Functional outcome of pelvic fractures in children: does age affect outcome?

Mohamed Gobba, Sherif A. Khaled, Ahmed Galal, Hazem A. Azeem

Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Cairo University Hospital, Kasr Alaini, Egypt

Correspondence to Sherif A. Khaled, 18 Omar Ibn El Khattab Street, Dokki, Giza, 12311, Egypt. Tel: +20 237 430 049; fax: +20 227 956 339; e-mail: sherifakhaled@yahoo.com

Received 12 November 2013 Accepted 5 December 2013

The Egyptian Orthopaedic Journal 2017, 52:72–77

Objective

The objective of this study was to assess the early radiological and functional outcome of either conservatively or surgically treated pediatric pelvic fractures. **Patients and methods**

This was a prospective study of pediatric patients with pelvic fractures resulting from high-energy trauma. Management was either conservative or surgical. Scorebased functional outcome assessment was done.

Results

A total of 30 patients were enrolled in the study. Of them, 20 patients were managed conservatively and 10 patients were surgically treated. We had three mortality cases. The mean follow-up period was 9 months. Functional outcome score was 74 for conservative and 70 after operative treatment according to Majeed score. Limblength discrepancy, back pain, skin macerations, infection, and nerve injury were the encountered complications.

Conclusion

Pediatric pelvic fractures classified as Tile A or B can be successfully managed conservatively. All vertically unstable fractures should be reduced and fixed as the pediatric pelvis has a very limited remodeling power for this type of fracture.

Keywords:

pediatric fractures, pediatric pelvic fractures, pelvic fracture, pelvic fracture in children, pelvis

Egypt Orthop J 52:72–77 © 2017 The Egyptian Orthopaedic Journal 1110-1148

Introduction

Trauma is the leading cause of death and disability in children. Pelvic fractures, although rare, with a reported incidence of one per 100 000 children per year, are associated with high mortality rates (up to 25%), and are second only to skull fractures for morbidity [1,2]. Fractures of the pelvis in adults are well documented in the literature; in contrast, there are relatively few reports on fractures of the pediatric pelvis. A pediatric pelvic fracture represents a reliable marker of multisystem trauma. The greater cartilaginous volume and bony plasticity of the pediatric pelvis provide an increased capacity for energy absorption before fracture. As a result of these anatomical differences, a pelvic fracture in a child demands a comprehensive, multisystem approach [3,4].

The treatment recommendations for pediatric pelvic fractures have undergone certain changes during the last decade. Historically, these fractures were managed nonoperatively with bed rest, traction, pelvic slings, or hip spica casts. The rationale for this approach being high union rates, extensive remodeling capacity, favorable results, and minimizing the risk of triradiate cartilage injury [5,6]. Long-term follow-up studies have however reported significant residual morbidity, primarily owing to low back pain and leg-length discrepancies [7,8].

In this study, we assessed the functional outcome and degree of disability or handicapping left after healing of the pediatric pelvic fracture treated either conservatively or surgically. The ethical committee of Cairo University approved the study.

Patients and methods

During the period between January 2010 and January 2012, we conducted a study to assess the functional outcome of pelvic fractures in children younger than 15 years of age managed conservatively or operatively. A total of 30 patients were enrolled in the study (18 males and 12 females), with mean age 7.2 years (1.5–15 years old). All the cases had high-energy trauma. Overall, 15 patients were involved in pedestrian accidents (most common), nine patients were involved in motor vehicle accidents, three patients had crushing injuries, and three patients fell from height.

All patients had an anteroposterior radiograph of the pelvis showing both hips (pelvis anteroposterior). After

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

According to Tile classification [9], there were three cases of type A, 21 cases of type B, and six cases of type C. According to Torode and Zeig classification [10], 28 cases were type 4 injuries.

Associated injuries were as follows: one (3.3%) brain concussion, one hemothorax, one pneumothorax (6.7% chest injuries), two splenic tears, one renal tear, two abdominal collections (16.7% abdominal), one bladder tear, two urethral tear, one vaginal tear, and one Morel-Lavallée lesion (subcutaneous serosanguinous collection over the hip and flank area) over the sacral area which needed evacuation by a small incision and ~500 ml of blood was drained. Regarding associated orthopedic injuries (43.3%), there were 10 lower limb fractures (tibia, femur, and neck of femur), one acetabular fracture, one traumatic above knee amputation, and two upper limb fractures.

