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Ilioinguinal versus modified Stoppa approach for open reduction and internal fixation of displaced acetabular fractures: A Protocol for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Abstract

Background:
The fracture of the acetabulum is one of the most challenging fractures to manage and operate for orthopaedic surgeons. To get a good surgical outcome, anatomical reduction of fractures and reconstruction of the joint is of utmost importance. To achieve a good postoperative outcome an appropriate surgical approach is necessary to achieve an anatomical reduction of fractures and fewer complications.

Objective: The current review aims to compare the outcomes of the ilioinguinal versus modified Stoppa approach for open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) of displaced acetabular fractures by analyzing the evidence from the current literature.

Methods:

A systematic review of the literature will be conducted in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines. The primary searches will be conducted on the Medline (PubMed), Embase, Scopus, and Cochrane Library databases, using a pre-defined search strategy. The studies of any design in the English language will be included which compared the outcomes of the ilioinguinal and modified Stoppa approach for ORIF of displaced acetabular fractures and reported at least one outcome of interest. Studies that do not compare the outcomes of the ilioinguinal and modified Stoppa approach for the treatment of displaced acetabular fractures in adults (>18 years of age), case reports, conference abstracts, posters, book chapters, review articles, biomechanical studies, technical tips, cadaveric studies, and articles not in the English language will be excluded. Both qualitative and quantitative analyses will be done. Qualitative analysis will be done using appropriate tables and diagrams. Wherever feasible, quantitative analysis to be done with the appropriate software. The risk-of-bias assessment will be done using the MINORS tool for the non-randomized comparative studies, and The Cochrane Collaboration’s risk-of-bias tool will be used for randomized control trials.
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1. Background

Acetabulum fracture is one of the most challenging intraarticular fractures to manage and operate for orthopaedic surgeons, to get a good surgical outcome, anatomical reduction of fractures and reconstruction of the joint are of utmost importance. [1] To achieve this an appropriate surgical approach is necessary to minimize complications. [2,3]

The iliopsoas approach is widely used for the fixation of the pelvis and acetabular fractures, it has been found effective in approaching most of the anterior acetabular fracture patterns. [3-5] However, this exposure is a quite extensive approach and poses risk to the neurovascular structures present in proximity, and other soft tissue related complications. [5-7] While the modified Stoppa intrapelvic approach is considered to be less invasive, avoids the middle window of the iliopsoas approach and gives better exposure of the quadrilateral plate, medial wall of the acetabulum, and sacroiliac joint. This approach requires identification of the corona mortis and its ligation to prevent excessive bleeding, however, there is a risk of the obturator nerve and superior gluteal artery injury. [8-9]

2. Need for review

There are several published literature that compared the clinical outcome and complications of the iliopsoas and modified Stoppa approach however only a few authors have conducted a systematic review or meta-analysis to compare the outcome of the approaches. [10-12] Therefore, the current review aims to perform a systematic review and meta-analysis from current literature to compare the outcomes of the iliopsoas versus modified Stoppa approach for ORIF of the anterior pelvic ring and acetabular fractures.

3. Objectives

Primary Objectives:

i) To compare the primary outcomes like duration of surgery, anatomical reduction quality, total and individual complications for the iliopsoas and modified Stoppa approach used for the ORIF of displaced acetabular fractures.

Secondary Objective:

i) Additionally, to compare the intraoperative blood loss, and clinical outcomes for both the surgical approaches.

4. PICO framework for the study

i) Participants: a human subject with displaced acetabulum fractures
ii) Intervention: Ilioinguinal approach for the open reduction and internal fixation of acetabulum fracture

iii) Control: modified Stoppa approach for the open reduction and internal fixation of acetabulum fracture

iv) Outcomes: The primary outcomes of interest will be the mean duration of surgery, anatomical reduction quality, total and individual complications (vascular injury, nerve injury, infection, and heterotopic ossification). The secondary outcomes of interest will be intraoperative blood loss and clinical outcomes.

5. Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis will be conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis guidelines (PRISMA). [13]

i) Review Protocol: A protocol of the review will be formulated in priority in accordance with the PRISMA-P guidelines. (Appendix I)

ii) Eligibility Criteria: The studies of any design in the English language will be included that compared the outcomes of the ilioinguinal approach and modified Stoppa approach for the treatment of displaced acetabular fractures and reported at least one outcome of interest. Studies that do not compare the outcomes of the ilioinguinal and modified Stoppa approach for the treatment of acetabular fractures in adults (>18 years of age), case reports, conference abstracts, posters, book chapters, review articles, biomechanical studies, technical tips, cadaveric studies, and articles not in the English language will be excluded.

iii) Information Sources & Literature search: A primary literature search will be conducted on the Medline (PubMed), Embase, Scopus, and Cochrane Library databases, using a pre-defined search strategy (Table-I). A manual secondary search of references from the full-text of all included articles and relevant review articles will be conducted. There will be no initial restrictions on the date or language of publication.

iv) Study Selection:

All the identified articles will be screened through titles and abstracts for eligibility independently by three authors. After initial screening, full texts of all selected articles will be obtained. Eligible articles will be sorted as per the prespecified inclusion and exclusion criteria. The reasons for the exclusion of those articles for which full-text was obtained will be documented. Any discrepancies in the article selection process will be resolved by mutual agreement.
Data Collection & Data Items: Data will be extracted on pre-formed data collection forms by two authors independently, a third author will cross-check the data for accuracy. Baseline data items will include:

- Name of the authors and year of publication
- Number of patients/cases
- Study design
- Surgical approach used
- Number of patients in each group
- Mean age of the patients
- Sex of the patients
- Mean follow up
- Primary outcomes and
- Secondary outcomes of interest.

Outcome Measures: The following outcome measures will be evaluated however addition and/or modifications will be made if needed:

- The primary outcomes of interest will be the mean duration of surgery, anatomical reduction quality, total and individual complications (vascular injury, nerve injury, infection, and heterotopic ossification).
- The secondary outcomes of interest will be intraoperative blood loss and clinical outcomes.

Data Analysis and Synthesis:

Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis will be performed. For qualitative data analysis, appropriate tables and data visualization diagrams will be used. Quantitative analysis will be performed if ≥ 2 studies included in this review, reported the values of either of the primary or secondary outcomes of interest. To describe the measure of treatment effects, the mean difference will be used for continuous variables, and odds ratio will be used for dichotomous variables. All the results will be expressed along with 95% confidence intervals. Forest plots will be constructed to visualize the results. The statistical heterogeneity will be determined by using the I² test. Reasons for clinical heterogeneity, if any, will be explored. If the heterogeneity was low (I² <75%) fixed-effects model, otherwise the random-effects model (I² >75%) will be used. Meta-analysis will be performed by using Review Manager Software version 5.4. [14]
Assessment of Risk of Bias: The risk-of-bias assessment will be done using the MINORS tool for the non-randomized comparative studies [15], and the Cochrane Collaboration’s risk of bias tool [16] will be used for randomized control trials
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**Table 1: Search Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embase</strong></td>
<td>(ALL (acetabular AND fracture) OR ALL (acetabulum AND fracture) AND ALL (ilioinguinal AND approach) AND ALL (stoppa AND approach))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scopus</strong></td>
<td>(ALL (acetabular AND fracture) OR ALL (acetabulum AND fracture) AND ALL (ilioinguinal AND approach) AND ALL (stoppa AND approach))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cochrane Library</strong></td>
<td>acetabular fracture in All Text OR acetabulum fracture in All Text AND ilioinguinal approach in All Text AND stoppa approach in All Text - (Word variations have been searched)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1: PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section and topic</th>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Checklist item</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Ilioinguinal versus modified modified Stoppa approach for open reduction and internal fixation of displaced acetabular fractures: A Protocol for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amit Srivastava, Rajesh Kumar Rajnish, Prasoon Kumar, Rehan Ul Haq, Ish Kumar Dhammi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of sponsor or funder</td>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility criteria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search strategy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated</td>
<td>Table 1, Page 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study records: Data management</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection process</td>
<td>11b</td>
<td>State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data collection process
11c Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data items</th>
<th>12 List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and prioritization</td>
<td>13 List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risk of bias in individual studies
14 Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis

### Data synthesis
15a Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised

| 15b | If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as \( I^2 \), Kendall’s \( \tau \)) |
| 15c | Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression) |
| 15d | If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned |

### Meta-bias(es)
16 Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)

### Confidence in cumulative evidence
17 Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)

* It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.