Periprosthetic fractures of total hip arthroplasty: a review of literature with a point of view

Saccomanni Bernardino*

ASL BARI, Altamura Hospital, Bari, Italy.

***Corresponding author**
Saccomanni Bernardino, ASL BARI, Viale Regina Margherita, 70022, Altamura (Bari), Italy.

Abstract
Periprosthetic fractures associated with total hip arthroplasty are becoming increasingly more common. The purpose of study is to review the treatment of periprosthetic fractures of total hip arthroplasty. A limited number of cases is proposed. Careful intraoperative technique and tissue handling are crucial to reduce periprosthetic fractures. Once identified, however, any number of well described the treatment options are available for the surgeons. Carefully approached, and using sound treatment principles, these fractures can be appropriately addressed, thus ensuring adequate patient results. In this review, there are not outcome and tables.

Keywords: Periprosthetic Fractures, Total Hip Arthroplasty

Introduction

In our experience, we are seeing a higher incidence of arthritis in younger patients. Total hip arthroplasty has become an increasingly popular and highly effective method of treating both pain and disability associated with this condition. Unfortunately, an otherwise excellent result from hip replacement can be compromised by any number of complications, not the least of which is a periprosthetic fracture. A review of the literature suggests that the prevalence of periprosthetic fractures associated with total hip replacement is increasing [1]. They can occur both intraoperatively and postoperatively, and involve either the acetabulum or femur.

Intraoperative Acetabular Fractures

Perhaps due to a low incidence of periprosthetic acetabular fractures, a limited number of the studies [2-9] regarding this phenomenon is available in the literature.

McElfresh and Coventry [9] documented an almost imperceptible incidence of 1 periprosthetic acetabular fracture among 5,400 cementeted total hip replacements, or 0.02%. Similarly, Peterson and Lewallen [7] described a total incidence of 16 periprosthetic acetabular fractures among 23,580 hip replacements, or 0.07%. Factors postulated to be associated with intraoperative acetabular fractures include the use of uncemented components [8], underreaming [10], osteopenia [8] and Paget's disease [4]. Despite suggestions [11] that the incidence of periprosthetic acetabular fractures has been increasing, and is primarily due the

advent of uncementeded acetabular component implantation, the literature fails the conclusively support this sentiment [7]. With the exception of only a handful of case reports and case series [2-9], little information is available on the subject. It is likely that this event goes highly unreported.

No clinically relevant classification of intraoperative periacetabular fractures has been described in literature. The use of Letournel classification system [12] would be reasonable due to its utilisation of anatomic location of the fracture. Treatment options would depend fracture location and severity as well as implant stability [13]. If the fracture is minor and the implant is stable then it is reasonable due to simply augment the component with additional screw fixation if possible, though it is arguable that these fractures could perhaps be left untreated. If the fracture is more severe and the cup is unstable, then fracture fixation with a plate or screw or use of a shelf-graft-like augment of the deficient area coupled with reapplication of another cemented cup would be warranted.

Postoperative Acetabular Fractures

Although postoperative periacetabular fractures are described to occur infrequently [13], one report [14] reports a 0.9% prevalence identified at the time of revision surgery. As the reported prevalence of periacetabular fractures appears to be higher postoperatively [14] than intraoperatively [8,9], it is quite possible than this trend represents a failure of identification of the fracture at the time of surgery [8]. It more likely, however, that postoperative periacetabular fractures occur in due process as a result of bone

loss and osteolysis and revision surgery is therefore indicated.

Only one classification system of postoperative periacetabular fractures has been identified in the literature [7], stratifying fractures into two groups: type 1 with the component found to be both clinically and radiographically stable; and type 2 with an unstable component. Despite having relevance with respect to treatment options, this study had a limited number of cases.

Nonetheless, it is imperative that these fractures are identified prior to attempting revision surgery in order to ensure availability of any necessary implants or fixation devices including, among others, jumbo cups, antiprotusio cages and bulk/structural allograft.

Intraoperative Femoral Fractures
Of all varieties of periprosthetic fracture, clearly more has been written about fractures of the femur. Undoubtedly, this is in direct relation to its reported higher incidence as compared to other fracture types. In particular, the incidence of intraoperative fractures appears to be related primiraly to the type of component used and stage of surgery. In this regard, periprosthetic femur fractures occur much more commonly with uncementeded femoral components. In a complex review of the Mayo Clinic Joint Registry, Berry [15] describes a periprosthetic femur fracture rate of 5.4% with uncemented femoral components as compared to 0.3% for cementeted components in primary hip replacements. These numbers strongly support the notion that the incidence of periprosthetic fractures has been increasing in recent years given the preponderance of the surgeons now preferentially choosing to implant uncemented components.

