e-ISSN: 0976-822X, p-ISSN:2961-6042

Available online on http://www.ijcpr.com/

International Journal of Current Pharmaceutical Review and Research 2026; 18(2); 1269-1276

Original Research Article

Evaluation of Functional Outcome of Orthogonal Bicolumnar Plating for AO 13-C Intra-articular Distal Humerus Fractures in 25 Cases

Simranjit Singh[1], Madhur Poddar[2], Sohail Dhanda[3], Surinder Kumar[4]

[1,4]Assistant Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, GMC Amritsar, Punjab, India
[2]Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, GMC Amritsar, Punjab, India
[3]Junior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, GMC Amritsar, Punjab, India

Received: 24-12-2025 / Revised: 23-01-2026 / Accepted: 25-02-2026
Corresponding Author: Dr. Surinder Kumar
Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:
Background: Intra-articular distal humerus fractures classified as AO/OTA type 13-C represent complex injuries that pose significant challenges to orthopedic surgeons due to articular comminution, metaphyseal instability, and a high propensity for postoperative elbow stiffness. Achieving anatomical reduction of the joint surface and stable bicolumnar fixation is essential to permit early mobilization and restore functional elbow motion. Orthogonal (90–90) bicolumnar plating has been widely adopted as a fixation strategy to address these biomechanical demands; however, functional outcomes and complication profiles continue to be evaluated, particularly in relation to fracture complexity.
Aim: To evaluate the functional outcome, radiological union, and complications associated with orthogonal bicolumnar plating in AO/OTA 13-C intra-articular distal humerus fractures.
Materials and Methods: This prospective observational study included 25 adult patients with AO/OTA 13-C distal humerus fractures treated by open reduction and internal fixation using orthogonal bicolumnar plating. Patients with pathological fractures, associated vascular injuries, or prior elbow pathology were excluded. Functional outcomes were assessed using the Mayo Elbow Performance Score (MEPS) and Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (DASH) score. Radiological union was evaluated on serial radiographs. Complications were documented systematically.
Results: The majority of patients were males (64.00%) and sustained injuries due to high-energy trauma, predominantly road traffic accidents (60.00%). Fracture subtypes 13-C2 and 13-C3 were most common (36.00% each). Radiological union was achieved in 96.00% of cases, with no nonunion or implant failure. Based on MEPS, 48.00% of patients achieved excellent outcomes and 32.00% achieved good outcomes, yielding an overall excellent-to-good rate of 80.00%. Increasing fracture complexity was significantly associated with poorer functional outcomes ($p = 0.031$). The mean MEPS was 85.20 ± 10.45, and the mean DASH score was 18.40 ± 7.90, with a strong negative correlation between the two ($r = -0.72$; $p < 0.001$). Elbow stiffness was the most common complication (16.00%).
Conclusion: Orthogonal bicolumnar plating is an effective and reliable method for managing AO/OTA 13-C distal humerus fractures, providing high union rates and favorable functional outcomes. Despite increased fracture complexity being associated with reduced function, acceptable complication rates and satisfactory recovery can be achieved with meticulous surgical technique and early rehabilitation.
Keywords: Distal humerus fracture; AO/OTA 13-C; Orthogonal bicolumnar plating; Mayo Elbow Performance Score; Functional outcome.
DOI: 10.25258/ijcpr.18.2.209

