

Available online at http://www.journalcra.com

International Journal of Current Research Vol. 9, Issue, 01, pp.45448-45450, January, 2017 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH

RESEARCH ARTICLE

MINIMALLY INVASIVE DHS (MIDHS) DOES IT REALLY MAKE A DIFFERENCE?: A COMPARISON OF A NOVEL TECHNIQUE AT A TERTIARY CARE TRAUMA CENTRE

Siddiqi, M. A., *Farooq, M. Z., Idrees, Z., Ali, S. D. and Khan, A.

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Liaquat National Hospital, Karachi, Pakistan

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT			
Article History: Received 24 th October, 2016 Received in revised form 09 th November, 2016 Accepted 18 th December, 2016 Published online 31 st January, 2017	 Aim: The purpose of the study was to compare Minimally Invasive DHS (MIDHS) or Conventional DHS (CDHS) techniques for surgical parameters affecting treatment of Extra capsular Proximal Femur fractures. Methods: Prospective Case Control study have evaluated 108 extracapsular proximal femur fractures operated upon between Feb 2014 to March 2016. Patients presenting to the Orthopaedic Surgery department with Extra Capsular Proximal Femoral Fractures who were treated with Minimally 			
<i>Key words:</i> Extracapsular Proximal Femur Fractures, Minimally Invasive DHS, Trauma.	 Invasive DHS (MIDHS) were compared with those who presented in the same time frame but were managed using Conventional DHS (CDHS) using a muscle reflecting lateral approach. The two groups were matched for pre-operative parameters such as age and gender distribution, mechanism of injury, patient comorbids, classification of fracture pattern. The two groups were compared for incision size and operative time. Postoperative outcome measures were analgesia requirement, Visual Analog Score for pain, accuracy of reduction and lag screw positioning as well as drop in Haemoglobin level and transfusion requirement. Hip functional scores (Katz Basic Activities of Daily Living - BADL) and (Harris Hip Functional Score) were also compared following the two procedures. Results: 97 patients met the inclusion criteria. Out of these 5 patients were lost in the followup, 3 due to death and 2 due to change in address and contact details. Out of the 92 patients that remained in the study MIDHS technique was employed in (n=40) cases and CDHS was done for (n=52) patients. Conclusion: In view of our findings we conclude that MIDHS significantly minimizes blood loss and transfusion requirement and reduces postoperative pain giving a much more cosmetically sized scar while not compromising on, operative time, accuracy of reduction and postoperative hip function. 			

Copyright©2017, Siddiqi et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Siddiqi, M. A., Farooq, M. Z., Idrees, Z., Ali, S. D. and Khan, A. 2017. "Minimally invasive DHS (MIDHS) does it really make a difference?: A comparison of a novel technique at a tertiary care trauma centre", *International Journal of Current Research*, 9, (01), 45448-45450.

INTRODUCTION

Proximal femur fractures in the elderly are becoming increasingly common not only in the developed world but also in the developing world. Most of these fractures occur after trivial trauma and are classical insufficiency fractures. Extracapsular Intertrochanteric fractures form a large group of proximal femur fractures. Fixation with a sliding hip screw and an angle bearing barreled side plate, the so called Dynamic Hip Screw (DHS) has cemented its place as the gold standard for management of these fractures. Conventional fixation technique involves a 10-15 cm long incision after which either a vastus splitting or a vastus elevating approach has been described. This method involves significant soft tissue dissection translating into an equally high intra-operative blood loss and more post- operative pain. Other options such as the intramedullary PFN, PFNa and the Gamma Nail are now becoming easily popular due to limited observation, less devascularization of bone and have shown better long term results. Since these implants are still costly in Pakistan, and the DHS system can be purchased at $1/3^{rd}$ of the cost of any of the Intramedullary devices, there is a strong need to continue to rely on extramedullary fixation until the cost can be brought down. However a need for more biological fixation needing lesser soft tissue stripping is always desirable. To achieve this surgeons have used specially designed implants or instruments for the Minimally Invasive DHS (MIDHS).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We in our prospective case control study have evaluated 108 extracapsular proximal femur fractures operated upon between Feb 2014 to March 2016. Minimum follow up was 6 months. Inclusion criteria were (a) Intertrochanteric fractures in adult patients who were (b) Ambulatory with or without assistance before the fracture with (c) Presented within 14 days of sustaining the fracture. Patients excluded from the study were

^{*}Corresponding author: Farooq, M. Z.

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Liaquat National Hospital, Karachi, Pakistan.

(a) Aged less than 16 years, (b) were bedbound or wheelchair dependent before the injury, (c) Has fracture extending to the subtrochanteric region or femoral neck (d) Bilateral hip fractures (e) Previous lower limb orthopaedic surgery (f) Polio affected extremity fracture (g) trauma to other regions of the body including head injury (h) those with cognitive impairment or (i) those who had a delayed presentation (more than 14 days of injury) or those with (i) nonunions and pathological fractures. 97 patients met the inclusion criteria. Out of these 5 patients were lost in the followup, 3 due to death and 2 due to change in address and contact details. Out of the 92 patients that remained in the study MIDHS technique was employed in (n=40) cases and CDHS was done for (n=52) patients. All the MIDHS were performed by two surgeons Ali S.D. and Siddiqi M.A. Out of the 52 CDHS procedures, 17 were performed by the same two surgeons and the other were performed by other surgeons of the department. Due to the assignments of the two surgeons, patient distribution was assumed to be randomized. We compared the outcome of the conventional technique

(CDHS) versus the Minimally Invasive (MIDHS) mainly for operating time, blood loss and postoperative pain. Other variables evaluated were lag screw position (Tip Apex Distance – TAD) and accuracy of reduction in terms of varus/valgus angultion in AP projection and posterior sag/angulation on a cross table lateral projection.

