

## Conservative versus Surgical Management with Locking Compression Plate (LCP) of Displaced Mid Shaft Clavicle Fractures: A Comparative Study

Randhir Kumar<sup>1</sup>, Govind Mohan Jee<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Darbhanga Medical College and Hospital, Darbhanga, Bihar, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor and HOD, Department of Orthopaedics, Darbhanga Medical College and Hospital, Darbhanga, Bihar, India

Received: 09-08-2023 Revised: 15-09-2023 / Accepted: 25-10-2023

Corresponding author: Dr. Randhir Kumar

Conflict of interest: Nil

### Abstract

**Aim:** The aim of the present study was to compare Conservative versus Surgical Management with Locking Compression Plate (LCP) of Displaced Mid Shaft Clavicle Fractures.

**Methods:** This was a cross-sectional study carried out department of Orthopaedics, patients with clavicle fracture during the two years period. During the one year period there were 100 patients with clavicle fracture were enrolled to study out of the 100 with the written and explained consent 50 patients were managed conservatively and 50 managed surgically by Compression Plate (LCP).

**Results:** The average age was comparable in both the groups i.e.  $43.17 \pm 3.16$  and  $42.18 \pm 4.16$  and there was male predominance in both the groups. The average healing was significantly more in conservative management group i.e.  $5 \pm 3.47$  months versus  $2.88 \pm 2.78$ . The complications were Mal-union, Union with symptoms, Delayed union, Infection etc. The complications were comparable in both the groups.

**Conclusion:** It can be concluded from our study that both the methods were comparable with respect to the complications but healing was significantly faster in the surgical method of management hence surgical management should be preferred but the manage should individualized as per the patient.

**Keywords:** Locking Compression Plate, Conservative Management, Surgical Management, Displaced Mid Shaft Clavicle Fractures.

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

### Introduction

Clavicle fractures are common injuries in young and active individuals, and they account for 2.6% of all fractures. Most clavicle fractures (80% to 85%) occur in the midshaft of the bone. Distal third fractures are the next most common type (15 to 20%). Medial third fractures are the rarest (0 to 5 %). Most of the least displaced clavicle fractures can be successfully treated non-surgically with some form of immobilization. [1] A weaker part can be seen in the middle of the clavicle, which is the cause of most fractures in this part. Many muscles and ligament forces act on the clavicle, so it is necessary to understand these different forces to understand the nature of bone fracture displacement and draw conclusions about why certain types of fractures are problematic without reduction and surgical fixation. [2]

Mid-clavicular fracture accounts for 45% of shoulder injuries, mostly in the third decade of life, with male to female ratio is 2:1. The incidence of open clavicular fracture is only 0.1% to 1% of

cases. The peak incidence occurs in the third decade of life. [3] In middle third clavicle fractures, the rate of nonunion is generally estimated as from 0.1 to 0.8%, however current data shows that the rate of non-union among adults is 10 to 15 percent, in displaced middle third clavicular fractures with comminution. [4] This shows that nonunion or malunion is relatively higher when treated conservatively than it was presumed earlier.

After conservative treatment, pressure from displaced fragments on the clavicle behind the brachial plexus can cause symptoms. Similarly, extensive separation of fragments with soft tissue interposition may cause a closed reduction to fail. In extensively displaced middle-third clavicle fractures, there is 15% of nonunion with conservative treatment, and most of the patients with >2cm of shortening of clavicle suffered nonunion. [5] At present increasingly surgeons are more willing to perform surgery because non-surgical results are clinically and functionally poor.

Numerous studies have shown the efficacy and safety of treating displaced midclavicular fractures with open reduction and internal fixation also established a higher rate of union with minimal complications. [6] In the majority of the patients with complex clavicle fractures, the locking compression plate provides a reasonable outcome, with fewer complications. [7] Surgical treatment by open reduction and internal fixation of displaced comminuted mid-shaft clavicular fractures helps in early return to function. [8]

Clavicle fractures are common injuries in young, active individuals, especially those who participate in activities or sports where high-speed falls (bicycling, motorcycles) or violent collisions (football, hockey) are frequent, and they account for approximately 2.6% of all fractures. [9] These fractures are often associated with shoulder girdle injuries in approximately 44% of cases. [10] Attributed to its S shape and thinner bone at the middle curvature, clavicle most commonly gets fractured at its middle third and hence is the most common site of fracture in approximately 70% to 80% of cases; while approximately 12% to 15% of fractures occur at lateral 1/3 rd and 5% to 8% occur at medial third 1/3rd of clavicle. [10]

The aim of the present study was to compare Conservative versus Surgical Management with Locking Compression Plate (LCP) of Displaced Mid Shaft Clavicle Fractures.

