



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

석 사 학 위 논 문

Clinical & Radiographic Outcomes of Radial Head Replacement for Complex Radial Head Fractures

계 명 대 학 교 대 학 원
의 학 과

백 청 신

지도교수 조 철 현

2021년 2월

Clinical & Radiographic Outcomes of Radial Head Replacement for Complex Radial Head Fractures

지도교수 조 철 현

이 논문을 석사학위 논문으로 제출함

2 0 2 1 년 2 월

계 명 대 학 교 대 학 원

의학과 정형외과학 전공

백 청 신

백청신의 석사학위 논문을 인준함

주 심 민 병 우

부 심 조 철 현

부 심 손 은 석

계 명 대 학 교 대 학 원

2 0 2 1 년 2 월

Acknowledgement

저에게 석사 과정은 전공의 수련 중 하나의 큰 도전이었습니다. 그간 미흡하고 힘든 점도 많았으나 본 학위 논문으로 전공의 수련 중 석사 과정을 무사히 마치게 되어 그 보람이 무엇보다 큰 것 같습니다.

여러모로 부족한 저에게 석사 과정 동안 논문 연구와 모든 방면으로 많은 도움을 주신 조철현 교수님께 특히 진심으로 감사의 인사를 드리고 싶습니다. 그리고 논문 심사에 신경써주시고 지도 해주신 민병우 교수님, 손은석 교수님께 감사드립니다. 논문 연구 과정의 시작부터 끝까지 물심양면으로 지원해 주신 정형외과 외국 동기와 선후배님들께 감사의 말씀드리고, 지금까지 정형외과학을 공부할 수 있는 기회를 주시고 가르침을 주신 모든 교수님께 무한한 감사를 드립니다.

마지막으로 부족한 아들이지만 항상 응원해주시고 믿어준 부모님께 마음을 전하며 이 논문을 바칩니다.

2021년 2월

백 청 신

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Materials and Methods	3
3. Results	7
4. Discussion	14
5. Summary	18
References	19
Abstract	23
국문초록	25

List of Tables

Table 1. The Demographic Data of Patients	6
Table 2. Summary of the Outcomes and Complications after Radial Head Replacement in Patients with Complex Radial Head Fracture	10
Table 3. Correlations between Clinical Outcomes and Various Parameters	11

List of Figures

Figure 1. Case presentation I	12
Figure 2. Case presentation II	13

1. Introduction

Radial head fractures are relatively common in orthopedic injuries, comprising 1.7–5.4% of all fractures, 33% of those being around the elbow joint (1). Although radial head fractures are often stable injuries, one-third are associated with another bone or soft tissue injury, including coronoid fracture, ligamentous injuries, or elbow dislocation (2). The goal of treatment is to restore the structure of the radial head, which functions as an important stabilizer to varus and valgus stress of the elbow (3). The Mason classification is commonly used for radial head fractures (4). Type I and II fractures are treated either non-operatively or by open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF). Type III and IV fractures are treated by ORIF or radial head replacement (RHR). However, the ideal treatment method continues to be controversial.

Numerous studies have compared the clinical outcomes of ORIF and RHR for Mason type III or IV fractures. Several studies have reported that ORIF achieves more satisfactory results in complex radial head fractures (5,6). Conversely, some studies have reported that RHR produces superior outcomes compared with ORIF by providing early stability (7,8). ORIF can result in a malunion or a painful, stiff elbow due to bone resorption, and loosening (9,10). Ring et al. (10) emphasized that fractures with more than three articular fragments had an unsatisfactory result after ORIF. In complex radial head fractures that are considered unreconstructable by ORIF, RHR offers better results than ORIF by achieving effective radiocapitellar contact, which improves the stability of the elbow (11).

RHR is indicated in cases of unreconstructable isolated radial head fractures and complex elbow injuries such as elbow fracture-dislocation,

terrible triad injuries, Monteggia fractures, or Essex-Lopresti lesions (2). Although RHR produces satisfactory outcomes (12,13), several studies have reported that it has a high percentage of complications and a higher risk of requiring re-operation (14-16). With these distinct benefits and risks, it remains to be determined whether RHR should become the primary treatment for complex radial head fractures.

The primary aim of the current study was to investigate short to mid-term outcomes and complications after RHR for complex radial head fractures. The secondary aim was to identify the factors associated with clinical outcomes following RHR.