Conservative or nonoperative treatment was adopted in closed fractures and vitally stable patients at presentation in whom adequate and accepted reduction could be achieved without the need for operative intervention. It was in the form of bed rest in eight cases and spica cast in 12 cases (Fig. 1).

A total of 10 patients were treated surgically. Indications were open fractures or hemodynamic instability necessitating the use of external fixator as a resuscitative method. Methods of fixation used were

Figure 1



A 1.5-year-old female patient was involved in a car accident, with open book fracture pelvis (Tile B1) with left subtrochanteric fracture femur; closed reduction under general anesthesia in a spica cast was done. (a) Radiograph of the pelvis anteroposterior with proximal femoral fracture on admission. (b) Follow-up radiograph at 3 months with Majeed score of 65.

external fixator (seven cases), iliosacral screws (two cases), and plates and screws (two cases). The patients who were treated in our study did not require any special rehabilitation program at the end of treatment.

For radiological outcome assessment, four criteria were evaluated in our patients' radiographs: posterior displacement, vertical displacement, pubic symphyseal translation, and sagittal rotation. Matta and Tornetta [11] graded the results according to the amount of displacement as follows: excellent (≤ 4 mm), good (4–10 mm), fair (10–20 mm), and poor (>20 mm).

Functional outcome assessment was done using a scoring system we made inspired from Majeed scoring system Table 1 [12]. It includes 30 points for pain, 10 points for sitting, and 36 points for gait assessment, with a total out of 76. The patients were scored after 3, 6 months, and every 6 months after injury.

Results

After exclusion of the mortality cases, 27 patients had been followed up for a mean of 9 months ranging from 6 to 24 months.

At the first 3 months of follow-up, the mean total score was 60. All the patients had problems with walking and standing, varying from inability to walk unaided to walking a distance then pain sets in. A total of four patients complained of unintended external rotation of the affected limb during walking especially when they try to run. Most patients had good satisfactory function regarding daily activities except for the residual limp (increases with attempt at running) that varied between patients but was getting prominent as the patient's age increased. At the 6 months visit, the mean total score was 73; most of the patients showed improvement regarding walking. Most of the patients were satisfied, and there was no need for further follow-up.

Regarding complications, we had three patients with limb-length discrepancy: two were less than 1 cm and one had significant at 5 cm, for which we did femoral lengthening 2 years later. Two patients experienced residual low back pain, two experienced skin macerations from the cast, two pin tract infections, one wound infection, and one case of postoperative foot drop.

Radiologically, residual displacement of the fractures and grading of our cases is stated in Table 2. More than

