Finite element comparison of retrograde intramedullary nailing and locking plate fixation with/without an intramedullary allograft for distal femur fracture following total knee arthroplasty
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Abstract
Purpose: Periprosthetic distal femur fracture after total knee arthroplasty due to the stress-shielding phenomenon is a challenging problem. Retrograde intramedullary nail (RIMN) or locking plate (LP) fixation with/without a strut allograft has been clinically used via less invasive stabilization surgery (LISS) for the treatment of these periprosthetic fractures. However, their biomechanical differences in construct stability and implant stress have not been extensively studied, especially for the osteoporotic femur.

Methods: This study used a finite-element method to evaluate the differences between RIMN, LP, and LP/allograft fixation in treating periprosthetic distal femur fractures. There were sixteen variations of two fracture angles (transverse and oblique), two loading conditions (compression and rotation), and four bony conditions (one normal and three osteoporotic). Construct stiffness, fracture micromotion, and implant stress were chosen as the comparison indices.

Results: The LP/allograft construct provides both lateral and middle supports to the displaced femur. Comparatively, the LP and RIMN constructs, respectively, transmit the loads through the lateral and middle paths, thus providing more unstable support to the construct and high stressing on the implants. The fracture pattern plays a minor role in the construct stabilization of the three implants. In general, the biomechanical performances of the RIMN and LP constructs were comparable and significantly inferior to those of the LP/allograft construct. The bone quality should be evaluated prior to the selection of internal fixators.

Conclusions: The LP/allograft construct significantly stabilizes the fracture gap, reduces the implant stress, and serves as the recommended fixation for periprosthetic distal femur fracture.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Distal femur fractures adjacent to total knee arthroplasty (TKA) present a rare and yet complex problem, with an incidence ranging from 0.3% to 2.5% after primary surgery and from 1.6% to 3.8% after revision surgery [1,2]. The occurrence of periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures can be attributed to the stress-shielding effects around the periprosthetic region [3–6]. Successful treatment requires regaining a painless, well aligned knee with a satisfactory range of motion and maintaining good alignment of the entire lower limb.

A wide variety of orthopedic devices had been used for the internal fixation of these fractures including angled blade plates, dynamic condylar plates, buttress plates, and flexible or rigid intramedullary nails [7]. Recently, peritactical locking plate (LP) or retrograde intramedullary nail (RIMN) fixation has become a popular treatment option with the less invasive stabilization system (LISS). The major advantage of LP is the ability to implant them with minimal soft tissue dissection, periosteal stripping, and multiple fixed-angle screws fixation around the fracture site to maintain distal fixation. Rigid RIMN can also be an effective device for minimally invasive stabilization of these fractures, and is considered if the patient has an open box femoral component for device access and adequate distal fracture fragments for locking fixation [8,9].

With unstable nail-bone contact, the construct stability of antegrade nailing for a periprosthetic fracture is weaker than that of the locking plate [10–12]. Comparatively, the retrograde nail makes deeper contact with the subchondral bone and operates in a minimally invasive fashion [13]. Consequently, RIMN has been recommended as an alternative for the treatment of periprosthetic fracture [14–17]. For LP fixation, the multiple points of cortical screws can provide better angular stability and secure bony anchoring for constructing stiffness and preservation of vascular supply [18–21]. However, the stress-shielding effect around the periprosthetic region potentially makes proximal screw loosening a major concern when using LISS plates [10–12,22,23]. Gardner et al. [24]...
used an intramedullary strut allograft to serve as the mechanical sup-
port supplemented to the LISS plate (LP/allograft) fixation, and declared
that the hybrid use of LP/allograft can significantly stabilize the con-
struct and facilitate the bony union. However, the complication rate is
still 15–20% due to nonunion, malunion, infection, hardware failure or
mortality even after RIMN or LP fixation for distal femur fractures fol-
lowing TKA [16,17,20,22,24]. However, biomechanical comparisons
among RIMN, LP, and LP/allograft have not been extensively
investigated.

Therefore, this study used the finite-element method to compare
the construct behaviour subject to the variations of three internal fix-
ations, two loading conditions, two fracture patterns, and four bony
strengths. The convergence and stiffness of the intact model was val-
idated. Then, the construct behaviour was evaluated in terms of con-
struct stiffness, fracture micromotion, and implant stress. The
purposes of this study provide biomechanical information about
the differences among RIMN, LP, and LP/allograft, and point to
which one should be indicated individually for various types of
periprosthetic fractures following TKA. This study hypothesized that
LP/allograft construct significantly stabilized fracture gap, reduced
implant stress, and is potentially suitable for the treatment of
periprosthetic distal femur fracture with comminution, deficient
bone stock, and severe osteoporosis.