2. Materials and Methods

Cases for 29 patients with RHR for complex radial head fractures at a single institution between 2006 and 2018 were retrospectively reviewed. The indications for RHR were complex radial head fractures with associated injuries including ligamentous injuries, terrible triad injuries, Monteggia fractures or Essex-Lopresti lesions. Inclusion criteria were as follows: [1] RHR for complex radial head fractures, [2] available medical records and radiographic findings, and [3] follow-up period more than 2 years following surgery. Exclusion criteria were [1] fracture sequelae and [2] failed ORIF. After applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 24 patients were included in the current study.

The mean age of the patients was 49.8 (range, 19 - 73 years). There were 11 women and 13 men. According to the Mason classification, 12 patients had type III fracture and 12 had type IV fracture. One patient had an open fracture. The mean interval from initial trauma to surgery was 8.7 days (range, 1 - 67 days) (Table 1). The EVOLVE radial head system® (Wright Medical Technology, Memphis, TN, USA) was used in 10 cases, Anatomical radial head system® (Acumed, Hillsboro, OR, USA) in 7 cases, ExploR radial head system® (Zimmer-Biomet, Warsaw, IN, USA) in 5 cases, and the RHS radial head system® (Tornier, Montbonnot-Saint-Martin, France) in 2 cases.

Additional fixation of adjacent bone and ligamentous injuries was performed for complex elbow injuries. Eleven patients had lateral collateral ligament (LCL) repair, 7 had fixation of coronoid or olecranon, 2 had medial collateral ligament (MCL) repair, and 1 had triceps tendon repair. After surgery, patients were immobilized with a splint for 1 weeks. If no complications including wound problems or instability were present,

passive rehabilitation using a hinged brace was begun 1 weeks postoperatively.

The mean follow-up period for patients was 58.9 months (range, 27 - 163 months). Clinical outcomes were assessed using the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) score for pain, the Mayo Elbow Performance Score (MEPS), the Quick Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (Quick-DASH) score, and active range of motion (ROM) of the elbow joint. For all patients, serial plain radiographs including anteroposterior, lateral, and both oblique views were used to evaluate periprosthetic lucency, heterotopic ossification, arthritic change of the elbow joint, and capitellar wear. Periprosthetic lucency was evaluated based on the number of zones and the amount of lucency around the prosthesis, and it was classified into 4 types (none, mild, moderate, severe) as described by Grewal et al. (17). Heterotopic ossification was graded according to the classification of Hastings and Graham (18): Type 1 does not cause a functional outcome; Type 2 has some functional limitation: 2A represents an elbow flexion contracture of 30 ° or greater and limited flexion of less than 130 °, 2B represents limited forearm rotation of less than 50 ° pronation or less than 50 ° supination, and 2C represents heterotopic bone causing limitation in both planes of motion; and Type 3 has ankyloses that prevent elbow motion. Arthritic change of the elbow joint was assessed on anteroposterior and lateral radiographs at the final follow-up evaluation and classified into 4 grades (normal, mild, moderate, severe), as described by Broberg and Morrey (19). Capitellar wear was graded as none, mild, moderate, or severe, as described by Lamas et al. (20). Periprosthetic lucency, arthritic change of the elbow joint, and capitellar wear that were above the moderate degree were considered significant. Complications were classified as either minor, those that did not compromise the outcome or require any further treatment, or major, those

that compromised the outcome or required a re-operation.

Statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS ver. 26.0 (IBM Co., Armonk, NY, SA). Kendall's tau B correlation analysis and Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine the correlations between final clinical scores and various parameters such as age, sex, Mason classification, time interval from initial trauma to surgery, peri-prosthetic lucency, heterotopic ossification, arthritic change of the elbow joint, and capitellar wear. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

The current study was approved by Institutional Review Board of Keimyung University Dongsan Hospital (IRB No. 2020-11-006).