### Materials and Methods

This was a cross-sectional study carried out at department of Orthopaedics, Darbhanga Medical

College and Hospital, Darbhanga, Bihar, India in the patients with clavicle fracture during the two years period. During the one year period there were 100 patients with clavicle fracture were enrolled to study out of the 100 with the written and explained consent 50 patients were managed conservatively (group A) and 50 managed surgically by Compression Plate (group B).

Patients in the surgical group were posted for surgery when fit for surgery. Patients' demographic profile was noted and short history and clinical examination were performed to find out the location of pain and swelling over the affected clavicle. Plain Antero-posterior roentgenogram shoulder with clavicle was taken to evaluate the site and type of fracture. The fractures were then classified by Robinson's classification. Patients aged < 18 years and >60 years, patients with open fractures, fracture in medial or lateral third of the clavicle, pathological fractures, undisplaced fractures, patients with established nonunion from a previous fracture, polytrauma patient, patients with any medical contraindication to surgery or general anesthesia (heart diseases, renal failure or active chemotherapy) and patients refusing surgery (lack of consent) were excluded from the study.

The details of the patients like age, sex, average duration of the wound healing, and various complications were noted. The statistical analysis was done by chi-square test and unpaired t-test and analyzed by SPSS 19 version software

### Results

**Table 1: Distribution of the patients as per age and gender**

Parameters	Group A	Group B	P Value
Age	43.17 ±3.16	42.18±4.16	>0.005
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	30	35	>0.005
Female	20	15	

The average age was comparable in both the groups i.e. 43.17 ±3.16 and 42.18±4.16 and there was male predominance in both the groups.

**Table 2: Distribution of the patients as per the healing time (months) on x-ray**

Parameters	Group A	Group B	P Value
Healing (Months)	5 ± 3.47	2.88± 2.78	<0.005

The average healing was significantly more in conservative management group i.e. 5 ± 3.47 months versus 2.88± 2.78.

**Table 3: Complications**

	Group A	Group B
No any complications	28	40
Mal union	8	2
Union with symptoms	6	2
Delayed union	4	2
Infection	2	0
Non-union	2	0

The complications were Mal-union, Union with symptoms, Delayed union, Infection etc. The complications were comparable in both the groups.

### Discussion

Clavicle fractures are one of the most common adult injuries, accounting for 5% to 12% of all fractures and representing up to 44% of injuries to the shoulder girdle. [11-13] About 80% to 85% of these fractures occur in the midshaft of the bone due to its narrow cross section and high compressive force resulting in bone failure. [14,15] Neer [16] reported low nonunion rates after nonoperative treatment of mid-shaft clavicle fracture of 0.1%. Although nonoperative treatment was the major treatment strategy used for a long time, recent studies have identified higher rates of nonunion. In addition, patients treated nonoperatively are at high risk of clinical symptoms such as pain, loss of strength, and rapid fatigability associated with nonunion and malunion of clavicle fractures. [17]

The average age was comparable in both the groups i.e.  $43.17 \pm 3.16$  and  $42.18 \pm 4.16$  and there was male predominance in both the groups. In Bostman et al [18] study 76 Patients (73.79%) were males compared to 27 females Patients (26.21%). In Cesare Faldini et al [19] study, out of 100 patients 78 were males and 22 were females. All these studies show a female predominance in fracture mid-third clavicle occurrence which was dissimilar to the present study. Considering the excellent remodeling of clavicle, irrespective of displacement, amount of comminution, in the past, every fracture clavicle was treated non-operatively. The surgical treatment was only reserved for cases with neurological deficits, open fractures, clavicle fractures causing skin tenting. Many recent studies have showed increased incidence of nonunion, residual pain, malunion, decreased shoulder endurance, shoulder weakness, inferior patient and surgeon-oriented outcome scores, and lower overall patient satisfaction rate following conservative treatment. [20]

The average healing was significantly more in conservative management group i.e.  $5 \pm 3.47$  months versus  $2.88 \pm 2.78$ . The complications were Mal-union, Union with symptoms, Delayed union, Infection etc. The complications were comparable in both the groups. A meta-analysis by Zlowodzki et al [21] in 2005 of recent studies revealed that the rate of nonunion for displaced midshaft clavicular fractures was 2.2% after plate fixation compared with 15.1% after nonoperative care, a relative risk reduction for nonunion of 86%. That meta-analysis also showed that primary plate fixation was contrary to prevailing opinion, a safe and reliable procedure.

In a randomized control study [22] by the Canadian orthopaedic trauma society, it was found that Constant score and DASH Scores are significantly better in the surgical group at 6 weeks, 12, and 24 weeks than the conservative group. The main advantage of surgical treatment of displaced mid-third fractured clavicle with plate is that it gives immediate pain relief, early shoulder movements less chance of non-union, and early return to work compared to conservative treatment.

