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Hemiarthroplasty vs. locking plate osteosynthesis – what is the better solution for displaced proximal humerus fractures?
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Abstract

Introduction: Displaced proximal humerus fractures pose significant clinical problems. The aim of this study was to compare treatment results between open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) and hemiarthroplasty (HA).

Material and methods: The study was a retrospective assessment. Sixty-three patients (30 HA, 33 ORIF) met the inclusion criteria; mean age: 64.5 years. The Constant-Murley scale, DASH score and VAS surveys for pain and satisfaction were used to evaluate the results.

Results: The HA group: the constant score was 44 points, and the DASH score was 57 points; 53% of patients had osteolysis of the greater tubercle; none of the patients had revision surgery. ORIF group: the constant score was 59 points, and the DASH score was 38 points; 21% of patients had vascular necrosis; revision surgery was performed in 18% of cases. A significant correlation between good functional outcomes and young age of patients was found in the ORIF group (p-value < 0.048). Patients who started physical therapy earlier achieved better results. DASH scores were better compared to ones from the objective Constant-Murley score. There was no difference in satisfaction between HA and ORIF groups (p-value < 0.1).

Conclusions: The ORIF should be considered for patients < 60 years old, but gives increased risk of urgent revision, due to screw protrusion. The HA provides fewer complications, lower risk of revision and can be better for patients between 60 and 70 years old. When choosing the treatment method, we should avoid focusing only on fracture configuration, but should also consider patient-related factors, such as age and lifestyle.
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Introduction

Proximal humerus fractures represent 4% to 5% of fractures among adults and 10% of fractures occurring above the age of 65 [1]. The classifications that we use are not fully satisfactory as a guideline for modern treatment and the final outcome indication. Predicting the damage to arterial vessels supplying the humeral head is the basis of AO/OTA classification [2]. 11C/AO fractures are intra-articular fractures with heal-
ing results often being disappointing [3]. When analyzing the international bibliography it can be noted that so far no algorithm for therapeutic procedures has been established and that there are no clear guidelines regarding the choice of best method of treatment [3, 4]. Correct qualification for the procedure and adequate surgical technique are important. There are many controversies regarding whether better results are obtained by internal fixation or hemiarthroplasty of the shoulder joint [5, 6]. For patients above the age of 70 one solution can be total reverse shoulder replacement, where functional results for this method are promising [7, 8]. In younger patients the choice of an appropriate method is still a problem that has not been entirely solved.

The aim of this study was to compare between the results of surgical treatment of displaced 11C/ \textit{AO} fractures using an angle stable locking plate and hemiarthroplasty, and to determine whether there are any variables having an impact on the final treatment results, which method is characterized by more revision surgery, and whether the objective result of the shoulder function (Constant-Murley score) is comparable with the subjective perceptions of a patient (DASH score, VAS satisfaction).

Material and methods

During the years 2009–2013, 233 patients in the Department of Orthopedics and Trauma Surgery of the Medical University of Gdansk were operated on because of proximal humerus fractures (57 treated using hemiarthroplasty, 176 using plate fixation). Sixteen patients died (6 after hemiarthroplasty, 10 after plate fixation) and 61 people were lost from the observation group (follow-up). Thirty-two cases were excluded from the study due to the sustained injury or paresis of the opposite upper limb. From the remaining 124 patients 63 cases were displaced 11C/\textit{AO} fractures (47 females, 16 males with the observation period longer than 12 months, mean age: 64.5 years (SD = 13.7), mean follow-up period 29 months (SD = 13.2). Thirty patients were treated using shoulder hemiarthroplasty and 33 patients using an angle stable locking plate. Since the study included patients without a history of any disease of the opposite shoulder joint, it was assumed that the opposite shoulder has 100% range of motion (constant 40 points) and 100% of strength for the given patient. Every patient gave informed consent to participate in the clinical trial and to use radiological and photographic documentation in the scientific study. Research permission was granted by the Independent Bioethical Commission for Scientific Research at the Medical University of Gdansk. Fracture types 11C2-C3/\textit{AO} were classified based on X-ray examination and, where in doubt, a computed tomography (CT) scan was performed. All the patients had X-rays done in two projections – AP and lateral (transthoracic) or scapular y-view during trauma, after surgery and after the treatment came to an end. Open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) post-operative X-rays were used to evaluate femoral neck-shaft angle, reposition of the articular surface and greater tubercle. Non-anatomical reposition was determined when: fragments of the articular surface were displaced by > 2 mm, the correct femoral neck-shaft angle of 135° was decreased or increased by 20° in the AP projection [9], or the greater tubercle was dislocated by > 10 mm [10]. On post-operative hemiarthroplasty X-rays greater tubercle reposition was evaluated using the Boileau score [11, 12]. Final radiological assessment was used to evaluate bone union or its disorders, presence of avascular necrosis of the humeral head or greater tubercle, occurrence of inflammatory osteolysis, occurrence of a conflict between the implant and coracoid process of the scapula, disruption of relations in the joint (dislocation, subluxation), heterotopic ossification and complications connected with implants (loosening, protrusion of the locking elements). Choice of a given operative treatment was done both before and intraoperatively (in case where stable osteosynthesis was not possible, conversion to hemiarthroplasty was performed). Procedures were done by three experienced surgeons (P.M., K.S., D.K.).

