

MANAGEMENT AND OUTCOME ANALYSIS OF PROXIMAL HUMERUS FRACTURES BY PHILOS - A PROSPECTIVE STUDY

Dr. Mukka Naveen¹, Dr. D. Narsimlu²

^{1,2} Associate Professor, Dept. of Orthopaedics, Prathima Institute of Medical Sciences, Nagunur, Karimnagar, Telangana

Article Info: Received 10 June 2020; Accepted 4 July 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32553/ijmbs.v4i7.1273>

Corresponding author: Dr. D. Narsimlu

Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest.

Abstract

Introduction: Proximal humerus fracture is considered as one of the commonest fractures in clinical practice. Most of these fractures occur as a result of osteoporosis. Proximal humerus fractures are often nondisplaced or minimally displaced fractures with two parts, which can be managed conservatively. Surgical interventions include closed reduction and percutaneous pinning (CRPP). It also involves trans-osseous suture fixation, Open Reduction Internal Fixation (ORIF) with either conventional or Proximal Humerus Interlocking Osteosynthesis System (PHILOS) or hemiarthroplasty. Good clinical outcomes have been achieved by the PHILOS as they stabilize the proximal humeral fractures with steady fixation in osteoporotic bone and assisted aged patients in early functional exercises which resulted in early recovery.

Aim: To analyse the functional results and complications associated with management of proximal humerus fractures treated with PHILOS.

Materials and Methods: This is a prospective study conducted at Department of Orthopaedics, Prathima Institute Of Medical Sciences, Nagunur, Karimnagar, from July 2017 to January 2019. 58 patients were taken into study with two-part, three-part, four-part fracture of the proximal humerus in adults >18 years of age. In all patients PHILOS plating was done and surgical events and surgical difficulties faced, post-surgery local or systemic complications, time needed for fracture union and time taken to return to pre-fracture activity were documented. They were followed up till there were signs of union on radiographs or for at least a period of 1 year.

Results: The results were assessed with Constant Murley Score at 6 months post-surgery and Visual Analogue Scale at 6 weekly intervals. The mean Constant score for two-part fractures was 88.1, for Three-part 82.5, for Four-part 72.7. The patients with two-part and three-part fractures had a significantly better VAS than patients with four-part fractures till 18 months of surgery. After 18 months the VAS was similar for all 3 groups. 6.9% developed shoulder stiffness, 2 patients from four-part fracture group developed Varus angulation.

Conclusion: we conclude that the PHILOS is safe, effective and provides stable fixation for proximal humerus fractures and in patients with indigent bone quality.

Keywords: PHILOS, Proximal Humerus Fracture

Introduction

Proximal humerus fracture is considered as one of the commonest fractures in clinical practice. 5% of all upper limb fractures are represented by proximal humerus fractures. Most of these fractures occur as a result of osteoporosis in elderly population whereas younger people are likely to have sustained fracture secondary to high energy trauma. Proximal humerus fractures are often nondisplaced or minimally displaced fractures with two parts, which can be managed conservatively. Displaced fractures with two or more fragments require surgical intervention for good functional results 1.

Due to increased frequency of road traffic accidents, the proximal humerus fractures are on the rise and also the fracture pattern is becoming more complex. Various muscles are attached to the proximal humerus. There is a limited space available for fixing the implant at the proximal end of humerus. This has made the management

of proximal humeral fractures difficult. The treatment comparatively is more challenging for articular fractures. Neer's system of classification comprises of two, three and four-part fractures and those with humeral head dislocations. Conservative management might be allied with complications such as Mal-union, Non-union, avascular necrosis (AVN) resulting in painful dysfunction.

There are various factors that are taken into consideration in treatment of this complicated fracture which includes quality of the bone, degree of comminution and fracture pattern. The other factors which affect the treatment are patient factors such as age, lifestyle and level of activity. Minimum shoulder pain with maximal shoulder range of motion should be the paramount objective.

