

1 **Buried or Exposed Kirschner Wire for the Management of Hand and**
2 **Forearm Fractures: A Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Meta-**
3 **Regression**

4 Nucki Nursjamsi Hidajat¹, RM. Satrio Nugroho Magetsari¹, Gregorius Thomas Prasetyo¹,
5 Danendra Rakha Putra Respati², Kevin Christian Tjandra^{2*}

6

7 ¹Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Faculty of Medicine Universitas Padjadjaran,
8 Bandung, Indonesia

9 ²Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

10

11 ***Corresponding author:** Kevin Christian Tjandra; Department of Medicine, Faculty of
12 Medicine, Universitas Diponegoro; Jl. Prof. Sudarto, Tembalang, Kec. Tembalang, Kota
13 Semarang, Jawa Tengah 50275

14 Email: kevinchristian2841@gmail.com

15

16 **Abstract**

17 **Background:** The recommendation on whether to bury or expose the Kirschner wire (K-wire)
18 for the management of fractures has still been controversial with inconsistent results in the
19 published studies. This study aims to summarize the comparison between buried and exposed
20 K-wire for the management of hand and forearm fractures.

21 **Methods:** We conducted relevant literature searches on Europe PMC, Medline, Scopus, and
22 Cochrane Library databases using specific keywords. The results of continuous variables were
23 pooled into the standardized mean difference (SMD), while dichotomous variables were pooled
24 into odds ratio (OR) along with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) using random-effect
25 models.

26 **Results:** A total of 11 studies were included. Our pooled analysis revealed that buried K-wire
27 was associated with a lower risk of pin site infection [RR 0.49 (95% CI 0.36 – 0.67), $p <$
28 0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$] and longer duration until pin removal [MD 33.85 days (95% CI 18.68 –
29 49.02), $p < 0.0001$, $I^2 = 99\%$] when compared with exposed K-wire. However, the duration of
30 surgery was significantly longer in the buried K-wire [MD 6.98 minutes (95% CI 2.19 – 11.76),
31 $p = 0.004$, $I^2 = 42\%$] with no significant difference in the early pin removal rate [RR 0.73 (95%
32 CI 0.36 – 1.45), $p = 0.37$, $I^2 = 0\%$]. Further regression analysis revealed that sample size, age,
33 sex, and duration of follow-up did not affect those relationships.

34 **Conclusion:** Buried K-wire may offer benefits in reducing the infection rate with a longer
35 duration until pin removal. However, further RCTs with larger sample sizes are still needed to
36 confirm the results of our study.

37

38 **Keywords:** *upper extremity; fixation; fractures; orthopaedics; traumatology*

39

40

41 INTRODUCTION

42 A fracture is defined as a break in the continuity of the bone tissue structure, which can
43 be caused by trauma or non-trauma.^[1] Forearm fractures involving the radius and ulna were
44 the most common fracture of the upper limb with an annual incidence of 16.2 fractures per
45 10,000 individuals, followed by hand fractures involving the metacarpals and phalanx with an
46 annual incidence of 12.5 and 6.4 fractures per 10,000 individuals, respectively.^[2] Both
47 forearms and hands are essential in carrying out daily activities so these two types of fractures
48 often result in the disruption of a person's quality of life.^[2]

49 Kirschner wire (K-wire) is often used by orthopedic surgeons, especially those
50 specializing in the field of hand and upper extremity surgery to provide fixation for unstable
51 hand or forearm fractures because it is associated with good outcomes at a relatively low
52 cost.^[3,4] Results from several previous studies have demonstrated the non-inferiority of K-wire
53 when compared to plate-screw fixation in the management of unstable metacarpal and
54 phalangeal fractures.^[5,6] A meta-analysis study involving 5 randomized clinical trials (RCTs)
55 and 9 cohort studies showed similar clinical, functional, and radiological outcomes between
56 percutaneous K-wires when compared with volar locking plates (VLPs) for distal radius
57 fixation, but with lower re-operation risk in the K-wire group.^[7] These wires can be implanted
58 under the skin or left exposed. A national survey conducted in the United Kingdom (UK)
59 showed that the majority of orthopedic surgeons, plastic surgeons, and junior surgical trainees
60 chose to leave K-wire not buried because it was easier to take.^[8] The concern that may arise
61 from exposed K-wire is the potentially greater risk of infection because it has direct contact
62 with the outside air and environmental exposure.^[8]

63 Several studies have been conducted to compare buried and exposed K-wires in the
64 management of hand and forearm fractures but have yielded inconsistent results.^[9,10] A
65 randomized trial study conducted by Maradei-Pereira JAR et al.^[9] distal radial, fractures

66 showed a greater risk of infection when K-wires were left exposed than when they were buried.
67 On the other hand, Khaled M et al.^[10] showed no significant difference in the complication
68 rate, including pin infection incidence between exposed and buried K-wire. Given these
69 inconsistencies, a meta-analysis may help. This systematic review and meta-analysis aim to
70 summarize the latest evidence regarding the comparison between exposed and buried K-wires
71 for the management of hand and forearm fractures.