All the patients were operated on under regional anaesthesia (brachial plexus block) and/or under general anaesthesia. The patient was seated in the “beach chair” position. A deltopectoral approach was used [13]. Philos Synthes implants were used in cases of ORIF. Reposition of tubercles was strengthened by nonabsorbable 2.0 sutures, which were stitched to the plate. Whenever possible, efforts were made to obtain stable fixation of three main fragments, i.e. the head and greater and lesser tubercle, using screws locked in the plate. The next step was fixation of the proximal end of the humerus with the shaft. Hemiarthroplasty was performed using implants from three companies (Epoca Synthes – 25 patients, Aequalis Tornier – 5 patients; choice of an implant was dictated by availability in the centre). After mounting the head of the prosthesis, the stem was fixed within the medullary cavity on bone cement in retrotorsion of about 20° determined from the long axis of the humerus. The level of endoprostheses fixation was 5 cm for men and 4 cm for women above the level of pectoralis major muscle attachment. The space between the stem and humeral tubercles and the space in the metaphysis were filled with grafts from the resected humeral head. Next, using nonabsorbable 2.0 sutures the greater...
and lesser tubercles were sutured along with rota-
tor cuff attachments [11, 14]. This was then addi-
tionally strengthened with a loop put over the neck
and tubercles of the humerus. In patients treated
using arthroplasty tenodesis of the biceps brachii
long head tendon was performed. The limb was
put on a sling after surgery. In case of doubts about
stability of the fixation or joint after arthroplasty
patients were provided with shoulder stabilizer for
3 to 6 weeks. Upon discharge from hospital all the
patients were given a protocol of exercises to per-
form at home, which included passive exercises of
bending the shoulder to the front and abduction
until the 3rd week, then for the next 3 weeks
additional passive exercises of external and inter-
nal rotation and 6 weeks after surgery active ex-
ercises. The time for starting rehabilitation under
supervision of medical supervision has varied (in
Poland the system is based on queues or option-
ally private). Six weeks after surgery patients had
shoulder radiographs done in two projections or
more frequently/later done in case of complica-
tions. Clinical analysis (minimum 12 months after
surgery) was based on pain assessment, range of
motion, shoulder muscle strength and satisfaction
with the performed treatment. The Constant-Mur-
ley scale [15] and DASH score [16] were used for
functional assessment of the shoulder. TheVAS
scale was used to assess pain and satisfaction
with treatment. Range of motion was examined
using a goniometer. Muscle strength was examined
using a spring balance with the limb abducted
to 90° in the shoulder joint, the elbow joint ex-
tended and the forearm pronated. If the patient
was not able to perform 90° abduction, measure-
ment was done in the highest achieved position.
The best result of strength of the affected limb
was the percentage of maximum strength of the
healthy limb. The obtained percentage value was
divided by 4 to obtain a result on a 0–25 point
scale [17].