Surgical Technique

The technique for CDHS has been well described in published literature. The VastusLateralis lifting approach was used as a standard in all the CDHS performed. The technique for MIDHS and its modifications adapted by the authors will be described in detail here. All the patients had spinal or spinal epidural anesthesia. They were positioned on a fracture table and the fracture was reduced by applying linear traction, internal rotation sequentially to obtain satisfactory closed reduction. Attainment of satisfactory closed reduction with stable apposition of the postero - medial cortex in both AP and Lateral projection on an image intensifier were regarded as prerequisites for MIDHS. After prepping and draping the operative site, two techniques were employed to mark the incision. In the first technique, a 4 hole side plate was positioned over the anterior aspect of the thigh and the image overlapped with the underlying femur in a position that the plate would be sitting in finally. A vertical line dropping to the ground was then drawn between hole 1 and 2 and hole 3 and 4. This was taken as the horizontal extent of the incision, approximately 3-4 cms. The lateral aspect of the femur was confirmed by palpation and the incision given between the two marked lines. In the alternative technique developed by S. D. Ali, the 135° angle guide with a guide wire was placed over the anterior aspect of the thigh and image overlapped with the underlying femur in the approximate position that the wire would finally be positioned in AP projection. Two lines drawn vertically down to the ground one from the oblique guide wire sleeve and the other from the end of the angle guide was used to mark the horizontal extent of the incision. The incision was then marked as previously described. Sharp dissection with a vastus splitting approach using a size 10 surgical knife was used to stab the fascia and the muscle up to the bone. The lateral surface of the bone was then bared using a periosteal dissector to extend 2 -3 cm distal to the superficial extent of the incision and upto the distal edge of the trochanteric/ flare proximally. Guide wire was introduced using the 135 degree angle guide introduced obliquely through the incision and final

placement confirmed by image intensifier. Angle guide was removed. A 50 cc feeding syringe with the tip cut was then used as a sleeve for the triple reamer, a technique developed by M.A. Siddiqi. Reaming and Tapping of the bone was then continued in the usual manner. The Screw was then introduced and the guide wire and sleeve removed at this stage. The DHS side plate was introduced in the 180° rotated position obliquely through the incision and was rotated back once in the submuscular plane using artery forceps. A 4.5 mm Hexagonal screwdriver was then introduced through the plate barrel and the plate guided into position over the lag screw under image intensifier using the screwdriver as a joystick. After confirmation of engagement of barrel to screw the plate was gently tapped into full seated position. Cortical screws were then inserted into the side plate using standard AO technique. Final confirmation of position was then checked under image intensification. Compression screw was then used only when the need for more acute compression was felt. After irrigation of the wound, Fascia was approximated using No 2 VICRYL[™] sutures. Subcutaneous fat was approximated using 2/0 VICRYLTM sutures and then skin was closed with staples. A drain was used in only 2 out of the 40 patients who underwent MIDHS and these were the patients in whom then incision had to be extended due to difficulty in plate insertion. The maximum incision length however in these remained

Post operatively, Hb levels were checked 24 hours after surgery as a routine for both MIDHS and CDHS patients. Mean drop in Hb from postoperative level was compared between the two groups. AP and Lateral Radiographs of the hip joint were obtained. Lag screw position was determined using the tip apex distance TAD <25 mm as reference for adequate positioning of the screw. Reduction was assessed and criteria for accurate reduction was (a) <10° Valgus / Varus angulation on AP radiographs, (b) $< 5^{\circ}$ angulation on lateral radiographs and (c) < 5mm of translation (sag) of either fragment with reference to the other on lateral radiograph. All the patients received a standard regimen of postoperative analgesia that included I/V Ketorolac 30 mg regularly 12 hourly, I/VNalbuphine 10 mg IV on need basis for 1st 48 hours after surgery. I/V ketorolac was switched to an oral NSAID on need basis on 3rd post-operative day. Oral Nuberol Forte[™] was added as regular oral analgesic and continued for 2 weeks postoperatively. Patients were usually discharged between 3rd to 5th POD. Number of I/V Nalbuphine injections required in the first 48 hours were recorded and Visual Analog Score - VAS for pain on 1st, 2nd and 3rd POD as well as on 1st Outpatient follow-up usually at 2 weeks.

Partial weight bearing was allowed on 1st POD and patients discharged on the same with the use of walker or crutches. Full weight bearing was allowed usually at 6 weeks or earlier depending on individual decision. Follow-up radiographs were taken at 6 and 12 weeks and then at 6 months post-op. Evidence of bridging callus and obliteration of fracture line was taken as evidence of satisfactory healing. Time to union in weeks was recorded and compared as outcome measure. BADL and HHS score was compared for CDHS and MIDHS patients at 6 months follow up.

Statistical Analysis

The chi-squared, Fisher's exact and independent values T-test were used where appropriate to compare the two groups. SPSS version 17.0 statistical package was used to analyze the data.