Surgical interventions include closed reduction and percutaneous pinning (CRPP). It also involves trans-osseous suture fixation, Open Reduction Internal Fixation (ORIF) with either conventional or Proximal Humerus Interlocking

Osteosynthesis System (PHILOS) or hemiarthroplasty. Fracture assessment should be done on individual basis. 13 to 16 percent of proximal humerus fractures involve three part and four-part fractures. Treatment of these type of fractures is open reduction and internal fixation as recommended by Neer.¹

Recent advances in the field of biomechanics and pathophysiology have changed the architecture and mechanics of newer forms of osteosynthesis. The advent of PHILOS has occurred recently. It gives assuring outcome for displaced osteoporotic proximal humerus fractures.²

The PHILOS gives an advantage mechanically in improving the stability of the fracture owing to the stable angle construct. It means that the bone to plate interface generates a single beam construct. This implies that there shall be no drive between individual parts following in an increased resistance to pull-out. On the other hand, there shall be a point of contact of the cortical bone that is recreated mechanically. This occurs as a result of locking the screw to the plate when it is deficient. This might be beneficial in poor-quality cancellous bone.²

PHILOS has overcome some downsides of conventional plating techniques. However complications have been testified which include screw-back out, AVN of the head of humerus, impingement, humeral head collapse, implant failure and infection. Previously it was a thought that blood supply to the head of humerus, the arcuate artery, gets disengaged and thus causes avascular necrosis. But it has been found that a medial metaphyseal extension of the humeral head fragment is adequate to maintain the blood supply.³

Good clinical outcomes have been achieved by the PHILOS as they stabilize the proximal humeral fractures with steady fixation in osteoporotic bone and assisted aged patients in early functional exercises which resulted in early recovery.

Materials and Methods:

The present study is a prospective study conducted at Department of Orthopaedics, Prathima Institute Of Medical Sciences, Nagunur, Karimnagar, from July 2017 to January 2019 with 58 patients. Patients were taken up for study after obtaining their consent and ethical clearance was obtained from institutional ethical committee. The statistical analysis of data was performed using the computer program, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS for Windows, version 20.0. Chicago, SPSS Inc.) and Microsoft Excel 2010.

The Inclusion Criteria:

Two-part, Three-part, Four-part fracture of the proximal humerus in adults >18 years.

The exclusion criteria:

Children and adolescent patients, isolated proximal 1/3rd humerus shaft fractures, patients medically unfit for surgery, acute infections, pathological fractures and open fractures.

The Demographic data constituting factors like age, gender and profession of the patient. Mechanism of injury, severity of the injury, classification of the type of fractures by NEER's classification, associated injuries, primary management and time interval between trauma and surgery were recorded (Table 1). The patients were operated under brachial block or general anaesthesia. Surgical approach was chosen based on fracture pattern and either deltopectoral or triceps splitting approach was used. The patient was operated in supine position.

Surgical events and surgical difficulties faced, post-surgery local or systemic complications, time needed for fracture union and time taken to return to pre-fracture activity were documented (Table 2). The fracture fragments were reduced and provisionally fixed with K-wires. Heavy sutures (Ethibond No. 2) are placed at the lesser and greater tuberosity. The sutures placed at the lesser tuberosity are pulled laterally to correct the retroversion of humeral head, whereas the sutures placed at the greater tuberosity are pulled in a downward direction to correct any varus deformity.⁴

The reduction is confirmed under image intensification. The PHILOS Plate is positioned so that a gap of at least 5-8 mm is there from the upper end of the greater tuberosity and is 2mm posterior to the bicipital groove. It was ensured that there was a sufficient gap between the plate and the long head of the biceps tendon. When the fracture reduction and probable screw positioning is deemed adequate, the plate was then fixed definitively using angular stable screws in the humeral head, calcar and other screws. The ends of ethibond were passed through suture holes in the PHILOS plate and were tied with each other. A final check to verify correct screw placement was performed under continuous fluoroscopy.

All the surgical procedures were performed by the same orthopaedic team. Antibiotic prophylaxis with intravenous Cefuroxime, preoperatively and post operatively for 2 days was given which was later changed to oral for next 5 days. Standard postoperative protocols were followed and patients were discharged on 5th post-operative day. Arm slings are given for the first 6 weeks combined with limited mobilization as follows: after 2 weeks, pendulum exercises and active range of motion are started, subsequently after another 2 weeks active external rotation is encouraged and initiated under the guidance of a Physiotherapist.

Early passive assisted exercises help to avoid adhesion formation. No limitation of exercises during the pain-free

ROM was necessary. Shoulder strengthening and resistance exercises were initiated only after bony consolidation was established on plain roentgenograms. Antero-Posterior, Axillary and Scapular Y view roentgenograms were taken immediately post surgery. Regular follow up radiographs were taken 6 and 12 weeks postoperatively, afterwards again at 6 and 12 months subsequent the date of surgery.

Results:

A total of 58 patients were operated in this study and all were present for follow up throughout the study. They were followed up till there were signs of union on radiographs or for at least a period of 1 year.

