Expert Consensus for a Principle-Based Classification in Treatment of Diaphyseal Pediatric Femur Fractures Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

Daniel Weltsch MD; Keith D. Baldwin MD, MPH, MSPT; Divya Talwar, PhD, MPH; John M. Flynn MD

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia



Background

- Pediatric Diaphyseal Femur Fractures (PDFF) are common
- Disagreement exists in optimal treatment for this common entity
- AAOS working groups have been convened
- Recommendations given have lacked specificity and are largely not followed
- PDFF heal routinely well, as such the goal of treatment is to promote optimal healing with the least intervention and cost.
- We performed a two stage study with a survey of experts in the field, and secondarily an analysis of institutional data to assess success of the classification/

Methods

Arm 1

- Survey designed with 15 PDFF cases
- Classification developed apriori but not given to raters
- Survey given to orthopedic fellows to work out any issues prior to distribution
- Survey given via RedCap to 17 thought leaders in PDFF
- Thought leader defined by >20 years call experience and publication of seminal papers in PDFF literature
- No information available to the raters as to other raters ratings or the classification itself

• Arm 2

- 2 raters assessed 289 consecutive institutional PDFF
- Fractures classified as "over" "under" or "ideal" treatment
- Outcomes including complications, reoperations and cost assessed within each group as rated
- Analyzed in terms of each classification level

Results (Expert Arm)

- 100% response rate
- Substantial Agreement for Classification (K 0.7)
- Near Perfect for Operative vs Non Operative (K 0.93)
- Flexible fixation vs Rigid near perfect (K 0.83)
- Damage control Substantial agreement (K 0.64)

Results (Institutional Arm)

- Suboptimal results found in 43% of undertreated patients 18.8% in those treated as recommended, and 14.3% of overtreated patients. (p value < 0.01)
- Family burden increased as more aggressive fixation was pursued.
- Charges trended higher as more invasive treatment was pursued.

Results- Family Burden

*Age <6N: Pavlik Harness /Soft Padding All type of fractures Class 1 High index of suspicion for abuse "Protect Until Healed" *Ages 6M- 4Y: Preferably Walking Spica Cast Incomplete fractures Complete, strict non-displaced fractures Neuro-muscular non-ambulant patient: Spica Cast/ Splint Cast/ Knee Brace *Ages 6M- 4Y: Walking / Regular Spica Cast, Close and Early Follow-up Class 2 Complete fractures with any displacement or shortening (in cases of modest shortening Walking Spica is preferred) "Active Cast Treatment" Prepare for cast-wedging during follow-up Ages 4-9 years: Elastic Nailing o All simple fractures (2 parts) Class 3 Age 9 years-until skeletal maturity: Elastic Nailing Simple fractures (2 parts) plus: "Flexible Fixation" *Length stable fractures (transverse, short oblique pattern) *Low energy trauma Ages 4-9 years: Sub-muscular Plate or External Fixation Complex (>2 parts) or comminuted fractures *Age 9 years- until skeletal maturity: Trochanteric-entry Rigid Nail or Sub-Class 4 muscular Plate or External Fixation length unstable fractures (long spiral/oblique pattern) "Rigid Fixation" High energy trauma o Weight >50 Kg *After skeletal maturity: Trochanteric-entry Rigid Nail or Sub-muscular Plate or External Fixation *All ages: Appropriate Early Care (Rigid Fixation) VS. Damage Control Orthopedics (Staged Approach Usually with Temporal External Fixation) Class 5 Systemic hemodynamic instability

Multi-trauma injuries

Vascular injury

Open fractures with high energy trauma or severe contamination

Results (Costs)

"Limb/Life Preservation"

Classification

Table 4. Reported Charges for A Random Small Sample of Patients

Group	Aedian charges	IQR	P value
Conservative Treatment (Classes 1-2)	\$168,141	\$42,782 - \$201,784	<0.001
Surgical Treatment (Classes 3-5)	\$700,554	\$432,520 - \$999,630	
Class 1 Imaging (Radiology) Charges	\$19619	\$16,106.5- \$34,840.5	<0.001
Class 2 Imaging (Radiology) Charges	\$20796.5	\$3,656- \$29,371.5	
Class 3 (Flexible Fixation) Total Charges	\$416,122	\$323,748 - \$822,954	0.047
Class 4 (Rigid Fixation) Total Charges	\$510,538	\$344,404 - \$714,122	
Class 3 Surgical and Adjunct Supply Char	ges \$11,773.5	\$9,845 - \$11,774	0.001
Class 4 Surgical and Adjunct Supply Char	ges \$39,136	\$14,429 -\$ 39,135	
One Stage Procedure (Classes 3-4)	\$471,529	\$339,084 - \$724,332	0.024
Two Staged Procedures (Class 5)	\$1,113,846	\$700,554 - \$4,610,244	4
*IQR= interquartile range			