Statistical analysis

In the study quantitative traits were described
with basic statistics using the mean and standard
deviation (SD). For the confidence interval at
which the result was considered statistically sig-
nificant the p-value was set as < 0.05. Student's
t-test was used to compare two means from inde-
pendent trials. For correlation analysis Pearson's
coefficient for continuous variables was used. Sta-
tistical calculations were performed using SPSS
software for Windows v 19.

Results

Constant analysis showed better function of
shoulders treated using ORIF. The range of mo-
tion was better in the following planes: flexion,
abduction, external rotation. There was no differ-
eence in the range of external rotation. Strength
of shoulders treated using ORIF was also better,
but no statistically significant difference was
found. DASH score analysis also showed better
function of the limb among ORIF treated pa-
tients. Comparing the obtained results it was
found that the DASH score does not correspond
to the results of the more restrictive and objec-
tified Constant-Murley scale. In the group treat-
ed using hemiarthroplasty there were almost
4 times more good or very good results in pa-
tients' subjective opinion, and the ORIF group
showed almost twice as many of such results
(Table I). Eighty percent of patients were satisfied
with their treatment regardless of the used meth-
ood, and most of the patients described the level
of pain using the Constant scale as mild or no
pain (ORIF 82%, hemiarthroplasty 56%) (Table II).
In 96.7% of cases (29 out of 30) after hemiarthro-
plasty, fixation of the implant and greater tuber-
cle reposition (dislocation < 10 mm [10]) were
satisfactory in the postoperative images. Sixteen
out of 30 cases after hemiarthroplasty showed
a complication in the form of delayed union and
osteolysis of the greater tubercle, whereas pa-
tients who did not present with resorption of the
greater tubercle (14 out of 30 cases) had better
functional results (constant 60.1 points; DASH
41.8 points). Those results were close to the re-
results of patients treated using ORIF. In our ma-
terial among patients after hemiarthroplasty het-
erotrophic ossifications were not very severe and
functional results did not differ from the results
of the entire group (constant 46.6 points; DASH
53.3 points). None of the patients required urgent
surgical intervention in the early postoperative
period (12 months). The most common radiologi-
ical problem visible on postoperative images after
ORIF was incomplete anatomical repositioning of
the proximal fragment of the humerus (39.3% of
cases). Avascular necrosis of the humeral head or
greater tubercle was observed in 21.2% of cas-
es. If the changes applied to the head fragment,
it highly influenced the general result (constant
17.6 points; DASH 76.6 points). Changes applying
to the greater tubercle were not progressive and
the obtained results were much better (constant
66.4 points; DASH 26 points). In 18.2% of cases
(6 patients) required urgent reoperation due to
protrusion of the blocking elements (Table III). In
the case of patients treated with plate fixation,
young patients showed better treatment results,
which was not observed among patients treat-
ed with hemiarthroplasty. Neither of the groups
showed dependence of general results on time
elapsed between injury and surgery (mean of 10
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days). In turn, shorter time taken to start postoperative rehabilitation under medical supervision increased the chances for a better final outcome regardless of the chosen method of treatment.

