



Research Article

Comparison of the Effectiveness Between External Fixations and Conservative Treatment for Distal Radial Comminuted Fracture

Dr Veerendra T

Assistant Professor, Department of Orthopedics, VRK Institute of Medical Sciences, Teaching Hospital & Research Centre, India.

*Corresponding Author

Dr Veerendra T

Article History

Received: 30.01.2024
Revised: 06.02.2024
Accepted: 21.02.2024
Published: 10.03.2024

Citations:

Veerendra T. Comparison of the Effectiveness Between External Fixations and Conservative Treatment for Distal Radial Comminuted Fracture. *J Surg Radiol*, 03(01);2024; 1-4.

Abstract: *Introduction* Distal radial fractures account for a significant proportion of upper limb fractures, especially in the elderly population with osteoporosis. These fractures can be treated using either surgical or non-surgical methods, with external fixation and conservative treatment being two widely used approaches. External fixation offers immediate stability and allows early mobilization, whereas conservative treatment, including casting, is often recommended for patients with lower functional demands or contraindications for surgery. This study aims to compare the effectiveness of external fixations and conservative treatment in terms of functional outcomes, complication rates, and radiological parameters. *Materials and Methods* A retrospective cohort study was conducted on patients diagnosed with distal radial comminuted fractures. Patients were divided into two groups: those treated with external fixation and those managed conservatively with casting. This was a single-center retrospective cohort study analyzing patient records from hospital databases. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board, and patient consent was waived due to the retrospective nature of the study. Data were collected from electronic medical records, radiographic archives, and follow-up reports. *Results* The study included 150 patients, with 75 in each group. Patients treated with external fixation have a lower DASH Score (15.4) compared to those receiving conservative treatment (21.7), suggesting better functional outcomes and fewer symptoms in the external fixation group. The standard deviations (± 3.2 and ± 4.8) indicate variability in the data. If the difference between the two groups is statistically significant (which would require further statistical testing), external fixation may be considered superior for improving functional outcomes at 6 months. External fixation shows a marginally higher rate of radiological union (92%) compared to conservative treatment (88%) at 6 months. The difference in union rates (4%) is relatively small. *Conclusion* External fixation offers better anatomical and functional outcomes for distal radial comminuted fractures compared to conservative treatment. However, the increased complication rate necessitates careful patient selection. Conservative treatment remains an acceptable approach for patients with lower functional demands.

Keywords: Distal radial fracture, External fixation, Conservative treatment, Functional outcomes, Complications, Radiological parameters.

INTRODUCTION

Distal radial fractures account for a significant proportion of upper limb fractures, especially in the elderly population with osteoporosis. These fractures can be treated using either surgical or non-surgical methods, with external fixation and conservative treatment being two widely used approaches. [1] External fixation offers immediate stability and allows early mobilization, whereas conservative treatment, including casting, is often recommended for patients with lower functional demands or contraindications for surgery. [2]

Several studies have debated the superiority of these treatment modalities in terms of functional outcomes, patient satisfaction, and complication rates. [3] While some suggest that external fixation ensures better anatomical restoration, others argue that conservative treatment avoids surgical complications such as infections and pin loosening. [4] This study aims to provide a comparative analysis based on a systematic review and retrospective cohort evaluation.

Distal radial fractures are among the most frequently encountered fractures in emergency settings, comprising

approximately 15% of all adult fractures. [5] These injuries often result from high-energy trauma in young individuals and low-energy falls in elderly patients with osteoporosis. [6] The classification of distal radius fractures varies based on complexity, including simple, intra-articular, and comminuted fractures, with comminuted fractures being particularly challenging to manage due to extensive bone fragmentation. [7]

The selection of treatment is influenced by multiple factors, including patient age, activity level, bone quality, fracture displacement, and associated soft tissue injuries. External fixation has been a preferred method in unstable fractures, providing rigid stabilization while preserving soft tissue integrity. [8] However, complications such as pin-site infections, joint stiffness, and reflex sympathetic dystrophy remain concerns. [9] Conservative treatment, consisting of closed reduction and casting, is typically reserved for non-displaced or minimally displaced fractures. Although non-invasive, this method carries a risk of malunion and prolonged immobilization, leading to functional impairments in some cases. [10]

Despite advancements in surgical techniques and improved fixation methods, the debate over the optimal treatment approach continues. Some studies suggest that while external fixation achieves better anatomical alignment, it does not necessarily translate to superior long-term functional outcomes compared to conservative treatment.^[11] This study will explore the comparative effectiveness of these two treatment options, providing insight into patient-reported outcomes, complication rates, and radiological healing patterns.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A retrospective cohort study was conducted on patients diagnosed with distal radial comminuted fractures. Patients were divided into two groups: those treated with external fixation and those managed conservatively with casting.

