Overview of Plate Osteosynthesis for different bones fractures

Mansour Mana Alghufaynah, Khalid Alabbas, Abdullah Omar Aljafaari, Ahmed Abdulhai Alsubahi, Khalid Awaad Alenizy, Saif Alshammari, Salman B. Almobayedh, Mahdi Mana Alabbas, Abdulmajeed Mohammad Alibrahem

Abstract:

The purpose of this article is to provide a brief overview of the history of plate as it relates to the development of the latest minimally invasive surgical techniques. Keywords: Internal fixation, plate, surgical techniques. We conducted a comprehensive literature search of related studies to Plate Osteosynthesis for different bones fractures, through database, PubMed (Midline) to the period of December 2017, using Mesh terms as following; Plate Osteosynthesis, bones fractures. The concepts of 'biological fixation' continue to evolve. New plate designs and plating techniques will possibly contribute to improved rates of fracture union, reduced rates of infection, and reduced occurrences of postoperative complications. Future fundamental and clinical studies will additionally identify the usefulness of and indicators for these methods. Biological osteosynthesis with conservation of the vascularity of the bone fragments by indirect reduction and less invasive implants results in an improvement in bone recovery which can be proven histomorphologically Dynamic plate osteosynthesis is a good choice for the stabilization of certain tibial and femoral fractures. It is an important option to intramedullary nailing, especially for distal fractures close to the joint. Management of fractures complicated by localized osteoporosis in the existence of nonunion presents a peculiar scenario in resource-poor countries. Orthopedic surgeons in developing countries have to come out with solutions as they are daily confronted with these problems.

Introduction:

Plate osteosynthesis is still acknowledged as the treatment of choice for the majority of articular fractures, many metaphyseal fractures, and certain diaphyseal fractures such as in the forearm. Considering that the 196Os, both the methods and implants used for internal fixation with plates have advanced to attend to enhanced healing. Most just recently, plating techniques have concentrated on the principles of 'biological fixation'. These techniques attempt to preserve the blood supply to improve the rate of fracture healing, lower the need for bone grafting, and decrease the occurrence of infection and re-fracture.

The idea of biological osteosynthesis [1] refers generally to the conservation of the vascularity of the bone during surgical intervention to ensure the continued vitality of the private pieces and to accomplish enhanced crack healing. The major methods of treatment are indirect decrease [2], ligamentotaxis [3] and bridge plating. Nonetheless, not just have personnel treatments transformed for many years, however implants have been boosted. Improvement of the periosteal flow was already accomplished by the layout of the LC-DCP that included undercuts on the undersurface of the plate [4] The PC-Fix stands for a new generation of plates, the undersurface which are made to ensure that there is only point contact with the bone and the monocortical screws lock into the plate, hence creating an internal fixator [5].

The purpose of this article is to provide a brief overview of the history of plate as it relates to the development of the latest minimally invasive surgical techniques. Keywords: Internal fixation, plate, surgical techniques.

Methodology:

We conducted a comprehensive literature search of related studies to Plate Osteosynthesis for different bones fractures, through database, PubMed (Midline) to the period of December 2017, using Mesh terms as following; Plate Osteosynthesis, bones fractures,. We tried to extract more studies from the references list of identified studies, to provide more supportive evidence for our study.

Discussion:

History of modern plate osteosynthesis

Although Robert Danis is generally considered as the father of modern-day osteosynthesis, earlier publications by Gurlt, Beranger-Feraud, Lister, Hansmann, Lane, Kiinig, Lambotte, and others each explained techniques of internal fixation [6].Gurlt published on the subject as early as 1862 and Lambotte coined the expression 'osteosynthesis' which described steady bone addiction. Danis' stated goals were to provide for active limb mobilization, total bone repair, and 'soudure each primam', or primary bone healing, making use of rigid fracture fixation [7].He created the 'coapteur' which was a plate created to supply 'Abstracts in German, French, Italian, Spanish and Japanese are published at the end of this supplement. compression through the dental implant and tighten the crack space. Using this tool, he radiographically experienced crack recovery without callus, currently typically described as 'direct' crack recovery [6].In 1957, Bagby and James developed a self pressing plate, referred to as the 'customized Colison' plate [8].Utilizing a screw with a conically designed head undersurface, the screw was eccentrically positioned and, when tightened, engaged the plate hole and displaced the plate perpendicularly along its long axis. Based on an old carpenter's concept, home plate produced just minimal compression [9].