72 **Material and Method**

73 **Registration**

74 The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) were
75 used for this project. On December 4th, 2023, this systematic review and meta-analysis was
76 registered to the Open Science Framework (OSF). The registration was identified as Buried or
77 Exposed Kirschner Wire for the Management of Hand and Forearm Fractures: A Systematic
78 Review, Meta-Analysis, and Meta-Regression. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/647WF>

79 **Eligibility Criteria**

80 This review was written following the PRISMA statement and Cochrane Handbook
81 guidelines.^[11,12] We included the following studies: (1) studies on patients of any age with the
82 diagnosis of hand (phalangeal or metacarpal) or forearm (radius or ulna) fractures who have
83 undergone surgery with Kirschner wire (K-wire) fixation (Population); (2) compare between
84 buried and exposed K-wire fixation (Intervention and Control); (3) have data on the primary
85 outcome (pin infection) with/without secondary outcomes (early pin removal, days to pin
86 removal, and duration of surgery) (Outcome); (4) presented in the form of observational studies
87 (cohort/case-control) or randomized clinical trials (RCTs) (Study Design).

88 Meanwhile, the studies (1) conducted in patients with humeral, shoulder, or lower
89 extremity fractures; (2) using another method of fixation besides K-wire for the patients; (3)

90 presented in the form of case reports, case series, and review articles were excluded from our
91 analysis.

92 **Literature Search and Study Selection**

93 The search of English literature on 4 international databases: Medline, Scopus, Europe
94 PMC, and Cochrane Library was performed by five independent authors from the date of
95 inception until March 7th, 2023. We used the following combined keywords to capture all
96 potentially eligible literature: “(buried OR implanted OR concealed OR embedded) AND
97 (exposed OR uncovered) AND (Kirschner wire OR K-wire) AND (hand fractures OR
98 phalangeal fractures OR metacarpal fractures OR forearm fractures OR radius fractures OR
99 ulna fractures)” as shown in **Table 1**. At first, the identified articles from those databases were
100 removed for duplicates and then screened based on their titles/abstracts. These articles that
101 passed the initial screening process underwent the second step of evaluation in the form of full-
102 text to see their compatibility with our inclusion/exclusion criteria. All of these processes for
103 article selection were conducted by the same five authors who performed the literature
104 searching process. All discrepancies were resolved through discussion with the third author.

105 **Table 1.** Literature search strategy

106 **Data Extraction and Quality Assessment**

107 We extracted the following data for analytical purposes: study ID, publication year,
108 country, study design, sample size, baseline characteristics of participants (mean age and sex
109 distribution), follow-up duration, the number of participants in the buried and exposed K-wire
110 groups, and the outcomes of interest. These data extracted by five independent authors were
111 tabulated into Microsoft Excel 2019.

112 The outcomes of interest in this study were divided into primary and secondary
113 outcomes. The primary outcome was pin site infection which encompassed both superficial
114 and deep infection at or around the site of K-wire placement. The secondary outcomes

115 consisted of early pin removal rate, days to pin removal, and duration of surgery. Early pin
116 removal was defined as the removal of K-wire before the initially planned date due to
117 complications.

118 **Risk of Bias Assessment**

119 The risk of bias assessment was conducted by five independent authors using validated
120 tools. For analyzing the quality of included RCTs, we used a tool from Cochrane
121 Collaborations, namely Risk of Bias version 2 (RoB v2), which includes a methodological
122 assessment of 5 domains: (a) randomization process; (b) deviations from intended
123 interventions; (c) missing outcome data; (d) measurement of the outcome; and (e) selection of
124 the reported results.^[13] The result is shown in **Fig 2**. The authors' evaluations were categorized
125 as "low risk," "high risk," or "some concerns" of bias.^[13] For analyzing the quality of included
126 cohort/case-control studies, we used Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) from the Ottawa Hospital
127 Research Institute (OHRI) which includes 3 domains of assessment: (1) selection of
128 participants; (2) comparability between exposed and non-exposed cohort; and (3) outcome
129 ascertainment.^[14] The total score that can be achieved ranged from 0 to 9 where articles with
130 ≥ 7 scores were considered as having "good" qualities.^[14]