Preoperative Variables Age (Mean)6 d+156 d+13Preoperative Variables Age (Mean)61±1564±13GenderMales15/4219/55GenderFemales27/4236/55ComorbidsHypertension9/4215/55ComorbidsDiabetes Mellitus13/4218/55Cardiac Disease8/427/55Respiratory Disorder2/424/55RTA5/426/55High Energy Fall3/424/55Type of FractureUnstable3/426/55Intra-Operative VariablesItag Serve Size (Mean)85±10Lag Serve Size (Mean)61±1369±14Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation14/4250/55InginementSatisfactory3/424/55Itareal AlginmentSatisfactory3/424/55Itareal AlginmentSatisfactory3/424/55Itareal AlginmentSatisfactory3/424/55Itareal AlginmentSatisfactory3/4220/55Posterior SagSatisfactory3/4220/55Posterior SagSatisfactory3/4220/55Vanal ReductionSatisfactory3/4220/55Visual Analog Score1" POD57VanalgesiaAvgNo of Nathuphine Injections35Visual Analog Score1" POD57Visual Analog Score1" POD69Visual Analog Score1" POD6	~			05.110	
Age (Mean)(Mean)(1=15)64±13GenderMales15/4219/55Females27/4236/55ComorbidsHypertension9/4215/55ComorbidsDiabetes Mellitus13/4214/55Renal Dysfunction2/424/55Respiratory Disorder2/424/55Mechanism of InjurySimple Fall30/4244/55Mechanism of InjurySimple Fall7/425/55Type of FractureStable3/4249/55Intra-Operative VariablesKarl85±105Lag Screw Size (Mean)Stable85±1085±10Plate Size4 Hole41/4250/55Incision Size (Cm)4.2±0.410.9±1.4Operative Time (Min)61±1369±14Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation20±5AP AlignmentSatisfactory3/4249/55AP AlignmentSatisfactory3/4249/55Overall ReductionUnsatisfactory3/4249/55Overall ReductionSatisfactory3/4249/55Overall ReductionSatisfactory3/4249/55TransfusionNo of Pattens Transfused1043V AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections35Final Outcome Measures147057Final Outcome Measures14755755Final Outcome Measures14152755Final Outcome Measures14152155	Parameter		MIDHS	CDHS	P Value
GenderMales15/4219/55ComorbidsFemales27/4236/55ComorbidsHypertension9/4213/55Diabetes Mellitus13/4218/55Cardiac Disease8/427/55Renal Dysfunction2/422/55Mechanism of InjurySimple Fall30/4244/55RTA5/426/55Type of FractureStable39/4249/55Unstable10/425/555/55Type of FractureStable39/4249/55Lag Serew Size (Mean)V8541085410Plate Size4 Hole1/425/55Incision Size (Cm)5 Hole1/425/55Incision Size (Cm)5 Hole1/425/55Operative Time (Min)51061±1369±14Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation1220±5Typ of Fracture20±520±555Operative Time (Min)5atisfactory3/424/55Iateral AlignmentSatisfactory3/424/55Unsatisfactory13/4219/555Posterior SagSatisfactory2/422/55Posterior SagNo of Patients Transfused1043IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections35Visual Analog Score1*POD692*4Visual Analog Score1*POD692*4Visual Analog Score1*POD1/421/55 <t< td=""><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	1				
ComorbidsFemales $27/42$ $36/55$ ComorbidsHypertension $9/42$ $15/55$ Cardiac Disease $8/42$ $7/55$ Renal Dysfunction $2/42$ $4/55$ Renal Dysfunction $2/42$ $2/55$ Mechanism of InjurySimple Fall $30/42$ $4/55$ Ri TA $5/42$ $6/55$ High Energy Fall $7/42$ $5/55$ Type of FractureStable $3/42$ $6/55$ Intra-Operative Variables $3/42$ $6/55$ Lag Serew Size (Mean) 4 Hole $41/42$ $5/55$ Incision Size (Cm) 4 Hole $41/42$ $5/55$ Incision Size (Cm) 4 Hole $4/42$ $5/55$ Incision Size (Cm) 4 Hole $4/42$ $5/55$ Incision Size (Cm) $20+5$ $51/65$ AP AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $20/55$ Ap AlignmentSatisfactory $3/42$ $4/55$ Iateral AlignmentSatisfactory $3/42$ $20/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $3/42$ $20/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $3/42$ $20/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters $12/42$ $20/55$ Final Outcome Measures 14^2 $1/55$ OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Final Outcome Meas					
$\begin{array}{cccc} {\rm Comorbids} & {\rm Hypertension} & {\rm 9}/42 & {\rm 15}/55 \\ {\rm Diabetes Mellitus} & {\rm 13}/42 & {\rm 18}/55 \\ {\rm Cardiac Disease} & {\rm 8}/42 & {\rm 7}/55 \\ {\rm Renal Dysfunction} & {\rm 2}/42 & {\rm 4}/55 \\ {\rm Renal Dysfunction} & {\rm 2}/42 & {\rm 4}/55 \\ {\rm Renal Dysfunction} & {\rm 2}/42 & {\rm 4}/55 \\ {\rm Respiratory Disorder} & {\rm 2}/42 & {\rm 4}/55 \\ {\rm RTA} & {\rm 5}/42 & {\rm 6}/55 \\ {\rm High Energy Fall} & {\rm 30}/42 & {\rm 4}/55 \\ {\rm RTA} & {\rm 5}/42 & {\rm 6}/55 \\ {\rm Type of Fracture} & {\rm 5table} & {\rm 3}/42 & {\rm 6}/55 \\ {\rm Intra-Operative Variables} & {\rm 5table} & {\rm 3}/42 & {\rm 6}/55 \\ {\rm Intra-Operative Variables} & {\rm 85\pm10} & {\rm 85\pm10} \\ {\rm Plate Size} & {\rm 4 Hole} & {\rm 4}/42 & {\rm 5}/55 \\ {\rm 5 Hole} & {\rm 1}/42 & {\rm 5}/55 \\ {\rm 1ncision Size (Cm)} & {\rm 61\pm13} & {\rm 69\pm14} \\ {\rm Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation} & {\rm 1}/42 & {\rm 5}/55 \\ {\rm 1ncision Size (Cm)} & {\rm 015tance (mm)} \\ {\rm 7p Apex Distance (mm)} & {\rm 3tisfactory} & {\rm 28}/42 & {\rm 4}/55 \\ {\rm 10statisfactory} & {\rm 29}/42 & {\rm 36}/55 \\ {\rm 10tratification} & {\rm 1}/42 & {\rm 19}/55 \\ {\rm 7p oterior Sag} & {\rm 5atisfactory} & {\rm 13}/42 & {\rm 19}/55 \\ {\rm 7p oterior Sag} & {\rm 5atisfactory} & {\rm 13}/42 & {\rm 19}/55 \\ {\rm 7p oterior Sag} & {\rm 1}/42 & {\rm 10}/55 \\ {\rm 10tastafactory} & {\rm 13}/42 & {\rm 2}/55 \\ {\rm 10tastisfactory} & {\rm 13}/42 & {\rm 2}/55 \\ {\rm 7p oterior Sag} & {\rm No of Patients Transfused} & {\rm 10} & {\rm 43} \\ {\rm 10} & {\rm 43} \\ {\rm 11} {\rm Malegesia} & {\rm AvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections} & {\rm 3} & {\rm 3} \\ {\rm 10} {\rm 40} & {\rm 1}/52 \\ {\rm 11} {\rm 10} {\rm 10} \\ {\rm 11} {\rm 10} \\ {\rm 10} {\rm 10} \\ {\rm 12} {\rm 10} \\ {\rm 10} & {\rm 10} \\ $	Gender				
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Diabetes Mellitus & 13/42 & 18/55 \\ Cardiac Disease & 8/42 & 77/55 \\ Renal Dysfunction & 2/42 & 4/55 \\ Respiratory Disorder & 2/42 & 2/55 \\ \hline Mechanism of Injury & Simple Fall & 30/42 & 4/55 \\ RTA & 5/42 & 6/55 \\ \hline High Energy Fall & 7/42 & 5/55 \\ \hline Type of Fracture & Stable & 39/42 & 49/55 \\ \hline Unstable & 3/42 & 6/55 \\ \hline Intra-Operative Variables & $$$$ Unstable & 11/42 & 5/55 \\ \hline Intra-Operative Variables & $$$$$ Size (Mean) & $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$					
$\begin{tabular}{l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l $	Comorbids		2 · · · =		
Renal Dysfunction 2/42 4/55 Mechanism of Injury Simple Fall 30/42 44/55 RTA 5/42 6/55 Type of Fracture Stable 39/42 49/55 Intra-Operative Variables ustable 39/42 6/55 Lag Screw Size (Mean) 85±10 85±10 85±10 Plate Size 4 Hole 4/42 5/55 Incision Size (Cm) 5 Hole 4/42 5/55 Incision Size (Cm) 4 2±0.4 10.9±1.4 Operative Radiographic Evaluation 61±13 69±14 Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation 20±5 20±5 Alignment Satisfactory 3/42 8/55 Lateral Alignment Satisfactory 3/42 8/55 Desterior Sag Satisfactory 3/42 4/55 Overall Reduction Satisfactory 3/42 2/55 Overall Reduction No of Patients Transfused 9/42 2/55 Transfusion No of PABC Transfused 9/42 2/55 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