Structure on Danis' work, the Arbeits gemeinschaft fur Osteosynthesefragen or AO, presented their concepts based on anatomical decrease, secure internal addiction, conservation of blood supply, and early active pain-free mobilization [10].The very first A0 self pressing plate was reported in 1963 [11].The plate was made from sheet metal and was 'semi-tubular' in style. Oblong holes and eccentrically placed screws gave the self-compression. Muller et al. additionally developed a removable stress tool as an outside source of compression for the round opening plate [11], an extensively used plate for years, however the used compression was unreliable [9].

In the early 1980's, Brunner and Weber presented the wave plate [12] and Heitemeyer and Hierholzer developed the bridge plate (14). These plates were created to cover the fracture site with a plate repaired proximally and distally along the bone. Particularly, the wave plate gave three theoretical advantages for the therapy of fractures: 1) decreasing vascular interruption at the crack site by staying clear of plate contact; 2) permitting the application of a corticocancellous bone graft at the crack website; and 3) altering the load of the plate to offer pure tension forces on the plate [12].

The idea behind the wave plate was indirectly sustained by various other authors' findings which recommend that bigger plates utilized on smaller bones may bring about raised issue rates [13].

A typical monitoring after plate osteosynthesis was radiographic bone loss. Although attributed to implant associated stress and anxiety defense, Perren et al. recommended that early bone porosis adjacent to implants was the outcome of death and internal remodelling [14].They provided data suggesting that: 1) bone porosis exists in renovation and is momentary; 2) the porosis exists in areas of disrupted flow beneath the plate and is absent in those areas which are mechanically unloaded; 3) plastic plates generate more porosis compared to steel plates; and 4) making use of plates with boosted flow reduces porosis.

- **From a rigid to a dynamic plate osteosynthesis**

For many years the goal for fracture stablizing of lengthy bones was an exact reduction of all crack fragments in mix with a stiff osteosynthesis (Figure 1). Lag screws were utilized to obtain compression at the crack site. Periosteum and muscle tissue had to be eliminated to acquire an anatomical decrease of all fragments. This sort of osteosynthesis resulted not just in lack of callus formation yet also in lowered bone perfusion. Moreover, it was difficult to monitor fracture healing by radiographs. Bone healing was delayed in many cases and hardware failings were frequently the result.

Figure 1. Rigid plate osteosynthesis of the femur. All fracture fragments are anatomically reduced. Many screws and lag screws are used. No callus formation is observed.

The objective in contemporary fracture stablizing, using either a plate or nail osteosynthesis, is to preserve the fracture hematoma and the perfusion of the bone, a so-called organic osteosynthesis [15].The AO (Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Osteosynthesefragen, Switzerland) recommended the need for biological crack management [16].An undamaged perfusion of bone and soft tissue is more vital for crack recovery than high primary mechanical stability (Figure 2). In an organic osteosynthesis the periosteum is preserved where feasible, an indirect reduction is carried out, and little crack fragments are left in place. The objective is to restore the size, axis, and turning of the bone without altering bone perfusion. It was recognized that callus development is not a sign of instability yet a natural and crucial process in fracture recovery. Micromotion at the crack void is needed in order to acquire callus development. "Dynamic plate osteosynthesis" refers to plate fixation that allows such micromotion.

Figure 2. Biological plate osteosynthesis. Preoperative (left) and postoperative (right) radiographs of a comminuted femoral fracture are shown. There are only a limited number of screws. Lag screws and screws in the fracture area are avoided. The unicortical screw.

- **The biology of fracture healing**

Along with the biological aspects, numerous mechanical problems have to be met for a busted bone to heal. The size of the crack void and the quantity of fracture motion are very important criteria that can boost or delay fracture healing. Aro and Chao described the principles for comprehending bone healing [17].The authors distinguished between osteonal and non-osteonal bone recovery. In non-osteonal fracture healing abundant callus formation is observed owing to periosteal and endosteal healing procedures. No primary recovery of the bone cortex is observed and redesigning procedures are slow. This kind of fracture is observed after cast immobilization, for example, where the fracture space and the movement between the pieces are huge. Abundant callus is needed to minimize motion at the fracture site, which lastly enables makeover and bone recovery.

