HUMERAL SHAFT FRACTURES; FUNCTIONAL OUTCOME OF OPERATIVE MANAGEMENT OF HUMERAL SHAFT FRACTURES
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ABSTRACT... Objectives: To determine the functional outcome of operative management of humeral shaft fractures. Study Design: Prospective cohort study. Place and Duration: At the Department of Orthopaedics, Benazir Bhutto Hospital, Rawalpindi, for a duration of 02 years from 12th January 2016 to 11th January 2018. Patients and Methods: 45 patients presenting with humeral shaft fractures and meeting the inclusion criteria were included. All patients underwent fixation with a Dynamic Compression Plate (DCP). Functional outcome assessed at six months post-operatively using the American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons Scoring System (ASES). Results: Mean age of patients included in the study was 34.6 ± 10.3 years. Out of the 45 patients, 31 (68.9%) were males and 14 (31.1%) females. Pre-dominant condition resulting in operative management was humeral shaft fracture in poly trauma patients (n=27, 60%). Shoulder functioning following surgery was good with a mean ASES score of 81.1±10.6. Conclusion: Plating in humeral shaft fractures results in a good functional outcome post-operatively.
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INTRODUCTION
Fractures of the shaft of humerus are not uncommon and they have an incidence around 5%. Majority of these fractures are managed conservatively.¹ Their common mechanisms of injury are either a road traffic accident or a fall from height.² Traditionally these fractures have been managed conservatively leading to primary healing. There are increased chances of losing the fracture reduction when managed in a cast. With the evolution in designs of implants and operative procedures, these fractures are more often being managed operatively.³ Fixing these fractures with a plate has always been the gold standard.⁴ Conservative treatment in these fractures has been the primary modality of management, with healing observed in above 90% cases.⁵ Operative treatment has the advantage of early mobilization and good functional outcome.⁷ This operative procedure is not without risks which can either be in the form of a technical error or post-operative complication like infection, injury to nerve, etc.⁸

Most of the studies have used fracture union as the major determinant of the outcome and very few studies have examined the functions at the shoulder and elbow. As functional outcome of treatment of these injuries has not been studied in our local population, so this study was conducted to determine the functional outcome of humeral shaft fractures.

MATERIAL AND METHODS
This prospective, cohort study was conducted in the Department of Orthopaedics, Benazir
Bhutto Hospital, Rawalpindi, Pakistan from 12th January 2016 to 11th January 2018. Inclusion criteria were diaphyseal fractures of humerus with less than two weeks duration and patients older than 18 years of age. Exclusion criteria were patients with previous osteomyelitis of humerus, pathological fractures, Severe head injury with associated humeral shaft fractures, previous history of fracture of humerus/shoulder and those treated conservatively having more than 2 weeks duration. Calculation of sample size of study was done with OpenEpi version 3.0, using 95% confidence interval and 80% power. An informed consent was taken from patients who met the inclusion criteria. All information recorded on a pre-formed questionnaire. All patients underwent surgical management of humeral shaft fractures by the same consultant Orthopaedic surgeon. All patients were operated under general anaesthesia using a standard posterior triceps splitting approach. Radial nerve was identified in all cases. A dorsal 3.5 or 4.5mm Dynamic Compression Plate (DCP) was utilized.

Initially for the first 2 weeks post-operatively, a poly sling was applied for the patients’ comfort. Post-operative rehabilitation included gentle pendulum and active assisted shoulder and elbow range of motion exercises which were initiated at 2 weeks post-op. These were followed-up by strengthening and passive range of motion exercises.

Patients were followed up at 2 and 6 weeks, and at 3 and 6 months post-operatively. Radiographs were taken at 6 weeks, and 3 and 6 months post-op. Assessment of functional outcome was done at 6th month post-op by the American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons Scoring System (ASES).

The ASES consisted of two parts; patient self-evaluation and a physician assessment. Patient self-evaluation part comprised of Visual Analog Pain Scale (VAS) and questions on daily living activities. The physician assessment consisted of assessing the range of motion (ROM), specific physical signs, strength, and stability.

Data analysis was done using SPSS version 23 and descriptive statistics for variables presented in the form of frequencies and percentages. Chi Square test applied for distribution of gender and side of fracture. Repeated measures ANOVA were used to show any variations in the dependent variables. Data was considered significant if p-value less than 0.05 and presented with 95% confidence interval.

RESULTS

A total of 45 patients were included in the study. 31 (68.9%) patients were male while 14 (31.1%) female (Table-I). 26 (57.8%) patients had fracture of right humerus while 19 (42.2%) had involvement of left humerus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of Patients (n) (%)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31 (68.9%)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14 (31.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side of fracture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Arm</td>
<td>26 (57.8%)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Arm</td>
<td>19 (42.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-I. Gender and operative side distribution Chi-square test applied

The mean age of patients was 34.6 ± 10.3 years. The common age group was 35 - 44 years with 17 (37.8%) patients falling in this category. Major indication for surgery was humeral shaft fracture in poly trauma patients accounting for 27 (60%) cases.

