

International Journal of Orthopaedics Sciences

E-ISSN: 2395-1958 P-ISSN: 2706-6630 IJOS 2021; 7(3): 533-536 © 2021 IJOS

www.orthopaper.com Received: 22-05-2021 Accepted: 24-06-2021

Dr. Sarath Kumar

Post Graduate, Department of Orthopaedics, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry, India

Dr. Sankaralal

HOD, Department of Orthopaedics, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry, India

Syndesmotic screw removed verusus retained: A comparative functional analysis

Dr. Sarath Kumar and Dr. Sankaralal

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22271/ortho.2021.v7.i3h.2799

Abstract

Aim: Aim of the study is to analyse and compare the functional outcome among patients who had retained their syndesmotic screw with the group who had undergone syndesmotic screw removal.

Materials and Methods: Study was conducted on 48 patients whose outcome has been evaluated ragiologically and functionally by AOFAS and OMAS score over a period of 12 months postoperatively. **Results:** On comparing functional as well as radiological outcome between the two groups of our study we found that the results are similar on both groups.

Conclusion: The functional and radiological outcome was similar. The chances of complications due to screw breakage and infection was very minimal.

Keywords: syndesmotic screw, verusus, radiological

Introduction

The syndesmosis is ruptured in ankle fractures as a result of a torsional movement of the talus which forces the tibia and fibula apart or as a result of severe abduction force [1]. Syndesmotic joint is a fibrous joint which is formed by distal part of tibia and fibula with the three strong ligaments (anterior inferior tibiofibular ligaments, posterior inferior tibiofibular ligaments and transverse tibiofibular ligaments) and interosseous membrane which provide exceptional stability to the ankle. Rupture of these 3 strong ligaments and interosseous membrane results in syndesmotic diastasis. While moving a ankle joint from a complete dorsiflexion to plantar flexion fibula rotates externally to a maximum of 2degrees relative to tibia with widening of ankle mortice about 1 mm.

Pain, persisting instability and osteoarthritis can be a long term complication in cases which are managed non-operatively ^[2, 3]. About 15% to 23% of ankle fractures that are managed surgically are assosciated with syndesmotic injury ^[9]. Calf compression also known as squeez test and External rotation stress are done to confirm the syndesmotic injury clinically ^[5]. Pettronne *et al.*, conducted a 5 year study with radiological widening of syndesmosis and found that it is necessary to treat syndesmotic injury with surgical stabilization ^[4]. Particularly patients with PER fracture with deltoid ligament rupture are at high risk of developing syndesmotic injury.

As per Lauge Hansen classification for ankle injuries most commonly Pronation- external rotation followed by supination-external rotation results in syndesmotic injury. Radiologically the Tibio-fibular clear space (horizontal distance between the lateral margin of the posterior tibial malleolus and the medial border of the fibula) which is the most reliable parameter for assesing syndesmotic injury and other parameters like tibio fibular overlap in AP View and mortis view. Cross- sectional imaging like MRI is fundamental to confirming syndesmotic injury. Even Absence of tibiofibular diastasis radiologically will never rules out the diagnosis. In that case Stress CT and the weight-bearing CT are promising diagnostic tools in near future [6],

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted according to principles of Declaration of Helsinki. The informed consent obtained from the patient after explaining about the treatment they were subjected and the processing of their personal data.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Sarath Kumar Post Graduate, Department of Orthopaedics, Sri Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry, India The case study was conducted between July 2019 and may 2021 among 54 patients in Sri Lakshmi Narayana medical college, Puducherry. Patients who are between age group 18 and 60 with weber B and C closed fractures which are unilateral fractures that is healed (confirmed by radiological investigations treated with plate and screws(ORIF) associated to syndesmotic fixations are included in the study. Out of 54 patients only 48 patients were taken up for final study (6 patients were excluded from the study as they developed infections, hardware failure, any requirement of resurgery, loss of medical records, those with severe comorbidities and patients who couldn't have proper follow up). After a thorough clinical and radiological assessment of patients who were done with syndesmotic fixation with 1 or 2 3.5mm screws with a tricortical or tetracortical placement they were divided into 2 groups: group 1(30 patients) with syndesmotic screw removed and group 2 with retained syndesmotic screw (18 patients). In our study syndesmotic screw were removed 3months after initial surgery.

Patients were adviced for strict immobilization for 4 weeks after which they were started with rehabilitation and progressive loading was allowed. It is completely a surgeons choice to decide whether to remove a screw or not



Fig 1: Showing Normal Tibifibular Clear Space

Radiological evaluation done using AP, Lateral and mortise view. Tibiofibular clear space (most reliable parameter) is used for evaluating syndesmosis. functional evaluation was done 12 months postoperatively through 2 validated scoring system namely AOFAS and OMAS.

