the forearm, sixty-four of whom had fractures of both bones of the forearm; however, the outcome results were combined for all patients and were not stratified by the bone fractured, whether the fracture was open or closed, or the method of treatment. By comparison, 80 percent of patients in this study (83 percent of those treated with ORIF) were pain free at the time of their last evaluation. No patient in this series was unable to work because of his/her forearm fracture, and 90 percent of all patients (92 percent of those treated with ORIF) returned to the same work following injury. The inclusion of patient satisfaction and work status in the assessment of outcomes supplies information about the long term results of these fractures not previously available and permits counselling of patients as to the economic implications of their injuries. While some authors have stated that closed methods of treatment for displaced diaphyseal fractures of the radius, ulna, or both forearm bones produce unacceptable results.^{4,6,19} Sarmiento et al.¹⁵ reported excellent functional results after closed treatment in fortythree patients. Although ORIF improved the overall outcomes in our study, it is clear that the greatest advantage of ORIF over other methods of treatment was in minimizing malalignment of the forearm and the resulting loss of forearm rotation. The rotation lost following CR and PIP was nearly double that lost following ORIF.

In this study overall, 60 percent of patients had less than twenty degrees combined malalignment of the radius and ulna on the final radiographs, with no difference between those patients with open and those with closed fractures. The method of treatment, however, had a significant effect on the final radiographic alignment: 79 percent of patients treated with ORIF had less than twenty-degrees combined malalignment of the radius and ulna on the final radiographs, a result seen in only 57 percent and 12 percent of patients treated with CR and PIP respectively.

Although alignment of the radius and ulna has been measured by various methods^{14,23-25}, all studies, including this one, have shown that loss of normal alignment of the radius and ulna closely correlates with loss of pronation and supination.^{4,14,23-25} Angular malalignment and the related loss of forearm rotation were the factors in this study most often associated with inability to return to the same work following injury. Although malalignment is measured radiographically, it is a major determinant of function following fractures of the forearm. The term "functional malunion" describes the upper limit of angular malalignment that was associated with return to the same work following injury. Patients in this study who had combined angular malalignment of the radius and ulna of less than forty degrees were limited in forearm rotation by no more than sixty degrees and usually returned to the same occupation. The rationale for defining malunion in terms of function is to provide an outcome-based application of a radiographic finding. Except for a longer time to union and a higher infection rate, the results of treatment for open and closed fractures were very similar. The infection rate in this study was comparable to that reported by others.^{6,26} the incidence of transient nerve palsies was unaffected by the presence of an open injury, although we expected more frequent nerve injury following open fractures because of more extensive soft tissue injuries. The 42 percent of patients in this series who sustained multiple trauma is similar to the 40 percent incidence reported by Chapman et al.⁶ Patients in this series with other injuries lost more

forearm rotation, and therefore had poorer end result ratings, than patients with isolated forearm fractures. The greater loss of forearm rotation resulted largely from more frequent synostoses in polytraumatized patients-(11.5 percent) compared to those patients with isolated fractures (3.7 percent). Interestingly, all five synostoses in patients with multiple trauma occurred in the setting of closed head injuries. The formation of ectopic bone following forearm fractures in patients with closed head injuries has been well documented.^{21,27,28}

Conclusion

We concluded that the fractures of the shafts of the radius and ulna were good to excellent regardless of the method of treatment chosen. Except for a longer time to union and a higher infection rate, the outcomes of open and closed fractures were very similar.