Respiratory Disorder 2/42 2/55 Mechanism of Injury Simple Fall 30/42 4/455 RTA 5/42 6/55 Type of Fracture Stable 39/42 49/55 Lag Screw Size (Mean) Unstable 3/42 49/55 Plate Size 4 Hole 41/42 50/55 Incision Size (Cm) 5 Hole 1/42 50/55 Operative Time (Min) 61±13 69±14 Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation 10.9±1.4 00±1.4 Operative Time (Min) 20±5 20±5 Post Distance (mm) 20±5 20±5 AP Alignment Satisfactory 38/42 47/55 Lateral Alignment Satisfactory 204/2 36/55 Overall Reduction Satisfactory 37/42 49/55 Overall Reduction Satisfactory 23/42 20/55 Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 10.942 26/55 Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 10.04 3 Visual Analog Score 1 ⁴					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		2			
RTÅ 5/42 6/55 Type of Fracture High Energy Fall $7/42$ 5/55 Intra-Operative Variables 3/42 6/55 Lag Screw Size (Mean) 85±10 85±10 Plate Size 4 Hole 1/42 5/55 Incision Size (Cm) 61±13 69±14 Operative Radiographic Evaluation 61±13 69±14 Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation 10.9±1.4 61±13 69±14 Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation 11.09±1.4 61±13 69±14 Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation 1.09±1.4 20±5 20±5 AP Alignment Satisfactory 29/42 36/55 Lateral Alignment Satisfactory 23/42 29/55 Overall Reduction Satisfactory 23/42 29/55 Overative Clinical Parameters 1.2±0.5 7±0.5 Prost-Operative Clinical Parameters 1.2±0.5 7±0.5 Transfusion No of Patients Transfused 10 43 IV Analgesia AvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
High Energy Fall7/425/55Type of FractureStable39/4249/55Intra-Operative Variables3/426/55Lag Screw Size (Mean)85±1085±10Plate Size4 Hole1/425/55Incision Size (Cm)5 Hole1/425/55Operative Radiographic Evaluation61±1369±14Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation204.5204.5Tip Apex Distance (mm)204.5204.5AP AlignmentSatisfactory38/4247/55Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory29/428/55Satisfactory29/4236/55Overall ReductionSatisfactory37/4249/55Overall ReductionSatisfactory37/4249/55Overall ReductionUnsatisfactory23/4226/55Post-Operative Clinical Parameters10433Drop in Hb(g/dl)112±0.52.7±0.5TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused1043IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections35Visual Analog Score1ª POD692 ^{min} POD571Complication1/421/55DeathLost to Followup1/421/55ComplicationKost Dellowup1/421/55Final Outcome Measures11/421/55ComplicationKeley Transfused1/401/52Final Outcome Measures1/401/52Complication	Mechanism of Injury	1			
Type of FractureStable $39/42$ $49/55$ $J/42$ Intra-Operative VariablesUnstable $3/42$ $6/55$ Lag Screw Size (Mean) 85 ± 10 85 ± 10 85 ± 10 Plate Size4 Hole $41/42$ $50/55$ Incision Size (Cm) 4.2 ± 0.4 10.9 ± 1.4 Operative Time (Min) 0 ± 1.4 69 ± 14 Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation 20 ± 5 20 ± 5 Tip Apex Distance (mm) 20 ± 5 20 ± 5 AP AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $36/55$ Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $36/55$ Destrior SagSatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Post-Operative Clinical ParametersUnsatisfactory $23/42$ $20/55$ Post-Operative Clinical ParametersUnsatisfactory $23/42$ $20/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 10 43 4 Iv AnalgesiaAvgNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $20/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 10 43 4 Visual Analog Score 1^{ar} POD 5 7 Pif PD (2Wks) 2 5 5 Final Outcome Measures $1/40$ $1/42$ $1/55$ Complication $1/40$ $1/52$ 755 SSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ 755 Final Outcome Measures $1/40$ $1/42$ $1/55$ Complication $1/40$ $1/52$ 755 SSSI $0/40$ <			÷, .=		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } Unstable & 3/42 & 6/5^{-} \\ Intra-Operative Variables & 85\pm10 & 85\pm10 \\ Intra-Operative Wize (Mean) & 85\pm10 & 85\pm10 \\ Plate Size & 4 Hole & 1/42 & 50/55 \\ & 5 Hole & 1/42 & 5/55 \\ Incision Size (Cm) & 42\pm0 & 10.9\pm1.4 \\ Operative Time (Min) & 01\pm13 & 69\pm14 \\ Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation & 20\pm5 & 20\pm5 \\ AP Alignment & Satisfactory & 38/42 & 47/55 \\ Lateral Alignment & Satisfactory & 4/42 & 8/55 \\ Lateral Alignment & Satisfactory & 29/42 & 8/55 \\ Dosterior Sag & Satisfactory & 13/42 & 19/55 \\ Posterior Sag & Satisfactory & 13/42 & 19/55 \\ Overall Reduction & Satisfactory & 13/42 & 29/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 13/42 & 29/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 19/42 & 26/55 \\ Overall Reduction & Satisfactory & 19/42 & 26/55 \\ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters & 1 \\ Drop in Hb(g/dl) & 1 & 2\pm0.5 & 2.7\pm0.5 \\ Transfusion & No of Patients Transfused & 9/42 & 26/55 \\ Visual Analog Score & 1st POD & 6 & 9 \\ 2nd POD & 5 & 7 \\ Outcome & AvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections & 3 & 5 \\ Visual Analog Score & 1st FUP (2Wks) & 2 & 5 \\ Final Outcome Measures & 1 \\ Outcome & Healed & 39/42 & 51/55 \\ Complication & I^{st} FUP (2Wks) & 1 & 1/55 \\ Death & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ Complication & I^{st} FIP (P (2Wks) & 1 & 1/55 \\ Death & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ Transfusion & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ SSS1 & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ DSS1 & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ WTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ WI & Respiratory Depression & 1/40 & 0/52 \\ Time to Healing (wks) & 11 & 12 \\ Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \\ \end{array}$					
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } Intra-Operative Variables & Station & Statisfactory & Sta$	Type of Fracture				
$\begin{array}{cccc} Lag Screw Size (Mean) & 85\pm10 & 85\pm10 \\ Plate Size & 4 Hole & 41/42 & 50/55 \\ \hline \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Unstable	3/42	6/55	