Introduction

Intra-articular distal humerus fractures (AO/OTA 13-C) remain among the most technically demanding injuries in adult trauma practice because they involve a small, complex articular surface, thin metaphyseal bone, and two structurally independent columns that must be restored simultaneously to achieve a stable, functional elbow. Even when the patient is physiologically young with good bone quality, comminution of the trochlea–capitellum complex and separation of the medial and lateral columns can compromise both fixation purchase and articular congruity, predisposing to stiffness, pain, and long-term functional limitation. Contemporary reviews emphasize that successful management depends on anatomic reconstruction of the joint surface, restoration of both columns, and fixation stability sufficient to permit early motion—an imperative at the elbow where prolonged immobilization rapidly leads to capsular contracture and loss of functional arc. [1] The goals of operative management in AO 13-C fractures are therefore dual: (1) precise articular reduction to re-establish congruent ulnohumeral and radiocapitellar mechanics, and (2) rigid bicolumnar stabilization that transforms a comminuted distal segment into a single functional unit. Open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) remains the dominant strategy for most reconstructable intra-articular fractures in adults, particularly in patients in whom arthroplasty is undesirable because of activity demands or concerns regarding implant longevity. [2] However, the complexity of fracture morphology, the proximity of major neurovascular structures, and the need to preserve soft-tissue biology mean that ORIF can be associated with a meaningful complication burden, including elbow stiffness, ulnar neuropathy, infection, heterotopic ossification, nonunion, and the need for secondary procedures. [3] Dual-plate fixation is widely accepted as the biomechanical foundation for AO/OTA 13-C fractures because it addresses the medial and lateral columns as independent load-bearing structures and resists varus/valgus and rotational forces generated across the elbow during early rehabilitation. The two most common constructs are parallel plating (plates placed along the medial and lateral supracondylar ridges) and orthogonal (perpendicular or "90–90") plating (typically a medial plate combined with a posterolateral plate). While both approaches aim to provide fixed-angle stability to the distal fragments and create a stable "arch" across the reconstructed articular block, the optimal configuration remains debated and is influenced by fracture pattern, bone quality, implant availability, and surgeon preference. In addition to plate orientation, the fixation philosophy increasingly emphasizes achieving a mechanically integrated distal segment through interdigitation of distal screws and column linkage principles to maximize stability in comminuted articular fractures.[4] Surgical exposure is another critical determinant of reduction quality and operative morbidity. AO 13-C fractures often require broad visualization of the articular surface to permit accurate reconstruction and placement of interfragmentary compression screws. Olecranon osteotomy is a widely used extensile approach that provides excellent access to the distal humeral articular surface, but it introduces an additional osteotomy site and implant construct that can contribute to delayed union, nonunion, implant irritation, and reoperation. A recent systematic review of olecranon osteotomy techniques and fixation constructs highlights clinically relevant rates of osteotomy-related complications and implant removal, underscoring that the benefits of exposure must be weighed against added morbidity—especially when alternative triceps-sparing or triceps-reflecting approaches can provide sufficient visualization for selected fracture morphologies.[5] This is particularly pertinent in high-energy 13-C fractures where soft-tissue compromise and postoperative stiffness risks are already substantial. Ulnar nerve handling is equally central to operative planning for distal humerus fixation. The ulnar nerve is vulnerable to traction, devascularization, scar tethering, and implant irritation during posterior approaches and bicolumnar plating. Postoperative ulnar neuropathy remains a commonly reported complication and can significantly affect patient-reported outcomes even when radiographic healing is achieved. Recent clinical work has continued to refine understanding of the incidence and determinants of postoperative ulnar neuropathy after intra-articular distal humerus fracture fixation, reinforcing the need for meticulous intraoperative identification, protection, and a rational strategy regarding decompression and transposition based on fracture configuration, implant position, and intraoperative nerve stability. [6] Functional outcome after AO 13-C fractures is best interpreted through validated elbow-specific and upper-limb disability metrics that capture pain, stability, and motion (such as the Mayo Elbow Performance Score) as well as patient-perceived disability (such as DASH/QuickDASH). These scores are particularly relevant in distal humerus fractures because an apparently "healed" fracture can still yield poor function due to stiffness, residual incongruity, nerve symptoms, or implant-related discomfort. Large contemporary syntheses of articular distal humerus fixation outcomes emphasize that complications and reoperations are not uncommon in this injury group, and that differences in fixation strategy and soft-tissue management may influence complication profiles.

Materials and Methods

This study was designed as a prospective observational clinical evaluation of patients with intra-articular distal humerus fractures classified as AO/OTA type 13-C, managed operatively using orthogonal bicolumnar plating. All cases were treated at a tertiary care orthopedic trauma center under standard institutional protocols for perioperative care, infection prevention, and rehabilitation. The primary objective was to evaluate functional outcomes following fixation with orthogonal (90–90) bicolumnar plating, with secondary objectives including radiological union and procedure-related complications. A total of 25 consecutive patients diagnosed with AO/OTA 13-C intra-articular distal humerus fractures and treated using orthogonal bicolumnar plating were included in the analysis. Eligible patients were enrolled after clinical and radiological confirmation of fracture configuration and after obtaining written informed consent. Demographic variables including age and sex, injury-related variables including side involved, mechanism of injury, and fracture subtype (13-C1/C2/C3), and treatment-related variables such as surgical approach and implant configuration were documented in a structured proforma.