Reference

1. Kasten P, Krefft M, Hesselbach J, Weinberg AM. How does torsional deformity of the radial shaft influence the rotation of the forearm? A biomechanical study. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2003;17(1):57-60.
2. Gadegone W, Salphale YS, Lokhande V. Screw elastic intramedullary nail for the management of adult forearm fractures. *Indian Journal of Orthopaedics*. 2012;46(1):65-70.
3. Kim SB, Heo YM, Yi JW, Lee JB, Lim BG. Shaft fractures of both forearm bones: The outcomes of surgical treatment with plating only and combined plating and intramedullary nailing. *Clinics in Orthopedic Surgery*. 2015;7(3):282-290.
4. Anderson, L. D.; Sisk, T. D.; Tooms, R. E.; and Park III, W. I.: Compression plate fixation in acute diaphyseal fractures of the radius and ulna. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1975. 57-A:287-297.
5. Burweli, H. N., and Charnley, A. D.: Treatment of forearm fractures in adults with particular reference to plate fixation. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1964. 46- B:404-424.
6. Chapman, M. W.; Gordon, J. E.; and Zissimos, A. G.: Compression plate fixation of acute fractures of the diaphyses of the radius and ulna. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1989. 71-A:159-169.
7. Grace, T. G., and Eversmann, W. W.: Forearm fractures: treatment by rigid fixation with early motion. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1980. 62-A:433-438.
8. Hadden, W. A.; Reschauer, R.; and Seggl, W.: Results of AO plate fixation of forearm shaft fractures in adults. *Injury*, 1983. 15:44-52.
9. Lyritis, G.; Ioannidis, T.; and Hartofylakidis Garofalidis, G.: The influence of timing and rigidity of internal fixation on bony union of fractures of the forearm. *Injury*, 1983. 15:53-56.
10. Sisk LA, Tooms TD, Park RE. Park III, W. I.: Compression plate fixation in acute diaphyseal fractures of the radius and ulna. *J Bone Joint Surg*. 1975;57-A:287-297.
11. Sage, F. P.: Medullary fixation of forearm fractures. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1959. 41-A:1489-1516.
12. Evans, E. M.: Fractures of the radius and ulna. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1951. 33-B:548-561
13. Knight, R. A., and Purvis, G. D.: Fractures of both bones of the forearm in adults. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1949. 31-A:755-764.
14. Matthews, L S.; Kaufer, H.; Garver, D. F.; and Sonstegard, D. A.: The effect of supination-pronation on angular malalignment of fractures of both bones of the forearm. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1982. 64-A14-17.
15. Sarmiento, A.; Cooper, J. S.; and Sinclair, W. F.: Forearm fractures: early functional bracing-A preliminary report. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1975. 57- A:297-304.

16. Shang, T.; Gu, Y.; and Dong, F.: Treatment of forearm fractures by an integrated method of traditional Chinese and Western medicine. *Clin. Orthop.*, 1987. 215:56-64.
17. Smith, J. E.: Internal fixation in the treatment of fractures of the shafts of the radius and ulna in adults. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1959. 41-B:122-131.
18. Street, D. M.: Intramedullary forearm nailing. *Clin. Orthop.*, 1986. 212:219-230.
19. Moed, B. R.; Keliam, J. F.; Foster, R. J.; Tile, M.; and Hansen, S.: Immediate internal fixation of open fractures of the diaphysis of the forearm. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1986. 68-A:1008-1017.
20. Rosacker, J. A., and Kopta, J. A.: Both bone fractures of the forearm: a review of surgical variables associated with union. *Orthopaedics*, 1981. 4:1353- 1356.
21. Teipner, W. A., and Mast, J. W.: Internal fixation of forearm diaphyseal fractures: double plating versus single compression plating-a comparative study. *Orthop. Clin. North America*, 1980.11:381-391.
22. Grace, T. G., and Eversmann, W. W.: The management of segmental bone loss associated with forearm fractures. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1980.62-AA1150- 1155
23. Schemitsch, E. H., and Richards, R. R.: The effect of malunion on functional outcome after plate fixation of fractures of both bones of the forearm in adults. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1992. 74-A:1069-1078.
24. Sarmiento, A.; Ebrahimzadeh, E.; Brys, D.; and Tarr, R. R.: Angular deformities and forearm function. *J. Orthop. Res.*, 1992. 10:121-133.
25. Tarr, R. R.; Garfinkel, A. I.; and Sarmiento, A.: The effects of angular and rotational deformities of both bones of the forearm. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1984. 66-A.:65-70.
26. Gustillo, R. B., and Anderson, J. T.: Prevention of infection in the treatment of one thousand twentyfive open fractures of long bones: Retrospective and prospective analyses. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1976. 58-A.-453-458.
27. Stern, P. J., and Drury, W. J.: Complication of plate fixation of forearm fractures. *Clin. Orthop.*, 1983. 175:25-29.
28. Vince, K. G., and Milier, J. E.: Cross-union complicating fracture of the forearm. *J. Bone and Joint Surg.*, 1987. 69-A.640-653.

Received :03-07-2020 Revised: 07-08-2020. Accepted:29-08-2020