Pain – 30 points0–5Intense, continuous at rest0–5Intense with activity10Tolerable but limits activity15With moderate activity, abolished at rest20Mild, intermittent, normal activity25Slight, occasional, or no pain30Work – 20 points0–4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting – 10 points0–4Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points2Valking aids (11)9Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)12Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Slight ilimp10Normal12	Questions and possible answers	Number of points
Intense with activity10Tolerable but limits activity15With moderate activity, abolished at rest20Mild, intermittent, normal activity25Slight, occasional, or no pain30Work - 20 points0-4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting - 10 points0-4Painful0-4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse - 4 points10Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing - 36 points4Walking aids (11)6Bedridden or almost0-2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)Cannot walk or almostCannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Pain – 30 points	
Tolerable but limits activity15With moderate activity, abolished at rest20Mild, intermittent, normal activity25Slight, occasional, or no pain30Work - 20 points0-4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting - 10 points0-4Painful0-4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse - 4 points3Painful (or if man erection not possible)0-1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing - 36 points8Walking aids (11)6Bedridden or almost0-2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0-2Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Intense, continuous at rest	0–5
With moderate activity, abolished at rest20Mild, intermittent, normal activity25Slight, occasional, or no pain30Work - 20 points0-4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting - 10 points0-4Painful0-4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse - 4 points8Painful (or if man erection not possible)0-1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing - 36 points8Walking aids (11)6Bedridden or almost0-2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)2Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Intense with activity	10
Mild, intermittent, normal activity25Slight, occasional, or no pain30Work - 20 points0-4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting - 10 points0-4Painful0-4Painful f prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse - 4 points2Painful (or if man erection not possible)0-1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing - 36 points0-2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Tolerable but limits activity	15
Slight, occasional, or no pain30Work - 20 points0-4No regular job0-4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting - 10 points0-4Painful0-4Painful f prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse - 4 points10Sexual intercourse - 4 points2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing - 36 points4Walking aids (11)6Bedridden or almost0-2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)10Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	With moderate activity, abolished at rest	20
Work - 20 points0–4No regular job0–4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting – 10 points0–4Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)10Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Mild, intermittent, normal activity	25
No regular job0–4Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting – 10 points20Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points2Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points4Walking aids (11)6Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Slight, occasional, or no pain	30
Light work8Change of job12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting – 10 points0–4Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)10Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Work – 20 points	
C12Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting – 10 points20Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)12Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	No regular job	0–4
Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting – 10 points20Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Light work	8
Same job, reduced performance16Same job, same performance20Sitting – 10 points20Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Change of job	12
Sitting – 10 points0–4Painful0–4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10		16
Painful0-4Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse - 4 points0-1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0-1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing - 36 points0-2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0-2Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Same job, same performance	20
Painful if prolonged or awkward6Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Sitting – 10 points	
Uncomfortable8Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points0–2Walking aids (11)0–2Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Painful	0–4
Free10Sexual intercourse – 4 points0–1Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points4Walking aids (11)0–2Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Painful if prolonged or awkward	6
Sexual intercourse – 4 pointsPainful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points4Walking aids (11)0–2Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Uncomfortable	8
Painful (or if man erection not possible)0–1Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points4Walking aids (11)0–2Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Free	10
Painful if prolonged or awkward2Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points4Walking aids (11)0–2Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Sexual intercourse – 4 points	
Uncomfortable, different from before3No complaints4Standing – 36 points4Walking aids (11)9Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0–2Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	•	0–1
No complaints4Standing – 36 pointsWalking aids (11)Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)12Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Painful if prolonged or awkward	2
Standing – 36 pointsWalking aids (11)Bedridden or almost0–2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)12Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Uncomfortable, different from before	3
Walking aids (11)02Bedridden or almost02Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)02Cannot walk or almost02Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	No complaints	4
Walking aids (11)02Bedridden or almost02Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)02Cannot walk or almost02Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10		
Bedridden or almost0-2Wheelchair4Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)12Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10		
Two crutches6Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)12Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10		0–2
Two sticks8One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)12Cannot walk or almost0–2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Wheelchair	4
One stick10No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0-2Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Two crutches	6
No sticks12Gait unaided (11)0-2Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Two sticks	8
Gait unaided (11)0-2Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	One stick	10
Cannot walk or almost0-2Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	No sticks	12
Shuffling small steps4Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Gait unaided (11)	
Gross limp6Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Cannot walk or almost	0–2
Moderate limp8Slight limp10	Shuffling small steps	4
Slight limp 10	Gross limp	6
	Moderate limp	8
Normal 12	Slight limp	10
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Normal	12
Walking distance (11)	Walking distance (11)	
Bed ridden or few meters 0–2	Bed ridden or few meters	0–2
Very limited time and distance 4	Very limited time and distance	4
Limited with sticks, difficult without, 6 prolonged standing possible		6
One hour with a stick, limited without 8		R
One hour without sticks, slight pain or limp 10		
Normal for age and general condition 12		
Total 100		

two-thirds of the patients graded as excellent were of the conservatively treated group.

The three patients with limb-length discrepancy had radiological malunion. Despite the presence of radiological malunion (within the 'fair' grade of Matta and Tornetta grading), patients were still satisfied functionally at 6 months.

Table 2 Radiological outcome grading using Matta and
Tornetta [11] grading system (total is 29 as there was one
patient who died on table)

<u>.</u>		,	
Grades	Number of patients	Conservatively treated (mean follow- up 8.1 months)	Surgically treated (mean follow-up 11.6 months)
Excellent	16	12	4
Good	9	5	4
Fair	3	3	-
Poor	1	-	1

None of our patients experienced implant failure or thromboembolic complications. All the patients had evidence of union by 3 months and almost complete union after 6 months.