Complications by treatment

	Under-Treated	Treated Appropriately	Over-Treated
Radiographic Malunion	20/56 (35.7%)	31/191 (16.2%)	4/42 (9.5%)
Return to operation room (ROR)	4/56 (7.1%)	11/191 (5.7%)	1/42 (2.3%)
Loss of reduction (LOR)	3/56 (5.3%)	6/191 (3.1%)	1/42 (2.3%)
Residual limb length discrepancy	2/56 (3.5%)	1/191 (0.5%)	1/42 (2.3%)
(LLD)>2 cm			
Surgical site infection (SSI).	0/56	2/191 (1%)	1/42 (2.3%)
	•	•	•

Discussion

Division of Orthopedics

- This classification was developed by the senior author over 20 years
- This study has shown the classification system to be reliable and has validated the classification for usage with 17 leading pediatric orthopedic trauma experts.
- Reliability estimates were high exceeding many commonly used fracture classification systems
- Usage of less surgically invasive means than recommended by the classification system results in more complications and less optimal outcome
- Usage of more surgically means than recommended by the classification results in greater costs, length of stay and doctors visits on average.
- The concept of the role of "Damage Control" orthopedics is poorly understood with respect to children, and likely has less to do with the polytraumatized child than the child with a vascular injury.
- Strengths include a sample of experts from across the country with >20 years of experience and a large institutional sample for the validation arm and perfect response rate
- Weaknesses include small survey size, and low numbers of certain arms of the classification including small numbers of patients for damage control

Conclusions

- This PDFF classification has been shown to be reliable and predictive of outcome via this study
- The guiding principle has been to provide the optimal outcome at the least possible cost and inconvenience to the family.
- This classification can be used as a reliable framework for community orthopedists pediatric orthopedists and fracture surgeons to guide selection of a treatment strategy for pediatric diaphyseal femur fractures.

References

- Flynn JM, Hresko T, Reynolds RA, et al. Titanium elastic nails for pediatric femur fractures: a multicenter study of early results with analysis of complications. J Pediatr Orthop. 2001 Jan-Feb;21(1):4-8.
- Kocher MS, Sink EL, Blasier RD, et al. Treatment of pediatric diaphyseal femur fractures. J Am Acad Orthop Surg. 2009 Nov;17(11):718-25.
- Al-Mahdi W, Ibrahim MM, Spiegel DA, et al. Is Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome Relevant to Pulmonary Complications and Mortality in Multiply Injured Children? J Pediatr Orthop. 2017 Oct 9.
- Adams AJ, Baldwin KD, Arkader A, et al. Assessing the Need for Common Perioperative Laboratory Tests in Pediatric Patients with Femoral Shaft Fractures. J Pediatr Orthop. 2019 Jul;39(6): e456-e461.
- Roaten JD, Kelly DM, Yellin JL, et al. Pediatric Femoral Shaft Fractures: A MulticenterReview of the AAOS Clinical Practice Guidelines Before and After 2009. J Pediatr Orthop. 2017 Apr 10.
- Jevsevar DS, Shea KG, Murray JN, et al. AAOS Clinical Practice Guideline onthe Treatment of Pediatric Diaphyseal Femur Fractures. J Am Acad Orthop Surg. 2015 Dec;23(12): e101. doi: 10.5435/JAAOS-D-15-00523. Epub 2015 Oct 27.

Group P value Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4 Class 5 Median (IQR) Median (IQR) Median (IQR) Median (IQR) Median (IQR) Length of Inpatient 1.5 (1-3) 1 (1-1) 2 (1-4) 7 (3.1-38.25) 1(1-2)< 0.01 Stay (Days) 2.5(2-3)4 (3-5) 5 (4-6) 4 (3-6) 5.5(3.25-6.75) < 0.01 Total Number of Outpatient Visits