

## **Comparison of outcomes of Long versus Short Cephalomedullary nails for the fixation of intertrochanteric femur fractures: A Protocol for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis**

### **Contributors**

1. Rajesh Kumar Rajnish, Assistant professor, Department of Orthopaedics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Jodhpur, India.
2. Amit Srivastava, Assistant professor, Department of Orthopaedics, University College of Medical Sciences and GTB Hospital, Delhi, India.
3. Prasoon Kumar, Assistant professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, India
4. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Assistant professor, Department of Orthopaedics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Jodhpur, India.
5. Siddhartha Sharma, Associate professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, India
6. Rehan Ul Haq, Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Bhopal, India.
7. Aditya Nath Aggarwal, Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, University College of Medical Sciences and GTB Hospital, Delhi, India.

**Amendments:** None

**Conflicts of Interest:** None

**Sources of Support/Funding:** None

**Contributions:** ANA, AS, RUH, and PK contributed in protocol conceptualization and gave critical inputs to formulate the protocol. RKR and SS planned the search strategy for literature. SKY and RKR wrote the manuscript, and RKR proofread it. Finally, this review protocol was approved by all the authors as the final version of the protocol for publication.

**Correspondence to:** Dr. Rajesh Kumar Rajnish, Department of Orthopedics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Jodhpur, India. 342005

Email: [duktiraj@gmail.com](mailto:duktiraj@gmail.com)

## **Comparison of outcomes of Long versus Short Cephalomedullary nails for the fixation of intertrochanteric femur fractures: A Protocol for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis**

### **Abstract**

**Background:** The incidence of intertrochanteric femur fracture (IFF) in the elderly has increased with increased life expectancy globally. These fractures require surgeries at the earliest to bring them out of bed and minimize the complications of recumbency, like decubitus ulcers, decreased cardiopulmonary reserves, and thromboembolic events. Dynamic hip screws and Cephalomedullary nails (CMN) are both considered adequate for the internal fixation of the stable IFF with comparable stability and outcomes. However, CMNs are considered to have better results in unstable IFF fixation.

**Objective:** To compare the outcomes of internal fixation of short CMN versus long CMN of IFF in the elderly by analyzing the evidence from the current literature.

**Methods:** A systematic review and meta-analysis will be performed in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines. A primary search of Medline, Embase, Scopus, and Cochrane Library databases will be conducted using a pre-defined search strategy. The studies of any design in the English language will be included, which have compared the outcomes of the internal fixation of short CMN versus long CMN of the IFF and reported at least one primary or secondary outcome of interest.

Studies that did not compare the outcomes of the internal fixation of short CMN versus long CMN of the IFF, conference abstracts, posters, case reports, book chapters, technical tips, review articles, biomechanical studies, cadaveric studies, and the articles not in the English language will be excluded.

Both qualitative and quantitative analyses will be performed. A qualitative analysis will be performed using appropriate tables and diagrams. Wherever feasible, quantitative analysis will be done with the appropriate software. The risk-of-bias assessment for non-randomized comparative studies will be done using the MINORS tool, and the Cochrane Collaboration's risk-of-bias tool will be used for randomized control trials (RCT).

**Keywords:** Intertrochanteric femur fracture; Pertrochanteric fracture; Hip fracture; Intramedullary; Cephalomedullary nail

## **1. Background**

The incidence of IFF in the elderly has increased with increased life expectancy globally. [1] The majority of elderly patients have some or the other medical co-morbidities, which can potentially increase the associated morbidity and mortality in these patients. [2] These fractures require surgeries at the earliest to bring them out of bed and minimize the complications of recumbency, like decubitus ulcers, decreased cardiopulmonary reserves, and thromboembolic events. It has been documented that surgery delays for hip fractures lead to increased mortality in the elderly. [3]

Both dynamic hip screws (DHS) and CMN are considered adequate for the fixation of the stable IFF with comparable stability and outcomes. [4] However, the adequacy of DHS in the fixation of unstable IFF is relatively inferior to CMN [5] and often leads to complications like loss of reduction, implant failure, or lag screw cut out [6]. The CMNs have shown better results in unstable IFF fixation and are considered more reliable. [7]

