

## Midshaft Clavicular Fractures: Intramedullary Nailing Versus Plate Fixation

Anshu Anand<sup>1</sup>, Ajoy Kumar Manav<sup>2</sup>

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

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

---

Received: 06-07-2021 / Revised: 10-08-2021 / Accepted: 15-09-2021

Corresponding author: Dr. Anshu Anand

Conflict of interest: Nil

---

### Abstract

**Aim:** The aim of this study to determine the intramedullary Nailing Versus Plate Fixation for the Treatment Displaced Midshaft Clavicular Fractures. **Methods:** A prospective randomised trial was conducted in the Department of Orthopaedics, Patna Medical College and Hospital, Patna, Bihar, India from December 2018 to December 2019. Those consenting to participation were randomised to open reduction and plate fixation with a 3.5 mm superior clavicular plate or a 2.0 mm to 3.5 mm titanium elastic nail in the second group. Patients with Age 18 to 58 yrs, Mid-shaft fracture, Displacement by one bone width, Tenting/compromised skin, Initial shortening of more than 15 mm, Angulation exceeding 30 were included in this study. Total of 100 fractures of the clavicle were included in this study and divided into 2 equal groups. Demographic data were recorded at presentation and patients completed a baseline Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (DASH) score to describe their shoulder function the week before injury. Standard standing radiographs with 15° caudal and 15° cephalad and a 'panorama' view of both clavicles were performed. **Results:** There were no demographic differences between the groups (Table 1) and they had the same baseline mean DASH score of 0.5 (0 to 6.7 for plate *versus* 0 to 15.8 for ESIN,  $p = 0.6$ ). The duration of surgery was shorter for ESIN (mean 51.4 minutes, 20 to 118) than for plate fixation (mean 67.7 minutes, 34 to 104;  $p < 0.001$ , independent samples *t*-test). After 12 months, there was no difference in DASH score between the plate fixation and ESIN, with both approaching their DASH baseline values of 0.5. Individual differences between baseline data and the DASH score after one year showed no statistical difference (1.5, -4.3 to 12.2 for plate *versus* 2.1, -14.3 to 28.4 for ESIN;  $p = 0.5$ , independent samples *t*-test). Compared with baseline values, 1 patient (2%) with plate fixation had a DASH score which worsened by ten points compared with 4 patients (8%) in the ESIN group. Both groups demonstrated similar satisfaction with their shoulder at 12 months as measured by VAS (9, 0 to 10 for plate fixation *versus* 9, 3 to 10 for ESIN;  $p = 0.87$ , independent samples *t*-test). Those in the ESIN group were, however, significantly more satisfied with their cosmetic results (mean 8.7, 3.6 to 10 *versus* mean 7.8, 0 to 10;  $p = 0.04$ , independent samples *t*-test). **Conclusion:** Fixation with plate or ESIN in completely displaced midshaft fractures of the clavicle produce equally excellent functional results at 12 months. In addition, nailing should not be undertaken with implants less than 2.5 mm in diameter. In the presence of comminution, plating may be the superior option.

**Keywords:** Midshaft Clavicular Fractures, Intramedullary Nailing, Plate Fixation.

---

This is an Open Access article that uses a fund-ing 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

## Introduction

Clavicle fractures, accounting for about 2.6% of total body fractures and 34% to 45% of shoulder girdle injuries in adults, are one of the commonest bone injuries in the body[1-3]. About 69% to 81% of clavicle fractures are in the middle one third of the clavicle, which is the thinnest part and entails the least soft tissue, 17% in the lateral one-third, and 2% in the medial one-third[4-6]. Recently, there has been a growing trend to the operative treatment of displaced midshaft clavicular fractures. Open reduction and internal plate fixation, and intramedullary nailing fixation are 2 of the widely used techniques for operative treatment[7,11] but the optimal fixation method for these types of fractures remains a topic of debate.

Previous meta-analyses have compared plate fixation versus intramedullary nailing fixation for the treatment of midshaft clavicle fractures[12,13]. However, the relatively small sample size in each published study made the results inconclusive. Moreover, several relevant studies on this topic have been published in recent years, which make the present meta-analysis more precise.