Plate Size4 Hole41/4250/55Incision Size (Cm)5 Hole $1/42$ $5/55$ Incision Size (Cm) 61 ± 13 69 ± 14 Operative Time (Min) 61 ± 13 69 ± 14 Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation 20 ± 5 20 ± 5 Tip Apex Distance (mm) 20 ± 5 20 ± 5 AP AlignmentSatisfactory $38/42$ $47/55$ Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $36/55$ Unsatisfactory $13/42$ $19/55$ Posterior SagSatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $19/42$ $26/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 12 ± 0.5 2.7 ± 0.5 TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused 10 43 IV Analgesia $AvgNo$ of Nalbuphine Injections 3 5 Visual Analog Score 1^{ai} POD 5 7 1^{ai} FUP (2Wks) 2 $51/55$ Final Outcome MeasuresHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ OutcomeHealed $1/42$ $1/55$ Death $1/42$ $1/55$ 255 Dost of Followup $1/42$ $1/55$ Death $1/40$ $1/52$ Transfusion $1/40$ $1/52$ Transfusion $1/40$ $1/52$ Transfusion $1/40$ $1/52$ Final Outcome Measures $1/40$ $1/52$ Time to Healing (wks)Easi to Followup $1/40$ $1/52$ </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c } & 5 \mbox{ Hole} & 1/42 & 5/55 \\ \hline Incision Size (Cm) & 4.2\pm0.4 & 10.9\pm1.4 \\ Operative Time (Min) & 01\pm13 & 69\pm14 \\ \hline Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation & 10\pm13 & 69\pm14 \\ \hline Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation & 20\pm5 & 20\pm5 \\ \hline AP \ Alignment & Satisfactory & 38/42 & 47/55 \\ \hline Lateral \ Alignment & Satisfactory & 29/42 & 8/55 \\ \hline Lateral \ Alignment & Satisfactory & 29/42 & 36/55 \\ \hline Unsatisfactory & 13/42 & 19/55 \\ \hline Posterior \ Sag & Satisfactory & 37/42 & 49/55 \\ \hline Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 29/55 \\ \hline Overall \ Reduction & Satisfactory & 23/42 & 29/55 \\ \hline Overall \ Reduction & Satisfactory & 19/42 & 26/55 \\ \hline Post-Operative \ Clinical \ Parameters & 1.2\pm0.5 & 2.7\pm0.5 \\ \hline Transfusion & No \ of \ Patients \ Transfused & 9/42 & 26/55 \\ \hline No \ of \ PRBC \ Transfused & 10 & 43 \\ \hline IV \ Analgesia & AvgNo \ of \ Nalbuphine \ Injections & 3 & 5 \\ \hline Visual \ Analog \ Score & 1^{\#} \ POD & 6 & 9 \\ 2^{nd} \ POD & 5 & 7 \\ 1 \ eff \ POD & 5 & 7 \\ 1 \ eff \ POD & 5 & 7 \\ 1 \ eff \ POD & 5 & 7 \\ 1 \ eff \ POD & 5 & 7 \\ \hline Instantion & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \hline Death & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \hline Death & 1/42 & 2/55 \\ \hline Lost to \ Followup & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \hline Death & 1/42 & 2/55 \\ \hline Complication & Failed \ Fixation & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ \hline SSSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ \hline SSSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ \hline Time \ to \ Healing (wks) & Interve \ Healing (wks) & Interve$					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Plate Size				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } Operative Time (Min) & 61\pm 13 & 69\pm 14 \\ Postoperative Radiographic Evaluation & 20\pm 5 & 20\pm 5 \\ Tip Apex Distance (mm) & Satisfactory & 38/42 & 47/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 29/42 & 36/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 29/42 & 19/55 \\ Overall Reduction & Satisfactory & 37/42 & 49/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 37/42 & 49/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 29/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 29/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 29/55 \\ Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 26/55 \\ Overall Reduction & Satisfactory & 23/42 & 26/55 \\ Overall Reduction & No of Patients Transfused & 9/42 & 26/55 \\ Transfusion & No of Patients Transfused & 10 & 43 \\ IV Analgesia & AvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections & 3 & 5 \\ Visual Analog Score & 1st POD & 6 & 9 \\ 2^{nd} POD & 5 & 7 \\ 1^{st} FUP (2Wks) & 2 & 5 \\ Final Outcome Measures & \\ Outcome & Healed & 39/42 & 51/55 \\ Non-Union & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ Death & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ Death & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ Death & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ Outcome & Failed Fixation & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ SSSI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ SSSI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ Time to Healing (wks) & I1 & 12 \\ Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \\ \end{array}$		5 Hole			
Postoperative Radiographic EvaluationTip Apex Distance (mm) 20 ± 5 20 ± 5 AP AlignmentSatisfactory $38/42$ $47/55$ Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $36/55$ Unsatisfactory $13/42$ $19/55$ Posterior SagSatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Unsatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters $10/42$ $26/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters $10/43$ $43/42$ Drop in Hb(g/dl) $1/2\pm0.5$ 2.7 ± 0.5 TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused $10/43$ $43/42$ IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections $3/5$ Visual Analog Score 1^{at} FUP (2Wks) $2/55$ Final Outcome Measures $1/42$ $1/55$ OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE $0/40$ Time to Healing (wks) $11/40$ $1/22$ Time to Healing (wks) $11/40$ $1/21$ Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) $4/4$ $4/4$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			61±13	69±14	
AP AlignmentSatisfactory $38/42$ $47/55$ Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $8/55$ Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $36/55$ Unsatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ Unsatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Drop in Hb(g/dl)1.2±0.5 2.7 ± 0.5 TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused 10 43 IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections 3 5 Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD 5 7 1^{st} FUP (2Wks) 2 5 7 Final Outcome Measures $9/42$ $2/55$ $1/40$ OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ $5SSI$ $0/40$ $1/52$ 7 VTE $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE MI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE MI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE MI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE MI $0/40$ $1/52$ $Virte$ $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/4$		1			
Lateral AlignmentUnsatisfactory $4/42$ $8/55$ Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $36/55$ Unsatisfactory $13/42$ $19/55$ Posterior SagSatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Post-Operative Clinical ParametersUnsatisfactory $19/42$ $26/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 12 ± 0.5 2.7 ± 0.5 TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused 10 43 IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections 3 5 Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD 5 7 1^{st} FUP (2Wks) 2 5 7 Final Outcome Measures $1/42$ $1/55$ 7 OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Non-Union $1/42$ $1/55$ 7 Death $1/42$ $1/55$ 7 Death $1/42$ $1/55$ 7 Death $1/42$ $1/55$ 7 Death $1/40$ $1/52$ 5 Disting To Poly SSI $0/40$ $1/52$ DSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ Time to Healing (wks) 11 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4 4					