In a mechanically steady situation, as is the case in a rigid osteosynthesis, primary osteonal fracture recovery will happen. Restoring osteones will certainly migrate straight from one fragment via the fracture gap to the contrary fragment. No remodeling will occur and no callus will certainly be seen. This type of crack recovery is possible only when the fragments remain in straight get in touch with. It does occur after rigid plate osteosynthesis with physiological decrease and interfragmentary compression. Much less inflexible osteosynthesis results in micromotion at the crack site. In this situation, fracture healing is started by periosteal and endosteal callus formation, adhered to by osteonal fracture recovery. This is called "secondary osteonal fracture healing". Improvement processes are quickly as long as the bone pieces remain in straight contact or with only a tiny fracture space. Today fracture recovery is tried to be attained by additional osteonal crack healing. It is very important for a surgeon to know in what means he can influence the quantity of micromotion at the fracture site and subsequently the rate of fracture healing.

- **The choice of the implant**

A number of surgical options such as plate osteosynthesis, intramedullary nailing, or external fixation are available for the treatment of fractures of long bones. The selection can be difficult. In an animal version fracture healing after 4 various types of osteosynthesis was contrasted [18].Comminuted tibial shaft cracks were treated by (i) inflexible plate osteosynthesis utilizing lag screws, (ii) linking osteosynthesis, (iii) exterior fixation, and (iv) intramedullary nailing. Of all procedures, the rigid, anatomically lowered plate osteosynthesis revealed the greatest mechanical security initially, yet the worst training course of fracture healing. The very best outcomes were obtained with the connecting osteosynthesis and outside fixation. For effective crack healing primary mechanical security appears less important compared to a biological osteosynthesis with an intact endosteal and periosteal perfusion.

Intramedullary nailing is typically the recommended therapy choice, specifically in shaft fractures of the shin or thigh. Open-reduction-and plate-osteosynthesis was brought into disrepute for its rigidity, long skin incisions, and soft tissue damage. However, organic plating techniques have enhanced and for that reason plate osteosynthesis has restored popularity.5 Nailing absolutely supplies numerous essential benefits: incisions are tiny, blood loss is marginal typically, and a dynamic stablizing can be attained. The surgical technique is basic and complete weight bearing for mobilization is possible. Nevertheless, the disadvantages of nailing additionally have to be taken into consideration: reaming could generate fat embolism and compromises the endosteal perfusion. In addition, the risk of rotational malalignment is increased in intramedullary nailing of distal femoral and tibial fractures [19], [20].In a methodical review of distal tibial fractures rotational malalignment showed up extra frequently in the intramedullary nailing team compared to in the plating team [21].The incidence of rotational malalignment after intramedullary nailing of femoral shaft fractures seems to be as high as 30% [22], [23].It seems noticeable that rotational malalignment could best be prevented by open decrease. It stays a trouble in comminuted cracks if minimal intrusive layering techniques are performed.

Anterior knee discomfort is one more usual problem after intramedullary nailing of the tibia [25] In a potential, randomized research 67% of the patients grumbled regarding anterior knee pain after transpatellar and 71% after paratendinous nailing [26].Plate osteosynthesis, specifically in distal tibial fractures, provides some reputable benefits. The risk for rotational malalignment and anterior knee pain can be neglected in straightforward fracture patterns, the fracture gap is normally little, and the endosteal perfusion can be maintained largely, even if open reduction is required. Furthermore, plate osteosynthesis is technically feasible in metaphyseal fractures near the joint, where intramedullary nailing reaches its constraints.

- **Possibilities for the surgeon to influence fracture healing**

The surgeon executing a plate osteosynthesis has different opportunities to influence fracture healing. He could manage micromotion at the fracture void and fixation strength of the plate. It has been demonstrated that lag screws decrease activity at the fracture gap considerably. Axial rigidity and torsional strength are affected mainly by the connecting size; as an example, the distance of the very first screw from the crack site [27].Micromotion increases exponentially with boosting connecting length. Omitting two or three plate holes at the fracture space and preventing lag screws, especially through the plate, enables adequate micromotion and as a result fast bone healing.