Table 1. The Demographic Data of Patients

Case	Age (years)	Sex	Mason classification	Associated injury	Time to surgery (days)	Other procedures	Follow-up (months)
1	67	F	IV	LCL, coronoid fx.	7	-	163
2	26	M	III	proximal ulnar fx.	25	ORIF	125
3	42	F	III	distal radius fx., ulnar shaft fx.	18	-	101
4	61	M	III	olecranon fx.	4	ORIF	28
5	24	M	III	Essex-Lopresti	67	-	31
6	43	M	IV	LCL, coronoid fx.	3	LCL repair	103
7	51	F	IV	MCL, coronoid fx., olecranon fx.	13	MCL repair, ORIF	94
8	38	F	IV	LCL, coronoid fx.	6	LCL repair	75
9	49	M	IV	MCL, LCL, coronoid fx.	4	LCL repair, ORIF	71
10	42	F	III	MCL, LCL, coronoid fx.	1	-	71
11	42	M	III	LCL, coronoid fx.	6	-	70
12	19	M	IV	LCL, coronoid fx.	4	LCL repair	36
13	36	M	III	olecranon, radial head & coronoid open fx., Radius shaft fx	4	ORIF	48
14	68	F	III	LCL, olecranon fx., coronoid fx.	2	LCL repair, ORIF	54
15	64	M	III	MCL	9	-	36
16	68	F	IV	MCL, LCL, coronoid fx.	1	MCL & LCL repair	47
17	44	M	IV	LCL, coronoid fx.	4	LCL repair	40
18	68	F	III	MCL & LCL, distal radius fx.	3	LCL repair	31
19	69	F	IV	LCL, olecranon fx., coronoid fx.	7	LCL repair, ORIF	34
20	67	F	IV	LCL, coronoid fx., triceps avulsion fx.	4	LCL & triceps repair	31
21	73	M	III	MCL avulsion fx., LCL	8	-	30
22	55	M	IV	LCL, coronoid fx.	1	-	31
23	39	M	III	LCL, coronoid fx.	6	-	37
24	41	F	IV	LCL	2	LCL repair	27

F: female; fx.: fracture; LCL: lateral collateral ligament; M: male; MCL: medial collateral ligament; ORIF: open reduction and internal fixation.

3. Results

3.1 Clinical Outcomes:

At the final follow-up evaluation, the mean VAS score for pain was 0.6 ± 1.1 . Fifteen patients had no pain, 8 had mild pain, and 1 had moderate pain. The mean MEPS was 88.7 ± 11.5 , with 14 excellent, 9 good, and 1 poor result. The mean Q-DASH score was 19.4 ± 7.8 . The mean ROM was $132.7^\circ \pm 7.4^\circ$ of flexion, $4.7^\circ \pm 10.8^\circ$ of extension, $76.2^\circ \pm 10.6^\circ$ of pronation, and $77.5^\circ \pm 5.3^\circ$ of supination.

3.2 Radiographic Outcomes:

Based on the plain radiographs at the final follow-up evaluation, significant periprosthetic lucency was found in 6 patients (25%): 11 patients with none, 7 with mild, 2 with moderate, and 4 with severe. Significant heterotopic ossification that affects functional outcomes was found in 4 patients (16.7%): 4 patients with none, 16 with type I, 2 with type 2A, and 2 with type 3. Significant arthritic change of the elbow joint was found in 7 patients (29.2%): 8 patients with normal, 9 with mild, and 7 with moderate. Significant capitellar wear was found in 5 patients (20.8%): 9 patients with none, 10 with mild, and 5 with moderate. (Table 2).

There were no significant correlations between the final clinical scores and various parameters including age, sex, Mason classification, time interval from initial trauma to surgery, periprosthetic lucency, heterotopic ossification, and capitellar wear ($p > 0.05$). However, arthritis change of

the elbow joint was significantly correlated with MEPS ($p < 0.05$). (Table 3).

Four cases of complications (16.6%) in 24 patients were observed, including 2 case of major complications and 2 cases of minor complications. The two patients with major complications (8.3%) required a re-operation. One patient had stiffness with heterotopic ossification and progressive ulnar neuropathy and underwent arthrolysis and ulnar nerve anterior transposition at 6 months after surgery. The other patient with RHR for open fracture had severe stiffness at 3 months after surgery. At 4 months after surgery, he underwent arthrolysis and removal of the implant for severe ankylosis. The two patients with minor complications had transient ulnar neuropathy but were completely recovered within 4 months.