**Discussion**

Despite continuously improving systems, treatment of multifragmentary fractures – mainly displaced 11C/AO – is still a challenge for surgeons [18]. Those fractures relate mainly to patients about and above the age of 60, mainly females with bones affected by osteoporosis, often accompanied by a damaged rotator cuff or arthritic changes to the joint. Precise anatomical realignment of severe dislocated fractures among these patients is still a problem [19]. Due to this, there is still no consensus regarding the method of treatment of such fractures. Performing hemiarthroplasty in the case of such fractures gives relief from pain [11, 17], primarily compared to patients treated conservatively [20]. The main cause of pain among patients after hemiarthroplasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>HA (N = 30)</th>
<th>ORIF (N = 33)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAS pain score</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>&lt; 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant pain score</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>&lt; 0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexion [°]</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>&lt; 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduction [°]</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>&lt; 0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rotation [°]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>&lt; 0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal rotation [°]</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>&lt; 0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength [kg]</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>&lt; 0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant score:</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>&lt; 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent and good results &gt; 70 points (%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory results &lt; 56 points (%)</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH score:</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>&lt; 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent and good results &lt; 51 points (%)</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory results &gt; 75 points (%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAS satisfaction score</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table I.** Comparison of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>HA (N = 30)</th>
<th>ORIF (N = 33)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>24 female, 6 male</td>
<td>23 female, 10 male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up [months]</td>
<td>39.1 (SD = 18.5)</td>
<td>29.2 (SD = 13.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO C2 (%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO C3 (%)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age [years]</td>
<td>68.9 (SD = 11.4)</td>
<td>62.3 (SD = 14.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r Constant score</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.41</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH score</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.97</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days from injury to surgery</td>
<td>13.4 (SD = 13.9)</td>
<td>8.11 (SD = 7.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r Constant score</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.94</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH score</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.39</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start medical rehabilitation [weeks]</td>
<td>8.3 (SD = 3.5)</td>
<td>5.3 (SD = 3.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r Constant score</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.032</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH score</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table II.** Characteristics of groups. Results in terms of variables (– Pearson correlation)
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according to Boileau et al. and Kontakis et al. [11, 12] is impingement syndrome caused by upward subluxation of the prosthesis. This can be seen in our group of patients, where osteolysis of the greater tubercle after shoulder arthroplasty and in consequence upward dislocation of the head were found in the observations. Pain was higher; four patients described it as chronic (Figure 1). In the case of patients treated with fixation Spross et al. [21] report that the protrusion of screws to the joint and irritation of the glenoid cavity cause severe shoulder pain, as in the case of our study. The range of shoulder motion after sustained 11C/AO fracture both among those treated with osteosynthesis and those treated with hemiarthroplasty demonstrates limitations in all planes. Robinson et al. report that after surgical treatment of multifragmentary fracture of the proximal part of the humerus patients regain an average of 50% of shoulder mobility [17], which is supported by the results of our study (ORIF group 58%, hemiarthroplasty group 42%). Only in 7 (23.3%) cases treated using arthroplasty did we observe flexion and abduction exceeding 90°. Comparable results were reported by Kralinger (167 cases of fractures treated with hemiarthroplasty), where abduction to the scapula level is achieved by only 35% of patients [22]. Most authors report unanimously that shoulder mobility after hemiarthroplasty is not fully satisfactory: Robinson et al. 24/40 points [17], Cai et al. 33.9/40 points [9], while in our study patients scored 17/40 points (Figure 2). It can be concluded that suffering a 11C/AO fracture is associated with future limitation in mobility as well as shoulder muscle strength. The literature gives a rate from 21% to 53% of problems connected with greater tubercle union after hemiarthroplasty (53.3% in our study) [11, 12, 22]. Lack of union and osteolysis of the greater tubercle are relatively frequent among patients after hemiarthroplasty, which leads to rotator cuff dysfunction and disappointing functional results [23]. Upward migration of the prosthesis is observed and patients are not able to lift the limb to more than 90°. Similar dependence is presented in studies by Bolieau et al. and Kontakis et al. [11, 12]. There are studies with good and very good functional results of shoulders after hemiarthroplasty with greater tubercle union in an anatomical position [11, 24]. Still, the question remains why more than half of correctly aligned greater tubercles underwent osteolysis in our study ma-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osteolysis of the greater tuberosity</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impingement syndrome</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficial infection</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ectopic calcification</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision surgery</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments of the articular surface &gt; 2 mm</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varus deformity</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perioperative protrusion screw</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avascular necrosis</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impingement syndrome</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficial infection</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision surgery</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Radiographs obtained at: A – the time of injury, B – postoperatively, C – after 24 months follow-up. The 78-year-old patient (constant 35 points, DASH 88 points)
Companies producing implants compete with each other in ideas regarding tubercle fixation, yet no univocal method has been found so far. Perhaps when finding fractures of the greater tubercle on a preoperative radiograph in the case of younger patients reverse shoulder arthroplasty is worth considering? Observations are distant and not extensive, and this requires further studies. In the group treated using fixation 11 cases showed varus deformity complication (the majority of them resulting in varus collapse) (Figures 3–5). The results of these patients are comparable for the entire group of patients after hemiarthroplasty (constant 46.7 points; DASH 47.5 points). Unfortunately, in four patients full necrosis of the humeral head was observed and two others had necrosis of the greater tubercle. Gardner in his work used an allograft from the fibula, using which he reconstructs the medial column, does plate fixation and claims that he does not observe complications such as varus collapse [25]. In our clinic we have not used this solution so far, but I find this method worthy of greater attention. Brunner et al. report that a complication in the form of protrusion of the fixating materials in the direct postoperative period is the main reason for revision in the early period. In their studies they reported protrusion of the locking elements in 14% of cases (22 out of 157 patients) after plate osteosynthesis [26]. Most commonly this complication is connected with the surgical technique, that is placing the locking screw too close to the articular surface. In the case of patients treated using plate osteosynthesis revision procedures were more frequent, representing 18.2% (6 out of 33 cases). In comparison to patients treated with hemiarthroplasty, no such cases were reported. Most publications state that ORIF more frequently requires revisions [23]. In their study, Spross et al. [21] qualified patients with type VI Neer fracture for comparative analysis and made a record of 45.5% of revision procedures in the group of patients treated using plate osteosynthesis (10 out of 22 cases) compared with 4.5% of procedures in the group of patients after hemiarthroplasty (1 out of 22 cases). Spross et al. [21] did not find better functional results in any of the groups. Cai et al. qualified patients with four-part...
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fractures according to the Neer classification for comparative analysis and found a slight advantage of patients after hemiarthroplasty compared to patients treated using ORIF (the differences were, however, small) [9]. Evaluation of treatment of three-part and four-part fractures according to the Neer classification was performed by Solberg et al. [27]. They reported, as in our study, better functional results in patients treated using osteosynthesis. The best results for shoulder function after hemiarthroplasty in trauma patients were presented by Charles Neer in 1970 [13]. Not many authors have been able to confirm these revelations. Murray et al. reported worse functional results for older patients who are not able to be actively involved in rehabilitation after surgery. In their opinion postponing rehabilitation treatment leads to periartricular adhesions and contractions [23]. In general, the literature does not give a clear answer on which method of treatment is best [4].