131 **Statistical Analysis**

132 We used mean difference (SMD) along with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for the
133 analytical pooling of continuous variables outcomes by using the Inverse-Variance formula.
134 We also pooled dichotomous variable outcomes into risk ratio (RR) along with 95% CI by
135 using the Mantel-Haenszel formula. Random-effect models were chosen in this review because
136 of the consideration that significant heterogeneity was expected due to differences in the
137 population characteristics and differences in the duration of follow-up. In this review, we used
138 the I-squared (I^2) statistic to assess the heterogeneity between studies where I^2 values of $>50\%$
139 were categorized as significant heterogeneity. We used a combined formula from Luo D et

140 al.^[15] and Wan X et al.^[16] to change the data expressed in the form of the median and
141 interquartile range (IQR) or data expressed as median, minimum, and maximum into mean and
142 standard deviations (SD) for pooled analysis purposes. A publication bias analysis was
143 performed when there were more than 10 studies on each outcome of interest. All of these
144 statistical analyses were carried out using an application from the Cochrane Collaboration,
145 namely Review Manager 5.4.

146 **RESULTS**

147 **Study Selection and Characteristics**

148 A literature search on 4 international databases yielded a total of 166 studies. After
149 removing duplicates and screening studies based on their titles and abstracts, 140 studies were
150 removed, leaving 26 studies. These 26 studies were assessed in a full-text form where 15
151 studies did not meet our eligibility criteria as follows: 8 studies were conducted on patients
152 with humeral fractures, 2 studies did not have any control group, 2 studies did not have data
153 on the outcome of interest, 1 study was only review article, 1 study did not use K-wire for all
154 of the participants, and 1 study was not published in the English language, thus only 11
155 studies^[9,10,17-25] were included in the final analysis **Fig 1**. Of these 11 studies, 5 were
156 prospective RCTs and 6 were retrospective cohort studies. The number of samples ranged from
157 52 to 695 with the duration of follow-up varying from 6 weeks to 1 year. A summary of the
158 baseline characteristics of the included studies can be found in **Table 2**.

159 **Figure 1**. PRISMA diagram of the detailed process of selection of studies for inclusion in the
160 systematic review and meta-analysis.

161 **Table 3**. Characteristics of included studies.

162 **Quality of Study Assessment**

163 The risk of bias assessment by using the RoB v2 tool revealed that only 1 RCT^[9] had a
164 "low risk" of bias in all five assessment domains. The remaining four RCTs^[10,17-19] were judged
165 to have "some concern" risk of bias. One RCT^[18] used consecutive non-random sampling for
166 the selection of participants which was deemed an inappropriate method for randomization,
167 but there was no significant difference in the baseline characteristics of participants in the two
168 groups of intervention, suggesting no serious problems during randomization, therefore was
169 judged to have "some concern" risk of bias in the randomization process. Two RCTs^[10,17] did
170 not mention in detail the blinding of the outcome assessors, therefore were judged to have
171 "some concern" risk of bias in the measurement of the outcome. Lastly, one remaining RCT^[19]
172 did not mention in detail regarding both the randomization method and "blinding" of the
173 outcome assessors, therefore were also judged to have "some concern" risk of bias in the
174 randomization process and measurement of the outcome. The evaluation of all included cohort
175 studies by using the NOS tool revealed "good quality" studies with total scores ranging from 7
176 to 8. The summary of the risk of bias assessment for all included studies in this review can be
177 found in **Fig 2** and **Table 3**.

178 **Table 3.** Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment of observational studies

179 **Primary Outcome**

180 *Pin Site Infection*

181 Based on our pooled analysis of 11 studies (n = 2,022), it has been shown that buried
182 K-wire was associated with a lower risk of pin site infection when compared with exposed K-
183 wire in patients with hand and forearm fractures [RR 0.49 (95% CI 0.36 – 0.67), $p < 0.00001$,
184 $I^2 = 0\%$, random-effect models] as shown in **Fig 3**. Subgroup analysis based on the study design
185 revealed consistent and significant results for both RCTs [RR 0.38 (95% CI 0.21 – 0.68), $p =$
186 0.001, $I^2 = 0\%$, random-effect models] and observational studies [RR 0.54 (95% CI 0.37 –

187 0.79), $p = 0.001$, $I^2 = 0\%$, random-effect models] with a lower RR was found in the RCTs
188 studies.