The three mortalities in our series were as follows: (a) a 3-year-old male child was run over by a car, had 7-cm sacroiliac diastasis, was vitally unstable on admission, and died of hypovolemic shock. (b) A 6-year-old girl with open Tile B1 fracture for whom an external fixator was done. She died after a few days of sepsis (Fig. 2). (c) A 10-year-old boy was run over by a truck and had massively crushed hemipelvis and external iliac complete maceration, for whom fixation and vascular grafting were done. He died after 2 days with multiple organ failure.

The mean age for the patients who were treated conservatively was lower than those treated surgically (6 years 3 months compared with 9 years 2 months).


The average functional score at 6 months of follow-up was 74 in patients treated conservatively and 70 in patients treated surgically. This difference was statistically significant (P=0.027).

Most of the surgically treated patients presented with shock, which indicates the aggressiveness of the trauma and hence the need for intervention.

The relationship between the functional score at 6 months and the age whether younger or older than 7 years showed that there was statistically significant difference (P=0.031), with higher functional score in patients younger than 7 years.

Discussion

Most of the literature shows that the preferred modality of treatment of pelvic fracture in the pediatric population is the conservative one and that operative management has a very limited role because of the remodeling and healing power in this age group [5,6,13]. This concept was adopted by these studies



A 6-year-old female patient was involved in a road traffic accident, with bilateral sacroiliac anterior diastasis and very minimal symphyseal diastasis (open injury with vaginal tears) and left femoral neck fracture (a, b). Femoral neck fracture was fixed, and the obstetrics/gynecology specialists repaired vaginal tears with the patient in lithotomy position. Immediate postoperative radiograph (c) showed marked symphyseal diastasis for which we reoperated and fixed it with external fixator (d). This patient died on the seventh postoperative day of sepsis.

with relatively good results, but recently this concept is changing because of the better understanding of the fracture patterns and the need for a method to avoid major significant complications that may leave long-lasting disability especially in children close to maturity.

In our series, we were not able to evaluate delayed sequel because the duration of follow-up is relatively short; however, most of our patients were united in less than 3 months.

All injuries were high-energy events, with pedestrian accidents as the most common mechanism, which agrees with other published studies [13–15]. The number of cases encountered in the time interval of our study reflects a relatively high incidence of pediatric pelvic fractures encountered in our hospital (which is one of the biggest hospitals in Egypt

and the Middle East). This may reflect the relatively less secure traffic for children in our country.

Regarding the fracture type, Leonard *et al.* [14] reported in their series that most children (18/39) sustained a Torode and Zeig type 3 fracture, which is a simple ring fracture, and 13 children sustained a type 4 ring disruption fracture. Subasi *et al.* [13] reported that according to Tile classification, 34 of the 58 fractures were type B and 24 were type C. Signorino *et al.* [16] reported that among the 20 patients evaluated, 15 of the fractures were not displaced or separated. In comparison with Signorino *et al.* [16] and Leonard *et al.* [14], our series had more unstable pelvic fractures, which may demonstrates the aggressiveness of the fractures we encountered in general.

Regarding associated injuries, our series supports the studies by Leonard *et al.* [14]. Banerjee *et al.* [15] and

References	Country	Period (years)	Type of study	Number of patients	Surgical	Clinical outcome	Mortalities
Leonard et al. [14]	Ireland	14	Retrospective	39	1	8 complicated cases: LLD, limp, incontinence	1
Banerjee et al. [15]	UK	10	Retrospective	44	1	1: secondary hip arthritis	7
Signorino et al. [16]	USA	20	Prospective	20	1	_	-
Chai <i>et al</i> . [17]	Australia	17	Retrospective	120	7	_	5
Subasi et al. [13]	Turkey	16	Retrospective	58	0	10: gait abnormalities and LLD	3
Grisoni et al. [18]	USA	6	Retrospective	57	_	_	_
This study	Egypt	2	Prospective	30	10	6: LLD, low back pain, foot drop. Mean score was 73/76	3

Table 3 Comparing different published series with our series

Chai *et al.* [17] that associated orthopedic injuries were common (43.3% in our series), but we had only one brain concussion in our series, which is against Leonard *et al.* [14] (25% of associated head injuries) and Chai *et al.* [17] (44%).