2. Methods

This study used the abbreviations LP and RIMN to denote the
periarticular locking plate and retrograde intramedullary nail. The
LP, RIMN, and LP/allograft fixations were compared in terms of two
fracture patterns: transverse (TP, TN, and TA) and oblique (OP, ON,
and OA). The femoral strengths were simulated by the three osteopo-
rotic conditions: ost-1 (mild), ost-2 (moderate), ost-3 (severe).

2.1. Models of femur and implants

A femoral model was developed from the CT-scanned images of a
mild-aged male (age: 45 years, weight: 60 kg, and height: 176 cm).
The femur consists of cortical shell and cancellous core (Fig. 1a and
b). Periprosthetic fracture was simulated as a displaced 1-cm gap
that is the worst-case condition for transferring the femoral loads
(Fig. 1c and d). This study used two patterns of the periprosthetic
fractures (transverse and oblique) to evaluate the effects of the frac-
ture pattern on the construct stability. Prior to instrumentation, the
intact femur was validated by comparing the predicted stiffness
with the experimental data of Koval’s study [25]. This study used
ANSYS version 12.0 (ANSYS Inc., USA) to perform construct stiffness
analysis. The mesh size of the intact femur was determined by a con-
vergence test of the construct stiffness vs. element number.

Three implants were instrumented into the fractured femur, in-
cluding a knee prosthesis, RIMN, and LISS plate (Fig. 1). The knee
prosthesis was a Zimmer Natural-Knee II PS (Zimmer Inc., Indiana,
USA). The RIMN was 10 mm in diameter and 240 mm in length
(TRIGEN, Smith and Nephew, USA). The LISS plate was 240 mm in
length and 3 mm in thickness (AO Synthes, Pennsylvania, USA). The
outer diameter, inner diameter, and length of the allografts were 17,
10, and 60 mm, respectively. All implants were instrumented into
the femoral models according to standard surgical procedure.

A 9-hole LISS plate was fixed to the distal femur with five proximal
and six distal cortical screws according to the manufacturer’s instruc-
tions (Figs. 1 and 2). The RIMN was secured by two proximal and two
distal interlocking screws. For the LISS plate with an allograft, the
allograft was fixed using distal locking screws without penetrating the
allograft surface. The allograft was secured against the medial cortex
of the femur to ensure maximal medial support (Fig. 2c). In total,
there were six variations of three implants and two fracture patterns
(Fig. 2).

Fig. 1. Internal fixators and fracture patterns used in this study. (A) Retrograde nailing. (B) LISS plating. (C) Transverse fracture. (D) Oblique fracture.
2.2. Finite-element analysis

Four bone conditions were used to simulate osteoporosis around the supracondylar region. Normal cases denoted healthy bone above and below the fracture gap. The bone modulus of the ost-1 and ost-3 was decreased by 33% and 86% for cortical bone and 66% and 86% for cancellous bone, respectively [26–29]. For the ost-2 case, the decayed moduli of the cortical and cancellous bones were the same as those of the ost-1 and the degeneration of the distal bones was similar to that of the ost-3. In general, the ost-2 was the most common condition of the implant-induced osteoporosis at the periprosthetic region [26]. The material properties of the bones and implants were assumed to be isotropic and linearly elastic, as shown in Table 1. The calculated von Mises stresses of all implants were compared with the yielding strength of the corresponding material to validate the assumption of linear elasticity.

The threads of the cortical screws and plate holes were omitted to simplify finite-element analysis. The contact behavior of the screw/bone and screw/plate interfaces was set as fully bonded to ensure the load transmission from the femur to the implant. However, friction coefficients of the nail/bone, allograft/bone, and screw/allograft were 0.08, 0.3, and 0.8, respectively [30,31].

Two types of knee loads, compression and rotation were applied at the knee condyles (Fig. 3). The compression simulated a one-leg standing condition of a subject weighing about 50-kg. 60% of the 500-N compression was distributed to the medial condyle and the remaining was exerted on the lateral condyle (Fig. 3a) [32]. During walking, the screw-home mechanism induces the rotation moment at the knee joint (Fig. 3b). For rotation, a 6-Nm torque was applied to the distal femur and the surface nodes of the proximal femur were fully constrained [33]. The construct stability was monitored in terms of axial and rotational micromotion at the fracture gap. The axial micromotion was defined as the height change in the points aa (lateral), bb (middle), and cc (medial) (Fig. 3c). The rotation of the proximal and distal femora was measured as the rotational micromotion. The changes in the inclined angles between the lines dd and ee were projected along the same line onto the lower and upper surfaces of the fracture gap (Fig. 3c).

