



E-ISSN: 2395-1958
P-ISSN: 2706-6630
IJOS 2024; 10(1): 21-24
© 2024 IJOS
<https://www.orthopaper.com>
Received: 02-12-2023
Accepted: 07-01-2024

Fode Ibrahima Kourala Keita
Faculty of Health Sciences and
Techniques, Gamal Abdel Nasser
University, Conakry, Guinea

Pape Alkaly Diouf
Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacy
and Odontostomatology, Cheikh
Anta Diop University, Dakar,
Sénégal

Alioune Badara Dione
Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacy
and Odontostomatology, Cheikh
Anta Diop University, Dakar,
Sénégal

Badara Dembélé
Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacy
and Odontostomatology, Cheikh
Anta Diop University, Dakar,
Sénégal

Charles Bertin Diémé
Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacy
and Odontostomatology, Cheikh
Anta Diop University, Dakar,
Sénégal

Corresponding Author:
Fode Ibrahima Kourala Keita
Faculty of Health Sciences and
Techniques, Gamal Abdel Nasser
University, Conakry, Guinea

What are the risks of death in elderly patients after a proximal femur fracture at Aristide Le Dantec hospital?

Fode Ibrahima Kourala Keita, Pape Alkaly Diouf, Alioune Badara Dione, Badara Dembélé and Charles Bertin Diémé

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22271/ortho.2024.v10.i1a.3490>

Abstract

Introduction: Proximal femur fractures are traumatic injuries involving the neck and trochanteric region of the femur. The aim was to identify risk factors for death following proximal femur fractures in elderly patients.

Patients and Methods: This was a prospective, observational, longitudinal study conducted over an 18-month period in the Orthopedics-Traumatology Department of Aristide Le Dantec Hospital in Dakar. We evaluated a total of 93 patients aged at least 60 years with a proximal femur fracture whose date of onset was less than 3 weeks. The identification of risk factors for death considered socio-demographic, clinical and therapeutic parameters.

Results: The number of patients who died was 19 (20.43%). There was no significant difference in mortality according to age, gender or residence. There was no association between admission time and mortality. The association between the number of comorbidities and mortality was significant. The association between mortality and ASA score and type of treatment was highly significant. Operating time had no influence on mortality. Type of anesthesia, on the other hand, did influence mortality.

Conclusion: Mortality due to proximal femur fractures in the elderly remains high. In our practice, this mortality was related to the presence of comorbidity, impaired cognitive function, ASA score, type of treatment and type of anesthesia.

Keywords: Elderly, proximal femur fracture, risk of death

Introduction

Proximal femur fractures are traumatic injuries involving the neck and trochanteric region of the femur. Their occurrence in the elderly is particularly distressing for patients and their families. Long considered rare in Africa, proximal femur fractures are becoming a reality [1-4]. They are associated with high mortality to the point of being considered the way elderly people die. The aim of this study was to assess the risk factors for death in the elderly following proximal femur fracture at Aristide le Dantec Hospital.

Materials and Methods

This was a prospective, observational, longitudinal study conducted over an 18-month period in the Orthopedics-Traumatology Department of Aristide Le Dantec Hospital in Dakar. We evaluated a total of 93 patients aged at least 60 years with a proximal femur fracture whose date of onset was less than 3 weeks.

Mortality was measured by considering socio-demographic, clinical and therapeutic characteristics (Table 1, 2, 3).

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics

Features	Number	Percentage
Age		
Seniors	45	48,4
Older people	44	47,3
Grand old men	4	4,3
Sex		
Male	50	53,7
Female	43	46,2
Place of residence		
Urban	75	80,6
Rural	18	19,3

Table 2: Clinical features

Features	Number	Percentage
Admission deadline		
<48h	67	72
>48h	26	28
Number of Comorbidities		
0	17	18,3
1	48	51,6
2	25	26,9
≥3	3	3,2
Cognitive functions		
Normal	83	89,2
Altered	10	10,8
Fracture site		
Femoral neck	50	53,7
Trochanterian massif	38	40,8
Subtrochanteric	5	5,4

Table 3: Therapeutic characteristics

Features	Number	Percentage
Operating time		
<48h	17	20,5
>48h	66	79,5
ASA score		
ASA 1	6	7,2
ASA 2	73	87,5
ASA 3	12	14,4
ASA 4	2	2,4
Anaesthesia performed		
Spinal anaesthesia	65	78,3
SA+GA	10	12
GA	8	9,6
Treatment performed		
Abstention	7	7,8
Osteosynthesis	56	62,2
Arthroplasty	27	30

SA: spinal anaesthesia GA: General anaesthesia

Of the patients evaluated, seven (7) did not undergo surgery: four (4) for financial reasons and three (3) because surgery was contraindicated. These included five trochanteric fractures and two femoral neck fractures.