## Materials and methods

A prospective randomised trial was conducted in the Department of Orthopaedics, Patna Medical College and Hospital, Patna, Bihar, India from December 2018 to December 2019, after taking the approval of the protocol review committee and institutional ethics committee. Those consenting to participation were randomised to open reduction and plate fixation with a 3.5 mm superior clavicular plate or a 2.0 mm to 3.5 mm titanium elastic nail in the second group. Patients with Age 18 to 65 yrs, Mid-shaft fracture, Displacement by one bone width, Tenting/compromised skin, Initial

shortening of more than 15 mm, Angulation exceeding 30 were included in this study.

Total of 100 fractures of the clavicle were included in this study and divided into 2 equal groups. Demographic data were recorded at presentation and patients completed a baseline Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (DASH)[14,15] score to describe their shoulder function the week before injury. Standard standing radiographs with 15° caudal and 15° cephalad and a 'panorama' view[16] of both clavicles were performed.

**Assessment of clinical outcomes.** The functional outcome was assessed with the DASH questionnaire and the modified Constant Score[14]. The DASH score consists of 30 questions providing a patient-rated score from zero points (perfect extremity) to 100 (completely disabled limb), while the surgeon records a Constant Score from 100 (perfect) to zero (completely disabled)[14,16,17,18]. Patients completed the shorter 11-question Quick DASH[19] questionnaire weekly for the first six post-operative weeks, while the DASH and Constant Scores were recorded at each outpatient attendance.

At 12 months, the patients rated their satisfaction with the cosmetic and general results of the procedure on a 10 cm visual analogue scale (VAS), where zero indicated a poor and ten a perfect result. They were also asked for yes/ no responses about pain over the implant, incisional numbness, and whether they experienced complete recovery of their shoulder function.

**Assessment of radiological outcomes.** Calibrated radiographs of the injured shoulder were obtained at each attendance until union was seen. Additionally, a calibrated panorama view of both clavicles was obtained pre-operatively and after union to evaluate shortening. A nonunion

was defined as absent osseous bridging of more than one cortex at six months.

**Statistical analysis.** To detect a statistically significant difference between groups of 10 points in the DASH score with a power of 80% and a significance level of 5%, 36 patients were required in each group. Groups were compared with the independent samples *t*-test or chi-squared testing, as appropriate.

## Results

There were no demographic differences between the groups (Table 1) and they had the same baseline mean DASH score of 0.5 (0 to 6.7 for plate *versus* 0 to 15.8 for ESIN,  $p = 0.6$ ). The duration of surgery was shorter for ESIN (mean 51.4 minutes, 20 to 118) than for plate fixation (mean 67.7 minutes, 34 to 104;  $p < 0.001$ , independent samples *t*-test).

**Clinical outcome.** According to the linear mixed model, plate fixation led to a better recovery as measured by Quick DASH during the first five weeks and at six weeks and three and six months as measured by both DASH and Constant Score. After 12 months, there was no difference in DASH score between the plate fixation and ESIN, with both approaching their DASH baseline values of 0.5. Individual differences between baseline data and the DASH score after one year showed no statistical difference (1.5, -4.3 to 12.2 for plate *versus* 2.1, -14.3 to 28.4 for ESIN;  $p = 0.5$ , independent samples *t*-test). Compared

with baseline values, 1 patient (2%) with plate fixation had a DASH score which worsened by ten points compared with 4 patients (8%) in the ESIN group. Both groups demonstrated similar satisfaction with their shoulder at 12 months as measured by VAS (9, 0 to 10 for plate fixation *versus* 9, 3 to 10 for ESIN;  $p = 0.87$ , independent samples *t*-test). Those in the ESIN group were, however, significantly more satisfied with their cosmetic results (mean 8.7, 3.6 to 10 *versus* mean 7.8, 0 to 10;  $p = 0.04$ , independent samples *t*-test).

**ESIN – subgroup analysis.** A strong predictor of the functional outcome in the ESIN group was the degree of fracture comminution as described by the number of intermediary fragments. The 12 patients with no intermediary fragments had a functional recovery comparable with that of those who underwent plate fixation, whereas patients with 2 or more fragments recovered significantly slower than those with fewer. These findings were not replicated in the plate group.