The most vital factor to boost pull-out strength of the screws in lengthy bones is the size of home plate [27].Oblique screws at home plate ends additionally enhance pullout strength [28].Another variable is the selection of the plate material. A titanium plate is twice as elastic as a steel plate and as a result permits even more micromotion with the very same plate configuration. The surgeon can influence crack healing by the variety of screws utilized. Drilling several screw holes might prompt regional heat necrosis and the local endosteal blood circulation might be disturbed without enhancing addiction strength. Thus, just few screws need to be used for crack fixation.

- **Biological Osteosynthesis**

In 1992 Baumgaertel showed that indirect reduction and bridge plating ('biological osteosynthesis') resulted in a general renovation in the worths for bone healing. The fracture gaps were linked more consistently and sequestra were rarely observed. The micro and macroangiographic evaluation revealed that the vascularity of the fragments was boosted. The bone showed a higher breaking toughness in mechanical screening. The outcomes were better boosted by application of the PC-Fix as a point get in touch with bridging fixator. There was an evident benefit over physiological reduction and application of the DCP. Bridging of the fracture gaps took place extra frequently and was a lot more pronounced. The blood supply to even the smaller fragments was well preserved. The results can be discussed in regards to histomorphology if the histological and radiological evaluations are thought about. It was revealed that callus connecting of the crack gap at the operative site and under the plate took place much earlier and was much more apparent after organic osteosynthesis. Some of the crack gaps had already been bridged by woven bone as early as the 2. - 3. week whereas for anatomical decrease with periosteal removing of the fragments there was no callus development even in the 6. week in many cases despite small spaces and good fragment adjustment.

The greater breaking strength of the bones at 8 weeks as observed by Baumgaertel after biological osteosynthesis was also associateded with much more substantial or solid bony linking. Another description for higher stability after indirect decrease may depend on the increased sample of measureable bone mass; the sample after indirect decrease got on occasions 2.5 times that acquired after anatomical reduction. Nonetheless, a statistically significant connection in between the bone and/or callus cross section and breaking stamina could not be established because of the small teams entailed. It is more likely that the breaking stamina is straight related to the amount of calcium deposited in the bone. The fluorescent stains are chelating agents of the calcium deposited in the callus so that they can be considered as direct signs of the mineralization of the bone. Those bones treated with biological decrease demonstrated high values after only 2 - 3 weeks. Incorporated with the arise from the radiographs it was established that several of the fracture spaces had already been connected and were practically entirely mineralized after 5 - 6 weeks. In contrast, callus linking of the crack gaps after physiological reduction was only just beginning by abdominal muscle out that time.

Conclusion:

The concepts of 'biological fixation' continue to evolve. New plate designs and plating techniques will possibly contribute to improved rates of fracture union, reduced rates of infection, and reduced occurrences of postoperative complications. Future fundamental and clinical studies will additionally identify the usefulness of and indicators for these methods. Biological osteosynthesis with conservation of the vascularity of the bone fragments by indirect reduction and less invasive implants results in an improvement in bone recovery which can be proven histomorphologically Dynamic plate osteosynthesis is a good choice for the stabilization of certain tibial and femoral fractures. It is an important option to intramedullary nailing, especially for distal fractures close to the joint. Management of fractures complicated by localized osteoporosis in the existence of nonunion presents a peculiar scenario in resource-poor countries. Orthopedic surgeons in developing countries have to come out with solutions as they are daily confronted with these problems.