3.3 Case:

3.3.1 Case 1:

A 67-year-old woman (No. 20) underwent RHR with LCL and triceps tendon repair because of terrible triad and triceps tendon rupture. At 31 months follow-up after RHR, the patient had satisfactory clinical outcomes in spite of severe periprosthetic lucency (Figure 1).

3.3.2 Case 2:

A 38-year-old woman (No. 8) underwent RHR with LCL repair because of terrible triad. After surgery, patient complained stiffness (95 ° of flexion, 35 ° of extension) and tingling sensation of 4 and 5th fingers. At 6 months after surgery, the patient underwent arthrolysis, resection of heterotopic ossification and ulnar nerve anterior transposition. At 75

months follow-up after RHR, the patient had satisfactory clinical outcomes in spite of radiographic outcomes. Ulnar neuropathy was recovered completely (Figure 2).

Table 2. Summary of the Outcomes and Complications after Radial Head Replacement in Patients with Complex Radial Head Fracture

Case	Periprosthetic lucency	HO	Arthritis change	Capitellar wear	VAS score	MEPS	Q-DASH score	ROM				Complications
								Flexion	Extension	Pronation	Supination	
1	None	I	Moderate	None	2	80	27	135	0	80	80	Transient ulnar neuropathy
2	Mild	0	Normal	None	0	100	15	140	0	80	80	
3	Mild	IIA	Mild	Mild	2	75	27	135	30	70	70	
4	Severe	IIA	Moderate	Moderate	0	85	19	115	15	70	70	
5	Severe	I	Mild	Mild	1	85	19	135	10	70	80	
6	Moderate	I	Moderate	Moderate	1	80	25	120	20	80	80	Stiffness, HO, progressive ulnar neuropathy
7	None	I	Normal	None	0	100	12	135	0	80	80	Stiffness
8	Severe	III	Moderate	Moderate	0	100	12	140	0	80	80	
9	Mild	I	Mild	Mild	0	100	15	140	0	80	80	
10	None	0	Mild	None	0	90	19	140	0	80	80	
11	Mild	I	Normal	Mild	0	95	14	130	0	80	80	
12	Mild	I	Normal	Mild	0	90	15	140	0	80	80	Transient ulnar neuropathy
13	None	III	Moderate	None	5	50	40	120	40	30	60	
14	None	I	Normal	None	0	95	15	135	0	80	80	
15	None	I	Normal	None	0	100	12	135	0	80	80	
16	None	I	Mild	Mild	0	100	12	120	0	80	80	
17	None	0	Normal	None	0	100	14	135	0	80	80	Stiffness
18	None	I	Mild	Mild	0	90	16	135	0	80	80	
19	None	I	Mild	None	1	80	32	135	0	80	80	
20	Severe	I	Moderate	Moderate	1	85	16	135	0	80	80	
21	Moderate	I	Mild	Mild	1	80	35	130	0	80	70	
22	Mild	I	Mild	Mild	0	95	15	135	0	80	80	Stiffness
23	Mild	I	Moderate	Moderate	1	85	24	125	0	70	70	
24	None	0	Normal	Mild	0	90	16	140	0	80	80	

HO: heterotopic ossification; MEPS: Mayo Elbow Performance Score; Q-DASH: Quick Disabilities of Arm, Shoulder, and Hand; ROM: range of motion; VAS: visual analog scale.

Table 3. Correlations between Clinical Outcomes and Various Parameters

Variables	VAS score	MEPS	Q-DASH
Age	1.000	0.859	0.782
Sex	1.000	0.955	0.865
Interval from initial trauma to surgery	0.079	0.456	0.594
Mason classification	0.671	0.319	0.198
Periprosthetic lucency	0.343	0.199	0.343
Heterotopic ossification	0.120	0.081	0.120
Arthritis change	0.055	0.047*	0.114
Capitellar wear	0.534	0.446	0.679

MEPS: Mayo Elbow Performance Score; Q-DASH: Quick Disabilities of Arm, Shoulder, and Hand; VAS: visual analog scale; *: statistically significant.



Figure 1. Case presentation I. A 67-year-old woman with terrible triad (A). Initial MRI after closed reduction shows LCL, triceps tendon rupture (B). Radial head replacement with LCL and triceps tendon repair were performed (C). At 31 months follow-up, the patient had satisfactory clinical outcomes in spite of severe periprosthetic lucency (D). LCL: lateral collateral ligament; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging.