Other associated risk factors include female gender [16], patients with metabolic bone disease, Paget's disease, osteopetrosis, rheumatoid arthritis [17], osteoporosis [18], cortical perforation of the femur [9], previous hip surgery and a small femur.

Furthermore, Berry [15] also described a higher rate of intraoperative femur fractures in revision (7,8%) as compared to primary (1%) joint replacement. One can only assume that the higher incidence seen with uncemented components is attributable to difficulties involved with ensuring a secure press-fit by using undersized broaches and reamers, something unnecessary with cemented components.

Classification
A number of classification systems have been developed to describe periprosthetic fractures of the femur [16,18-24], though the Vancouver Classification by Duncan and Masri [19] is not the most widely accepted, as it bears relevance to treatment.
However, this classification was intended to specifically address postoperative periprosthetic femoral fractures. As a result, Masri, Meek, and Duncan [11] have recently modified the original classification to appropriately consider intraoperative fractures of the femur.

Whereas the original classification stratified fractures based not only on location, but also on the status of the femoral component as well as the quality of bone present [19], the modified version also includes the location, pattern and stability of the fractures [11].

Modified Vancouver Classification and Treatment Options
In this modification of the original classification system, developed to address fractures identified intraoperatively, fractures are similarly divided into location with Type A representing proximal methaphyseal fractures not extending into the diaphysis, Type B involving the diaphysis but not distal diaphysis and Type C fractures are distal diaphyseal that can extend into distal femoral methaphysis. These types are then furher subdivided into Subtype 1, which represents a simple cortical perforation, Subtype 2 rapresenting undisplaced longitudinal fractures and Subtype 3 representing displaced and unstable fracture patterns.

Postoperative Periprosthetic Femur Fractures
As mentioned above, the Vancouver Classification [19] was originally designed to address periprosthetic fractures of the femur identified postoperatively. This system stratifies fractures based on location, stability of the implant and quality of the bone stock.

Vancouver Classification and Treatment Options
Type A
These fractures involve either the greater trochanter (Ag) or the lesser trochanter (Al) and are usually associated with osteopenia. Intraoperative longitudinal cracks of the proximal femur, including specifically the calcar, can be considered to be Type A fractures. These fractures can be treated either by cerclage wiring (for Al) and claw fixation (for Ag) in conjunction with protected weight-bearing postoperatively.

Type B
Type B fractures are those that occur around the step or stem tip but not distal to it.
They are stratified as fellows: B1 has well-fixed stem; B2 has a loose stem; and B3 has a loose stem with poor proximal femoral bone quality.

B1 fractures that are either long oblique or spiral fractures can be treated with cerclage wires and crimp sleeves, though it is also arguable to utilise plate fixation in this category. Short oblique or transverse fractures must be treated with either plate fixation, cortical onlay struts or both [25] (Figure 1). A number of different devices are available for fixation of these fractures including the AO/ASIF plate, the Mennen plate, the Ogden plate, Dall-Miles plate, Cable Ready plate and less invasive stabilization systems (LISS) plate. B2 fractures demand a revision of the femoral component to a longer perhaps fully coated stem to gain diaphyseal fixation. These can be used in conjunction with onlay structs or plates to help both with initial stabilisation of the fracture and to improve bone stock (Figure 2).

Figure 1: Type B1 fracture with stable cemented implant and good bone stock having a long spiral pattern repaired using cerclage wires.

Figure 2a: Type B2 fracture with loose uncemented prosthesis addressed via revision of the femoral stem and cortical onlay struct allograft and cerclage wires. Cup revision was also performed. Fracture in this case was likely due to osteolysis.

Figure 2b: Type B2 fracture with loose cemented stem converted to long uncemented revision stem and adjunct cable plate and screws.

B3 fractures are the least common though greatest challenge to deal with. In these fractures, careful preoperative planning is an absolute necessity. Either a tumour-type or megaprosthesis or a proximal femoral allograft (PFA) and prosthesis composite are the only true viable options. In the latter, a long smooth stem is cemented into a PFA which is appropriately sized to fit into the deficient proximal femur. The PFA is fashioned to join to the native diaphysis with either an oblique or step cut to help control rotation and increase the surface area in which to heal. The native diaphysis is prepared to accept the long stem with a tight interference fit. The main goal of this composite is to have a completely stable proximal construct, while allowing the PFA and host bone junction to heal with the assistance of either onlay structs or morselised graft. It is not intended for the distal end of the stem to have a porous coating as this would allow for ingrowth of the native diaphysis on the stem of the composite and hence prevent the junction from healing. The remnant of the native proximal femur, with its soft tissue attachments, is often treated with an extended trochanteric osteotomy and is wrapped around the new composite to act as living bone graft.