Eighty-three (83) patients underwent surgical treatment.

The types of osteosynthesis performed were:

- DHS plate screw for 54 patients
- Gamma nail for two (2) patients

All patients with femoral neck fractures underwent intermediate arthroplasty.

Data analysis was performed using SPSS 17.0 software. Continuous variables were compared using the ANOVA test, and scale variables using Fisher's exact test. The significant threshold was 0.05.

Results

The number of patients who died was 19 (20.43%).

In-hospital mortality concerned 3 patients (3.22%). These patients died while awaiting surgery.

Out-of-hospital mortality involved 16 patients (17.20%):

- Nine deaths within 1 month
- Zero deaths in 3 months
- Seven deaths at 6 months.

There was no significant difference in mortality according to age, gender or residence. Table IV shows the relationship between mortality and socio-demographic parameters.

There was no association between time to admission and mortality (P=0.33). The association between the number of comorbidities and mortality was significant (P=0.04). Table V shows mortality as a function of clinical parameters.

The relationship between mortality and ASA score and type of treatment was highly significant (table VI).

Operating time had no influence on mortality (P =0.11). Type of anaesthesia, on the other hand, did influence mortality. Table VII shows mortality as a function of operating time and anesthesia type.

Table 4: Mortality as a function of socio-demographic parameters

Variable	Deceased (n=19)		Survivor (n=74)		Total (n=93)		P
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Age							
Gérontin	6	13,3	39	86,7	45	48,4	0,09
Old man	13	29,5	31	70,5	44	47,3	
Grand old man	0	0	4	100	4	4,3	
Type							
Male	8	16	42	84	50	53,7	0,45
Female	11	25,6	32	74,4	43	46,2	
Place of residence							
Urban	17	22,7	58	77,3	75	80,6	0,28
Rural	2	11,1	16	88,9	18	19,4	

Table 5: Mortality by clinical parameter

Variable	Group						P
	Deceased (n=19)		Survivor (n=74)		Total (n=93)		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Admission deadline							
<48h	12	17,9	55	82,1	67	72	0,33
>48h	7	26,9	19	73,1	26	28	
Comorbidities							
< 3	17	18,9	73	81,1	90	96,8	0,04
>3	2	66,7	1	33,3	3	3,2	
Cognitive function							
Normal	10	12	73	88	83	89,2	0,01
Altered	9	90	1	10	10	10,8	
Fracture site							
Trochanterian massif	8	16	42	84	50	53,7	0,16
Femoral neck	11	28,9	27	71,1	38	40,8	
Subtrochanterian	0	0	5	100	5	5,4	

Table 6: Mortality by ASA score and type of treatment

Variable	Group						P
	Deceased (n=19)		Survivor (n=74)		Total (n=93)		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
ASA score							
ASA1	0	0	6	100	6	7, 2	0, 01
ASA2	13	17, 8	60	82, 2	73	87, 5	
ASA3	4	33, 3	8	66, 7	12	14, 4	
ASA4	2	100	0	0	2	2, 4	
Type of treatment							
Surgical abstention	5	71, 4	2	28, 6	7	7, 8	0, 01
Osteosynthesis	4	7, 1	52	92, 9	56	62, 2	
Arthroplasty	7	25, 9	20	74, 1	27	30	

Table 7: Mortality by operative time and type of anaesthesia

Variable	Group						P
	Deceased (n=11)		Survivor (n=72)		Total (n=83)		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Operating time							
< 48h	1	5, 9	16	94, 1	17	20, 5	0,
>48h	10	15, 1	56	84, 8	66	79, 5	11
Type of anaesthesia							
SA	4	6, 1	61	93, 8	65	78, 3	0, 01
SA+GA	3	30	7	70	10	12	
GA	4	50	4	50	8	9, 6	

SA= Spinal anaesthesia GA= General anaesthesia

Discussion

The mortality rate we found was close to that reported by other authors [5-7].