All the collected data are compiled through Microsoft excel. Clinical outcomes measured using AOFAS and OMAS are compared using Non-Parametric whitney U test. Statistical analysis were done using statistical package for the social sciences for windows (version 20.0). statistical significance found to have a p value of <0.05. A total of 48 patients were included in the study (32 were males and 16 were females). Mean age at the time of injury was 42 years (range 18-60 years). Among study population 21 patients sustained Denis-Weber B type fractures and the remaining 27 patients had type C injuries. Group 1 comprised of 30(62%) patients on

whom syndesmotic screw is removed about 7 to 10 weeks after initial surgery whereas in Group 2 totally 18 patients were involved. Among the patients in group 2 totally 4 patients broke the screw but then also there is no difference in overall outcome.

OMAS and AOFAS scores were used for assessing the clinical outcome (table 1.). Tibiofibular clear space and tibiofibular overlap is assesd radiologically from immediate post-op to 10-12 months postoperatively. Both clinical and radiological assessment were found to be equal with no differences in patients symptoms as well as x-ray findings. Both found to have a p value (p<0.05). In a mean period of 3.8 months (rang 2.8 to 5 months) all fractures healed.

Table 1: A Clinical Outcomes of Study Population.

| Clinical Outcome | OMAS | AOFAS |
|------------------|----------|----------|
| Group-1 | 92 | 92 |
| Group-2 | 96 | 98 |
| P Value | p=0.0076 | p =0.056 |



Fig 2: Xray Showing Syndesmotic Screw with Tri- Cortical Tetra Cortical Purchase.



Fig 3: Fluroscopic Image of Syndesmotic Screw.



Fig 4: Intraoperative Image of Syndesmotic Screw Fixation.



Fig 5: Showing Broken Syndesmotic Screw

 Table 2: Radiological outcomes of study population

| Radiological outcomes of study population | Tibiofibular clear space. Pre-operative in mm.[mean value] | Tibiofibular clear space. Post-operative |
|---|---|--|
| Group -1 | 5.0 | 4.5 |
| Group -2 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| P value | p = 0.175 | p = 0.685 |

Discussion

Overall, there is no absolute guidelines or indications available regarding removal of syndesmotic screw ^[7, 9]. Removal of syndesmotic screw before weight bearing has got no clinical significance. On other hand with no relation to clinical significance there are few cases reported with recurrence of diastasis in screw removed gap ^[8, 9]. Screw breakage is one of the most common complication and it has

got less significance in patients mobility. Interrosseous breakage of syndesmotic screw is associated with high rates of screw removal due to pain. Placement of screw about 20mm or higher from the tibiotalar joint might decrease the risk of syndesmotic screwbreakage [15]. Minor or major wound infection, morbidity, economical burden are the issues faced, in case of screw removal [10]

Kaftandziev I, et al conducted a study and found that broken screw has more functional outcome than intact screw [12, 13]. Weening B et al conducted a study and came with a hypothesis that intact screw decreases the physiological movement of the fibula in relation to the tibia due to which ankle movement is limited [16]. Breakage of syndesmotic screw may happen due to aggressive rehabilitation and early weight bearing which can be avoided by strict avoidance of early weight bearing [17]. Again it is highly controversial to decide the ideal time to remove a syndesmotic screw because in a study conducted by Kempland C Walley et al they concluded that Removal of syndesmotic screws is advisable mainly in cases of patient complaints related to the other implanted perimalleolar hardware or malreduction of the syndesmosis after at least 8weekspostoperatively [22]. Sometimes due to fear about the complications from broken screw patients themselves insist to remove the screw which is difficult to explain to them. In a study conducted by Young Jae MD and concluded that recurred diastasis of ankle significantly increased in the group with screws removed within 3 months hence removal of syndesmotic screws can be performed about 3 to 4 months after surgery, especially patients with discomfort or limitation of ankle movements due to these screws [18]. On comparing our study results with previous studies the functional outcome between those two groups were found to be similar. In our study syndesmotic screw were removed after 7 to 10 weeks of initial surgery and found to have no recurrence of syndesmotic diastasis.

Conclusion

It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the group of patients done with syndesmotic screw removal and those with retained screw. The common complications such as implant failure can be minimal by proper placement of syndesmotic screw and proper post op rehabilitation and regular follow up. Additional surgery to remove a syndesmotic screw can be avoided to prevent minor or major wound infection, morbidity and economical burden to the patients.