Figure 2. Case presentation II. A 38-year-old woman with terrible triad (A). Radial head replacement with LCL repair were performed (B). Radiographs at 6 months after surgery show heterotopic ossification (C). Left elbow stiffness at 6 months after surgery (D). Intraoperative findings after arthrolysis and resection of heterotopic ossification (E). At 75 months follow-up, the patient had satisfactory clinical outcomes in spite of radiographic outcomes (F). LCL: lateral collateral ligament.

4. Discussion

The present study revealed that RHR for complex radial head fractures produced satisfactory short to mid-term clinical outcomes, although the rate of radiographic complications was relatively high. Arthritic change of the elbow joint was correlated with clinical scores. The results presented here indicate that RHR is an effective option for treatment of complex radial head fractures.

In complex radial head fractures, the results after ORIF are highly variable and have had with many failures (21). Even a successful ORIF can often result in osteonecrosis of the fragments, failure of hardware which generates stiffness, and unstable or painful elbow (10). RHR is indicated in cases of unreconstructable isolated radial head fractures and complex elbow injuries (2). Indications for RHR in the current study were complex radial head fractures with associated injuries including ligamentous injuries, terrible triad injuries, Monteggia fractures, or Essex-Lopresti lesions. Recently, RHR has been widely used in the treatment of complex radial head fractures. However, the use of RHR has been debated due to a relative lack of studies on the long-term outcomes (14,22). Several reports that compare ORIF and RHR in complex radial head fractures (23,24). In a systematic review, Dou et al. (11) reported that patients with Mason type III fractures receiving RHR had a significantly higher satisfaction rate compared to those with ORIF, as well as better Broberg and Morrey scores and a lower rate of complications. In a recent systematic review with meta-analysis, Li and Chen (9) reported a higher complication rate for ORIF than RHR for Mason type III fractures (58.1% versus 13.9%), and satisfaction rate was higher in RHR (51.6% versus 91.7%). Bone non-union/bone absorption

was the main reported complication of ORIF at 50%.

Tarallo et al. (12) reported 31 cases for RHR for Mason type III fractures with a mean follow-up of 30 months. Cases presented with good clinical results based on the MEPS, excellent in 77% of the patients, good in 10%, and fair in 4%. Sershon et al. (13) reported 16 cases of RHR for radial head fractures with a mean follow-up period of 10.5 years with good to excellent MEPS in 15 patients (94%), 1 patient reporting a fair outcome, and no patients reporting a poor outcome. In the present study, at a mean follow-up of 58.4 months, based on the MEPS, excellent results were obtained in 14 patients (58.3%), good in 9 (37.5%), and poor in 1 (4.1%). The current findings are consistent with those of previous studies, suggesting that RHR is a reasonable option, producing good clinical outcomes in patients with complex radial head fractures.

Several studies have reported the relationship between radiographic findings and clinical outcomes of RHR (25,26). Ha et al. (1) performed a 10-year retrospective review of 258 radial head implants in 244 patients. Radiographic complications included heterotopic ossification (46.9%), arthritic change of the elbow joint (27.9%), loosening (19.8%), fracture (2.3%), and hardware dislocation (2.7%). Overall, there were 62 re-operations (24.0%), and heterotopic ossification (53.2%) was the most common cause. A significant correlation between radiographic complications and clinical outcomes was reported. Age, sex, side, and type of arthroplasty did not correlate with either the clinical or radiographic outcomes. Chen et al. (26) reported long-term outcomes after RHR for unreconstructable radial head fractures where 26 of 32 patients had good to excellent results. At a mean follow up of 8.9 years, the mean MEPS was 83.4 points, and the mean Q-DASH score was 11.7. Additionally, periprosthetic lucency did not correlate with functional or pain scores. Fehring et al. (25) reported on 17 patients who underwent metal RHR

with smooth stems for comminuted radial head fractures with a minimum 2-year follow-up. Results indicated that “Mean stem radiolucency” did not correlate with proximal radial forearm pain. The current study revealed a significant correlation between arthritic change of the elbow joint and MEPS. Periprosthetic lucency, heterotopic ossification, and capitellar wear did not correlate with clinical scores. However, further long-term follow-up studies of a larger scale are needed to account for the possibility of late progression.