189 **Figure 3.** Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and exposed K-wire
190 for the pin site infection outcome in both randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and observational
191 studies.

192 **Secondary Outcome**

193 *Early Pin Removal*

194 Pooled analysis from 6 studies ($n = 1,200$) showed a non-significant difference in the
195 rate of early pin removal between buried and exposed K-wire for patients with hand and
196 forearm fractures [RR 0.73 (95% CI 0.36 – 1.45), $p = 0.37$, $I^2 = 0\%$, random-effect models] as
197 in **Fig 4**. Subgroup analysis based on the study design revealed that the results remained non-
198 significant for both RCT [RR 0.65 (95% CI 0.10 – 4.03), $p = 0.64$, $I^2 = 31\%$, random-effect
199 models] and observational studies [RR 0.74 (95% CI 0.34 – 1.61), $p = 0.44$, $I^2 = 0\%$, random-
200 effect models].

201 **Figure 4.** Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and exposed K-wire
202 for the early pin removal outcome in both randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and observational
203 studies.

204 *Days to Pin Removal*

205 Pooled analysis from 4 studies ($n = 1,493$) showed that buried K-wire was associated
206 with significantly longer days to pin removal when compared to exposed K-wire in patients
207 with hand and forearm fractures [MD 33.85 days (95% CI 18.68 – 49.02), $p < 0.0001$, $I^2 =$
208 99%, random-effect models]. The forest plot is available in **Fig 5** Subgroup analysis based on
209 the study design revealed significant results for both RCT [MD 29.00 (95% CI 24.04 – 33.96),
210 $p < 0.00001$, random-effect models] and observational studies [MD 32.53 (95% CI 16.89 –

211 48.18), $p < 0.0001$, $I^2 = 99\%$, random-effect models] with the MD was found to be higher in
212 the observational studies.

213 **Figure 5.** Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and exposed K-wire
214 for the days to pin removal outcome in both randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and
215 observational studies.

216 *Duration of Surgery*

217 Pooled analysis from 3 studies ($n = 325$) showed that the duration of surgery was
218 significantly longer for the buried K-wire when compared to exposed K-wire in patients with
219 hand and forearm fractures [MD 6.98 minutes (95% CI 2.19 – 11.76), $p = 0.004$, $I^2 = 42\%$,
220 random-effect models] as shown in **Fig 6**. Subgroup analysis based on the study design
221 revealed that a significant difference in the duration of surgery was only seen in the RCTs
222 studies [MD 7.53 (95% CI 0.74 – 14.31), $p = 0.03$, $I^2 = 70\%$, random-effect models] but not in
223 the observational studies [MD 5.45 minutes (95% CI -5.14 – 16.04), $p = 0.31$, random-effect
224 models].

225 **Figure 6.** Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and exposed K-wire
226 for the duration of surgery outcome in both randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and observational
227 studies.

228 *Meta-Regression*

229 Identification of risk factors that influence the relationship of buried and exposed K-
230 wire with all of the outcomes of interest was done with meta-regression. Our meta-regression
231 revealed that variability in those outcomes in hand and forearm fractures patients receiving
232 buried or exposed K-wire fixation cannot be explained by known patient factors associated
233 with predictors of treatment outcomes (Table 4). From our meta-regression analysis, it was
234 revealed that pin site infection in hand or forearm fractures patients treated with either buried

235 or exposed K-wire was not significantly influenced by sample size ($p = 0.3469$) (**Fig 7A**), age
236 ($p = 0.5300$) (**Fig 7B**), sex ($p = 0.1105$) (**Fig 7C**), or follow-up duration ($p = 0.2895$) (**Fig 7D**).

237 **Figure 7.** Bubble-plot for meta-regression. Meta-regression analysis showed that the
238 comparison between buried and exposed K-wire with the pin site infection outcome was not
239 significantly affected by sample size (A), age (B), sex (C), nor follow-up duration (D)

240

241 The association between either buried or exposed K-wire with early pin removal was
242 not significantly influenced by sample size ($p = 0.8827$) (**Fig 8A**), age ($p = 0.4780$) (**Fig 8B**),
243 sex ($p = 0.5103$) (**Fig 8C**), or follow-up duration ($p = 0.2063$) (**Fig 8D**).