**Radiological outcome.** All fractures united in the plate group. There was 2 nonunion in the ESIN group, where the nail was removed early due to pain, 12 weeks post-operatively. 5 patients in the ESIN group exhibited shortening of  $> 15$  mm after union. This did not affect the clinical result at 12 months with a mean DASH of 0.9 (0 to 3.4) compared with 2.3 (0 to 28.4) for those with shortening  $< 15$  mm ( $p = 0.3$ , independent samples *t*-test).

**Table 1: Patient demographics and fracture characteristics**

Variable	ESIN, n = 50	Plate, n = 50
Mean age at injury (yrs) (range)	35.4 (18.5 to 55.2)	33.6 (18 to 58.1)
Mean time elapsed before surgery (days) (range)	5.4(0 to 12)	5.8 (0 to 16)
Gender (male/female) (n)	43/7	43/7
<b>Mechanism of injury (n)</b>		
Simple fall	12	12
Motor vehicle accident	13	15
Sports	22	20
Other	3	3
<b>Fracture characteristics</b>		
Affecting the right side	22	25

Intermediary fragments (n, %)		
0	12 (24)	13(26)
1	14 (28)	12 (24)
2	17 (34)	17 (34)
≥ 3	7 (14)	8(16)
Initial displacement (bone width) (range)	1.58(0* to 3)	1.62(1 to 3)
Initial shortening (mm) (range)	8.7(-14 to 33)	11.3 (-5 to 39)
*angulation > 30° ESIN, elastic stable intramedullary nailing		

**Table 2: Variables increasing the odds of performing open elastic stable intramedullary nailing in 50 patients with isolated completely displaced mid-shaft fractures of the clavicle**

Variable	Multivariate logistic regression model	
	OR (95% CI)	p-value
Mean age (yrs)	0.96 (0.9 to 1.1)	0.5
Mean time to surgery (five days)	1.8 (1.5 to 2.2)	<b>0.03</b>
<b>Intermediary fragments</b>		
0 – ref.	1.1	-
1	7.3 (1.1 to 47.2)	<b>0.05</b>
2	5.8 (0.9 to 35.3)	0.06
3	34.8(1.8 to 621.4)	<b>0.03</b>

Open reduction was performed in 28 fractures, while 22 were closed procedures. Closed reduction resulted in a significantly better functional outcome at all points in all three measures ( $p < 0.05$ ) except for the Constant Score at 12 months. Closed procedures were performed after a mean of 4.5 days (0 to 12) and open procedures at 6.8 days (1 to 14) after injury ( $p = 0.03$ , independent samples t-test). Multivariate logistic regression demonstrated an 82% increase in odds ( $p = 0.03$ ) of an open procedure if surgery was delayed five days. Fractures with intermediary fragments also had higher odds of open reduction (Table 2).

**Table 3: Complications and additional procedures in 100 patients treated surgically for a displaced mid-shaft fractures of the clavicle**

Variable	ESIN (n)	Plate (n)	p-value
<b>Major complications requiring revision surgery under general anesthesia</b>			
Revision surgery for deep infection	0	3	
Nonunion	2	0	
Implant failure	2	0	
<b>Minor complications</b>			
Superficial infection	0	6	
Wound dehiscence	5	0	
Incisional numbness at 12 mths	9	28	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>
Pain over nail entry point or over plate at 12 mths	17	24	0.3
Implant failure	1	4	
Re-fracture	0	1	
<b>Implant removal</b>			
Local anaesthesia	22	0	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>
General anaesthesia	10	4	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>

\*2 shortened in local anesthesia, all removed after bony healing, 2 mm nail prematurely removed after 12 wks, 2 mm nail that was not sufficiently anchored laterally and lost reduction

early, chi-squared test, more than one complication could occur in a single patient. Bold p-values are statically significant

**Complications – plate group.** 3 patients exhibited loosening of screws medially and three laterally (Table 3). Everyone was observed and given restrictions in load bearing until callus was seen on the radiographs. Another patient had an undisplaced fracture through the medial screw at seven weeks post-operatively, after heavy lifting, and this healed uneventfully after 4 weeks not loading the clavicle. 3 of these patients had their plates removed due to a painful prominence of the hardware. 3 patients with plate fixation acquired a deep infection. They were treated successfully with soft-tissue revision surgery and antibiotics and went on to union. 1 implant was later removed due to persistent infection after union and the other 18 months later due to pain over the implant. Superficial infection developed in 6 patients and was successfully treated with oral antibiotics.