Various factors (e.g., patient characteristics and types of RHR implant) that affect clinical outcomes, complications, and re-operation of RHR have been reported. Duckworth et al. (15) reported on 105 patients who underwent RHR for complex radial head fractures. All implants were uncemented monopolar prostheses, with 86% being metallic and 14% being silastic. Twenty-nine patients (28%) underwent reoperation due to one of the following complications: stiffness [12], painful loosening [5], isolated pain [4], subluxation [3], synovitis [2], ulnar neuropathy [2], or infection [1]. Results demonstrated that silastic implants and lower age were independent risk factors for re-operation. Lott et al. (2) retrospectively reviewed 18 stable and 50 unstable elbow injury groups treated with RHR by a single surgeon during a 15-year period. The results showed that the unstable elbow injuries group achieved satisfactory functional ROM with no difference in radiographic outcomes, complication rates, or implant survivorship compared with the stable elbow injuries group. In a recent systematic review and meta-analysis, Agyeman et al. (27) examined fixation methods to determine if “fixed” or “unfixed” resulted in better clinical outcomes. The results identified 878 unduplicated patients: 522 fixed and 356 unfixed. Implant fixation type did not appear to affect clinical outcomes of RHR. However, rigidly fixing the implant (cement implant) may have increased the risks of

re-operation and complications. In the current study, there were no significant correlations between the final clinical scores and age, sex, Mason classification, or time interval from initial trauma to surgery. Because of small sample size, this study could not analyze the outcomes according to implant design. Overall complication and re-operation rates were 16.6% and 8.3%, respectively, including 2 cases of major complication (1 stiffness with heterotopic ossification and progressive ulnar neuropathy and 1 stiffness) and 2 cases of minor complications (2 transient ulnar neuropathy). These results were either in line with or better than previous RHR studies.

The current study had several limitations. First, it was a retrospective study with a small number of cases. Second, heterogeneous RHR implants were used, which could have affected clinical outcomes. Third, the follow-up period was relatively short and heterogenous. Additionally, exact radiographic results that are important in long-term implant survival were not provided. Future long-term prospective studies are needed to evaluate clinical and radiographic outcomes after RHR for complex elbow fractures.

RHR for the treatment of complex radial head fractures yielded satisfactory short to mid-term clinical outcomes, though radiographic complications were relatively high. Results suggest that radiographic complications did not compromise clinical outcomes, and only arthritic change of the elbow joint was correlated with clinical scores. Further long-term studies are needed to fully understand clinical outcomes and complication rates of RHR.

5. Summary

This study was conducted to investigate short to mid-term outcomes and complications following RHR for complex radial head fractures and identify the factors associated with clinical outcomes. Twenty-four patients with complex radial head fractures were treated by RHR. The mean age of patients was 49.8 (range, 19 - 73 years) and mean follow-up period was 58.9 months (range, 27 - 163 months). The mean VAS score, MEPS, and Quick-DASH score were satisfactory. The mean range of motion was 132.7 ° of flexion, 4.7 ° of extension, 76.2 ° of pronation, and 77.5 ° of supination. Periprosthetic lucency was observed in 6 patients (25%). Heterotopic ossification was observed in 4 patients (16.6%). Arthritic change of the elbow joint developed in 7 patients (29.1%). Capitellar wear was found in 5 patients (20.8%). Arthritic change of the elbow joint was significantly correlated with MEPS. Four complications (16.6%) were observed. This study demonstrate that RHR for the treatment of complex radial head fractures yielded satisfactory short to mid-term clinical outcomes, though radiographic complications were relatively high.

References

1. Ha AS, Petscavage JM, Chew FS: Radial head arthroplasty: a radio-logic outcome study. *AJR Am J Roentgeno* 2012; 199: 1078-82.
2. Lott A, Broder K, Goch A, Konda SR, Egol KA: Results after radial head arthroplasty in unstable fractures. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2018; 27: 270-5.
3. Ahmed I, Mistry J: The management of acute and chronic elbow instability. *Orthop Clin North Am* 2015; 46: 271-80.
4. Broberg MA, Morrey BF: Results of treatment of fracture-dislocations of the elbow. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1987; 216: 109-19.
5. Wang TM, Leu LJ, Wang JS, Lin LD: Effects of prosthesis materials and prosthesis splinting on peri-implant bone stress around implants in poor-quality bone: a numeric analysis. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 2002; 17: 231-7.
6. Koslowsky TC, Mader K, Gausepohl T, Pennig D: Reconstruction of mason type-III and type-IV radial head fractures with a new fixation device: 23 patients followed 1 - 4 years. *Acta Orthopaedica* 2007; 78: 151-6.
7. Ruan HJ, Fan CY, Liu JJ, Zeng BF: A comparative study of internal fixation and prosthesis replacement for radial head fractures of mason type III. *Int Orthop* 2009; 33: 249-53.