244 **Figure 8.** Bubble-plot for meta-regression. Meta-regression analysis showed that the
245 comparison between buried and exposed K- wire with the early pin removal outcome was not
246 significantly affected by sample size (A), age (B), sex (C), nor follow-up duration (D)

247 Our meta-regression analysis also revealed that the days to pin removal in patients with
248 hand or forearm fractures receiving either buried or exposed K-wire were not significantly
249 influenced by sample size ($p = 0.1839$) (**Fig 9A**), age ($p = 0.0514$) (**Fig 9B**), or sex ($p = 0.8928$)
250 (**Fig 9C**). Variable "follow-up duration" was not possible to be included in the meta-regression
251 analysis for this outcome because of the insufficient number of data in the included studies.

252 Finally, the outcome "duration of surgery" was also not possible to be analyzed in the
253 meta-regression analysis due to the insufficient number of included studies for this outcome.

254 **Figure 9.** Bubble-plot for meta-regression. Meta-regression analysis showed that the
255 comparison between buried and exposed K- wire with the days to pin removal outcome
256 was not significantly affected by sample size (A), age (B), sex (C), nor follow-up duration
257 (D).

258 All the meta-regression results for each outcome of interest is summarized in this below **Table**
259 **4.**
260 **Table 4.** Result for the meta-regression models for each outcome of interest.

261 **Publication Bias**

262 The Funnel-plot analysis shown in **Fig 10** for the pin site infection outcome revealed a
263 relatively symmetrical inverted plot, suggesting no indication of publication bias. Meanwhile,
264 the publication bias analysis was not performed for the early pin removal, days to pin removal,
265 and duration of surgery outcomes due to less than 10 studies included in these outcomes where
266 funnel plots and statistical tests to detect publication bias are less reliable.^[26,27]

267 **Figure 10.** Funnel plot analysis that showed a relatively symmetrical inverted plot for the pin
268 site infection outcome, indicating no publication bias.

269 **DISCUSSION**

270 Based on the results of our meta-analysis, it has been shown that buried K-wire was
271 associated with a lower risk of pin site infection and longer duration of pin removal when
272 compared with exposed K-wire in patients with hand and forearm fractures, although the early
273 pin removal rate did not differ significantly between two groups and the duration of surgery
274 was significantly longer in the buried K-wire group. Further regression analysis also revealed
275 that the study's variables, such as sample size, age, sex, and follow-up duration did not
276 significantly influence these relationships.

277 The results of our meta-analysis were in line with the results of the previous study by
278 Chen L et al.^[28] which also showed that buried K-wires had a lower risk of infection compared
279 to exposed K-wires even though early pin removal did not differ significantly between groups.
280 However, there were some differences between our current meta-analysis and the previous
281 study by Chen L et al.^[28]

282 First, the previous study by Chen L et al.^[28] only included a total of 7 studies consisting
283 of 2 RCTs and 5 observational studies. Meanwhile, our current meta-analysis has included
284 more studies, a total of 11 studies (5 RCTs and 6 observational studies) with an additional 3
285 RCTs and 1 observational study when compared to the previous study which will certainly
286 produce more solid evidence.

287 Second, the previous study by Chen L et al.^[28] combined the results from RCT studies
288 with results from observational studies. This action was inappropriate and not recommended
289 when we referred to the guidelines from the Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews of
290 Intervention.^[12] Observational studies tend to be susceptible to several biases such as selection
291 bias and information bias which can have an impact on the research results.^[29,30] Selection bias
292 can lead to differences in the baseline characteristics of the two groups of participants which
293 will also influence the results of the analysis.^[29,30] Information bias can lead to inaccuracies of
294 data and the results of outcome measurement obtained.^[29,30] In addition, observational studies
295 are often unable to anticipate the existence of several confounders which can also have an
296 impact on research results.^[29,30] Meanwhile, RCTs can avoid the presence of confounders
297 through a process of randomizing the participants.^[31,32] The existence of bias such as selection
298 bias and information bias can also be minimized by allocation concealment and blinding
299 methods, both for the participants and the outcome assessors.^[31,32] Therefore, it is advisable to
300 separate the results from RCTs and the results from observational studies. In our current meta-
301 analysis, we have followed the recommendations of the Cochrane guidelines by separating the
302 results from the RCTs and observational studies that can be seen in all of our forest plots,
303 although there were no significant differences in results between those two study designs.

