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Clinical Outcomes of Internal Lengthening Nails

• Successful (good to excellent) outcomes
  – Cole et al., Injury 2001; Guichet et al., JBJS, 2003; Hankemeier et al., Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2004

• Complications
  - Papanna et al., Acta Orthop Belg 2011; Mazeau PJ Pediatr Orthop B. 2012; Kenawey et al., CORR 2011; Mahboubian et al., CORR 2012
    – “run away nails”
    – Inaccurate and unreliable distraction
    – Premature consolidation
    – Nonunions
    – Nerve injuries
    – Joint contractures

• Need for more accurate distraction
ISCSD distraction was poorly controlled
- 1.7 mm/day in fast group (>1 mm/day)
- 0.84 mm/day in slow group (<1 mm/day)

- Complications
  - 50% of ISKD patients required unanticipated surgeries

- Conclusion
  - LON was more predictable and with fewer complications
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Abstract
Background Lengthening over a nail and internal lengthening nails have been developed to minimize or eliminate patients’ time wearing a frame during femur lengthening. However, it is unclear whether either of these two approaches results in faster times to union or fewer complications over the other.

Question/purpose We asked which technique better achieved: (1) the lengthening goals, (2) the distraction rate control, (3) quality of the regenerate bone, (4) fewer complications, and (5) if SF-36 scores and American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons Lower Limb Module (AAOS LLM) scores differ in each treatment modality?

Methods We retrospectively reviewed the records and radiographs of 11 patients who had 12 Intramedullary Skeletal Kinetic Distractors (ISKD) procedures between 2002 and 2005, and 21 patients with 22 femoral lengthenings performed as lengthening over nail procedures between 2005 and 2009. Details such as leg length discrepancies, operative time, time of removal of the external fixator or ISKD, and any complications encountered were recorded. SF-36 and AAOS LLM scores also were compiled. The minimum followup for the ISKD and the lengthening over nail cohorts were 62 months (average; 76 months; range, 62–93 months) and 13 months (average, 27 months; range, 13–38 months), respectively.

Results We observed no difference in achieving the lengthening goals between the two procedures. Distraction was not well controlled in the ISKD group; the distraction rates were 1.7 mm per day for the fast group (distraction rate greater than 1 mm/day) and 0.84 mm per day for the slow group (less than 1 mm/day). The lengthening over nail group had an average distraction rate of 0.88 mm per day. One of 20 of the patients who had lengthening over a nail had complications requiring additional unanticipated surgeries whereas six of 12 patients who had femoral lengthening in the ISKD group had such complications.

Conclusions Based on our observations, we believe the lengthening over nail technique for femoral lengthening is associated with fewer complications than the ISKD.

Level of Evidence Level III, therapeutic study. See the Guidelines for Authors for a complete description of levels of evidence.

Introduction
Distraction osteogenesis has become a widely used and accepted method for limb lengthening. Since the classic ilizarov method of using an external ring fixator for limb
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Localization of the internal magnet

Intraop distraction
These were first 24 patients (August 2012-July 2013)

29% of patients who underwent limb lengthening surgery during that time period
Primary Outcome Variables

I. Accuracy of Lengthening
   – Distraction distance & accuracy measured using a calibrated digital radiology system (PACS, OnePacs LLC, New York, NY)

   \[
   \text{A) } \% \text{ Error} = \frac{\text{Distraction prescribed} - \text{Lengthening measured}}{\text{Distraction prescribed}} \times 100
   \]

   \[
   \text{B) Accuracy of distraction} = 100 - \% \text{ Error}
   \]

II. Change in bone alignment

III. Effect on adjacent joint ROM
I. Accuracy of Lengthening

At 19 weeks follow-up (range, 1-42 weeks):

- Average lengthening was **35 mm** (range, 14mm-65mm)
- Accuracy was **96%**
### II. Absolute Change in Bone Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BONE</th>
<th>ANGLE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE CHANGE (degrees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Intentional reduction of femur bow (5/17)
- Blocking screws (4/17 femur & 6/8 tibia)
III. Joint ROM

- Hip, knee and ankle ROM well maintained
- **Temporary** loss of motion in early postop period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE LOSS (degrees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee Flexion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee Extension</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle Dorsiflexion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle Plantarflexion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ITB release (10/17 femur)
- Gastrocnemius recession (5/8 tibia)
Overall Clinical Outcomes

- All femur cases had excellent bone healing
- In 2 tibia cases, BMAC was injected for delayed bone healing
- There was 1 case of failure of the magnet mechanism requiring nail exchange
- One case of premature consolidation
Conclusions

• All patients achieved lengthening goal
• Minimal (insignificant) unwanted change in bone alignment
• Adjacent joint ROM was minimally affected
  – Mild temporary loss of motion that resolved
• Implant failure 4%
  – Change of nail led to excellent outcome
• Excellent bone healing in femur
  – Tibia requires slower distraction
• Blocking screws useful in tibia and retrograde femur
  – When nail does not fill IM canal adjacent to osteotomy site
Summary