By age, the highest mortality rate was found among the elderly, representing more than twice the mortality rate of the geriatric population. There were no deaths among the very old. Advanced age is a predictive factor for mortality in hip fractures [7]. In our study, there was no correlation between age and mortality.

Female mortality was higher than male. The study by Hebatu-allah *et al.* [5] reported a male predominance. Most studies agree on the predominance of males in proximal femur fracture mortality [8, 9]. Gender had no influence on mortality in our series.

We recorded twice as many deaths among patients living in urban areas. This may be explained by the greater frequency of comorbidities in urban patients than in those living in rural areas. It would appear that proximal femur fractures are an urban condition, and that comorbidities are more frequent in urban patients [10]. However, this study does not show a significant link between mortality and place of residence.

Late patient admission is considered a factor contributing to increased morbidity and mortality, due to the risk of embolic disorders [11]. In the present study, we found no correlation between admission delay and mortality rate. Clague *et al.* [12] made the same observation.

This study showed a correlation between mortality and the number of comorbidities. Roche *et al.* [13] found that the risk of death within 30 days post-op was high for patients with three (3) or more comorbidities.

Patients with impaired cognitive function had higher mortality. The assessment of our patients' cognitive functions was inspired by the Senegal test, a screening test for dementia in the elderly [14].

The presence of delirium or dementia prior to or following proximal femur fracture in the elderly is recognized as a poor prognostic factor. This fact has been reported by several authors [15, 16].

The mortality rate for trochanteric fractures is slightly higher than for cervical fractures. This result differs from that reported by Hebatu-allah [5]. He found a higher mortality rate for cervical fractures. Fracture site has no influence on mortality.

The mortality rate was proportional to the ASA score. The higher the ASA score, the higher the mortality. This observation was made by Usoigwe *et al.* [17]. The ASA score is a powerful predictor of hip fracture mortality in the elderly. The mortality rate of patients operated on 72 hours after the trauma was at least three times higher than that of patients operated on between 24 and 48 hours. This difference was not statistically significant.

There is no consensus on the relationship between surgical delay and mortality in this condition. Some authors report a benefit of early surgery [17, 18]. Others have found that surgical delay has very little impact on mortality [19].

For our part, early or delayed surgery, the most important thing is to rigorously manage the comorbidities that lead to death.

The benefits of surgical management of proximal femur fractures are well established [20, 21, 22]. Surgery avoids complications that can lead to death. Non-operative treatment carries a high mortality risk. It is reserved for exceptional contraindications, such as elderly, frail, high-risk patients [21, 22].

In our context, lack of financial resources was a reason for non-operative treatment.

The mortality rate for patients undergoing surgery was higher for arthroplasties.

High mortality was recorded in patients who underwent spinal anaesthesia combined with general anaesthesia. This association was explained by operative difficulties that prolonged the duration of the procedure. Longer operating times increase the risk of morbidity and mortality. The link between type of anaesthesia and mortality was significant.

Conclusion

Mortality due to proximal femur fractures in the elderly remains high. In our practice, this mortality was related to the presence of comorbidity, cognitive impairment, ASA score, type of treatment and type of anaesthesia.

