



Original research article

# Physal fractures of the lower leg in children and adolescents: Therapeutic results, pitfalls and suggested management protocol - based on the experience of the authors and contemporary literature

Marcin Karlikowski<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Jerzy Sułko<sup>a,b</sup><sup>a</sup> Department of Orthopedics, Children's University Hospital of Cracow, Cracow, Poland<sup>b</sup> Pediatric Surgery Clinic, Department of Orthopedics, Pediatric Surgery Clinic, Jagiellonian University Collegium Medicum, Cracow, Poland

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 3 June 2017

Accepted 17 October 2017

Available online 26 October 2017

## Keywords:

Salter-Harris fractures

Periosteum interposition

Complications

Physal fractures

AOFAS scale

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** Physal fractures in children frequently give rise to concerns about the condition of the growth plate. Our observations have proven that the dysfunction of the growth plate is less frequent complication in those cases than misdiagnosed interposition of the periosteum. The aim of this paper is to familiarize the readers with the issue of treatment of physal fractures of the distal tibia and fibula in the growing skeleton.

**Materials and methods:** We analyzed the group of 75 patients – children and adolescents – with surgically treated physal fractures of the lower leg. The analysis included age, sex, circumstances of trauma infliction, type of sustained damage, employed therapeutic technique, timing of surgical procedure, duration of hospitalization, complications, duration of follow-up, radiological and functional results according to the AOFAS scale.

**Results:** The group consisted of 23 girls and 52 boys. The mean age was 13.6 years. The most frequent cause of trauma was same-level fall, usually during sports activities (35 cases). The most common type of damage was Salter-Harris type II fracture (35 cases). Among the employed surgical techniques, open reduction and stabilization with K-wires was the most often used (52 cases). A group of four patients attracted our attention, in whom after a closed reduction, signs of periosteum interposition were noted. These patients required a second procedure. In one patient, the growth plate arrest occurred; it was directly caused by local osteomyelitis.

**Conclusions:** With adequately conducted treatment of distal tibia and distal fibula physal fractures, the results are good. Misdiagnosed periosteum interposition poses a more serious clinical problem as opposed to the commonly anxiety-provoking post-traumatic growth plate dysfunction.

© 2017 Medical University of Białystok. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Physal fractures of the lower leg do not represent the most frequent injury among children and adolescents; they are also rarely considered a clinical challenge. However, as all physal fractures, they tend to give rise to concern about the condition of the growth-plate. The character of these injuries often causes anxiety among doctors inexperienced in the field of pediatric orthopedics, which results in abundance of referrals to specialized

centers – such referrals are frequently excused only by “the lack of pediatric orthopedist on call”.

Our observations have shown that the growth plate dysfunction is not the most frequent complication of the therapeutic process. Misdiagnosed periosteal interposition is observed more often.

The goal of this article is the assessment of the therapeutic results of the physal fractures of the lower leg in children and adolescents; the second objective is to propose a comprehensive management protocol.

## 2. Material and methods

The material for our analysis consisted of patients with fractures of the distal physis of the tibia and/or fibula managed surgically in the period from June 2009 to December 2015. The

\* Corresponding author at: Children's University Hospital of Cracow, Department of Orthopedics, Wielicka 256, 30-663 Cracow, Poland.

E-mail addresses: [marcinkarlikowski@poczta.onet.pl](mailto:marcinkarlikowski@poczta.onet.pl) (M. Karlikowski), [jerzysulko@hotmail.com](mailto:jerzysulko@hotmail.com) (J. Sułko).

starting point in data gathering was the list of procedures performed in the operating room obtained from the OR office.

The initial analysis resulted in a group of 109 cases. In the course of further selection, the following exclusion criteria were applied: incomplete medical or radiology files and a follow-up period shorter than 2 months. The application of the aforementioned criteria resulted in limiting the study group to 75 patients.

Age at the moment of injury, sex and circumstances of the injury were listed among the analyzed criteria. Dividing patients into groups was difficult due to multiple variants of the sustained injuries, frequently combining Salter Harris fractures of the distal tibia, fractures of the fibula, damage to the tibiofibular syndesmosis and ligaments. While assessing the method of injury management in patients subjected to multiple operations, only the method employed during the final procedure was taken into account. Duration of this operation was obtained from the anesthetic files. A simple scoring system was devised for the assessment of the radiologic outcome; the system allowed for allocating 1 to 5 points:

5—an image resembling normal anatomy,

4—a slight deviation from normal anatomy – a condition appropriate for spontaneous correction

3—deviation not appropriate for spontaneous correction, but without the necessity of corrective surgery,

2—deviation requiring corrective surgery

1—persistent deviation

Any deviation from the normal post-operative course was considered a complication, with no regard for its impact on the outcome of the therapeutic process.