Lateral AlignmentSatisfactory $29/42$ $36/55$ Unsatisfactory $13/42$ $19/55$ Posterior SagSatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ Post-Operative Clinical ParametersUnsatisfactory $19/42$ $26/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 1.2 ± 0.5 2.7 ± 0.5 TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD 6 9 2^{nd} POD 5 7 1^{st} POD 6 9 2^{nd} POD 5 7 1^{st} POD 6 9 2^{nd} POD 5 OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Non-Union $1/42$ $1/55$ Death $1/42$ $2/55$ Lost to Followup $1/42$ $1/55$ Desth $1/40$ $2/52$ DSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ Time to Healing (wks) 11 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4 4	AP Alignment	2			
$\begin{array}{cccc} & Unsatisfactory & 13/42 & 19/55 \\ \hline Posterior Sag & Satisfactory & 37/42 & 49/55 \\ & Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 29/55 \\ \hline Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 29/55 \\ & Unsatisfactory & 23/42 & 26/55 \\ \hline Post-Operative Clinical Parameters & & & & & & \\ \hline Post-Operative Clinical Parameters & & & & & & & \\ \hline Post-Operative Clinical Parameters & & & & & & & \\ \hline Drop in Hb(g/dl) & & 1.2\pm0.5 & 2.7\pm0.5 \\ \hline Transfusion & No of Patients Transfused & 9/42 & 26/55 \\ \hline No of PRBC Transfused & 10 & 43 \\ \hline V Analgesia & AvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections & 3 & 5 \\ \hline Visual Analog Score & 1st POD & 6 & 9 \\ & 2^{ad} POD & 5 & 7 \\ & 1^{st} FUP (2Wks) & 2 & 5 \\ \hline Final Outcome Measures & & & & & \\ \hline Outcome & Healed & 39/42 & 51/55 \\ \hline Complication & Failed Fixation & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \hline Complication & Failed Fixation & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ & SSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ & DSSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ & DSSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ & DSSI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ & VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ & VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ & VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ & Time to Healing (wks) & & & 11 & 12 \\ \hline Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$		Unsatisfactory	4/42	8/55	
Posterior SagSatisfactory $37/42$ $49/55$ (UnsatisfactoryOverall ReductionSatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ (UnsatisfactoryPost-Operative Clinical Parameters $19/42$ $26/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters 1.2 ± 0.5 2.7 ± 0.5 TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused 10 43 IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections 3 5 Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD 6 9 2^{ad} POD 5 7 1^{st} FUP (2Wks) 2 Final Outcome Measures $1/42$ $2/55$ $1/55$ OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Complication 7 $1/42$ $1/55$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ $SSSI$ $1/40$ $2/52$ $DSSI$ $0/40$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE $0/40$ MI <	Lateral Alignment	5	=>/ ·=		
Unsatisfactory $5/42$ $6/55$ Overall ReductionSatisfactory Unsatisfactory $23/42$ $29/55$ $29/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters $19/42$ $26/55$ Drop in Hb(g/d) 1.2 ± 0.5 2.7 ± 0.5 TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused 10 43 IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections 3 5 Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD 6 9 2^{ad} POD 5 7 1^{st} FUP (2Wks) 2 Final Outcome Measures 0 $39/42$ $51/55$ OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Lost to Followup $1/42$ $1/55$ Death $1/42$ $2/55$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/40$ $2/52$ $DSSI$ $0/40$ $1/52$ NTE MI $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ $Time$ to Healing (wks) 11 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4		5			
Overall ReductionSatisfactory Unsatisfactory $23/42$ $19/42$ $29/55$ $26/55$ Post-Operative Clinical Parameters $19/42$ $26/5526/55Drop in Hb(g/dl)1.2\pm0.52.7\pm0.52.7\pm0.5TransfusionNo of Patients TransfusedNo of PRBC Transfused1043IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections2^{nd} POD2^{nd} POD1^{st} FUP (2Wks)32Final Outcome Measures1^{st} FUP (2Wks)22OutcomeHealedNon-Union39/421/42ComplicationFailed Fixation1/421/421/55ComplicationFailed FixationMIMI1/400/40Time to Healing (wks)111212Hander Croat 12Hander Croat 1211Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)44$	Posterior Sag	2			
Unsatisfactory19/4226/55Post-Operative Clinical Parameters1.2±0.52.7±0.5Drop in Hb(g/dl)1.2±0.52.7±0.5TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused9/4226/55No of PRBC Transfused1043IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections35Visual Analog Score1 st POD69 2^{nd} POD57 1^{st} FUP (2Wks)25Final Outcome Measures1/421/55OutcomeHealed39/4251/55Death1/421/55Lost to Followup1/421/55ComplicationFailed Fixation1/401/52SSSI1/402/52DSSI0/401/52VTE0/401/52MI0/401/52Time to Healing (wks)1112Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)44		Unsatisfactory	5/42	6/55	
Post-Operative Clinical ParametersDrop in Hb(g/dl)1.2±0.52.7±0.5TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused9/4226/55No of PRBC Transfused1043IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections35Visual Analog Score1st POD69 2^{nd} POD571st FUP (2Wks)25Final Outcome Measures1/4251/55OutcomeHealed39/4251/55Death1/421/55Death1/422/55Lost to Followup1/421/55ComplicationFailed Fixation1/401/52SSSI1/402/52DSSI0/401/52VTE0/401/52MI0/401/52Time to Healing (wks)1112Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)44	Overall Reduction			29/55	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Unsatisfactory	19/42	26/55	
TransfusionNo of Patients Transfused $9/42$ $26/55$ No of PRBC Transfused1043IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections35Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD69 2^{nd} POD57 1^{st} FUP (2Wks)25Final Outcome Measures1/4251/55OutcomeHealed $39/42$ 51/55Death1/421/55Death1/422/55Lost to Followup1/421/55ComplicationFailed Fixation1/401/52SSSI0/401/52DSSI0/401/52VTE0/401/52MI0/401/52Time to Healing (wks)1112Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)44					