Regarding mortalities, we had three cases in our series (10%); all were victims of pedestrian run-over car accidents with aggressive injuries including symphyseal diastasis about 9 cm in one, sacroiliac (SI) diastasis about 10 cm in another, and rupture urethra and retroperitoneal hematoma in the last one. Our mortalities percentage lies within other studies percentage range with Leonard *et al.* [14] having 2.5%, Subasi *et al.* [13] 5%, and Banerjee *et al.* [15] 15.9%.

Regarding life-threatening hemorrhage from the pelvic fracture, we found it less common in children compared with adults. In our series, hemorrhage leading to shock happened only in one patient. This finding agrees with many authors [4,5,18]. As stated by previous authors, the lower incidence of vascular disruption in children may be because of the vasoactive properties of their blood vessels (particularly the arteries which undergo vasoconstriction as opposed to the more friable atherosclerotic adult vessels). Hence, by reducing the rate of hemorrhage, coagulation factors are not overconsumed, and life-threatening coagulopathy is avoided [5,19].

More than two-thirds of our patients had excellent radiological outcome. They were of the conservatively treated group, and this can be explained by the fact that most of these patients had minimal displacement compared with those treated surgically who had more displacement that required surgery.

The treatment recommendations for pediatric pelvic fractures have undergone certain changes during the last decade. Historically, these fractures were managed nonoperatively with bed rest, traction, pelvic slings, or hip spica casts. The rationale for this approach was the presence of high union rates, extensive remodeling capacity, and favorable results and to minimize the risk of triradiate cartilage injury [8,9]. However, longterm follow-up studies have reported significant residual morbidity such as low back pain and limblength discrepancy [7,8].

Oransky *et al.* [20] reported eight unstable fracture patients who were managed surgically with plates and screws. He was the first to describe injury of the Risser's growth nuclei. This injury can partially explain the pathogenesis of iliac wing undergrowth that occurred in three patients of their series. They recommended that surgical treatment in displaced vertical fracture in children is mandatory as it is in adults and anatomical reduction of the fracture should be considered. Implants should be removed in all patients between 3 and 4 months after surgery to prevent growth arrest [20].

We agree with Leonard *et al.* [14], Banerjee *et al.* [15], and Subasi *et al.* [13] (Table 2) that most of the patients will be treated conservatively. Moreover, we agree on the importance of the anatomical reduction of vertically unstable pelvic fractures [20].

The mean age for the patients who were treated conservatively was lower than those treated surgically (6 years 3 months compared with 9 years 2 months) which can be attributed to the relatively accepted reduction of the fracture in younger age groups compared with older ones whom should be treated as adults as usually conservative management fails to achieve good results in this age group; hence, we concluded that better outcome is expected with younger patients.

We cannot conclude from these results that conservative management is better than the surgical one, as most of the conservatively treated patients had less severe trauma and lower incidence of associated injuries and hence less aggressive mode of management was chosen for them.

We agree with Leonard *et al.* [14], Banerjee *et al.* [15], and Subasi *et al.* [13] (Table 2) that patients who developed complications mostly were because of vertically unstable pelvic fractures. We used the Majeed scoring system for functional outcome assessment because it is specific for pelvic fractures which gave us solid objective data, and it was not done by any of the studies we are comparing with except Signorino *et al.* [16] who used the more general WeeFIM instrument (formerly known as the Functional Independence Measure for Children) which assesses self-care, mobility, and cognition.

Weakness of our study is the short-term follow-up. Longer-term follow-up period is needed to assess certain complications encountered in other studies like secondary scoliosis and growth affection (Table 3).

Conclusion

Our results indicate that pediatric pelvic fractures are not uncommon in our society with road traffic accidents being the most common mechanism of injury. They are also characterized by the high incidence of associated injuries, which should be looked for thoroughly immediately after pediatric pelvic fracture is diagnosed. Initial treatment goals are to indentify lifethreatening injuries and to control hemorrhage. Pediatric pelvic fractures classified as Tile A or B can be successfully managed conservatively through spica casting as long as good reduction is achieved with the fact that patient satisfaction is usually better than the radiological sacroiliac joint persistent gap or delayed union. Vertically unstable fractures can lead to Leg Length Discrepancy (LLD) and delayed sequel unless treated by open reduction internal fixation (ORIF) and accurate reduction.

Generally, when fair reduction is achieved and maintained with suitable treatment choice in the pediatric population, the child obtains good functional outcome by 6 months specially those who are younger than 7 years. Long-term follow-up is needed to assess affection on growth, sacroiliac joint ankylosis and low back compensations like scoliosis beside the functional outcome.