304 Third, our current meta-analysis had an additional outcome in the form of "days to pin
305 removal" which was not analyzed in the previous study by Chen L et al.^[28] From this new
306 outcome, it was found that buried K-wire was able to provide a longer time for pin removal

307 when compared to exposed K-wire. In addition, our current meta-analysis was also equipped
308 with a meta-regression analysis to see the effect of several study variables, such as sample size,
309 age, sex, and follow-up duration. From the results of our regression analysis, we have found
310 no significant effect of these variables on the outcomes of interest.

311 Despite having several advantages above, our current meta-analysis is not without
312 limitations. The majority of included studies have small sample sizes, under 100 participants.
313 Some of these studies, especially the RCTs, also have "some concern" risk of bias caused by a
314 lack of detailed information regarding the randomization method and the blinding of the
315 outcome assessors. Two of our outcomes of interest, namely days to pin removal and duration
316 of surgery, have relatively high heterogeneities (above 50%) which may be due to differences
317 in the surgeon's experience and length of follow-up duration. Finally, data regarding the cost-
318 effectiveness analysis of the two K-wire methods were lacking in the included studies,
319 therefore cannot be analyzed further. Further RCTs with larger sample sizes are still needed to
320 confirm the results of our meta-analysis.

321 **CONCLUSION**

322 Our systematic review dan meta-analysis suggests that buried K-wire may be more
323 beneficial than exposed K-wire to provide a lower risk of infection and longer duration until
324 pin removal in patients with hand and forearm fractures. However, the duration of surgery was
325 relatively longer in the buried K-wire groups with no significant difference in the rate of early
326 pin removal. The final decision on whether to bury or expose the K-wire fixation should still
327 be based on the surgeon's judgment with the consideration of the patient's clinical condition as
328 well as the benefits and risks for each patient. Further RCTs with larger sample sizes are still
329 needed to confirm the results of our study.

330 **STATEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS:**

331 **Availability of data and materials:**

332 *Underlying data*

333 All data underlying the results are available as part of the article and no additional source
334 data are required.

335 *Reporting guidelines*

336 Mendeley Data: Buried or Exposed Kirschner Wire for the Management of Hand and

337 Forearm Fractures: A Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Meta-Regression. doi:

338 10.17632/cxjd9nm8r.1.

339 Data are available under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](#)
340 [license](#) (CC-BY 4.0).

341 **Competing Interest:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests

342 **Funding:** None

343 **Acknowledgment:** None

344 **Ethical Approval:** Not applicable

345 **Patient's Consent for Publication:** Not applicable

346 REFERENCE

- 347 1. Court-Brown CM, Caesar B. Epidemiology of adult fractures: A review. *Injury*. 2006
348 Aug;37(8):691-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2006.04.130>
- 349 2. Karl JW, Olson PR, Rosenwasser MP. The Epidemiology of Upper Extremity Fractures in
350 the United States, 2009. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2015 Aug;29(8):e242-4.
351 <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOT.0000000000000312>
- 352 3. Shoemaker SD, Comstock CP, Mubarak SJ, Wenger DR, Chambers HG. Intramedullary
353 Kirschner wire fixation of open or unstable forearm fractures in children. *J Pediatr Orthop*.
354 1999 May-Jun;19(3):329-37.
- 355 4. Dzaja I, MacDermid JC, Roth J, Grewal R. Functional outcomes and cost estimation for
356 extra-articular and simple intra-articular distal radius fractures treated with open reduction
357 and internal fixation versus closed reduction and percutaneous Kirschner wire fixation. *Can*
358 *J Surg*. 2013 Dec;56(6):378-84. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cjs.22712>
- 359 5. Ahmed Z, Haider MI, Buzdar MI, Bakht Chughtai B, Rashid M, Hussain N, et al.
360 Comparison of Miniplate and K-wire in the Treatment of Metacarpal and Phalangeal
361 Fractures. *Cureus*. 2020 Feb 19;12(2):e7039. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.7039>
- 362 6. Köse A, Topal M, Engin MÇ, Şencan A, Dinçer R, Baran T. Comparison of low-profile
363 plate-screw and Kirschner-wire osteosynthesis outcomes in extra-articular unstable
364 proximal phalangeal fractures. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol*. 2019 Apr;29(3):597-604.
365 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00590-018-2342-4>
- 366 7. Youlden DJ, Sundaraj K, Smithers C. Volar locking plating versus percutaneous Kirschner
367 wires for distal radius fractures in an adult population: a meta-analysis. *ANZ J Surg*. 2019
368 Jul;89(7-8):821-826. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.14903>