Eligibility Criteria: Patients were included if they were adults with fresh AO/OTA 13-C intra-articular distal humerus fractures undergoing primary fixation with orthogonal bicolumnar plating and were willing to comply with follow-up and rehabilitation protocols. Patients were excluded if they had pathological fractures, associated vascular injury requiring repair, polytrauma precluding standardized rehabilitation, ipsilateral upper-limb injuries that could confound elbow functional assessment, prior elbow pathology or surgery, open fractures with gross contamination requiring staged fixation, or cases managed with alternative fixation constructs other than orthogonal bicolumnar plating.

Preoperative Assessment and Imaging: All patients underwent standardized clinical evaluation including neurovascular examination with specific documentation of ulnar, median, and radial nerve function. Radiological assessment included anteroposterior and lateral radiographs of the elbow, and computed tomography with 3D reconstruction was utilized where necessary to define articular comminution, column integrity, and fracture lines to support surgical planning. Fractures were classified according to the AO/OTA system into 13-C1, 13-C2, and 13-C3 patterns, and baseline elbow status was documented including swelling, skin condition, and preoperative range of motion where assessable.

Surgical Technique: All cases were operated under regional or general anesthesia with the patient positioned prone or lateral decubitus as per surgeon preference and fracture requirements, using a sterile pneumatic tourniquet when appropriate. A posterior midline skin incision was used, followed by a triceps-reflecting or olecranon osteotomy approach based on the degree of articular comminution and exposure required for accurate reduction. The ulnar nerve was identified, protected throughout the procedure, and managed according to intraoperative findings; decompression was performed routinely, with anterior transposition undertaken when deemed necessary due to implant proximity, nerve subluxation tendency, or excessive tension. Articular reduction was achieved by reconstructing the distal humeral articular surface with provisional K-wire fixation and interfragmentary lag screws where feasible, followed by restoration of medial and lateral columns. Definitive fixation was performed using orthogonal bicolumnar plating (medial plate and posterolateral plate at approximately 90 degrees to each other) with a combination of locking and non-locking screws to maximize distal purchase and provide stable fixation of both columns. In cases with olecranon osteotomy, fixation was performed using tension band wiring or precontoured olecranon plate, and stability was confirmed intraoperatively by taking the elbow through a gentle arc of motion after final tightening and fluoroscopic verification.

Postoperative Protocol and Rehabilitation: Postoperatively, patients received standardized analgesia and antibiotic prophylaxis as per institutional protocol, and the limb was supported in a posterior splint with the elbow in a functional position for comfort in the immediate postoperative period. Early controlled mobilization was initiated once pain and soft tissue condition permitted, with emphasis on active-assisted range of motion exercises to minimize stiffness while protecting fixation. Supervised physiotherapy included progressive flexion–extension and pronation–supination exercises, edema control, scar management, and gradual strengthening once radiological progression toward union was evident. Patients were advised to avoid heavy lifting and resisted extension early in the recovery phase, and adherence to rehabilitation was reinforced at each follow-up.

Outcome Measures: Functional outcome was evaluated using objective and validated parameters. The primary functional scoring system was the Mayo Elbow Performance Score (MEPS), incorporating pain, range of motion, stability, and function, with outcomes graded as excellent, good, fair, or poor. Disability and patient-reported upper limb function were assessed using the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (QuickDASH or DASH, as applicable), recorded at final follow-up. Range of motion was measured using a goniometer and included flexion, extension lag, and the functional arc, while forearm rotation (supination and pronation) was also recorded. Radiological union was assessed on serial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs, defined by bridging trabeculae across fracture lines and obliteration of the fracture gap with absence of tenderness at the fracture site on clinical examination. Complications were systematically recorded, including superficial or deep infection, implant failure, nonunion or delayed union, heterotopic ossification, elbow stiffness, symptomatic hardware, olecranon osteotomy-related complications (if performed), and ulnar neuropathy or other nerve palsies.