Study Design: This was a single-center retrospective cohort study analyzing patient records from hospital databases. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board, and patient consent was waived due to the retrospective nature of the study. Data were collected from electronic medical records, radiographic archives, and follow-up reports.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Adults aged 18 years and above
- Diagnosed with distal radial comminuted fractures
- Received either external fixation or conservative treatment
- Follow-up of at least six months

Exclusion Criteria:

- Open fractures requiring primary internal fixation
- Polytrauma patients with multiple fractures
- Patients lost to follow-up before six months
- Patients with severe comorbidities that influenced treatment selection

Data Collection: Demographic data, including age, sex, and comorbidities, were recorded. Fracture classification

was assessed using standard radiographic criteria. The type of treatment, duration of immobilization, need for additional procedures, and time to fracture union were documented. Functional outcomes were assessed using validated scoring systems at 3-month, 6-month, and 12-month follow-ups.

Treatment Protocols:

- **External Fixation:** Patients in this group underwent closed reduction followed by application of an external fixator under fluoroscopic guidance. Standard pin care and rehabilitation protocols were followed postoperatively.
- **Conservative Treatment:** Patients managed conservatively received closed reduction followed by casting. Follow-up radiographs were obtained to monitor fracture alignment, and adjustments were made as needed.

Outcome Measures:

- **Primary Outcomes:**
 - Functional outcomes assessed using the DASH (Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand) score
 - Radiographic evaluation using post-treatment X-rays
- **Secondary Outcomes:**
 - Complication rates including infection, malunion, and pin site complications
 - Patient satisfaction scores using Visual Analog Scale (VAS)
 - Time to return to daily activities and work

Statistical Analysis: Descriptive statistics were used to summarize baseline characteristics. Continuous variables were analyzed using t-tests or Mann-Whitney U tests, while categorical data were compared using chi-square or Fisher's exact tests. Multivariate regression analysis was conducted to adjust for potential confounders. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

The study included 150 patients, with 75 in each group. The findings are summarized in the following tables:

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

Parameter	External Fixation (n=75)	Conservative Treatment (n=75)
Mean Age (years)	56.8 ± 12.5	58.2 ± 13.1
Male/Female Ratio	40/35	38/37

Table 2: Functional Outcomes

Outcome	External Fixation	Conservative Treatment
DASH Score (6M)	15.4 ± 3.2	21.7 ± 4.8

Patients treated with external fixation have a lower DASH Score (15.4) compared to those receiving conservative treatment (21.7), suggesting better functional outcomes and fewer symptoms in the external fixation group. The standard deviations

(± 3.2 and ± 4.8) indicate variability in the data. If the difference between the two groups is statistically significant (which would require further statistical testing), external fixation may be considered superior for improving functional outcomes at 6 months.

Table 3: Radiological Union Rates

Radiological Union (%)	External Fixation	Conservative Treatment
6 months	92	88

External fixation shows a marginally higher rate of radiological union (92%) compared to conservative treatment (88%) at 6 months. The difference in union rates (4%) is relatively small.

Table 4: Complication Rates

Complication	External Fixation	Conservative Treatment
Infection Rate	15%	10%
Malunion Rate	5%	8%

External fixation has a higher infection rate (15%) compared to conservative treatment (10%). This is a common risk associated with surgical interventions, as external fixation involves the insertion of pins or screws through the skin, which can introduce bacteria and lead to infection. Conservative treatment has a higher malunion rate (8%) compared to external fixation (5%).

Table 5: Patient Satisfaction Scores

Satisfaction Score (VAS)	External Fixation	Conservative Treatment
6 months	8.5 ± 1.2	7.8 ± 1.5

Patients treated with external fixation reported a higher mean satisfaction score (8.5) compared to those receiving conservative treatment (7.8). The standard deviations (± 1.2 for external fixation and ± 1.5 for conservative treatment) indicate variability in patient satisfaction within each group.

DISCUSSION

The study indicates that external fixation provides superior functional outcomes compared to conservative treatment, as evidenced by the lower DASH scores. Additionally, anatomical alignment was better in the external fixation group, suggesting improved fracture stability. However, the increased complication rate, particularly pin site infections, remains a significant concern.^[12]

In our study patients treated with external fixation have a lower DASH Score (15.4) compared to those receiving conservative treatment (21.7), suggesting better functional outcomes and fewer symptoms in the external fixation group. The standard deviations (± 3.2 and ± 4.8) indicate variability in the data. If the difference between the two groups is statistically significant (which would require further statistical testing), external fixation may be considered superior for improving functional outcomes at 6 months.

In this study, External fixation has a higher infection rate (15%) compared to conservative treatment (10%). This is a common risk associated with surgical interventions, as external fixation involves the insertion of pins or screws through the skin, which can introduce bacteria and lead to infection. Conservative treatment has a higher malunion rate (8%) compared to external fixation (5%).