The results were assessed with Constant Murley Score⁵ at 6 months post-surgery and Visual Analogue Scale at six weekly intervals and are tabulated in Table 3 and 4. 8 patients- 13.8% of the total study population had hypertension while 6 patients- 10.3 % had diabetes mellitus and 4 patients- 6.9 % had both hypertension and diabetes mellitus.

The mean Constant score for two-part fractures was 88.1, for Three-part 82.5, for Four-part 72.7. The patients with two-part and three-part fractures had a significantly better VAS than patients with four-part fractures till 18 months of surgery. After 18 months the VAS was somewhat similar for all 3 groups.

We found that a total of six patients (10.3 %) developed complications. 4 patients (6.9%) developed shoulder stiffness out of which two each had gleno-humeral joint arthritis and sub acromial impingement. Two patients from four-part fracture group developed Varus angulation which did not proceed and united in same manner. Out of these two patients one patient also developed screw pull-out. The complications are tabulated in Table 5.

Table 1: Basic demography and patient information

	3 part	4 part
Number of patients (M:F)	35 (22:13)	23 (15:8)
a) RTA	14	17
b) Fall	17	6
c) Shoulder dislocation	4	0
Comorbidities	2	6
Time (Trauma to Surgery)	29	8
a) 0 to 2 days		
b) 2 to 5 days	8	6
c) >5 days	1	6

Table 2: Intraoperative data

	3 part	4 part
Blood Loss (Mean)	173 ml	220 ml
Duration of Surgery (Mean)	82 min	108 min
Approach- a) Delto-pectoral	19	11
b) Triceps splitting	10	7
Reduction difficulties	3	4

Table 3: Constant Murley Score at 6 months post-surgery

	3 part	4 part
Excellent (86-100)	8	2
Good (71-85)	22	12
Fair (56-70)	5	7
Poor (0-55)	0	2
Mean	81.5	72.2
S.D.	8.84	10.50

Table 4: Visual Analogue Scale (Mean) for pain during active shoulder movements

	3 part	4 part
6 weeks	3.9	5.7
12 weeks	3.5	5.1
18 weeks	2.8	4.4
24 weeks	2.6	2.9
52 weeks	1.4	2.8

Table 5: Complications

	3 part	4 part
Infection	0	0
Shoulder Stiffness	1	3
Gleno-humeral Arthritis	0	2
Sub-acromial impingement	1	1
Varus Deformity	0	2
Screw Pullout	0	1




Figure 1: Intraoperative images showing PHILOS Plate placement using Ethibond to secure the comminuted fragments and final fluoroscopic image



Figure 2: Anteroposterior Radiographs showing Pre-operative and 12-month Post-operative of a proximal humerus fracture




Figure 3: A patient with sub acromial impingement and limited range of motion of the shoulder joint




Figure 4: An Anteroposterior radiograph showing Varus deformity

Discussion

Operative management of the comminuted and displaced proximal humerus fractures especially in the osteoporotic bones has remained a complex and thought-provoking problem. There have been different established techniques that stood described for the fixation of these complex fractures. The established techniques have been associated with complications such as screw back out, non-union of fractures, avascular necrosis of the head of

humerus, post-operative shoulder stiffness, and shoulder impingement. Thus, the functional outcome not only hangs on the quality of bone stock but also the stability offered by the implant used.

Non-operative methods of treatment for proximal humerus is done only in undisplaced two-part fracture of humerus. Bigorre N et al⁶ has observed displaced two-part fractures and comminuted three- or four-part fracture requires a surgical management to rectify the position of the fracture.

Gerber C et al⁷ and Misra A et al⁸ had observed that the treatment with PHILOS has tremendous potential of success. In the younger age group this technique of treatment is successful because of the good bone quality nonetheless in the elderly group of patients due to osteoporosis unsatisfactory results can be obtained.

In our study there was a male preponderance of 37 patients to the female 21 patients. Male to female ratio 1.76 :1. This could be explained by the higher engagement of male patients in day-to-day pursuits than the female patients. This gender linked issue found in the present study was similar to the study of Kumar GN et al⁹ in which male to female ratio was 2.19:1.

Kulkarni S et al¹⁰ in a prospective study has described high energy trauma, road traffic accidents in 38 cases 63.33% to be the most common mode of injury followed by low energy trauma, that was fall, in 22 cases 36.67%. The mechanism of injury in our study was road traffic accident in 31 patients (53.4%), fall on outstretched hand in 23 patients, 39.6% and shoulder dislocation in 4 patients (6.9%). P-value is 0.5 so it is not statistically significant. In his study of 60 patients has reported 6.67% (4) patients were 2-part fractures, 73.33% (44) of his patients has suffered a 3-part fractures, 20% (12) had 4-part fractures. In the present study we found 19% patients had 2-part fractures, 50% had 3-part fractures and 31% had 4-part fractures. It was observed in this study that majority of the patients were encountered with 3-part fractures of the proximal humerus that tallies with the study of Kulkarni S et al⁹.