No of PRBC Transfused1043IV AnalgesiaAvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections35Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD69 2^{nd} POD57 1^{st} FUP (2Wks)25Final Outcome MeasuresHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Doeath1/42 $1/55$ Death1/42 $2/55$ Lost to Followup1/42 $1/55$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ SSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ DSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ Time to Healing (wks)11 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)44					
$\begin{array}{cccc} \mathrm{IV} \mbox{ Analgesia} & \operatorname{AvgNo} \mbox{ of Nalbuphine Injections} & 3 & 5 \\ \mathrm{Visual} \mbox{ Analog} \mbox{ Score} & 1^{\mathrm{st}} \mbox{ POD} & 6 & 9 \\ 2^{\mathrm{nd}} \mbox{ POD} & 5 & 7 \\ 1^{\mathrm{st}} \mbox{ FUP} (2\mathrm{Wks}) & 2 & 5 \\ \hline & & & & & & \\ \mathrm{Outcome} & \mathrm{Healed} & 39/42 & 51/55 \\ \mathrm{Outcome} & \mathrm{Healed} & 39/42 & 1/55 \\ \mathrm{Outcome} & \mathrm{Healed} & 1/42 & 2/55 \\ \mathrm{Death} & 1/42 & 2/55 \\ \mathrm{Lost} \ \mathrm{to} \ \mathrm{Followup} & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \mathrm{Complication} & \mathrm{Failed} \ \mathrm{Fixation} & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ \mathrm{SSSI} & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ \mathrm{DSSI} & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ \mathrm{VTE} & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ \mathrm{VTE} & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ \mathrm{MI} & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ \mathrm{Time} \ \mathrm{to} \ \mathrm{Healing} \ (\mathrm{wks}) & & & & & \\ \mathrm{Time} \ \mathrm{to} \ \mathrm{Healing} \ (\mathrm{wks}) & & & & & & \\ \mathrm{Basic} \ \mathrm{Activities} \ \mathrm{of} \ \mathrm{Daily} \ \mathrm{Living} \ \mathrm{Score} \ (\mathrm{Total} = 6) & & & & & \\ \end{array}$	Transfusion		,, · · =		
Visual Analog Score 1^{st} POD69 2^{nd} POD57 1^{st} FUP (2Wks)25Final Outcome Measures 2 5OutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Non-Union $1/42$ $1/55$ Death $1/42$ $2/55$ Lost to Followup $1/42$ $1/55$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ DSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ DSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ Time to Healing (wks)I1 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4 4					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		AvgNo of Nalbuphine Injections			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } I^{st} \mbox{FUP} (2Wks) & 2 & 5 \\ \hline Final Outcome Measures & & & & & \\ \hline Outcome & Healed & 39/42 & 51/55 \\ \hline Non-Union & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \hline Death & 1/42 & 2/55 \\ \hline Lost to Followup & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \hline Complication & Failed Fixation & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ \hline SSSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ \hline DSSI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ \hline VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ \hline VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ \hline Respiratory Depression & 1/40 & 0/52 \\ \hline Time to Healing (wks) & 11 & 12 \\ \hline Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	Visual Analog Score				
Final Outcome MeasuresOutcomeHealed $39/42$ $51/55$ Non-Union $1/42$ $1/55$ Death $1/42$ $2/55$ Lost to Followup $1/42$ $1/55$ ComplicationFailed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ SSSI $1/40$ $2/52$ DSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ Time to Healing (wks) 11 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4 4					
Outcome Healed $39/42$ $51/55$ Non-Union $1/42$ $1/55$ Death $1/42$ $2/55$ Lost to Followup $1/42$ $1/55$ Complication Failed Fixation $1/40$ $1/52$ SSSI $1/40$ $2/52$ DSSI $0/40$ $1/52$ VTE $0/40$ $1/52$ MI $0/40$ $1/52$ Time to Healing (wks) I1 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4 4		1 st FUP (2Wks)	2	5	
$\begin{array}{c cccc} & Non-Union & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ Death & 1/42 & 2/55 \\ Lost to Followup & 1/42 & 1/55 \\ \hline Complication & Failed Fixation & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ SSSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ DSSI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ Respiratory Depression & 1/40 & 0/52 \\ \hline Time to Healing (wks) & 11 & 12 \\ \hline Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \\ \end{array}$					
$\begin{array}{c c} \text{Death} & 1/42 & 2/55\\ \text{Lost to Followup} & 1/42 & 1/55\\ \text{Complication} & Failed Fixation & 1/40 & 1/52\\ \text{SSSI} & 1/40 & 2/52\\ \text{DSSI} & 0/40 & 1/52\\ \text{VTE} & 0/40 & 1/52\\ \text{VTE} & 0/40 & 1/52\\ \text{MI} & 0/40 & 1/52\\ \text{Respiratory Depression} & 1/40 & 0/52\\ \text{Time to Healing (wks)} & 11 & 12\\ \text{Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)} & 4 & 4\\ \end{array}$	Outcome				
Lost to Followup 1/42 1/55 Complication Failed Fixation 1/40 1/52 SSSI 1/40 2/52 DSSI 0/40 1/52 VTE 0/40 1/52 MI 0/40 1/52 Respiratory Depression 1/40 0/52 Time to Healing (wks) 11 12 Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4 4		Non-Union			
$ \begin{array}{c c} Complication & Failed Fixation & 1/40 & 1/52 \\ SSSI & 1/40 & 2/52 \\ DSSI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ MI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ Respiratory Depression & 1/40 & 0/52 \\ \hline Time to Healing (wks) & 11 & 12 \\ Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \\ \end{array} $		Death	1/42		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Lost to Followup	1/42	1/55	
$\begin{array}{cccc} DSSI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ MI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ Respiratory Depression & 1/40 & 0/52 \\ Time to Healing (wks) & 11 & 12 \\ Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \end{array}$	Complication	Failed Fixation	1/40	1/52	
$\begin{array}{ccc} VTE & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ MI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ Respiratory Depression & 1/40 & 0/52 \\ Time to Healing (wks) & 11 & 12 \\ Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \end{array}$		SSSI	1/40	2/52	
$ \begin{array}{ccc} MI & 0/40 & 1/52 \\ Respiratory Depression & 1/40 & 0/52 \\ Time to Healing (wks) & 11 & 12 \\ Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) & 4 & 4 \\ \end{array} $		DSSI	0/40	1/52	
Respiratory Depression1/400/52Time to Healing (wks)1112Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)44		VTE	0/40		
Time to Healing (wks)1112Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6)44		MI	0/40	1/52	
Basic Activities of Daily Living Score (Total = 6) 4 4		Respiratory Depression	1/40	0/52	
			11	12	
Harris Hip Score (Total = 100) 82 83			-	-	
			82	83	