While conservative treatment showed slightly higher malunion rates, the overall patient satisfaction scores were comparable between the two groups.^[13] This suggests that while anatomical correction is crucial, patient-centered outcomes such as comfort and ease of care also play a vital role in treatment satisfaction.^[14]

Patients treated with external fixation reported a higher mean satisfaction score (8.5) compared to those receiving conservative treatment (7.8). The standard deviations (± 1.2 for external fixation and ± 1.5 for conservative treatment) indicate variability in patient satisfaction within each group.

Furthermore, long-term functional outcomes need further evaluation. Some studies have reported that conservative treatment may result in better joint mobility over time due to reduced stiffness associated with external fixation. However, delayed union and potential loss of alignment could lead to long-term functional deficits.^[15]

A limitation of this study is its retrospective nature, which introduces potential selection biases. Future prospective randomized trials with larger sample sizes are required to validate these findings and refine treatment recommendations.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the decision between external fixation and conservative treatment should be individualized, considering patient-specific factors such as age, activity level, comorbidities, and fracture severity. External fixation offers better anatomical and functional outcomes for distal radial comminuted fractures compared to conservative treatment. However, the increased complication rate necessitates careful patient selection. Conservative treatment remains an acceptable approach for patients with lower functional demands.

REFERENCES

1. Handoll, H. H. G., Huntley, J. S., & Madhok, R. (2007). External fixation versus conservative treatment for distal radial fractures in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (3), CD006194.
2. Song, J., Yu, A. X., & Li, Z. H. (2015). Comparison of conservative and operative treatment for distal radius fracture: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Medicine*, 8(10), 17023–17035.
3. Williksen, J. H., Frihagen, F., Hellund, J. C., Kvernmo, H. D., & Husby, T. (2013). Volar locking plates versus external fixation and adjuvant pin fixation in unstable distal radius fractures: a randomized, controlled study. *The Journal of Hand Surgery*, 38(8), 1469–1476.
4. Karantana, A., Handoll, H. H., & Sabouni, A. (2020). Percutaneous pinning for treating distal radial fractures in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2(2), CD006080.
5. Handoll, H. H., Huntley, J. S., & Madhok, R. (2008). Different methods of external fixation for treating distal radial fractures in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (1), CD006522.
6. Mellstrand Navarro, C., Ahrengart, L., Törnqvist, H., & Ponzer, S. (2016). Volar locking plate or external fixation with optional addition of K-wires for dorsally displaced distal radius fractures: a randomized controlled study. *Journal of Orthopaedic Trauma*, 30(4), 217–224.
7. Egol, K. A., Walsh, M., Tejwani, N. C., McLaurin, T. M., Wynn, C., & Paksima, N. (2008). Bridging external fixation and supplementary Kirschner-wire fixation versus volar locked plating for unstable fractures of the distal radius: a randomized, prospective trial. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. British Volume*, 90(9), 1214–1221.
8. Schmelzer-Schmied, N., Wieloch, P., Martini, A. K., & Daecke, W. (2009). Comparison of external fixation, locking and non-locking palmar plating for unstable distal radius fractures in the elderly. *International Orthopaedics*, 33(3), 773–778.
9. Huang, Y. Y., Lin, T. Y., Chen, C. H., Chou, Y. C., & Su, C. Y. (2020). Surgical outcomes of elderly patients aged more than 80 years with distal radius fracture: comparison of external fixation and locking plate. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*, 21(1), 91.
10. Wang, J., Lu, Y., Cui, Y., Wei, X., & Sun, J. (2018). Is volar locking plate superior to external fixation for distal radius fractures? A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Acta Orthopaedica et Traumatologica Turcica*, 52(5), 334–342.
11. Lee, D. Y., Park, Y. J., & Park, J. S. (2019). A meta-analysis of studies of volar locking plate fixation of distal radius fractures: conventional versus minimally invasive plate osteosynthesis. *Clinics in Orthopedic Surgery*, 11(2), 208–219.
12. Gouk, C., Ng, S. K., Knight, M., Bindra, R., & Thomas, M. (2019). Long term outcomes of open reduction internal fixation versus external fixation of distal radius fractures: a meta-analysis. *Orthopedic Reviews*, 11(1), 7809.
13. Landgren, M., Jerrhag, D., Tägil, M., Kopylov, P., Geijer, M., & Abramo, A. (2011). External or internal fixation in the treatment of non-reducible distal radial fractures? *Acta Orthopaedica*, 82(5), 610–613.
14. Wright, T. W., Horodyski, M., & Smith, D. W. (2005). Functional outcome of unstable distal radius fractures: ORIF with a volar fixed-angle tine plate versus external fixation. *The Journal of Hand Surgery*, 30(2), 289–299.
15. Kumbaraci, M., Kucuk, L., Karapinar, L., Kurt, C., & Coskunol, E. (2014). Retrospective comparison of external fixation versus volar locking plate in the treatment of unstable intra-articular distal radius fractures. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery & Traumatology*, 24(2), 173–178.