3 (6.7%) patients had iatrogenic radial nerve injury while none of the patient had post-operative infection. Based on a visual analogue scale ranging from 1 to 10 for severity of pain, 22 (48.9%) patients rated pain severity associated with humeral fracture at 0 and 14 (31.1%) rated pain at 1. The maximum pain severity reported was 6 out of 10, rated by one patient.

The findings of the physical assessment of patients with humeral fractures conducted by a physician are shown in Table-II. The range of motion in 42 (93.3%) patients was characterized by an arc of motion > 100 degrees and 41 (91.1%) patients had shoulder joint stability. Functional ability was retained for most activities of daily living: combing hair (100%); bathing (93.3%); self-feeding and dressing (86.7%).
The median shoulder functionality scores in the different age groups ranged from 80 to 85 out of 100. The oldest age group (45 years and above) had lower scores with median score of 80 and range 48.3 to 85 (Table-III).

Functional Outcome was assessed using ASES score for shoulder function derived from patient self-reported visual analog score (50%) rating of pain and cumulative activities of daily living scores (50%), yielding a maximum score of 100. On average shoulder functioning following surgery was good with a mean ASES score of 81.1±10.6 and range 46.7 to 91.7. (Table-IV).

The mean age of patients presenting with humeral fractures in our study was 34.6 ± 10.3 years which was comparable to a study done by Pal et al in which mean age was 34.4 years. The modal age group was 35-44 years with 17 patients in this age category. The second most common patient age group was 25-34 years accounting for 14 patients. In our study, 31 (68.9%) patients were male while 14 (31.1%) female. Similar gender statistics were shown by a study done by Sarwar et al at Allied Hospital Faisalabad, Pakistan in which 57.6% patients were male.

Of the 45 patients operated, 26 (57.8%) had right sided humeral fracture while 19 (42.2%) had left side involvement. This was in contrast with a previous study done by Bergdahl et al which showed humeral shaft fractures pre-dominantly affecting the left arm (54%). The humeral shaft extends between the upper borders of the insertion of the pectoralis major muscle proximally to the supracondylar ridge distally. The proximal portion of the humeral shaft assumes more of a cylindrical shape, but it develops into a triangular shape as you move distally.

DISCUSSION
Operative indications for humeral shaft fractures include patients with multiple injuries, open fractures, fractures associated with neurovascular compromise or associated shoulder, elbow or forearm fractures of the same limb; bilateral humeral fractures, failed conservative methods and pathological fractures. In this study humeral shaft fractures in poly trauma patients was the leading cause of operative management (60% cases) which was in accordance with a study done by Pidhorz.
Kim et al found 50% of the fractures occurred at the proximal end of humerus while the next common site was distal humerus.²

All 45 patients were managed operatively by plating. This could be due to surgeon’s preference/experience and good previous results with this mode of fixation. In a study carried out by Wei et al, he reported a mean time of healing of 15.9 weeks in patients with plating which was in accordance to our study which had a mean healing time of 17.4 weeks.¹⁵ In a study by Govindasamy et al incidence of non-union in humeral shaft fractures was around 15% but in our study no case of non-union was seen.¹⁶

6.7% cases had an iatrogenic radial nerve injury in our study. These statistics were favoured by a study done by Pal et al which had 7.6% patients with nerve palsy.¹⁰

Based on a visual analogue scale (VAS) ranging from 1 to 10 for severity of pain, 22 (48.9%) patients rated pain severity associated with humeral fracture at 0 meaning they had no pain and 14 (31.1%) mild pain rated at 1. The maximum pain severity reported was 6 out of 10, rated by one patient.

The findings of the physical assessment of patients with humeral fractures conducted by a physician were similar to patient self-reports. Physician established that 23 (51.1%) patients were not in pain. Of the remaining 22 patients, 20 had mild pain.

The range of motion in 42 (93.3%) patients was characterized by an arc of motion > 100 degrees and 41 (91.1%) patients had shoulder joint stability. Functional ability was retained for most activities of daily living: combing hair (100%); bathing (93.3%); self-feeding and dressing (86.7%). Clement in a similar study found good range of motion post operatively.⁵

Functional Outcome was assessed using ASES score for shoulder function derived from patient self-reported visual analog score (50%) rating of pain and cumulative activities of daily living scores (50%), yielding a maximum score of 100. On average shoulder functioning following surgery was good with a mean ASES score of 81.1±10.6 and range 46.7 to 91.7. This was similar to a previous study by Fan et al whose ASES score on average was 90.33±1.32.¹⁷ Limitations of our study were a sample size and no comparison with other treatment modalities was done. Studies should be done in future comparing functional outcomes of different operative modalities.

**CONCLUSION**

In patients with indication for operative management of humeral shaft fractures, plating can be done because of good functional outcome and healing potential.
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