3. Results

3.1. Model validation

Fig. 4 showed the validation of the current study in terms of result convergence and construct stiffness. The construct stiffness was defined as the ratio of the vertical displacement at the medial points cc to the applied loads (Fig. 3c). During validation of construct stiffness, the intact femur was subject to the same loads as in Koval’s study [25] and the experiment test. The construct stiffness converged to 1,226 N/mm until the element number reached about 72,000. The element size was set as 3 mm in this study, except at the bone/implant interfaces (Fig. 4a). For the convergent stiffness, the error of our study and Koval’s study was only 0.3% (Fig. 4b). This indicates that good agreement was achieved and the intact femur was validated for further analyses.

3.2. Construct stiffness

Comparisons between the axial stiffness of the different constructs are shown in Fig. 5a. Except for the ost-3 bone, the TA construct significantly provided the highest stiffness. The stiffness values of the TP and TN constructs were comparable under all bone conditions. For the normal bone, the stiffness of the TA construct was about 95% higher than those of the TP and TN constructs. For the ost-1 bones, the stiffness difference between the TA construct and the other counterparts was reduced to 45% on average. For the ost-2 bones, the stiffness of the TA construct was 57% and 29% higher than those of the TP and TN constructs. For the ost-3 bone, the TA and TN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Elastic Modulus (MPa)</th>
<th>Poisson's Ratio (dimensionless)</th>
<th>Yield Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortical Shell</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellous Core</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ost-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortical Shell</td>
<td>8308</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellous Core</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ost-2 upper part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortical Shell</td>
<td>8308</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellous Core</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ost-2 lower part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[3,26–28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortical Shell</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellous Core</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ost-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[26–28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortical Shell</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellous Core</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixators</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knee prostheses</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allograft</td>
<td>12400</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Boundary and loading conditions of the femoral models. (A) Compression. (B) Rotation. (C) Five lines from a to e were used to calculate the axial and rotational micromotion of the fracture gap.

Fig. 4. (A) Convergence test of the intact model. (B) Stiffness comparison between this study and previous studies.
constructs exhibited comparable stiffness and were slightly stiffer than the TP construct. On average, the stiffness of the ost-1 construct was 12%, 139% higher than that of the ost-2 and ost-3 constructs, respectively. The results of the oblique and transverse fractures were similar.

Fig. 5b shows the results of rotational stiffness for the different constructs. Similar to axial stiffness, fracture pattern plays a minor role in rotational stiffness. Under all bone conditions, the TA construct was the stiffest, followed by the TP construct, and the TN construct was the weakest. However, the rotational stiffness of the ost-3 condition was comparable among all three implants. For all implants, the construct stiffness of the ost-1 condition was the highest and the ost-3 condition was the least. On average, the construct stiffness of the ost-1 condition was 8% higher than that of ost-2. However, the stiffness difference between the ost-1 and ost-3 conditions increased to 93%.

3.3. Fracture micromotion

The axial and rotational stability was evaluated by the fracture micromotion, as shown in Fig. 6. The results of the axial and rotational micromotions were similar for the transverse and oblique fractures. For the axial loading, the lateral gap of the TN construct was the most unstable and the micromotion of the TA construct was the least unstable (Fig. 6a). Under normal and ost-2 conditions, the micromotion of the TP construct was respectively 80% and 152% higher than the other counterparts (Fig. 6c). For the rotational micromotion, the TA construct provided the highest fracture-stabilizing ability in comparison to the other implants. For the rotational loading, the micromotion of the TA construct was consistently lower than those of the TN and TA constructs. For the rotational loading, the micromotion of the TA construct was comparable for all bone conditions and consistently higher than those of the TP and TA constructs (Fig. 6d). For the normal and ost-2 bones, the rotational micromotion of the TN construct was respectively 1.91 and 2.83 times those of the TP and TA constructs.

3.4. Implant stress

Fig. 7 shows the comparison of maximum von Mises stress among the implants instrumented into the ost-2 bone. For axial and rotational loading, the sequence of the implant stresses was similar among transverse and oblique fractures. For the axial loading, the stress value of the TP construct was respectively 22% and 132% higher than those of the TN and TA constructs (Fig. 7a). For all implants, the maximum stresses of all implants consistently occurred around the fracture sites. For the rotational loading, the stress of the TN construct was 27% and 90% higher than those of the TP and TA construct, respectively. The TP and TA implants were highly stressed at the plate holes proximal to the fracture gap. The highest stress of the TN construct occurred at the second proximal screw (Fig. 7a).