RESULTS

All the surgeries were performed using a 4-hole DHS side plate except for 6 cases (1 for MIDHS and 5 for CDHS) where a 5 hole side plate was used mainly due to fracture extension or unavailability of the 4-hole plate. A locking screw side plate was used in two cases of MIDHS and 3 cases of CDHS due to poor bone quality and the need for locking screws for better pullout strength.

Conclusion

As per the results mentioned, minimally invasive DHS has similar functional outcome as compared to the conventional DHS which is indicated by the similar Harris hip scoring. Also it is less time consuming and post op morbidity is reduced. One limitation is that this technique requires higher level of surgical skill. We recommend it should be a routine practice to use minimally invasive DHS technique for most extra capsular proximal femur fracture.

Limitations of the study

Single Centre study. Results of a high volume trauma Centre.

REFERENCES

- Alobaid A, Harvey EJ, Elder GM, Lander P, Guy P, Reindl R. 2004. Minimally invasive dynamic hip screw. Prospective randomized trial of two techniques of insertion of a standard dynamic fixation device. *Journal of Orthopaedic Trauma*, 18(4):207–212. [PubMed]
- LaVelle DG. 2003. *Campbell's Operative Orthopaedics*. Vol. 1. Mosby; Fractures of hip; pp. 28–75.
- Mishra AK. 2007. Management of intertrochantric fracture by using dynamic hip screw/dynamic martin screw. *Journal of Orthopaedics.*, 4(2, article e40)
- Watson-Jones R. 2009. Fracture Treatment. (7th edition) 29
- Wong T-C, Chiu Y, Tsang W-L, Leung W-Y, Yeung S-H. 2009. A double-blind, prospective, randomised, controlled clinical trial of minimally invasive dynamic hip screw fixation of intertrochanteric fractures. *Injury*, 40(4):422– 427. [PubMed]