8. Chen X, Wang SC, Cao LH, Yang GQ, Li M, Su JC: Comparison between radial head replacement and open reduction and internal fixation in clinical treatment of unstable, multi-fragmented radial head fractures. *Int Orthop* 2011; 35: 1071-6.
9. Li N, Chen S: Open reduction and internal-fixation versus radial head replacement in treatment of mason type III radial head fractures. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol* 2014; 24: 851-5.
10. Ring D, Quintero J, Jupiter JB: Open reduction and internal fixation of fractures of the radial head. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2002; 84: 1811-5.
11. Dou Q, Yin Z, Sun L, Feng X: Prosthesis replacement in mason III radial head fractures: a meta-analysis. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2015; 101: 729-34.
12. Tarallo L, Mugnai R, Rocchi M, Capra F, Catani F: Mason type III radial head fractures treated by anatomic radial head arthroplasty: Is this a safe treatment option? *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res*. 2017; 103: 183-9.
13. Sershon RA, Luchetti TJ, Cohen MS, Wysocki RW: Radial head replacement with a bipolar system: an average 10-year follow-up. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2018; 27: e38-e44.
14. Van Riet RP, Sanchez-Sotelo J, Morrey BF: Failure of metal radial head replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2010; 92: 661-7.

15. Duckworth AD, Wickramasinghe NR, Clement ND, Court-Brown CM, McQueen MM: Radial head replacement for acute complex fractures: what are the rate and risks factors for revision or removal?. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014; 472: 2136-43.
16. Laumonerie P, Reina N, Ancelin D, Delclaux S, Tibbo ME, Bonneville N, et al.: Mid-term outcomes of 77 modular radial head prostheses. Bone Joint J 2017; 99-B: 1197-203.
17. Grewal R, MacDermid JC, Faber KJ, Drosdowech DS, King GJ: Comminuted radial head fractures treated with a modular metallic radial head arthroplasty. Study of outcomes. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2006; 88: 2192-200.
18. Hastings H, 2nd, Graham TJ: The classification and treatment of heterotopic ossification about the elbow and forearm. Hand Clin 1994; 10: 417-37.
19. Broberg MA, Morrey BF: Results of delayed excision of the radial head after fracture. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1986; 68: 669-74.
20. Lamas C, Castellanos J, Proubasta I, Dominguez E: Comminuted radial head fractures treated with pyrocarbon prosthetic replacement. Hand (NY) 2011; 6: 27-33.
21. Ring D: Displaced, unstable fractures of the radial head: fixation vs. replacement--what is the evidence? Injury 2008; 39: 1329-37.
22. Laumonerie P, Ancelin D, Reina N, Tibbo ME, Kerezoudis P,

- Delclaux S, et al: Causes for early and late surgicalre-intervention after radial head arthroplasty. *Int Orthop* 2017; 41: 1435-43.
23. Schnetzke M, Aytac S, Deuss M, Studier-Fischer S, Swartman B, Muenzberg M, et al.: Radial head prosthesis in complex elbow dislocations: effect of oversizing and comparison with ORIF. *Int Orthop* 2014; 38: 2295-301.
24. Al-Burdeni S, Abuodeh Y, Ibrahim T, Ahmed G: Open reduction and internal fixation versus radial head arthroplasty in the treatment of adult closed comminuted radial head fractures (modified mason type III and IV). *Int Orthop* 2015; 39: 1659-64.
25. Fehring EV, Burns EM, Knierim A, Sun J, Apker KA, Berg RE: Radiolucencies surrounding a smooth-stemmed radial head component may not correlate with forearm pain or poor elbow function. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2009; 18: 275-8.
26. Chen AC, Chou YC, Weng CJ, Cheng CY: Long-term outcomes of modular metal prosthesis replacement in patients with irreparable radial head fractures. *J Orthop Surg Res* 2018; 13: 134.
27. Agyeman KD, Damodar D, Watkins I, Dodds SD: Does radial head implant fixation affect functional outcomes? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2019; 28: 126-30.