Analyzing data obtained from the studies it can be concluded that the functional results do not fully correspond with the treatment satisfaction level. This is supported by patients after hemiarthroplasty who achieved much poorer results in range of motion and shoulder strength, but 80% of these patients were happy with their treatment.

In conclusion, none of the compared methods of fracture treatment releases patients from pain entirely or restores full mobility of the shoulder joint. In younger patients (< 60 years old) ORIF should be considered as a treatment method of choice, as the shoulder range of motion after hemiarthroplasty is very often unsatisfactory. However, when choosing ORIF varus deformity should be avoided due to the high risk of avascular necrosis of the humeral head, screw protrusion to the joint and in consequence urgent revision.

Figure 4. Radiographs obtained at: A – the time of injury, B – postoperatively (varus deformity), C – after 3 months follow-up with partial AVN. The 64-year-old patient (after 24 months of excellent function: constant 94 points, DASH 4 points)

Figure 5. Radiographs obtained at: A – the time of injury, B – postoperatively (varus deformity), C – after 3 months follow-up. The 76-year-old patient (after 24 months of satisfactory function: constant 56 points, DASH 13 points)
surgery. When preparing for the surgery, conversion from fixation to arthroplasty always needs to be considered with implants ready for both procedures. Despite ORIF giving a better range of motion, it shows higher risk of complications leading to surgical intervention. Hemiarthroplasty is characterized by a low number of complications requiring urgent revision procedures and seems to be a better choice of treatment for patients aged between 60 and 70 years. It is worth mentioning that the satisfaction level among patients treated with hemiarthroplasty and ORIF did not differ. The decision of a given method of treatment should be made during direct conversation between the surgeon and the patient after individual case consideration. A multidisciplinary approach and inclusion of professional rehabilitation treatment are also important.
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