Acknowledgments

Funding: No funding sources

Conflict of Interest: None declared

Ethical approval: The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee

References

1. Baldov PK, Ocloo A, Ansa V. The patterns of hip fractures over a ten year periode in a major referral center in Ghana. *Post Gr Med J Ghana*. 2018;7(2):98-104.
2. Tsabasvi M, Davey S, Temu R. Hip fracture pattern at a major Tanzanian hospital: focus on fragility hip fractures. *Arch Osteoporos*. 2017;12:47. DOI:10.1007/s11657-017-00338-Z
3. Paruk F, Matthews G, Cassim B. Osteoporotic hip fractures in Black South africans: a regional study. *Arch Osteoporos*. 2017;12:107. DOI: 10.1007/s11657-017-0409-1
4. El magharaoui A, Koumba B, Jroundi I, *et al*. Epidemiology of hip fractures in 2002 in Rabat, Morocco. *Osteoporos Int*. 2004;16(6):597-602.
5. Zaki HE, Moussa SM, El Said SMS, Mortay AK. Morbidity and Mortality following Surgery for Hip Fractures in Elderly Patients. *Journal of Aging Research*. 2019, 7084657.
6. Morri M, Ambrosi E, Chiari P, *et al*. One-year mortality after hip fracture surgery and prognostic factors: A prospective cohort study. *Scientific reports*. 2019;9:18718. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-55196-6>
7. Huette P, Abou-Arab O, Djebara A, *et al*. Risk factors and mortality of patients undergoing hip fracture surgery: a one-year follow-up study. *Sci Rep*. 2010;10:9607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-66614-5>
8. Wehren LE, Hawkes WG, Orwig D, *et al*. Gender differences in Mortality After Hip Fracture: The Role of Infection. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2003;18(12):2231-2237.
9. Sterling RS. Gender and Race/Etnicity Differences in Hip fracture Incidence Morbidity Mortality and function. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2011;469(7):1913-1918.
10. Solbakken SM, Magnus JH, Meyer HE, *et al*. Urban-Rural Differences in Hip Fracture Mortality: A Nationwide NOPOS Study. *JBMR plus*. 2019;3(11):e10236.
11. Millineaux J. Cutting the delay reduces the risk. Assessment of the risk of developing pressure sores among elderly patients in A and E. *Prof Nurse*. 1993;9(1):22-30.
12. Clague JE, Craddock E, Andrew G, *et al*. Predictors of outcome following hip fracture. Admission time predicts length of stay an in-hospital mortality. *Injury, Int J. Care Injured*. 2002;33:1-6.
13. Roche JJW, Wenn RT, Sahota O, Moran CG. Effect of comorbidities and postoperative complications on mortality after hip fracture in elderly people: Prospective observational cohort study. *BMJ*. 2005;331:1374.
14. Touré K, Coumé M, Ndiaye NND, *et al*. The Senegal test: a valid and reliable instrument for screening for dementia in a population of elderly Senegalese. *AJNS*. 2008, 27(1).
15. Fong TG, Tulebaev SR, Inouye SK. Delirium in elderly adults: diagnosis, prevention and treatment. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2009;5(4):210-220.
16. Cole MG, Primeau FJ. Prognosis of delirium in elderly hospital patients. *CMAJ*. 1993;149(1):41-46.
17. Uzoigwe CE, Burnand HGF, Cheesman CL, and al. Early and ultra-early surgery in hip fracture patients improves survival. *Injury, Int J Care Injured*. 2013;44:726-729.
18. Beaupre LA, Khong H, Smith C, Kang S, Evens L, Jaiswal PK, *et al*. The impact of time to surgery after hip fracture on mortality at 30- and 90-days: Does a single benchmark apply to all? *Injury*. 2019 Apr;50(4):950-955. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2019.03.031. Epub 2019 Mar 18. PMID: 30948037.
19. Moran CG, Wenn RT, Sikand JMS, *et al*. Early mortality after hip fracture: is delay before surgery important? *BS*. 2005;87(3):483-489.
20. Thorngen KG. Fractures of the femoral neck and proximal femur in European surgical Orthopaedics and Traumatology. The EFORT Textbook Bentley G (ed) springer; c2014. p. 2204-2268.
21. Tay E. Hip fractures in the elderly: operative versus non operative management. *Singapore Med J*. 2016;57(4):178-181.
22. Vanderec CLP, De Jongh MAC, Peeteos CMM, De Munter L, Roukema JA, Gosens T. Hip fractures in elderly people: surgery or no surgery? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Geriatr Orthop Surg*. 2017;8(3):173-180.

How to Cite This Article

Keita FIK, Diouf PA, Dione AB, Dembélé B, Diémé CB. What are the risks of death in elderly patients after a proximal femur fracture at Aristide Le Dantec hospital?. *International Journal of Orthopaedics Sciences*. 2024;10(1):21-24.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.