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Abstract

Background: Trochanteric fractures are devastating injuries that most commonly affect the elderly and also in young, have a tremendous impact on both the health care system and society in general. The mainstay of treatment of intertrochanteric fracture is fixation with a screw slide plate device or intramedullary device. The purpose of this retrospective study to review the long term functional outcome of Intertrochanteric femoral fractures treated with dynamic hip screw (DHS) v/s proximal femoral nail (PFN).

Methods: This study was conducted on 1000 patients of both sexes with intertrochanteric femoral fractures above 16 years of age group which were operated for intertrochanteric femoral fracture by DHS (500 patients) and PFN (500 patients) from January 2009 to December 2012. Functional results were assessed by Harris hip scoring system.

Results: In our study Mean age 62.66±16.99. The ratio of males to female was 1.23:1. 85.2% of patients were found with domestic fall and both sides were equally involved. In our study 5.2% cases of infection noted in the PFN group and 9.4% in the DHS group. Peri-Implant fracture occurred in 8 cases (1.6%) in PFN group and 19 cases (3.8%) in DHS group. Mechanical complications like (Breakage of PFN/DHS screw and PFN/ DHS plate) occurred in 24 cases (4.8%) in PFN group and in DHS group were found in 16 cases (3.2%). Deformity (varus deformity and external rotation) occurred in 11 cases (2.2%) in PFN group and 44 cases (8.8%) in DHS group. Mean HHS of PFN was 92.064 and of DHS was 91.753(p=0.425).

Conclusions: We conclude that long term functional outcome measured by HHS of Intertrochanteric femoral fractures treated with dynamic hip screw v/s proximal femoral nail have no significant difference but complication like peri-implant fracture, Shortening, Screw cut-out, varus deformity were more in patient operated by DHS.
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Introduction

Trochanteric fractures are devastating injuries that most commonly affect the elderly and also in young, have a tremendous impact on both the health care system and society in general. They are three to four times more common in women who are osteoporotic; trivial fall being the most common mechanism of injury [1].

The incidence of intertrochanteric fractures varies from country to country. Gulberg et al. [2] has predicted that the total no of hip fractures will reach 2.6million by 2025 and 4.5 million by 2050. In 1990 26% of all hip fractures occurred in Asia whereas this figure could rise to 37% in 2025 and 45% in 2050 [3].

In Denmark the incidence of hip fractures has declined about 20% from 1997 to 2006. Hagino et al. reported a lifetime risk of hip fracture for individuals at 50 yrs of age of 5.6% for men and 20.0% for women [4].

For many, this fracture is often a terminal event resulting in death due to cardiac, pulmonary or renal complications. Approximately 10 to 30% of patients die within one year of an intertrochanteric fracture [5].
The goal of treatment of an intertrochanteric fracture is the restoration of the patient to his or her pre-injury status as early as possible. Operative treatment for hip fractures was introduced in the 1950s with the expectation of improved functional outcome and a reduction of the complications associated with immobilization and prolonged bed rest [6,7].

The purpose of this retrospective study to review the long term functional outcome of Intertrochanteric femoral fractures treated with dynamic hip screw v/s proximal femoral nail.

**Material and Method**

This retrospective study was conducted on 1000 patients admitted in the Department of Orthopedics JLN Hospital and Medical College, Ajmer which were operated for intertrochanteric femoral fracture by dynamic hip screw (500 patients) and proximal femoral nail (500 patients) from January 2009 to December 2012. Patients of both sexes with intertrochanteric femoral fractures above 16 years of age group who underwent dynamic hip screw v/s proximal femoral nail were included in this study while patients who had pathological fracture, ipsilateral shaft femur fracture, open fractures and patients with peri-prosthetic fracture were excluded from this study. Functional Results were assessed by Harris hip scoring system [8,9].

**Results**

This study involved 1000 cases of intertrochanteric femur fracture of either sex from January 2009 to December 2012. 500 were treated by proximal femoral nail and 500 were treated by dynamic hip screw.

In our study maximum age was 97 years and minimum was 17 years (Mean age=62.66±16.99 with male to female ratio of 1.23:1 and mode of injury domestic fall in majority (85.2%). Both side were equally involved.

Infection, Shortening (>1 cm), Peri-implant fracture and Mechanical complications found more in DHS group then PFN group and have significant difference.

Most of patients (95.0%) have good to excellent outcome in PFN group compare to (90.0%) in DHS.

**Table 1:** Common complications in pfn and dhs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>PFN (n-500)</th>
<th>DHS (n-500)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw cut-out</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior thigh pain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortening (&lt; 1cm)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortening (&gt; 1cm)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakage of PFN screw</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakage of DHS screw</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakage of implant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z effect</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse Z effect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-implant Fracture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rotation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal rotation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varus deformity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valgus deformity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** Comparative Harris Hip Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harris Hip Score</th>
<th>PFN</th>
<th>DHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig 1:** DHS with peri-implant fracture

**Fig 2:** DHS with screw cut out
Fig 3: DHS with screw cut out and varus collapse

Fig 4: DHS with screw back out

Fig 5: PFN with shortening, varus collapse and peri-implant fracture

Fig 6: PFN with Reverse Z effect

Fig 7: PFN with broken screw and screw cut out

Fig 8: PFN with Breakage of implant
Discussion
In the last few decades treatment of intertrochanteric fractures has evolved significantly. The aim of management accordingly has drifted to achieving early mobilization, rapid rehabilitation and quick return of individuals to pre-morbid home and work environment as a functionally and psychologically independent unit.