**Complications – ESIN group.** The intramedullary nail was placed outside the medullary canal of the lateral fragment in 2 patients. This was discovered on the post-operative radiograph and the fixation revised. 4 patients were found to have a very small medullary diameter; of these, 3 crossed over to plate fixation intra-operatively, while a 2 mm nail was used in the other 4. In 2 of these it was advanced only 16 mm into the distal fragment, which, failed early, and was plated. 2 developed a hypertrophic nonunion after the nail was removed prematurely at 12 weeks and went on to be revised to a plate. The nail was bent during introduction, but the fracture healed successfully. These 4 patients were all analysed by intention to treat.

## Discussion

We found that 12 months following displaced mid-shaft fractures of the clavicle treated with either a plate or ESIN, the outcome was excellent. During the first five weeks, there was a statistically significant

difference in Quick- DASH favouring plate fixation, and at six weeks to six months in both the DASH score and Constant Score. The minimum clinically important difference for the Quick- DASH is 8 points, indicating that our finding of a mean difference of 8.8 points during the first five weeks is clinically detectable[20].

The more comminution, the higher were the Quick- DASH and DASH scores during the first six months in the ESIN group. This effect was not reproduced in the plate group. Nailing of fractures without comminution gave broadly the same scores as those of plate fixation. Plating appears to be able to negate the effect of comminution when bridging the fracture. We suggest the effect diminishes over time as callus forms in the nail construct, and the fracture becomes inherently more stable[21].

Open reduction was the strongest predictor of poor functional outcome at 12 months in the ESIN group, in contrast with Van der Meijden et al[22] who reported no such effect. In our series, 56% were open procedures, compared with 74% in the study of 120 patients by Van der Meijden et al.[22] It is possible that an inadequate number of procedures were performed closed in that study to reach a statistically sound conclusion. The risk of open reduction increased with time elapsed between injury and fixation, and contracture of the adjacent muscles, consolidation of the fracture haematoma and early callus formation all contribute to making closed reduction progressively harder. The high incidence of complications in the patients with narrow medullary cavities who underwent fixation with a 2 mm nail suggests that this is not an appropriate construct, and in patients where a 2.5 mm nail may not be used, conversion to open reduction and internal fixation with a plate is the most appropriate course of action.

The incidence of minor complications related to prominence of the implant and incisional numbness were high in both groups. This is consistent with other studies reporting complaints over the nail to be 20% to 70% and 14% to 44% with plating and the need for secondary surgery with implant removal of 53% to 96% in ESIN and 3% to 63% for plate fixation[22-24].

One of the limitations of this study is that the degree of fracture comminution was rated according to the number of fragments. This does not account for the different size of fragments, which is impossible to measure correctly in a radiograph, and we thus chose to report results as higher or lower degree of comminution as this might be more clinically applicable. Some patients did not complete their base-line DASH score correctly, scoring instead their current function; these cases were removed from the analysis. The subgroup analyses were not predetermined; thus, no power analyses were performed, meaning their results should be interpreted with caution. While the randomisation procedure was performed by an otherwise uninvolved colleague, computerised randomisation would have arguably been more robust.

### Conclusion

Fixation with plate or ESIN in completely displaced midshaft fractures of the clavicle produce equally excellent functional results at 12 months. In addition, nailing should not be undertaken with implants less than 2.5 mm in diameter. In the presence of comminution, plating may be the superior option.