4. Discussion

From the biomechanical viewpoint, the RIMN, LP, and LP/allograft were the representatives of the middle, lateral, and middle/lateral support to the femur, respectively (Fig. 1). Fig. 8 schematically shows the load-transferring paths from the knee condyles to the proximal femur: through plate (line pp), nail (line nn), and allograft (line gg). The implant-induced support to the displaced femur was evaluated in terms of construct stiffness, fracture micromotion, and implant stress in this study. Without bony union, this study aimed
to compare the construct stability of the three implants within the immediate postoperative period.

For construct stability, the LP/allograft construct exhibited the highest stiffness and the least micromotion (Figs. 5 and 6). This can be attributed to the reason that the knee loads of the LP/allograft construct are transferred through the paths of lines pp and gg (Fig. 8a and c). Although Schutz's and Ricci's studies claim that only the LISS plate can provide stable fixation for the periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures [19,34], this study demonstrated that the allograft can partially transmit the knee loads to the proximal femur and decrease the moment arm between the allograft and condyles (Fig. 8c). This reduced the mechanical demands of the lateral LISS and made the LP/allograft more stable and less stressed. For the axial stiffness, the lateral plate and middle nail provided comparable stiffness (Fig. 5a). For the RIMN construct, the RIMN was approximately in the position of the femoral axis and was inefficiently resistant to the rotational loads. This can explain why the rotational stiffness and micromotion of the RIMN construct were comparable (Figs. 5a and 6c). This finding was similar to the result of the Bong's and Hou's studies [32,37] where the RIMN and LP provided similar fixation of fractures without significant comminution. However, the rotational stiffness and micromotion were still significantly different, except for with the osteoporotic bones (Figs. 5b and 6a-d). This can be explained by the fact that the RIMN provides inefficient rotation-resisting ability to the displaced femur. In Heiney's study [38], the RIMN also showed superior ability to stabilize the fracture over the locking compression plate under different magnitudes of axial loading.

After surgery, this study revealed that the fracture patterns have little effect on the construct stiffness, fracture micromotion, and implant stress from the axial and rotational loadings (Figs. 5–7). This can be explained by the fact that the fracture fragments were displaced by 1-cm gap and the load-transferring function of the fracture gap was assumed to be totally disabled (Fig. 1). Under such circumstances, the biomechanical behaviors of the femoral construct were determined by the implant properties. This study further showed that the axial stiffness and medial micromotion of the RIMN and LP constructs were comparable (Figs. 5a and 6c). This finding was similar to the result of the Bong's and Hou's studies [32,37] where the RIMN and LP provided similar fixation of fractures without significant comminution. However, the rotational stiffness and micromotion were still significantly different, except for with the osteoporotic bones (Figs. 5b and 6a-d). This can be explained by the fact that the RIMN provides inefficient rotation-resisting ability to the displaced femur. In Heiney’s study [38], the RIMN also showed superior ability to stabilize the fracture over the locking compression plate under different magnitudes of axial loading.
loosening at the screw/plate and screw/bone interfaces were not simulated due to the convergence problem of the highly nonlinear analysis. If the back-out of the screws from the plate and bone occurs, the instability of the entire construct might reduce the biomechanical difference between the three fixations. However, this should be further investigated by experimental rather than numerical methods due to the fact of interfacial nonlinearity.

For the ost-3 bone, the axial and rotational stiffness of the TP, TN, and TA construct were comparable (Fig. 5). However, the stiffness differences between the TA and TN constructs were about 93% (axial) and 139% (rotational) for the normal bone. For micromotion, bone quality had a minor effect on the RIMN in comparison to other constructs (Fig. 6). This was attributed to the two fixation mechanisms: screws and plate. For the screw fixation, the LP screws were fully inserted into the cancellous bone and only two ends of the RIMN screws were fixed at the cortical bone. This makes the mechanical support of the LP screws more sensitive to the decay of the bone quality when compared with the nail screws. Lin et al. showed that the nail-cancellous contact plays a minor role in maintaining the construct stability with the supracondylar region [39]. Consequently, the deflection of the lateral plate relies more on the structural properties of the distal femur than on the nail. This indicates that quality verification of the periprosthetic bone is essential prior to internal fixation [28].

In conclusion, bone quality is one of the key factors when treating periprosthetic supracondylar fractures. Compared with the LP/allograft construct, the LP and RIMN constructs provided more comparable performance. However, the mechanical failure of highly stressed LP and RIMN is one the major concerns for osteoporotic and overweight patients. The use of the LP/allograft significantly stabilizes the fracture gap and reduces the implant stress, making it potentially suitable for the treatment of periprosthetic distal femur fractures.

Fig. 7. Comparison of the maximum implant stress under (A) Compression (B) Rotation.

Fig. 8. Schematical diagrams showing load-transferring paths from the distal to proximal femurs. (A) The LP contact, line pp. (B) The nailing construct, line nn. (C) The LP/allograft construct, line gg.
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