In terms of design, although both short and long CMNs are suitable for the fixation of IFF, the use of short CMNs has reported advantages of shorter surgical duration, lesser intraoperative blood loss, and blood transfusion. [8] On the other hand, long CMNs have the theoretical advantage of minimizing stress concentration near the distal end of the nail, hence potentially decreasing the occurrence of secondary fractures of the shaft femur [9]. However, the superiority of one design over the other has been a matter of debate despite multiple studies in the literature. [8-10]

## **2. Need for review**

There is a lack of clarity regarding the superiority of short CMN over the long CMN fixation of IFF in elderly patients. There are published reviews on the current topic, however, with a limited number of articles and outcomes. [8-11] Hence, further analysis is needed for the evidence of the superiority of one implant over another, including a maximum number of published studies. Therefore, the current review aims to perform a systematic review and meta-analysis of the current literature to compare the outcomes of IFF internal fixation with short CMN versus long CMN.

## **3. Objectives**

### **Primary Objectives:**

- i) To compare the primary outcomes like ipsilateral shaft femur re-fractures, and mortality following internal fixation of IFF with short CMN versus long CMN.

### **Secondary Objective:**

- i) Additionally, to compare implant-related complications, overall complications, intra-operative blood loss, duration of surgery, re-operation rates, blood transfusion required, lengths of hospital stay, and fluoroscopy time.

#### 4. PICO framework for the study

- i) *Participants:* Human adults with intertrochanteric femur fractures
- ii) *Intervention:* Internal fixation with short CMN
- iii) *Control:* Internal fixation with long CMN
- iv) *Outcomes:* the primary outcome will be ipsilateral shaft femur re-fractures and mortality. Secondary outcomes will be implant-related complications, overall complications, re-operation rates, duration of surgery, intra-operative blood loss, blood transfusion required, lengths of hospital stay, and fluoroscopy time.

#### 5. Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis will be performed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines. [12] A protocol for the review was formulated and registered to the PROSPERO database vide registration number CRD42023390520.

- i) Review Protocol: A protocol for the review will be formulated 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 compare the outcomes of the internal fixation of short CMN versus long CMN of internal fixation of IFF and report at least one primary or secondary outcome of the review. Studies that do not compare the outcomes of the internal fixation of short CMN versus long CMN of the IFF, 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.
- ii) Information Sources & Literature search: A primary literature search will be conducted on the Medline, Embase, Scopus, and Cochrane Library databases, using pre-defined search strings of keywords “(*intertrochanteric AND fracture OR (perthrochanteric AND fracture) OR 'hip fracture'*) AND '*intramedullary nail' OR 'cephalomedullary nail' OR 'cephalomedullary nail.'*” A manual secondary search of the bibliography of the full text of all included articles and relevant review articles will be conducted. Articles published from the year 2000 till the date of the search will be included.

iii) 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 excluding those articles for which full text was obtained will be documented. Any discrepancies in the article selection process will be resolved by mutual agreement.

v) Data Collection & Data Items: Data will be extracted on pre-formed data collection forms by two authors independently, and a third author will cross-check the data for accuracy. Baseline data items will include:

1. Name of authors and year of publication
2. Number of patients/cases
3. Study design
4. Type of CMN used
5. Number of patients in each group
6. Mean age
7. Gender ratio
8. Fracture classification
9. Mean follow up
10. Primary and Secondary outcomes

vi) 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 ipsilateral shaft femur re-fractures, and mortality. The secondary outcomes of interest will be implant-related complications, overall complications, re-operation rates, duration of surgery, intra-operative blood loss, blood transfusion required, lengths of hospital stay, and fluoroscopy time.

vii) Data Analysis and Synthesis: A qualitative data synthesis will be performed with appropriate tables and data visualization diagrams. The quantitative synthesis will be performed if  $\geq 2$  studies included in this review reported the values of either the primary or secondary outcomes of interest. To describe the measure of treatment effects, the mean difference will be used for continuous variables, and the odds ratio will be used for dichotomous variables. All the results will be expressed along with 95% confidence intervals. Forest plots will be made to visualize the results in diagrammatic representation. The statistical heterogeneity will be determined by using the I-square test. Reasons for clinical heterogeneity, if any, will be explored. If the heterogeneity is low (I-square value near 0%) fixed-effects model otherwise, the random effects model will be used. If possible, subgroup analysis will be performed. Publication bias will

be estimated and will be shown with a funnel plot using one of the primary outcomes. Meta-analysis will be performed by using Review Manager Software version 5.4. [13]

viii) Assessment of Risk of Bias: The risk-of-bias assessment will be done using the MINORS tool for the non-randomized comparative studies [14], and the Cochrane Collaboration's risk-of-bias tool [15] will be used for randomized control trials.