### Reference

1. Neer CSII. Fractures of the distal third of the clavicle. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1968; 58:43–50.
2. Robinson CM. Fractures of the clavicle in the adult Epidemiology and classification. *J Bone Joint Surg (Br).* 1998; 80:476–484.
3. Khan LA, Bradnock TJ, Scott C, et al. Fractures of the clavicle. *J Bone Joint*

- Surg Am.* 2009; 91:447–460.
4. van der Meijden OA, Gaskill TR, Millett PJ. Treatment of clavicle fractures: current concepts review. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2012; 21:423–429.
5. Postacchini F, Gumina S, De Santis P, et al. Epidemiology of clavicle fractures. *J Should Elbow Surg.* 2002; 11:452–456.
6. Nordqvist A, Petersson C. The incidence of fractures of the clavicle. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1994; 300:127–132.
7. Lenza M, Faloppa F. Surgical interventions for treating acute fractures or non-union of the middle third of the clavicle. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015;7:CD007428.
8. Jubel A, Andermahr J, Schiffer G, et al. Elastic stable intramedullary nailing of midclavicular fractures with a titanium nail. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2003; 408:279–285.
9. Ali KM, Lucas HK. Plating of fractures of the middle third of the clavicle. *Injury.* 1978; 9:263–267.
10. Wang XH, Guo WJ, Li AB, et al. Operative versus nonoperative treatment for displaced midshaft clavicle fractures: a meta-analysis based on current evidence. *Clinics.* 2015; 70:584–592.
11. Schemitsch LA, Schemitsch EH, Veillette C, et al. Function plateaus by one year in patients with surgically treated displaced midshaft clavicle fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2011; 469:3351–3355.
12. Duan X, Zhong G, Cen S, et al. Plating versus intramedullary pin or conservative treatment for midshaft fracture of clavicle: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Should Elbow Surg Am.* 2011; 20:1008–1015.
13. Wang J, Meng XH, Guo ZM, et al. Interventions for treating displaced midshaft clavicular fractures: a Bayesian network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Medicine.* 2015; 94: e595.

14. Hudak PL, Amadio PC, Bombardier C. Development of an upper extremity outcome measure: the DASH (disabilities of the arm, shoulder and hand) [corrected] The Upper Extremity Collaborative Group (UECG). *Am J Ind Med* 1996; 29:602–608.
15. Finsen V. Norwegian version of the DASH questionnaire for examination of the arm shoulders and hand. *Tidsskr Nor Laegeforen* 2008; 128:1070. (In Norwegian)
16. Smekal V, Deml C, Irenberger A, et al. Length determination in midshaft clavicle fractures: validation of measurement. *J Orthop Trauma* 2008; 22:458–462.
17. Constant CR, Murley AH. A clinical method of functional assessment of the shoulder. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1987; 214:160–164.
18. Constant CR, Gerber C, Emery RJ, et al. A review of the Constant score: modifications and guidelines for its use. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2008; 17:355–361.
19. Beaton DE, Wright JG, Katz JN, Upper Extremity Collaborative Group. Development of the Quick DASH: comparison of three item-reduction approaches. *J Bone Joint Surg [Am]* 2005;87-A:1038–1046.
20. Mintken PE, Glynn P, Cleland JA. Psychometric properties of the shortened disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand Questionnaire (Quick DASH) and Numeric Pain Rating Scale in patients with shoulder pain. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2009; 18:920–926.
21. Zeng L, Wei H, Liu Y, et al. Titanium Elastic Nail (TEN) versus Reconstruction Plate Repair of Midshaft Clavicular Fractures: A Finite Element Study. *PLoS One* 2015; 10:0126131.
22. van der Meijden OA, Houwert RM, Hulsmans M, et al. Operative treatment of dislocated midshaft clavicular fractures: plate or intramedullary nail fixation? A randomized controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg [Am]* 2015; 97:613–619.
23. Andrade-Silva FB, Kojima KE, Joeris A, Santos Silva J, Mattar R Jr. Single, superiorly placed reconstruction plate compared with flexible intramedullary nailing for midshaft clavicular fractures: a prospective, randomized controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg [Am]* 2015; 97:620–626.
24. Wijdicks FJ, Houwert M, Dijkgraaf M, et al. Complications after plate fixation and elastic stable intramedullary nailing of dislocated midshaft clavicle fractures: a retrospective comparison. *Int Orthop* 2012; 36:2139–2145.