The follow-up period was measured in months, starting from the day of the surgery until the closure of the treatment recorded in the patient's clinical files. All the patients who decided to continue their post-surgical treatment in other medical centers were excluded from the study group.

The functional result according to the AOFAS scale was based on the entries in the clinical files [1,2,3]. Although the scale was not in use during follow-up, the correctly conducted medical records contained description of each patient's condition: the function of the injured limb, post-traumatic deformities and deficits, complaints, physical activity. The descriptions combined with the aforementioned scale allowed for expressing the functional outcome as a numerical score.

### 3. Results

After applying the aforementioned criteria, the study group was limited to 23 girls and 52 boys, giving a total of 75 patients aged 7 to 17 years. The mean age in the study group was 13.6 years. The most frequent cause of injury was same-level fall, usually during sports activities, with football and gym-classes appearing to be the most common, as 35 patients sustained injuries in such circumstances. Multi-level falls (six patients) and incidents "involving a vehicle" (17 patients) were next on the list. A considerable number of cases lacked the description of the circumstances of the accident in the medical records (17 cases).

Classification of the injuries was based on X-ray imaging. When in doubt as to the type of the injury or the character of the dislocation, CT scans were obtained. Due to multiple variants of the injury, the classification was based on the type of Salter-Harris fracture of the distal tibial epiphysis [4]. The following division of the study group was obtained:

type I – 9 patients (in 8 cases – a co-existing fracture of the lateral malleolus),

type II – 35 patients (in 28 cases – a co-existing fracture of the fibula),

type III – 9 patients, including two cases of Tilleaux fracture (in 4 cases – a co-existing fracture of the fibula),

type IV – 14 patients, including 8 cases of a "tri-plane fracture" (in 4 cases – a co-existing fracture of the fibula).

In addition, four patients were diagnosed with type I Salter-Harris fracture of the distal fibula and another four patients with the fracture of the tip of the lateral malleolus (just below the growth-plate).

In four patients with dislocation of the bone fragments of only 2–3 mm, a closed reduction and cast immobilization was performed. A closed reduction followed by bone fragments fixation was performed in 19 patients. K-wire was the most frequently used means of fracture fixation, in only one case was the screw used.

An open reduction and fracture fixation was performed in 52 patients – in nine cases the screw was employed; in the remaining cases, K-wire fixation was employed. In this group, in 30 cases, periosteal interposition between the bone fragments of a Salter-Harris fracture was diagnosed intra-operatively; four patients should be considered a distinctive sub-group: those patients were qualified for open revision of the fracture after a previously performed closed reduction – the X-ray showed widening of the growth plate, which suggested periosteal interposition (in spite of satisfactory reduction of the bone fragments) and this suspicion was confirmed during open revision.

The data concerning the duration of each operation were obtained through the analysis of the anesthetic files. The majority of the procedures lasted less than an hour (64 operations). In eight cases, the time needed for injury management was between 60 and 90 min. Only three patients did require an operation with the OR-time exceeding 90 min.

The patients with physeal fractures of the lower leg usually did not require prolonged hospitalization. The minimal recorded hospitalization time was two days, while the maximal duration was 14 days and the mean time was 4.65 days. The pre-operative hospitalization time was measured from the moment of admission until the final management of the injury; the recorded values ranged from 0 to 9 days, with the mean value of 0.53 day. The post-operative hospital care duration ranged from 1 to 13 days, with the mean value of 3.29 days.

The bone union was obtained in all the patients. The time required for bone union was measured in weeks from the moment of the final management of the injury to the moment when X-ray showed the stage of bone union suitable for hardware removal. In all the cases of non-surgical treatment, we measured the time needed for obtaining bone union suitable for full weight-bearing. The necessary data were obtained through the analysis of radiologic images and clinical file entries. The time of fracture healing in our study group lasted from 4 to 16 weeks, with the mean time of 5.73 weeks.

Any deviation from the normal course of treatment was considered a complication, with no regard for its impact on the therapeutic outcome. Problems with wound healing were the most frequent complication (five cases). The second most common was a misdiagnosed periosteal interposition that required revision (four cases). Pressure ulcer over the lateral malleolus – an effect of a poorly applied plaster splint – occurred in one patient. In three cases, infection was diagnosed: inflammation in the vicinity of K-wires (two cases) and osteomyelitis resulting in growth-plate arrest (one case).