• The new Precice® nails have **excellent clinical efficacy** with ~ **96% accuracy**
• **Implant failure: 4% (1/25)**
• **No other major complications**
• Use of remote control was **straightforward**
• Acute **rotational and angular correction** was possible
• **Malalignment was prevented** by using correct nail size, osteotomy level and blocking screws
• **Length of the thicker nail segment** beyond the osteotomy is **critical** to ensure stability and prevent iatrogenic deformities
Example 2: Retrograde Femur

- 30M
- 3.6 cm LLD
- 7° genu valgum (MAD 14 mm lateral)
- 10° ER deformity
- Post-traumatic growth arrest after R femur Fx
- Lower back and R LL pain
Example 2: Retrograde Femur

24 weeks after surgery
68 y/o male  
LLD 4 cm  
Dysplastic Ankle
BMAC Injection@ end distraction
Femur lengthening: a comparison of internal lengthening with a remote controlled magnetic internal lengthening nail versus lengthening over a nail

Anton M. Kurtz MD, Jonathan R. Barclay BS, Joseph Nguyen MPH, Austin T. Fragomen MD, S. Robert Rozbruch MD

Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY

INTRODUCTION

Lengthening over a nail (LON) has been shown to be superior to lengthening with a previous generation of mechanical internal lengthening nail in the femur.\(^1\) It is unclear, however, whether a newer generation of remote controlled magnet driven internal lengthening nail (MILN) has overcome the weaknesses of earlier technologies.\(^2\)

OBJECTIVES

We asked which technique (LON or MILN) better achieved:

1. The lengthening goals,
2. The distraction rate control,
3. Optimal quality of the regenerate bone, and
4. Fewer complications.

METHODS

We conducted a retrospective comparison study between LON and MILN techniques. We reviewed the records and radiographs of 21 consecutive patients with 22 femoral LONs between 2005 and 2009, and 35 consecutive patients with 40 femoral lengthenings using a remote controlled magnetic internal lengthening nail between 2012 and 2014. Details such as limb length discrepancy (LLD), etiology, time to bony union, knee range of motion, regenerate quality, and any complications encountered were compiled. The minimum follow-up times for the LON and MILN cohorts were 13 months (mean, 27 months; range, 13–38 months) and 10 months (mean 19.9 months; range, 10.31 months), respectively.

RESULTS

1. Patients treated with MILN had a significantly smaller post-treatment residual LLD (0.0 mm) than those treated with LON (3.6 mm) (p=0.003).
2. Rate of distraction was closer to the goal of 1 mm/day and more tightly controlled for the MILN cohort (0.9 mm/day, SD 0.1 mm/day) than for the LON group (0.84 mm/day, SD 0.19 mm/day) (p=0.044).
3. Regenerate quality (as measured with the modified Li score, and healing index (months/cm)) were not significantly different between the cohorts. Time to union, however, was shorter in the MILN group (3.3 months) than in the LON group (4.5 months) (p=0.001).
4. Knee flexion at the end of distraction was significantly greater for MILN patients (105 degrees) than for LON patients (88.8 degrees) (p=0.033). The percentage of patients who experienced a complication was not different in the MILN group (15.8%) than in patients treated with LON (20%) (p=0.724).

Below: (A) LON at end of distraction, (B) LON fully healed, (C) MILN at end of distraction, (D) MILN fully healed.

CONCLUSIONS

Femoral lengthening with the MILN is safe and well controlled, offering the limb lengthening surgeon greater accuracy in achieving lengthening goals, tighter distraction rate control, faster time to union, and greater knee mobility during treatment as compared to lengthening with the LON technique while maintaining an acceptable risk of complications and reliable healing. Though not documented specifically in this study, MILN patients typically require less pain medication during treatment. Additionally, MILN requires one less surgery than LON and eliminates external fixation-related complications like pin infections.
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Methods

• Retrospective comparison LON vs. PRECICE

• LON: 22 femurs in 21 patients (2005-2009)
  – Same control group used for ISKD study
  – Follow-up: 27 months (13-38 months)

• PRECICE: 40 femurs in 35 patients (2012-2014)
  – Follow-up: 20 months (10-31 months)
Results

• PRECICE had significantly smaller post-treatment residual LLD (0 vs. 3.6 mm)

• Rate of distraction closer to goal of 1 mm per day in PRECICE
  – Precise: 0.9 mm/day, SD 0.1 mm/day
  – LON: 0.84 mm/day, SD 0.14 mm/day
  – ISKD distraction was poorly controlled
    • 1.7 mm/day in fast group (> 1 mm/day)
    • 0.84 mm/day in slow group (< 1 mm/day)

• Time to union significantly shorter in PRECICE
  – (3.3 vs. 4.5 months)

• Knee flexion significantly greater at end distraction
  – 105 vs 89 degrees

• PRECICE had one less surgery than LON
Age 8, congenital
LLD 5.5 cm, femur /tibia
PLLD = 9.5 cm

Plan: 4.5 cm lengthening
Of femur
Second future lengthening
tibia
5 cm lengthening with Precice at age 14 after skeletal maturity
Humerus lengthening with Precice Nail
LLD = 6 cm
Deformity: varus and apex anterior
11 mm to go
50 mm max on this nail (8.5 x 215 femur nail)
Distraction rate 0.25 mm 3x/day
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