Reference:

1. Brunner Ch F, Weber GB. Besondere Osteosynthesetechniken. Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer, 1981.
2. Mast J, Jakob R, Ganz R. Planning and reduction technique in fracture surgery. Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer, 1989.
3. Vidal J. Treatment of articular fractures by 'ligamentotaxis' with external fixation. In: Brooker HS, Edward CC (eds) External Fixation: Current State of the Art. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1979.
4. Perren SM, Klaue K, Pohler O, Predieri M, Steinemann S, Gautier E. The limited contact dynamic compression plate (LC-DCP). Arch. Orthop. Trauma Surg. 1990;109:304-10.
5. Tepic S, Predieri M, Plavljanic Met al. Internal fixation with minimal plate-to-bone contact. 38th Annual Meeting, Orthopaedic Research Society, Feb. 17-20, 1992, Washington, D.C.
6. Colton CL. The history of fracture treatment. In: Browner BD, Jupiter JB, Levine AM and Trafton PG (eds). Skeletal Trauma. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1992;3-30.
7. Danis R. Theorie et pratique de I'osteosynthese. Paris: Masson, 1949.
8. Bagby GW, Janes JM. An impacting bone plate. Staff meeting: Mayo Clinic, 1957;32:55-57.
9. Perren, SM. The concept of biological plating using the limited contact-dynamic compression plate (LC-DCP). Scientific background, design and application. Injury (Suppl.), 1991;1-41.
10. Miiller ME, Allgijwer M, Schneider R, Willenegger H. Manual of Internal Fixation. 3rd Ed. Berlin: SpringerVerlag, 1991.

11. Miiller ME, Allgiiwer M, Willenegger H. Technik der operativen Frakturenbehandlung. Berlin: Springer, 1963.
12. Brunner CF, Weber BG. Besondere Osteosynthesetechniken. Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer, 1981.
13. Chapman MW, Gordon JE, Zissimos AG. Compressionplate fixation of acute fractures of the diaphyses of the radius and ulna. J. Bone Joint Surg. (Am.) 1989;71:159-169.
14. Perren SM, Cordey J, Rahn BA, Gautier E, Schneider E. Early temporary porosis of bone induced by internal fixation implants - A reaction to necrosis, not to stress protection. Clin. Orthop. 1988;232:139-151.
15. Weber BG. Stuttgart: Thieme;; 2004. Minimax fracture fixation.
16. Gerber C, Mast JW, Ganz R. Biological internal fixation of fractures. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 1990;109:295–303.
17. Aro HT, Chao EY. Bone-healing patterns affected by loading, fracture fragment stability, fracture type, and fracture site compression. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1993;293:8–17.
18. Claes L, Heitemeyer U, Krischak G, et al. Fixation technique influences osteogenesis of comminuted fractures. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1999;365:221–9.
19. Papakostidis C, Grotz MR, Papadokostakis G, et al. Femoral biologic plate fixation. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2006;450:193–202.
20. Boucher M, Leone J, Pierrynowski M, et al. Three-dimensional assessment of tibial malunion after intramedullary nailing: a preliminary study. J Orthop Trauma. 2002;16:473–83.
21. Puloski S, Romano C, Buckley R, et al. Rotational malalignment of the tibia following reamed intramedullary nail fixation. J Orthop Trauma. 2004;18:397–402.
22. Zelle BA, Bhandari M, Espiritu M, et al. Treatment of distal tibia fractures without articular involvement: a systematic review of 1125 fractures. J Orthop Trauma. 2006;20:76–9.
23. Ricci WM, Bellabarba C, Lewis R, et al. Angular malalignment after intramedullary nailing of femoral shaft fractures. J Orthop Trauma. 2001;15:90–5.
24. Jaarsma RL, van Kampen A. Rotational malalignment after fractures of the femur. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2004;86:1100–4.
25. Court-Brown CM, Gustilo T, Shaw AD. Knee pain after intramedullary tibial nailing: its incidence, etiology, and outcome. J Orthop Trauma. 1997;11:103–5.
26. Toivanen JA, Väistö O, Kannus P, et al. Anterior knee pain after intramedullary nailing of fractures of the tibial shaft. A prospective, randomized study comparing two different nail-insertion techniques. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2002;84:580–5.
27. Stoffel K, Dieter U, Stachowiak G, et al. Biomechanical testing of the LCP – how can stability in locked internal fixators be controlled? Injury. 2003;34:B11–9.
28. Stoffel K, Stachowiak G, Forster T, et al. Oblique screws at the plate ends increase the fixation strength in synthetic bone test medium. J Orthop Trauma. 2004;18:611–6.