### Conclusion

It can be concluded from our study that both the methods were comparable with respect to the complications but healing was significantly faster in the surgical method of management hence surgical management should be preferred but the manage should individualized as per the patient.

### References

1. Egol KA, Zuckermann JD. Handbook of Fracture. LWW. 4th edition Handbook of Fracture 242,477,439.
2. Robert Buchholz, James Heckman D. Charles Court- Brown, Rockwood Green's Fractures In Adults 6th Edition 2006;1:1213-16.
3. Schiffer G, Faymonville C, Skouras E, Andermahr J, Jubel A. Midclavicular fracture: not just a trivial injury: current treatment options. *Deutsches Arzteblatt International*. 2010;107(41):711-717.
4. Wun-JerShen MD, Tsung-Jen Liu MD, Young-Shung Shen MD. Po-Cheng Orthopaedic Institute, 100 Po-Ai 2nd Road, Kaohsiung, 813, Taiwan. Plate Fixation Of Fresh Displaced Midshaft Clavicle Fractures, / *Bone Joint Surg[Br]* 2008;90- B:495-B.
5. Terry Canale S, James Beaty H. Campbell's Operative Orthopedics 11th Edition 3,3371-76.
6. Stegeman SA, de Jong M, Sier CF, Krijnen P, Duijff JW, van Thiel TP, de Rijcke PA, Soesman NM, Hagenaars T, Boekhoudt FD, de Vries MR. Displaced midshaft fractures of the clavicle: non-operative treatment versus plate fixation (Sleutel-TRIAL). A multicentre randomised controlled trial. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2011 Dec;12(1):1-7.
7. Modi N, Patel AD, Hallam P. Outcome of 62 clavicle fracture fixations with locked compression plate: Is this the right way to go?. *Injury Extra*. 2011;9(42):118.
8. Kulshrestha V. Primary plating of displaced mid-shaft clavicular fractures. *Medical Journal Armed Forces India*. 2008 Jul 1;64(3):208-11.
9. Canale ST, Beaty JH. Campbell's Operative Orthopaedics. 11th Ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier, 2008,3371-3376.

10. Craig EV, Basamania CJ, Rockwood CA. Fractures of the clavicle. The shoulder. 3rd edition Philadelphia: Saunders, 2004, 455-519.
11. JOHNSON EW, COLLINS HR. Nonunion of the clavicle. Archives of surgery. 1963 Dec 1;87(6):963-6.
12. Richards RR, An KN, Bigliani LU, Friedman RJ, Gartsman GM, Gristina AG, Iannotti JP, Mow VC, Sidles JA, Zuckerman JD. A standardized method for the assessment of shoulder function. Journal of shoulder and elbow surgery. 1994 Nov 1;3(6):347-52.
13. Paffen PJ, Jansen EW. Surgical treatment of clavicular fractures with Kirschner wires: a comparative study. Archivum chirurgicum Neerlandicum. 1978 Jan 1;30(1):43-53.
14. Court-Brown CM, Heckman JD, McQueen MM, Ricci WM, Tornetta PI, McKee MD. Rockwood and Green's fractures in adults. Vol. 1. 8th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health; 2015: 1427-9.
15. Robinson CM. Fractures of the clavicle in the adult: epidemiology and classification. The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery British Volume. 1998 May 1;80(3):476-84.
16. Neer CS. Nonunion of the clavicle. Journal of the American Medical Association. 1960 Mar 5;172(10):1006-11.
17. Hill JM. Closed treatment of displaced middle-third fractures of the clavicle gives poor results. The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery British Volume. 1997 Jul 1;79(4):537-8.
18. Bostman O, Manninen M, Pihlajamaki H. Complications of plate fixation in fresh displaced midclavicular fractures. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery. 1997 Nov 1; 43(5):778-83.
19. Faldini C, Nanni M, Leonetti D, Acri F, Galante C, Luciani D, Giannini S. Nonoperative treatment of closed displaced midshaft clavicle fractures. Journal of Orthopaedics and Traumatology. 2010 Dec; 11:229-36.
20. Nowak J, Mallmin H, Larsson S. The aetiology and epidemiology of clavicular fractures. A prospective study during a 2-year period in Uppsala, Sweden. Injury. 2000; 31(5):353-358.
21. Zlowodzki M, Zelle BA, Cole PA, Jeray K, McKee MD. Treatment of acute midshaft clavicle fractures: systematic review of 2144 fractures: on behalf of the Evidence-Based Orthopaedic Trauma Working Group. Journal of orthopaedic trauma. 2005 Aug 1;19(7):504-7.
22. Canadian Orthopedic Trauma Society. Nonoperative treatment compared with plate fixation of displaced midshaft clavicular fractures. A multicenter randomized clinical trial. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2007;89(1):1-10.