- 369 8. WIRE Research Collaborative. Buried Versus Exposed Kirschner Wires Following
370 Fixation of Hand Fractures: I Clinician and Patient Surveys. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob*
371 *Open*. 2018 Apr 16;6(4):e1747. <https://doi.org/10.1097/GOX.0000000000001747>
- 372 9. Maradei-Pereira JAR, Dos Santos AP, Martins JR, Maradei-Pereira MR. Infection after
373 buried or exposed K-wire fixation of distal radial fractures: a randomized clinical trial. *J*
374 *Hand Surg Eur Vol*. 2021 Feb;46(2):154-158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1753193420936543>
- 375 10. Khaled M, Fadle AA, Hassan AA, Khalifa A, Nabil A, Hafez A, et al. To bury or not to
376 bury the k-wires after fixation of a pediatric both bone forearm fracture, a randomized
377 controlled trial. *Research Square*. 2022 Dec. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2386791/v1>
- 378 11. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
379 PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*.
380 2021 Mar 29;372:n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- 381 12. Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Chandler J, Welch VA, Higgins JP, et al. Updated guidance
382 for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic
383 Reviews of Interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019 Oct 3;10:ED000142.
384 <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.ED000142>
- 385 13. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a
386 revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019 Aug 28;366:14898.
387 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.14898>
- 388 14. Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality
389 of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2010 Sep;25(9):603-5.
390 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-010-9491-z>
- 391 15. Luo D, Wan X, Liu J, Tong T. Optimally estimating the sample mean from the sample size,
392 median, mid-range, and/or mid-quartile range. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2018
393 Jun;27(6):1785-1805. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280216669183>

- 394 16. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from
395 the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2014
396 Dec 19;14:135. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-135>
- 397 17. Hargreaves DG, Drew SJ, Eckersley R. Kirschner wire pin tract infection rates: a
398 randomized controlled trial between percutaneous and buried wires. J Hand Surg Br. 2004
399 Aug;29(4):374-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhsb.2004.03.003>
- 400 18. Khan H, Adil A, Ul Ain N, Qureshi BA, Chishti UF, Malik TS. Outcome of Buried Versus
401 Exposed Kirchner Wires in Terms of Infection in Fractures of Phalanges and Metacarpal
402 Bones of Hand. Cureus. 2022 Feb 23;14(2):e22515. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.22515>
- 403 19. Waheed K, Mulhall K, Mwaura B, Kaar K. PERCUTANEOUS WIRE FIXATION OF
404 DISTAL RADIAL FRACTURES: IS IT PREFERABLE TO BURY THE WIRES?. Orthop
405 Procs. 2004;86-B(SUPP_II):125-126. [https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-
406 620X.86BSUPP_II.0860125e](https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.86BSUPP_II.0860125e)
- 407 20. Al-Qattan MM. Closed reduction and percutaneous K-wires versus open reduction and
408 interosseous loop wires for displaced unstable transverse fractures of the shaft of the
409 proximal phalanx of the fingers in industrial workers. J Hand Surg Eur Vol. 2008
410 Oct;33(5):552-6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1753193408090130>
- 411 21. Mcquail PM, Awan N, Mcquail PM, Awan N. A comparison of pin site infection rates
412 between percutaneous buried and exposed K-wires in treating distal radius fractures. Irish
413 J Med Sci. 2015;184:S204.
- 414 22. Ohshima K, Tokutake K, Takegami Y, Asami Y, Matsubara Y, Natsume T, et al. Longer
415 time of implantation using the buried pin technique for intramedullary nailing would
416 decrease refracture in the diaphyseal forearm fracture in children-retrospective multicenter
417 (TRON) study. Injury. 2023 Mar;54(3):924-929.
418 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2023.01.025>