The follow-up time was measured from the day of the operation until the day of the treatment completion as recorded in the patient's clinical files. All the patients who continued their post-surgical treatment in other medical institutions were excluded from our study group. The shortest follow-up period was nine months, the longest one – two years. The mean follow-up period

from the day of the surgery until the treatment completion was 11.5 months.

Both the radiologic and functional outcomes of the therapeutic process were assessed. The radiologic scores spanned the full spectrum of the employed scale (see: 2.2), with the average score of 4.76.

In the assessment of the functional outcome, the data obtained from the clinical files were expressed in the AOFAS scale [1–3]. The recorded clinical condition of our patients was analyzed and the emerging picture was expressed using the aforementioned scale. With the scores ranging from 82 points to 100 points, the average score was 98.38 points.

#### 4. Discussion

Among our patients, the most frequent cause of the growth-plate fractures of the distal tibia and fibula were sports injuries. The age at the moment of the injury in our study group was nearly 14 years, which is slightly older than the age mentioned in the contemporary literature, i.e. less than 13 years (11.5 and 12.6 years) [5–7].

The diagnosis of the distal tibia growth-plate fractures is based primarily on the X-ray imaging, which – in diagnostically unclear cases – can be supported by CT scans.

It is particularly true in the case of potential involvement of the articular surface, namely in Salter-Harris type III and IV fractures. This is crucial, because – as a rule – articular fractures must be anatomically reduced.[8]. Application of CT scanning in the assessment of the fracture type, range of injury and dislocation pattern is emphasized in the contemporary literature [9,8]. One of the published studies described the assessment of the fracture type based only on X-ray imaging, which was reassessed after CT [9]. It showed that after CT imaging, in 37% of patients, the diagnosis concerning the type of the physal fracture, as well as the magnitude of the dislocation had to be revised. CT scanning resulted in the revised decision about the treatment method as well; the percentage of patients qualified for operation increased from the initial 28% to 65% [9].

The therapeutic protocol employed in our facility is based on the commonly recognized treatment methods for physal fractures

[6]. The indications for treatment that are established and recognized also by other authors are as follows.

If the dislocation does not exceed 2 mm, then immobilization using plaster of Paris is performed; the plaster should reach up into the thigh area. Fractures with bone fragments dislocation greater than 2 mm are qualified for a closed reduction and percutaneous K-wire fixation[10,11]. In case of a failed closed reduction, when dislocation exceeding 2 mm persists, an open reduction and fracture fixation is indicated (Fig. 1).

During radiologic assessment of a closed reduction – especially in type I and II Salter-Harris fractures – attention should be paid not only to the correct reduction of the bone fragments, but also to the width of the growth-plate. In case of any doubts, a comparative X-ray of the unaffected growth-plate should be obtained (Fig. 2).

If the width of the growth-plate after reduction is greater than in the unaffected limb, then a high probability of the interposition of the periosteum should be assumed; in those cases, the periosteum was most probably ripped by the sharp portion of the dislocated metaphysis and then interposed between bone fragments during the attempted reduction of the fracture (Fig. 3). According to some authors, the growth-plate width of 3 mm or more visible on the control X-ray indicates a periosteal interposition and should be regarded as an indication for surgical revision [12]. We share this view (Fig. 3).

In our opinion, even the difficulty in a closed reduction of Salter-Harris fracture of the distal tibial epiphysis (and widening of the growth-plate in spite of an unmistakable successful closed reduction) should be regarded as an indication for surgical revision and open reduction. Therefore, we suggest the following management algorithm (Fig. 4):

Another problem widely discussed in the literature is the probability of the growth-plate arrest. The occurrence of this complication is estimated to be as high as 20%, however, the figure is debatable [5,13]. In our patients, a premature growth-plate arrest occurred only once. After the analysis of our experience, as well as literature reports, we reached a conclusion that it might be caused by particular caution exercised in patients qualified for surgical revision in Salter-Harris type II fractures, in whom the periosteal interposition is not that uncommon and even a correct reduction with existing interposition can cause the growth-plate arrest. The






Fig. 1. Therapeutic indications.



**Fig. 2.** Salter-Harris type II fracture of the distal tibial epiphysis. After reduction and casting, widening of the growth plate contour is visible and therefore, periosteal interposition is suspected.