References

- 1. Federici A, Sanguineti F, Santolini F. The closed treatment of severe malleolar fractures. Acta Orthop Belg. 1993;59(2):189-196.
- 2. Chissell HR, Jones J. The influence of a diastasis screw on the outcome of Weber type-C ankle fractures. J Bone Joint Surg Br 1995;77(3):435-438.
- 3. Leeds HC, Ehrlich MG. Instability of the distal tibiofibular syndesmosis after bimalleolar and trimalleolar ankle fractures. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 1984;66(4):490-503.
- 4. Pettrone FA, Gail M, Pee D, *et al.* Quantitative criteria for prediction of the results after displaced fracture of the ankle. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 1983;65(5):667-677.
- Alazzawi S, Sukeik M, King D, Vemulapalli K. Foot and ankle history and clinical examination: A guide to everyday practice. World J Orthop 2017;8(1):21-29 [PMID: 28144575 DOI: 10.5312/wjo.v8.i1.21]
- Tourné Y, Molinier F, Andrieu M, Porta J, Barbier G. Diagnosis and treatment of tibiofibular syndesmosis lesions. Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research 2019;105(8):S275-86.
- Desouky O, Elseby A, Ghalab AH. Removal of Syndesmotic Screw After Fixation in Ankle Fractures: A Systematic Review. Cureus 2021;13(6):e15435. doi: 10.7759/cureus.15435. PMID: 34104613; PMCID: PMC8176268.
- 8. Moon YJ, Kim DH, Lee KB. Is it necessary to remove syndesmotic screw before weight-bearing ambulation?. Medicine 2020;99:11 (e19436).
- Walley KC, Hofmann KJ, Velasco BT, Kwon JY. Removal of Hardware After Syndesmotic Screw Fixation: A Systematic Literature Review. Foot Ankle Spec 2017;10(3):252-257. doi: 10.1177/1938640016685153. Epub 2016 Dec 27. PMID: 28027655.
- 10. Schepers T, Van Lieshout EM, de Vries MR, Van der Elst M. Complications of syndesmotic screw removal. Foot Ankle Int. 2017;32(11):1040-4. doi: 10.3113/FAI.2011.1040. PMID: 22338952.
- 11. Desouky O, Elseby A, Ghalab AH. Removal of Syndesmotic Screw After Fixation in Ankle Fractures: A Systematic Review. Cureus 2021;13(6):e15435. doi:10.7759/cureus.15435.
- 12. Kaftandziev I, Spasov M, Trpeski S, Zafirova-Ivanovska B, Bakota B. Fate of the syndesmotic screw—search for a prudent solution. Injury 2015;46(6):S125-9. 10.1016/j.injury.2015.10.062.
- 13. Hamid N, Loeffler BJ, Braddy W, Kellam JF, Cohen BE, Bosse MJ. Outcome after fixation of ankle fractures with an injury to the syndesmosis. The effect of the syndesmosis screw. J Bone Joint Surg Br 2009;91:1069-73. 10.1302/0301-620X.91B8.22430
- 14. Walley KC, Hofmann KJ, Velasco BT, Kwon JY. Removal of Hardware After Syndesmotic Screw Fixation Systematic Literature Review. Foot Ankle Spec 2017;10(3):252-7.
- 15. Ibrahim IO, Velasco BT, Ye MY, Miller CP, Kwon JY. Syndesmotic Screw Breakage May Be More Problematic Than Previously Reported: Increased Rates of Hardware Removal Secondary to Pain With Intraosseous Screw

- Breakage. Foot Ankle Spec. 2020 Jun 19:1938640020932049. doi: 10.1177/1938640020932049. Epub ahead of print.
- doi: 10.1177/1938640020932049. Epub ahead of print PMID: 32551861
- 16. Weening B, Bhandari M. Predictors of functional outcome following transsyndesmotic screw fixation of ankle fractures. J Orthop Trauma 2005;19(2):102-8.
- 17. Weening B, Bhandari M. Predictors of functional outcome following transsyndesmotic screw fixation of ankle fractures. J Orthop Trauma 2005;19(2):102-8.
- 18. Moon, Young Jae MD, Kim, Dong Hee, Lee, Kwang-Bok Is it necessary to remove syndesmotic screw before weight-bearing ambulation?, Medicine 2020;99(11):e19436 doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000019436
- 19. Leeds HC, Ehrlich MG. Instability of the distal tibiofibular syndesmosis after bimalleolar and trimalleolar ankle fractures. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery 1984;66-A:490-503.
- 20. Lloyd J, Elsayed S, Hariharan K, Tanaka H. Revisiting the concept of talar shift in ankle fractures. Foot and Ankle International 2006;27:793-6.
- Pettrone FA, Gail M, Pee D. Quantitative criteria for prediction of the results after displaced fracture of the ankle. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery 1983;65-A:667-77
- 22. Ramsey PL, Hamilton W. Changes in tibiotalar area of contact caused by lateral talar shift. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery 1976;58(3):356-7.
- 23. Walley KC, Hofmann KJ, Velasco BT, Kwon JY. Removal of Hardware After Syndesmotic Screw Fixation: A Systematic Literature Review. Foot Ankle Spec. 2017;10(3):252-257. doi: 10.1177/1938640016685153. Epub 2016 Dec 27. PMID: 28027655
- 24. Hahn DM, Colton CL, Rüedi TP, Murphy WM, Principles of Fracture Management of Malleolar Fractures. NY: Thieme 2001, 583-4.
- 25. Tile M. Fractures of the ankle. In: Schatzker J, Tile M, eds. The Rationale of Operative Fracture Care. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag 2005, 580-1.