Follow-up and assessment schedule: Patients were reviewed at regular postoperative intervals with clinical examination and radiographs at each visit. At every follow-up, pain status, wound condition, neurovascular status, elbow stability, and range of motion were documented, and radiographs were evaluated for maintenance of reduction, implant position, and progression toward union. Functional scoring (MEPS and DASH/QuickDASH) was recorded at a standardized endpoint after completion of rehabilitation to permit uniform comparison across cases.

Statistical Analysis: Data were entered into a structured database and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 26.0. Continuous variables such as age and range of motion were summarized as mean with standard deviation or median with interquartile range based on distribution, while categorical variables such as sex, fracture subtype, complication rates, and MEPS outcome categories were summarized using frequencies and percentages. Normality was assessed using the Shapiro–Wilk test. Comparisons of continuous outcomes between fracture subtypes (13-C1/C2/C3) were performed using one-way ANOVA for normally distributed variables or the Kruskal–Wallis test for non-normal distributions, and post-hoc testing was applied when appropriate. Associations between categorical variables were assessed using Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test where cell counts were small. Correlation between functional scores (MEPS) and disability scores (DASH/QuickDASH) was assessed using Pearson or Spearman correlation based on distribution. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Demographic and injury characteristics (Table 1): The study population consisted of 25 patients with intra-articular distal humerus fractures. The majority of patients belonged to the economically active age group of 31–50 years, accounting for 44.00% of cases, followed by patients older than 50 years (32.00%). Younger adults aged 18–30 years constituted 24.00% of the cohort. There was a clear male predominance, with males forming 64.00% of the study population, while females accounted for 36.00%. The right upper limb was more commonly involved (56.00%) compared to the left (44.00%). Road traffic accidents were the most frequent mechanism of injury, responsible for 60.00% of fractures, highlighting the high-energy nature of these injuries. Falls from height accounted for 32.00% of cases, whereas low-energy domestic falls were seen in 8.00% of patients.

Fracture pattern distribution (Table 2): According to the AO/OTA classification, fracture subtype 13-C2 and 13-C3 were equally common, each representing 36.00% of cases. Type 13-C1 fractures constituted 28.00% of the study population. This distribution indicates that a majority of patients sustained more complex intra-articular fractures (C2 and C3), emphasizing the technical challenges involved in achieving stable fixation and good functional outcomes in this cohort.

Functional outcome based on MEPS (Table 3): Functional assessment using the Mayo Elbow Performance Score demonstrated favorable outcomes in most patients. Excellent results were achieved in 48.00% of cases, while good outcomes were observed in 32.00%. Fair and poor results were noted in 16.00% and 4.00% of patients, respectively. Overall, 80.00% of patients achieved excellent to good functional outcomes following orthogonal bicolumnar plating, indicating the effectiveness of this fixation method in restoring elbow function in AO/OTA 13-C fractures.

Association between fracture type and functional outcome (Table 4): When functional outcomes were analyzed in relation to fracture subtype, a clear trend was observed. All patients with 13-C1 fractures (100.00%) achieved excellent or good outcomes, reflecting the relatively simpler fracture morphology. Among 13-C2 fractures, 88.89% of patients had excellent or good results, with only 11.11% showing fair or poor outcomes. In contrast, patients with 13-C3 fractures demonstrated comparatively inferior outcomes, with only 55.56% achieving excellent or good results and 44.44% having fair or poor outcomes. This association between increasing fracture complexity and poorer functional outcome was found to be statistically significant (Chi-square test, $p = 0.031$), underscoring the impact of articular comminution on postoperative elbow function.

Radiological union and complications (Table 5): Radiological evaluation revealed successful fracture union in 96.00% of cases, with only one patient (4.00%) showing delayed union. No cases of non-union or implant failure were observed, indicating satisfactory biomechanical stability achieved with orthogonal bicolumnar plating. Postoperative complications were relatively limited. Elbow stiffness was the most common complication, occurring in 16.00% of patients, followed by transient ulnar neuropathy in 12.00%. Superficial infection was noted in 8.00% of cases and was managed successfully with antibiotics and local wound care. Heterotopic ossification was observed in 4.00% of patients. Overall, the complication profile was acceptable and manageable.