Financial support and sponsorship Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

References

- Letts M, Davidson D, Lapner P. Multiple trauma in children: predicting outcome and long-term results. Can J Surg 2002; 45:126–131.
- 2 Gordon RG, Karpik K, Hardy S. Techniques of operative reduction and fixation of pediatric and adolescent pelvic fractures. Oper Tech Orthop 1995; 5:95–114.
- 3 Rieger H, Brug E. Fractures of the pelvis in children. Clin Orthop Relat Res 1997; 336:226–239.
- 4 Silber H, Jeff S, John M, Flynn L, Kim M, Koffler M, Quinby WC, et al. Analysis of the cause, classification, and associated injuries of 166 consecutive pediatric pelvic fractures. J Pediatr Orthop 2001; 21: 446–450.
- 5 Musemeche CA, Fischer RP, Cotler HB, Andrassy RJ. Selective management of pediatric pelvic fractures: a conservative approach. J Pediatr Surg 1987; 22:538–540. Quoted from: Leonard *et al.* [14]
- 6 Nierenberg G, Volpin G, Bialik V, Stein H. Pelvic fractures in children: a follow-up in 20 children treated conservatively. J Pediatr Orthop (B) 1993; 1:140–142.
- 7 McDonald GA. Pelvic disruptions in children. Clin Orthop Relat Res 1980; 151:130–134. Quoted from: Leonard et al. [14]
- 8 McLaren AC, Rorabeck CH, Halpenny J. Long-term pain and disability in relation to residual deformity after displaced pelvic ring fractures. Can J Surg 1990; 33:492–494.
- 9 Tile M. Describing the injury: classification of pelvic ring injury. In: Tile M, Helfet DL, Kellam J, editors. Fractures of the pelvis and acetabulum. 3rd ed. Baltimore: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2003. pp. 130–167.
- 10 Torode I, Zeig D. Pelvic fractures in children. J Pediatric Orthop 1985; 5:76–84. Quoted from Roger F Widmann. Chapter 20; Fracture of the pelvis in Children, Rockwood & Wilkins Fractures in children, 6th edition (2006) Lippincott William & Wilkins, 836-847
- 11 Matta JM, Tornetta P. Internal fixation of unstable pelvic ring injuries. Clin Orthop 1996; 329:129–140.
- 12 Majeed SA. Grading the outcome of pelvic fractures. J Bone Joint Surg [Br] 1989; 71-B:304–306.
- 13 Subasi M, Arslan H, Necmioglu S, Onen A, O?zen S, Kaya M. Long-term outcomes of conservatively treated pediatric pelvic fractures. Injury 2004; 35:771–781.
- 14 Leonard M, Ibrahim M, Mckenna P, Boran S, McCormack D. Pediatric pelvic ring fractures and associated injuries. Injury 2011; 42:1027–1030.
- 15 Banerjee S, Barry MJ, Mark J, Paterson H. Pediatric pelvic fractures: 10 years experience in a trauma centre. Injury 2009; 40:410–413.
- 16 Signorino PR, Densmore J, Werner M, Winthrop A, Stylianos S, Guice KS, Oldham KT. Pediatric pelvic injury: functional outcome at 6-month followup. J Pediatr Sur 2005; 40:107–113.
- 17 Chai JP, Holland AJ, Little D, Cass DT. Pelvic fractures and associated injuries in children. J Trauma 2004; 56:83–88.
- 18 Grisoni N, Connor S, Marsh E, Thompson G, Cooperman D, Blakemore L. Pelvic fractures in a pediatric level I trauma center. J Orthop Trauma 2002; 16:458–463.
- 19 Bond SJ, Gotschall CS, Eichelberger MR. Predictors of abdominal injury in children with pelvic fracture. J Trauma 1991; 31:1169–1173. Quoted from Roger F Widmann. Chapter 20; Fracture of the pelvis in children, Rockwood & Wilkins Fractures in children, 6th ed. (2006) Lippincott William & Wilkins, 836-847.
- 20 Oransky M, Arduini M, Tortora M, Roa Zoppi A. Surgical treatment of unstable pelvic fracture in children: long term results. Injury 2010; 41:1140–1144.