- 419 23. Rafique A, Ghani S, Sadiq M, Siddiqui IA. Kirschner wire pin tract infection rates between
420 percutaneous and buried wires in treating metacarpal and phalangeal fractures. Journal of
421 the College of Physicians and Surgeons—pakistan : JCPSP. 2006 Aug;16(8):518-520.
422 <https://doi.org/8.2006/jcpsp.518520>
- 423 24. Ridley TJ, Freking W, Erickson LO, Ward CM. Incidence of Treatment for Infection of
424 Buried Versus Exposed Kirschner Wires in Phalangeal, Metacarpal, and Distal Radial
425 Fractures. J Hand Surg Am. 2017 Jul;42(7):525-531.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhsa.2017.03.040>
- 427 25. Terndrup M, Jensen T, Kring S, Lindberg-Larsen M. Should we bury K-wires after
428 metacarpal and phalangeal fracture osteosynthesis? Injury. 2018 Jun;49(6):1126-1130.
429 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2018.02.027>
- 430 26. Thornton A, Lee P. Publication bias in meta-analysis: its causes and consequences. J Clin
431 Epidemiol. 2000 Feb;53(2):207-16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0895-4356\(99\)00161-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0895-4356(99)00161-4)
- 432 27. Terrin N, Schmid CH, Lau J, Olkin I. Adjusting for publication bias in the presence of
433 heterogeneity. Stat Med. 2003 Jul 15;22(13):2113-26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1461>
- 434 28. Chen L, Wang Y, Li S, Luo R, Zhou W, Li Y, et al. Effect of buried vs. exposed Kirschner
435 wire osteosynthesis on phalangeal, metacarpal and distal radial fractures: A systematic
436 review and meta-analysis. Arthroplasty. 2020 Feb 3;2(1):4.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42836-020-0021-5>
- 438 29. Pandis N. Bias in observational studies. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop. 2014
439 Apr;145(4):542-3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2014.01.008>
- 440 30. Ranstam J. Bias in observational studies. Acta Radiol. 2008 Jul;49(6):644-5.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02841850802075082>

- 442 31. Hannan EL. Randomized clinical trials and observational studies: guidelines for assessing
443 respective strengths and limitations. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2008 Jun;1(3):211-7.
444 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcin.2008.01.008>
- 445 32. Booth CM, Tannock IF. Randomised controlled trials and population-based observational
446 research: partners in the evolution of medical evidence. *Br J Cancer.* 2014 Feb
447 4;110(3):551-5.

448 **Supporting Information**

449 **S1 Fig. Figure 1. PRISMA diagram of the detailed process of selection of studies for**
450 **inclusion in the systematic review and meta-analysis.**

451 **S2 Fig. Figure 2. Risk of Bias assessment of the included studies using RoB v2 tool**

452 **S3 Fig. Figure 3. Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and**
453 **exposed K-wire for the pin site infection outcome in both randomized clinical trials**
454 **(RCTs) and observational studies.**

455 **S4 Fig. Figure 4. Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and**
456 **exposed K-wire for the early pin removal outcome in both randomized clinical trials**
457 **(RCTs) and observational studies.**

458 **S5 Fig. Figure 5. Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and**
459 **exposed K-wire for the days to pin removal outcome in both randomized clinical trials**
460 **(RCTs) and observational studies.**

461 **S6. Fig. Figure 6. Forest plot that demonstrates the comparison between buried and**
462 **exposed K-wire for the duration of surgery outcome in both randomized clinical trials**
463 **(RCTs) and observational studies.**

464 **S7. Fig. Figure 7. Bubble-plot for meta-regression. Meta-regression analysis showed that**
465 **the comparison between buried and exposed K- wire with the pin site infection outcome**
466 **was not significantly affected by sample size (A), age (B), sex (C), nor follow-up duration**
467 **(D)**

468 **S8. Fig. Figure 8. Bubble-plot for meta-regression. Meta-regression analysis showed that**
469 **the comparison between buried and exposed K- wire with the early pin removal outcome**
470 **was not significantly affected by sample size (A), age (B), sex (C), nor follow-up duration**
471 **(D)**

472 **S9. Fig. Figure 9. Bubble-plot for meta-regression. Meta-regression analysis showed that**
473 **the comparison between buried and exposed K- wire with the days to pin removal**
474 **outcome was not significantly affected by sample size (A), age (B), sex (C), nor follow-up**
475 **duration (D).**

476

477 **S10 Fig. Figure 10. Funnel plot analysis that showed a relatively symmetrical inverted**
478 **plot for the pin site infection outcome, indicating no publication bias.**


479

480 **S1 Table. Table 1. Literature search strategy**

481 **S2 Table. Table 2. Characteristics of included studies**

482 **S3 Table. Table 3. Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment of observational studies**


483 **S4 table. Table 4. Result for the meta-regression models for each outcome of interest**




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).


Study ID	Randomization process	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing outcome data	Measurement of the outcome	Selection of the reported result	Overall
Hargreaves DG (2004)						
Khaled M (2022)						
Khan M (2022)						
Maradei-Pereira JAR (2020)						
Waheed K (2004)						

Low risk
 Some concerns
 High risk










medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).







medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).






medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

SE(log[RR])

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299683>; this version posted December 9, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