Type C

These fractures occur well distal to the implant and can also extend into the distal femoral metaphysic. Type C fractures should be treated independently of the femoral stem, as by definition the stability of the femoral component stem, as by definition the stability of the femoral component has not been jeopardised. A number of fixation devices are available to address these fractures including, among others, fixed-angle or locking plates, retrograde intramidullary nails and cortical onlay strut allografts with cerclage wires (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Type C, fracture, though also above a total knee replacement, with a stable cemented femoral stem treated with a fixed angled device.

Conclusion

Periprosthetic fractures associated with total hip arthroplasty are becoming increasingly more common and are ambitious tasks to deal with, even for the most experienced surgeons. Careful intraoperative technique and tissue handling are crucial to reduce their incidence. Once identified, however, any number of well described treatment options are available for the surgeon.

Carefully approached, and using sound treatment principles, these fractures can be appropriately addressed, thus ensuring adequate patient outcomes.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests.

References

1. Kavanagh BF (1992) Femoral fractures associated with total hip arthroplasty. Orthop Clin North Am 15:751.
2. Mahoney CR, Garvin KL (2002) Periprosthetic acetabular stress fracture causing pelvic discontinuity. Orthopaedics 25:83-88.
3. Sanchez-Soleto J, McGrory BJ, Berry DJ (2000) Acute periprosthetic fracture of the acetabulum associated with osteolytic pelvic lesions: a report of 3 cases. J Arthroplasty 15:126-130.
4. McGrory BJ (1999) Periprosthetic fracture of the acetabulum

during total hip arthroplasty in a patient with Paget's disease. Am J Orthop 28:248-250.

5. Chatoo M, Parfitt J, Pearse MF (1998) Periprosthetic acetabular fracture associated with extensive osteolysis. J Arthroplasty 13:843-845.

6. Mears DC, Shirahama M (1998) Stabilization of an acetabular fracture with cables for acute total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 13:104-107.

7. Peterson CA, Lewallen DG (1996) Periprosthetic fracture of the acetabulum after total hip arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 78:1206-1213.

8. Sharkey PF, Hozack WJ, Callaghan JJ et al (1999) Acetabular fracture associated with cementless acetabular component insertion: a report of 13 cases. J Arthroplasty 14:426-431.

9. McElfresh EC, Coventry MB (1974) Femoral and pelvic fractures after total hip arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 56:483-492.

10. Kim YS, Callahghan JJ, Ahn PB, Brown TD (1995) Fracture of the acetabulum during insertion of an oversized hemispherical component. J Bone Joint Surg Am 77:111-117.

11. Masri BA, Meek RMD, Duncan CP (2004) Periprosthetic fractures evaluation and treatment. Clin Orthop 420:80-95.

12. Letournel E (1961) Les fractures du cotyle, etude d'une serie de 75 cas. J Chir 82:47-87.

13. Berry DJ (2002) Management of periprosthetic fractures. J Arthroplasty 17:11-13.

14. Berry DJ, Lewallen DG, Hansenn AD et al (1999) Pelvic discontinuity in revision total hip arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 81:1692-1702.

15. Berry DJ (1999) Epidemiology of periprosthetic fractures after major joint replacement: hip and knee. Orthop Clin North Am 30:183-190.

16. Schwartz JT, Mayer JG, Engh CA (1989) Femoral fracture during non-cemented total hip arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 71:1135-1142.

17. Poss R, Ewald FC, Thomas WH et al (1976) Complications of total hip arthroplasty in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. J Bone Joint Surg Am 58:1130.

18. Kelley SS (1994) Periprosthetic femoral fractures. J Am Acad Orthop Surg 2:164.

19. Duncan CP, Masri BA (1995) Fractures of the femur after hip replacement. Instr Course Lect 44:293-304.

20. Bethea JS, De Andrade JR, Fleming LL et al (1982) Proximal femoral fractures following total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 170:95-106.

21. Johansson JE, McBroom R, Barrington TW, Hunter GA (1981) Fracture of the ipsilateral femur in patients with total hip replacement. J Bone Joint Surg Am 63:1435-1442.

22. Mont MA, Maar DC (1994) Fractures of the ipsilateral femur after hip arthroplasty. A statistical analysis of outcome based on 487 patients. J Arthroplasty 9:511-519.

23. Morrey BF, Kavanagh BF (1992) Complications with revision of the femoral component of total hip arthroplasty. Comparation between cemented and uncemented techniques. J Arthroplasty 7:71-79.

24. Wittaker RP, Sotos LN, Ralston EL (1974) Fractures of the femur about femoral endoprosthesis. J Trauma 14:674-694.

25. Haddad FS, Duncan CP, Berry DJ, Lewallen DG, Gross Allan E, et al. (2002) Periprosthetic femoral fractures around well-fixed implants: use of cortical onlay allografts with or without a plate. J Bone Joint Surg Am 84:945-950.