**Fig. 3.** Intra-operative photograph: interposition of the periosteal flap between bone fragments is visible.



**Fig. 4.** The suggested protocol in Salter-Harris fractures of the distal tibial epiphysis.

following fact should be emphasized: the growth-plate arrest – so much dreaded and usually listed as the first among potential complications of Salter-Harris fractures – in our study group was four times less frequent than the missed periosteal interposition. Even the team proficient in the field of pediatric orthopedics had to re-operate patients with misdiagnosed interposition of the periosteum four times more often than they needed to deal with

the post-traumatic growth-plate arrest – this situation should be reflected on.

## 5. Conclusions

Generally speaking, the correctly conducted therapeutic process in case of the physal fractures in children and adolescents

results in good clinical outcomes [14]. Missed periosteal interposition is a more serious problem than the usually anxiety-provoking post-traumatic growth-plate dysfunction. Even in case of an experienced surgical team, it is more frequent than the growth-plate arrest (with a ratio of 4:1 in our study group). It should be emphasized, however, that an early diagnosis of this complication followed by a prompt surgical intervention allow for avoiding its detrimental effect on the final clinical outcome.

#### Authors statement

Both authors (Marcin Karlikowski, Jerzy Sułko) have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript being submitted. We warrant that the article is our original work, hasn't received prior publication and isn't under consideration for publication elsewhere. During the research and writing of our article no conflict of interest of any kind has occurred – our professional judgement and actions were not affected by any kind of external influence. No external funding of our work was provided – all the work necessary for writing our article was funded only by our personal resources. All the material and data necessary for research and writing of our article was obtained based on permission from appropriate authorities and with respect for code of ethics and legal regulations.

#### References

- [1] Rodrigues RC, Masiero D, Mizusaki JM, et al. Translation, cultural adaptation and validation of the american orthopaedic foot and ankle society's (AOFAS) ankle-Hindfoot scale. *Acta Ortop Bras* 2008;2:107–11.
- [2] Kitaoka HB, Ian J, Alexander IJ, Adelaar RS, et al. Clinical rating systems for the ankle-Hindfoot, midfoot, hallux and lesser toes. *Ankle International* 1994;15:7.
- [3] Nageswaran J, Ganesan GR, Bedford SC. Ankle-Hindfoot scale vs comprehensive SRMC scoring system in acute achilles tendon rupture. *J Foot and Ankle Surg (Asia-Pac)* 2015;2(2):77–9.
- [4] Mac Nealy GA, Rogers LF, Hernandez R, Poznanski AK. Injuries of the distal tibial epiphysis: systematic radiographic evaluation. *Am J Roentgenol* 1982;138(4):683–9.
- [5] Cottalorda J, Béranger V, Louahem D, Camilleri JP, et al. Salter-Harris Type III and IV medial malleolar fractures: growth arrest: is it a fate? A retrospective study of 48 cases with open reduction. *J Pediatr Orthop* 2008;28(6):652–5.
- [6] Cai H, Wang Z, Cai H. Surgical indications for distal tibial epiphyseal fractures in children. *Orthopedics* 2015;38(3):189–95.
- [7] Russo F, Moor MA, Mubarak SJ, et al. Salter-Harris II fractures of the distal tibia: does surgical management reduce the risk of premature physal closure? *J Pediatr Orthop* 2013;33(5):524–9.
- [8] Crawford AH. Triplane and Tillaux fractures: is a 2 mm residual gap acceptable? *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2012;32(1):69–73.
- [9] Nenopoulos A, Beslikas T, Gigis I, et al. The role of CT in diagnosis and treatment of distal tibial fractures with intra-articular involvement in children. *Injury* 2015;46(11):2177–80.
- [10] Inal S, Gök K, Gök A, Pinar AM. Biomechanical effects of three different configurations in Salter Harris Type 3 distal femoral epiphyseal fractures. *J Braz Soc Mech Sci Eng* 2017;39(4):1069–77.
- [11] Gök A, Gök K, Bilgin MB. Three dimensional finite element model of the drilling process used for fixation of salter harris type 3 fractures by using a K-Wire. *Mech Sci* 2015;6:147–54.
- [12] Podeszwa DA, Mubarak SJ. Physal fractures of the distal tibia and fibula (Salter-Harris Type I, II, III, and IV fractures). *J Pediatr Orthop* 2012;32(1):62–8.
- [13] Leary JT, Handling M, Talerico M, et al. Physal fractures of the distal tibia: predictive factors of premature physal closure and growth arrest. *J Pediatr Orthop* 2009;29(4):356–61.
- [14] Gawelowicz K, Rawo T, Kąpiński JW, Czop A. Ocena wyników leczenia złamań nasady dalszej kości piszczelowej u dzieci i młodzieży. XXV Symposium of the Section for Pediatric Orthopedics ?Polish Association for Orthopedics and Trauma.