Operative treatment in the form of internal fixation permits early rehabilitation and offers the best chance of functional recovery, and hence has become the treatment of choice for virtually all fractures in the trochanteric region.

The purpose of this retrospective study was to review the long term functional outcome of Intertrochanteric femoral fractures treated with dynamic hip screw v/s proximal femoral nail.

The study was conducted on 1000 treated patients of intertrochanteric femur fracture (500 patients by PFN and 500 patients by DHS) in Department of Orthopedics, JLN Hospital and Medical College, Ajmer from January 2009 to December 2012.

In our study average age was 62.66 years (range: 17-97 years). This is comparable with other studies done by Jonnes C et al. (2016) [10], Endigeri P et al. (2017) [11], Yadav A et al. (2014) [13] they observed the mean age of patients was near about 60 years in their studies.

Korkmaz et al. (2014) [14] and Shivanna et al. (2014) [15] observed the mean age of the patients were higher than our and other workers. In our study both side was equally involved (p=0.658).

The ratio of males to female was 1.23:1 for both the groups (p=0.849). This is comparable with other studies done by Jonnes C et al. (2016) [10], Shivanna et al. (2014) [15], Korkmaz et al. (2014) [14] observed in their study male: female was 1:2.12.

This variation is probably because our study measured the male female ratio amongst operated fractures that reported for follow up and not the actual sex incidence for all trochanteric fractures.

The fracture due to domestic fall occurred in 85.2% patients while 13.2% patients met road traffic accident and in 10.1% patients fracture occur due to fall from height and fracture occur due to Assault in 0.6% patients.

Korkmaz et al. (2014) [14], Shivanna et al. (2014) [15] observed that more than 80% of hip fractures in the elderly result from a simple fall. Hip fractures in young adults were observed to result most often with high energy trauma such as motor vehicular accidents or a fall from height.

There were 26 cases (5.2%) of infection noted in the PFN group and 47 cases (9.4%) in the D.H.S group (p=0.015). They were seen within few days of surgery and treated by local debridement and antibiotic.

Sheoran et al. (2016) [16] and Sarukte et al. (2016) [17] also observed similar result.

Anterior thigh pain occurred in 17 cases (3.4%) in PFN group and 29 cases (5.8%) in DHS group (p=0.097). The plate and screw device weaken the bone mechanically. Yeganesh et al. (2016) [18] also found high Anterior thigh pain in DHS treated patients.

Shortening (<1 cm) occurred in 13 cases (2.6%) in PFN group and 21 cases (4.2%) in DHS group (p=0.222 NS).

Shortening (>1 cm) occurred in 18 cases (3.6%) in PFN group and 42 cases (8.4%) in DHS group (p=0.002 S). Even though there was more shortening in the D.H.S group it was not significant enough to cause any gait or functional impairment. Shortening might have resulted due to comminution of variable degree at fracture site & concentric collapse at fracture site.

Similar observation by Sarukte et al. (2016) [17], Faisal et al. (2016) [19], and Mulay et al. (2015) [20].

Peri-Implant fracture occurred in 8 cases (1.6%) in PFN group and 19 cases (3.8%) in DHS group (p=0.051).

Smaller diameter and fluting tip helped to reduce the stress forces below the tip of the nail and thereby reducing the incidence of low energy fractures at nail tip. Stress rising of the construct also can be reduced by increasing length, small valgus angle and higher location of this angle at nail tip. Jonnes C et al. (2016) [10] also found Peri-Implant fracture rate higher in DHS patients.

Mechanical complications like (Breakage of PFN screw and PFN) occurred in 24 cases (4.8%) in PFN group and Mechanical complications (Breakage of Plate and Richard screw) in DHS group were found in 16 cases (3.2%).

Screw cut out occurred in 23 cases (4.6%) in DHS group. Z and reverse Z effect were found in 22 cases (4.4%) in PFN group. length of hip pin is larger than the lag screw then hip pin will become loose and result in Z effect this might force the pin to slide into the joint and lag screw slide laterally.

Deformity (varus deformity and external rotation) occurred in 11 cases (2.2%) in PFN group and 44 cases (8.8%) in DHS group (p<0.001). Due to the pull of the muscle the distal shaft fragment has the tendency to migrate upwards thus resulting in varus deformity.

Jonnes C et al. (2016) [10], Sheoran et al. (2016) [16], Sarukte et al. (2016) [17] were observed higher deformity with DHS treatment.

Our study shows Mean HHS of PFN was 92.064 and of DHS was 91.753 (p=0.425). Average harris hip score in both groups have no statically significant difference.

Jonnes C et al. (2016) [10] (<0.31), Bhakat et al. (2013) [21] (<0.467) and Chaitanya et al. (2015) [22] were found no statically significant difference in both groups.

Conclusion
In this study we conclude that long term functional outcome measured by HHS of Intertrochanteric femoral fractures treated with dynamic hip screw v/s proximal femoral nail have no significant difference but more excellent results found in patients which treated by PFN. Complication like Peri-implant Fracture, Shortening, Screw cut-out, Varus deformity were more in patient operated by DHS. We conclude that intertrochanteric fractures can be better and more effectively treated with Proximal Femoral Nailing and had better functional outcome less complications.
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