Correlation between MEPS and DASH scores (Table 6): The mean MEPS was 85.20 ± 10.45, indicating good overall elbow function, while the mean DASH score was 18.40 ± 7.90, reflecting low levels of disability. Correlation analysis demonstrated a strong negative correlation between MEPS and DASH scores ($r = -0.72$), which was statistically highly significant ($p < 0.001$).

Table 1: Demographic and Injury Characteristics of the Study Population (n = 25)

Variable	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Age group (years)		
18–30	6	24.00
31–50	11	44.00
>50	8	32.00
Sex		
Male	16	64.00
Female	9	36.00
Side involved		
Right	14	56.00
Left	11	44.00
Mechanism of injury		
Road traffic accident	15	60.00
Fall from height	8	32.00
Domestic fall	2	8.00

Table 2: Distribution of AO/OTA Fracture Subtypes (n = 25)

AO/OTA fracture type	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
13-C1	7	28.00
13-C2	9	36.00
13-C3	9	36.00
Total	**25**	**100.00**

Table 3: Functional Outcome Based on Mayo Elbow Performance Score (MEPS)

MEPS outcome	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Excellent (≥90)	12	48.00
Good (75–89)	8	32.00
Fair (60–74)	4	16.00
Poor (<60)	1	4.00
Excellent + Good	**20**	**80.00**

Table 4: Comparison of MEPS Outcome with AO/OTA Fracture Type

Fracture type	Excellent/Good n (%)	Fair/Poor n (%)	Total	p-value*
13-C1	7 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	7	
13-C2	8 (88.89)	1 (11.11)	9	
13-C3	5 (55.56)	4 (44.44)	9	
Overall	**20 (80.00)**	**5 (20.00)**	**25**	**0.031**

*Chi-square test; $p < 0.05$ (statistically significant)

Table 5: Radiological Union and Postoperative Complications

Parameter	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Radiological union		
United	24	96.00
Delayed union	1	4.00
Non-union	0	0.00
Complications		
Elbow stiffness	4	16.00
Ulnar neuropathy (transient)	3	12.00
Superficial infection	2	8.00
Implant failure	0	0.00
Heterotopic ossification	1	4.00

Table 6: Relationship Between MEPS and DASH Score

Outcome measure	Mean ± SD	Correlation coefficient (r)	p-value
MEPS	85.20 ± 10.45		
DASH score	18.40 ± 7.90	−0.72	**<0.001**

Discussion

The present series of 25 AO/OTA 13-C intra-articular distal humerus fractures treated with orthogonal (90–90) bicolumnar plating demonstrated that these injuries predominantly affected an active adult population, with 44.00% in the 31–50-year group, male predominance (64.00%), and a high proportion of high-energy trauma (road traffic accidents, 60.00%). This profile is consistent with the established epidemiology of adult distal humerus fractures, where high-energy mechanisms are common in younger and middle-aged adults and contribute to complex intra-articular patterns requiring stable fixation and early mobilization (Robinson et al, 2003). [7]

With respect to fracture morphology, 13-C2 and 13-C3 patterns comprised the majority in this study (36.00% each), indicating a substantial load of complex articular injuries. A comparable predominance of comminuted patterns has been reported in clinical series managing complex distal humerus fractures; for example, Atalar et al (2009) reported a higher proportion of advanced comminution (AO type C3: 12/21, 57.14%), with fewer C1 injuries (3/21, 14.29%), reinforcing that many treated cohorts are heavily skewed toward more technically demanding articular reconstructions. [8]

Functionally, the present study achieved favorable outcomes, with 80.00% of patients attaining excellent-to-good MEPS categories and a mean MEPS of 85.20 ± 10.45, while disability was relatively low (mean DASH 18.40 ± 7.90). These findings align with outcome expectations when stable dual-column fixation permits early motion; Gofton et al (2003), in a cohort of AO type C fractures treated using dual orthogonal plate fixation, reported minimal subjective deficits (10%) and high satisfaction (mean 93%), albeit with a notable overall complication rate (48%) that was largely minor, supporting that good perceived outcomes can coexist with manageable complication profiles in complex distal humerus ORIF. [9]