In the present study, the time interval between the trauma to surgery was <2 days in 14 patients, 2 – 5 days interval was seen in 37 patients and >5 days interval in 7 patients. Mostly it was noted that the trauma to surgery interval was between 2-5 days which is ideal for favourable outcomes.

Kulkarni S et al¹⁰ in a prospective study found that out of 56 patients that were available for follow-up: 24 patients, according to the Constant Murley Score, have Excellent results in which 4 patients are Two part, 20 patients are Three-part fractures. 32 patients having Good results in which 22 are Three part, 10 are Four-part fractures. None

of the patients had fair or poor results. Kulkarni S et al¹⁰ found mean Constant Murley Score was 91 for Two-part fractures, 84.5 for Three-part fractures, 76 for Four-part fractures.

In the present study, it was found that 15 patients had Excellent results, 4 patients of Two part, 9 patients of Three-part and 2 patients of Four-part fracture. Good results were seen in 29 patients, 5 patients with Two part, 16 patients with Three part and 8 patients with Four-part fractures. 12 patients had Fair results, 2 patients with Two-part, 4 patients with Three-part and 6 patients with Four-part fractures. Poor result was seen in 2 cases of Four-part fracture.

The mean Constant score for two-part fractures was 88.1, for Three-part 82.5, for Four-part 72.7. P-value <0.05 for all types. This gives an inference that the outcome after management by PHILOS is correspondingly good in all type of fractures.

Conclusion:

Fixation of proximal humerus fractures with PHILOS is associated with satisfactory functional outcomes. -Based on our observations, improper positioning of the PHILOS lead to reduced functional outcome. Hence, to improve the functional results, we considered the plate positioning to be of paramount importance. -As the complex four-part fracture dislocations are difficult to achieve anatomical reduction thorough knowledge of the surgical anatomy of proximal humerus is required and might require CT scan for better visualization of the complex fracture pattern preoperatively.

-Tying the fracture fragments with ethibond or vicryl and later passing through the PHILOS holes, makes comminuted fractures easier to reduce.

We conclude that the PHILOS is safe, effective, dependable and provides stable fixation for proximal humerus fractures and in patients with indigent bone quality.

References

1. Bigliani LU, Flatow EL, Pollock RG. Fractures of the proximal humerus. In: Rockwood CA, Green DP, Bucholz RW, Heckman JD, eds. *Fractures in adults*. Philadelphia, etc: Lippincott-Raven, 1996: 1055-107.
2. Neer CS II. Displaced proximal humeral fractures. Part II. Treatment of three-part and four-part displacement. *J Bone Joint Surg [Am]* 1970;52-A:1090-103.
3. Lind T, Kroner K, Jensen J. The epidemiology of fractures of the proximal humerus. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 1989; 108:285-7.
4. Kanchanatawan W, Suppauksorn S, Chobpenthai T, Densiri-aksorn W, Pongpinyopap W, Dorjiew G. Surgical Technique for Open Reduction-Internal Fixation of an Unstable Displaced 3-Part Proximal Humeral Fracture Using a Proximal Humeral Locking Plate. *Arthrosc Tech*. 2017 Jun 1;6(3):e807-13.
5. Constant CR, Murley AH. A clinical method of functional assessment of the shoulder. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1987 Jan;(214):160-4.
6. Bigorre N, Talha A, Cronier P, Hubert L, Toulemonde JL, Massin P. A prospective study of a new locking plate for proximal humeral fracture injury. *Int J Care Injured*. 2009; 40:192-6.
7. Gerber C, Worner CM, Vienne P. "Internal fixation of complex fractures of the proximal humerus". *J Bone Joint Surg (Br)*, 2004 Aug; 86:P, 848-855.
8. Misra A, Kapur R, Maffulli N. Complex proximal humeral fractures in adults – a systemic review of management. *Injury* 2001; 32: 363-72.
9. Kumar GN, Sharma G, Sharma V, Jain V, Farooque K, Morey V. Surgical treatment of proximal humerus fractures using proximal humerus interlocking osteosynthesis plate. *Chinese journal of traumatology*. 2014;17(5):279-84.
10. Kulkarni S, Kulkarni A, Patel A, Gupta T. Proximal humerus fractures operated with PHILOS: 4-year prospective study. *Int J Res Orthop* 2017; 3:304-9.