## 6. References

1. Gullberg B, Johnell O, Kanis JA. World-wide projections for hip fracture. *Osteoporos Int.* 1997; 7(5):407-13.
2. Endo Y, Aharonoff GB, Zuckerman JD, Egol KA, Koval KJ. Gender differences in patients with hip fracture: a greater risk of morbidity and mortality in men. *J Orthop Trauma.* 2005;19(1):29-35.
3. Uzoigwe CE, Burnand HG, Cheesman CL, Aghedo DO, Faizi M, Middleton RG. Early and ultra-early surgery in hip fracture patients improves survival. *Injury.* 2013;44(6):726-9.
4. Whale CS, Hulet DA, Beebe MJ, Rothberg DL, Zhang C, Presson AP, et al. Cephalomedullary nail versus sliding hip screw for fixation of AO 31 A1/2 intertrochanteric femoral fracture: a 12-year comparison of failure, complications, and mortality. *Curr Orthop Pract.* 2016;27(6):604-13.
5. Palm H, Jacobsen S, Sonne-Holm S, Gebuhr P, Hip Fracture Study Group. Integrity of the lateral femoral wall in intertrochanteric hip fractures: an important predictor of a reoperation. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2007; 89(3):470-5.
6. Mohan R, Karthikeyan R, Sonanis SV. Dynamic hip screw: does side make a difference? Effects of clockwise torque on right and left DHS. *Injury.* 2000; 31(9):697-9.
7. Anglen JO, Weinstein JN, American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery Research Committee. Nail or plate fixation of intertrochanteric hip fractures: changing pattern of practice. *A*

- review of the American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery Database. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2008; 90:700-7.
8. Dunn J, Kusnezov N, Bader J, Waterman BR, Orr J, Belmont PJ. Long versus short cephalomedullary nail for trochanteric femur fractures (OTA 31-A1, A2 and A3): a systematic review. *J Orthop Traumatol.* 2016;17(4):361-7.
  9. Sohatee, M. and Bennet, J. 'A systematic review of short versus long intramedullary fixation in the management of pertrochanteric fractures', *Trauma.* 2018; 20(3):161-8.
  10. Page PRJ, Poole WEC, Shah K, Upadhyay PK. Short or long intramedullary devices for hip fracture? A systematic review of the evidence. *J Orthop.* 2020 Aug 29;22:377-382.
  11. Cinque ME, Goodnough LH, Md BJS, Fithian AT, DeBaun M, Lucas JF, Md MJG, Bishop JA. Short versus long cephalomedullary nailing of intertrochanteric fractures: a meta-analysis of 3208 patients. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2022 Jul;142(7):1367-1374.
  12. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6(7):e1000097.
  13. Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.4, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2020.
  14. Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D, Kwiatkowski F, Panis Y, Chipponi J. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (minors): development and validation of a new instrument. *ANZ J Surg.* 2003; 73(9):712-6.
  15. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. Cochrane Bias Methods Group Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011; 343: d5928.

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\*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Page Number
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</b>			
Title:		Comparison of outcomes of Long versus Short Cephalomedullary nails for the fixation of intertrochanteric femur fractures: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis	1,2
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1,2
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	NA
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	4
Authors:		Rajesh Kumar Rajnish, Amit Srivastava, Prasoon Kumar, Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Rehan Ul Haq, Aditya Nath Aggarwal	1
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	1
Amendments	4	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	NA
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	1
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	1
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	None
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	3
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	4
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	8	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	4
Information sources	9	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	4
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	4
Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	5
Selection	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent	5

process		reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	
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	5
Data items	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	5
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	5
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	6
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	5
	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 $\tau$ )	5
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	5
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	5
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	5
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Not Planned

**\* 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.**

*From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.*