A key finding in the current analysis was the statistically significant association between increasing fracture complexity and poorer functional category ($p = 0.031$), with 13-C1 fractures achieving 100.00% excellent/good outcomes versus 55.56% in 13-C3. This gradient is clinically intuitive because severe articular comminution compromises reduction quality, fixation purchase, and postoperative motion. In randomized comparative work on double-plating configurations, Shin et al (2010) observed broadly similar clinical outcomes between perpendicular (orthogonal) and parallel plating, but reported that all patients achieved union except two in the perpendicular group (supracondylar nonunion), emphasizing that stability in the supracondylar/metaphyseal region and fracture biology—often challenged in more complex patterns—can influence healing and subsequent function. [10]

When the current results are interpreted in the context of modern comparative series, they appear consistent with larger datasets showing broadly equivalent functional recovery between orthogonal and parallel constructs when contemporary implants and sound fixation principles are applied. Haglin et al (2021) reported similar final MEPI scores between orthogonal and parallel groups (88.1 ± 7.3 vs 88.4 ± 9.8) and comparable mean time to union (16.1 ± 12.3 vs 15.8 ± 8.7 weeks), with no statistically significant differences in complication rates, suggesting that plate orientation alone may be less decisive than articular reconstruction, distal fixation density, and early rehabilitation protocols. [11]

Radiological union in this study was achieved in 96.00% (delayed union 4.00%, nonunion 0.00%) without implant failure, supporting the mechanical adequacy of orthogonal bicolumnar plating for AO/OTA 13-C injuries. In contrast, larger clinical cohorts using dual plating have reported nonunion and broader complication burdens; for example, Bhayana et al (2019) in a 94-case prospective series treated with parallel plating reported mean time to union of 11.8 weeks (range 9–26), heterotopic ossification in 3.1%, and emphasized that roughly one-third developed at least one complication with ulnar neuropathy being the most common, while mean MEPS was 88.40 and mean DASH 39.62. The present series showed a comparable functional score range but a substantially lower mean disability score (DASH 18.40), which may reflect differences in cohort characteristics, rehabilitation adherence, and/or the disability instrument's sensitivity to whole-limb function. [12]

Postoperative elbow stiffness was the most frequent complication in the current study (16.00%), followed by transient ulnar neuropathy (12.00%) and superficial infection (8.00%), with heterotopic ossification being relatively uncommon (4.00%). These rates compare variably across published series; in a prospective evaluation of parallel plating for intercondylar distal humerus fractures, Kumar et al (2015) reported excellent objective elbow performance (mean MEPS 96.32) but substantially higher residual disability (mean DASH 31.42), illustrating that even when elbow-specific scores are high, patient-reported disability may remain clinically meaningful and may be influenced by stiffness, pain, and broader upper-limb participation restrictions. [13]

From an evidence-synthesis perspective, the present study's near-universal union and absence of implant failure are consistent with the overall conclusion that both orthogonal and parallel dual plating are effective for distal humerus fractures, while union timing may differ modestly. Wang and Liu (2020), analyzing six randomized controlled trials (305 participants), concluded that orthogonal plating was associated with longer union time than parallel plating, but found no significant differences in elbow function, MEPS, reduction quality, or postoperative complications, implying that union kinetics may favor parallel constructs in pooled analyses even when functional recovery is comparable. [14]

Finally, the present study demonstrated a strong negative correlation between MEPS and DASH ($r = -0.72$, $p < 0.001$), confirming that improved elbow performance is associated with lower perceived disability, and supporting the concurrent use of clinician-based and patient-reported outcomes in distal humerus fracture research. This integrated interpretation is consistent with systematic review findings; Yu et al (2019) reported that both orthogonal and parallel plating achieved satisfactory outcomes with similarly low complication rates, while parallel plating showed shorter union time ($p = 0.018$) and no significant differences in heterotopic ossification, transient ulnar neuropathy, or ankylosis, reinforcing that orthogonal bicolumnar plating remains a valid construct when meticulous articular reconstruction, stable bicolumnar fixation, and structured rehabilitation are achieved. [15]

Conclusion

Orthogonal bicolumnar plating provides stable fixation for AO/OTA 13-C intra-articular distal humerus fractures, resulting in a high rate of fracture union and predominantly excellent to good functional outcomes. Increasing fracture complexity, particularly in 13-C3 patterns, was associated with comparatively inferior functional results. The complication profile was acceptable and manageable, with no implant failures or nonunions observed. Overall, orthogonal bicolumnar plating remains an effective and reliable fixation strategy for complex distal humerus fractures when meticulous surgical technique and early rehabilitation are employed.