Clinical & Radiographic Outcomes of Radial Head Replacement for Complex Radial Head Fractures

Bek, Chung-Shin

Department of Orthopedic Surgery
Graduate School

Keimyung University

(Supervised by Professor Cho, Chul-Hyun)

(Abstract)

The purpose of the current study was to investigate short to mid-term outcomes and complications following radial head replacement (RHR) for complex radial head fractures. Twenty-four patients were treated by RHR. The mean age of patients was 49.8 years and mean follow-up periods was 58.9 months. Clinical & radiographic outcomes were evaluated using a visual analog scale (VAS) for pain, the Mayo Elbow Performance Score (MEPS), the Quick Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (Quick-DASH) score, and serial plain radiographs. Complications were also evaluated. At the final follow-up, the mean VAS score, MEPS, and Quick-DASH score were 0.6, 88.7, and 19.4. The mean range of motion was 132.7 ° of flexion, 4.7 ° of extension, 76.2 ° of pronation, and 77.5 ° of supination. Periprosthetic lucency was ob-

served in 6 patients (25%). Heterotopic ossification was observed in 4 patients (16.6%). Arthritic change of the elbow joint developed in 7 patients (29.1%). Capitellar wear was found in 5 patients (20.8%). Arthritic change of the elbow joint was significantly correlated with MEPS. Four complications (16.6%) were observed. RHR for the treatment of complex radial head fractures yielded satisfactory short to mid-term clinical outcomes, though radiographic complications were relatively high.

요골두 복잡골절에서 시행한 요골두 치환술의 결과

백 청 신

계명대학교 대학원

의학과 정형외과학 전공

(지도교수 조 철 현)

(초록)

본 연구의 목적은 요골두 복잡골절에서 시행한 요골두 치환술의 결과와 합병증을 조사하고 임상적 결과와 연관된 인자를 연구하는 데 있다. 요골두 복잡골절에서 요골두 치환술을 시행한 24명의 환자를 후향적으로 조사하였다. 환자군의 평균 나이는 49.8세(19 - 73세)였고 평균 추시 기간은 58.9개월(27 - 163개월) 이었다. 임상적 결과는 시각 통증 척도, Mayo Elbow Performance Score(MEPS), Quick Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand(Quick-DASH) 점수와 능동적 관절 가동 범위를 측정하여 평가하였고, 방사선학적 결과는 주기적인 단순 방사선 촬영 검사를 통해 평가하였다. 또한, 술 후 발생한 합병증에 대하여 평가하였다. 최종 추시 시 시각 통증 척도는 평균 0.6 ± 1.1 점, MEPS는 평균 88.7 ± 11.5 점, Quick-DASH 점수는 평균 19.4 ± 7.8 점이었다. 주관절 평균 굴곡은 평균 $132.7^\circ \pm 7.4^\circ$, 신전은 평균 $4.7^\circ \pm 10.8^\circ$, 회내전은 평균 $76.2^\circ \pm 10.6^\circ$, 회외전은 평균 $77.5^\circ \pm 5.3^\circ$ 의 소견을 보였다. 의미 있는 삼입물

주위 투과는 6명(25%), 이소성 골화증은 4명(16.6%), 주관절의 퇴행성 변화는 7명(29.1%), 소두의 마모는 5명(20.8%)에서 관찰되었다. 주관절의 퇴행성 변화는 MEPS와 유의한 상관관계를 보였고 다른 인자들과 임상적 결과와의 유의한 상관관계는 없었다. 2예의 주요한 합병증(강직, 이소성 골화증, 진행하는 척골 마비 1예와 강직 1예)과 2예의 합병증(일시적인 척골 마비 2예)을 포함한 4예(16.6%)에서 합병증이 발생하였다. 요골두 복잡골절에서 시행한 요골두 치환술은 방사선학적 합병증이 비교적 높았지만, 만족스러운 임상적 단기, 중기 추시 결과를 보여주었다.