References

1. Morrey ME, Morrey BF, Sanchez-Sotelo J, Barlow JD, O'Driscoll S. A review of the surgical management of distal humerus fractures and nonunions: From fixation to arthroplasty. J Clin Orthop Trauma. 2021;20:101477. doi:10.1016/j.jcot.2021.101477.
2. Holte AJ, Dean RE, Chang G. Distal humerus fractures: review of literature, tips, and tricks. JSES Rev Rep Tech. 2023;4(3):639-646 (eCollection 2024). doi:10.1016/j.xrrt.2023.11.004.
3. Yetter TR, Weatherby PJ, Somerson JS. Complications of articular distal humeral fracture fixation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2021;30(8):1957-1967. doi:10.1016/j.jse.2021.02.017.
4. Heifner JJ, Sandilands SM, Bolano LE, Rubio F, Davis TA, Mercer DM, Araiza ET. Clinical outcomes for linked fixation of distal humerus fractures: a multicenter study. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2024;33(11):2463-2471. doi:10.1016/j.jse.2024.05.029.
5. Feinstein SD, Paterno AV, Allen AD, Jewell E, Wright ST, Draeger RW. Techniques and Fixation of Olecranon Osteotomy: A Systematic Review. J Hand Surg Glob Online. 2023;5(5):643-649. doi:10.1016/j.jhsg.2023.04.001.
6. Oshika Y, Takegami Y, Tokutake K, Yokoyama H, Oguchi T, Imagama S. Ulnar Nerve Neuropathy After Surgery for Intraarticular Distal Humerus Fractures: An Analysis of 116 Patients. J Hand Surg Am. 2023;48(11):1171.e1-1171.e5. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2023.02.001.
7. Robinson CM, Hill RMF, Jacobs N, Dall G, Court-Brown CM. Adult distal humeral metaphyseal fractures: epidemiology and results of treatment. J Orthop Trauma. 2003;17(1):38–47. doi:10.1097/00005131-200301000-00006.
8. Atalar AC, Demirhan M, Salduz A, Kilicoglu O, Seyahi A. Functional results of the parallel-plate technique for complex distal humerus fractures. Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc. 2009;43(1):21–27. doi:10.3944/AOTT.2009.021.
9. Gofton WT, MacDermid JC, Patterson SD, Faber KJ, King GJW. Functional outcome of AO type C distal humeral fractures. J Hand Surg Am. 2003;28(2):294–308. doi:10.1053/jhsu.2003.50038.
10. Shin SJ, Sohn HS, Do NH. A clinical comparison of two different double plating methods for intraarticular distal humerus fractures. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2010;19(1):2–9. doi:10.1016/j.jse.2009.05.003.
11. Haglin JM, Kugelman DN, Lott A, Belayneh R, Konda SR, Egol KA. Intra-articular distal humerus fractures: parallel versus orthogonal plating. HSS J. 2021;18(2):256–263. doi:10.1177/15563316211009810.
12. Bhayana H, Pandit R, Dhammi IK, et al. Comparative study for assessment of functional outcome of intraarticular AO type C distal humerus fractures treated by parallel plating. Indian J Orthop. 2019;53(2):319–326. doi:10.4103/ortho.IJOrtho_541_17.

13. Kumar R, Malhotra R. Intercondylar humerus fracture—parallel plating and its results. J Clin Diagn Res. 2015;9(2):RC01–RC04. doi:10.7860/JCDR/2015/11208.5541.
14. Wang X, Liu G. A comparison between perpendicular and parallel plating methods for distal humerus fractures: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Medicine (Baltimore). 2020;99(23):e19602. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000019602.
15. Yu X, Xie L, Wang J, et al. Orthogonal plating method versus parallel plating method in the treatment of distal humerus fracture: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Surg. 2019;69:49–60. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2019.07.028.