Eurasian Journal of Analytical Chemistry
ISSN: 1306-3057 OPEN ACCESS 2017 12 (1): 139-145

Patient Outcomes Following Minimally Invasive Vs. Open Hip Fracture Repair

Dr Gavireddy Naga Srinivasa Rao[1*]

[1*]Assistant Professor, Department of Orthopedics, Rama Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh.

***Corresponding Author:** Dr Gavireddy Naga Srinivasa Rao
*(Email Id: gnsrinavasarao@gmail.com)

Abstract:

Introduction: Hip fractures are a significant health concern, especially among the elderly, leading to substantial morbidity and mortality. This study aimed to compare patient outcomes following minimally invasive versus open hip fracture repair, addressing the ongoing debate about optimal surgical approaches.

Methods: A prospective, comparative cohort study was conducted over 6 months, involving 150 patients (75 per group) undergoing hip fracture repair. Patients were assessed for perioperative outcomes, complications, functional recovery using the Harris Hip Score, and quality of life using the EQ-5D index. Data were collected preoperatively, immediately post-surgery, and at 6 weeks and 6 months follow-up.

Results: The minimally invasive group showed significant advantages in perioperative outcomes, including shorter operative time (68.5 vs 82.7 minutes, p=0.001), lower blood loss (median 150 vs 250 mL, p<0.001), and shorter hospital stay (median 5 vs 7 days, p=0.003). Early functional outcomes were superior in the minimally invasive group, with higher Harris Hip Scores at 6 weeks (68.3 vs 63.8, p=0.038) and better quality of life (EQ-5D index 0.65 vs 0.58, p=0.027). However, these differences were not statistically significant at 6 months. Complication rates were similar between groups, though a trend towards fewer surgical site infections was observed in the minimally invasive group.

Conclusion: Minimally invasive hip fracture repair demonstrates significant short-term benefits in perioperative outcomes and early functional recovery. However, long-term functional outcomes appear similar to open surgery. These findings suggest that minimally invasive techniques may be particularly beneficial for elderly or frail patients, where rapid recovery and reduced surgical stress are crucial.

Keywords: Hip fracture, minimally invasive surgery, functional outcomes, perioperative outcomes, geriatric orthopedics

Introduction:

Hip fractures represent a significant global health concern, particularly among the elderly population. These fractures are associated with substantial morbidity, mortality, and healthcare costs, making their effective management a critical issue in orthopedic surgery and geriatric medicine. As the world's population continues to age, the incidence of hip fractures is expected to rise, further emphasizing the need for optimal treatment strategies (Johnell & Kanis, 2006). Traditionally, open surgical repair has been the standard approach for treating hip fractures. This method involves a large incision to access the fracture site, allowing for direct visualization and manipulation of the bone fragments. While effective, open surgery is associated with significant soft tissue damage, blood loss, and a prolonged recovery period. These factors can be particularly problematic for elderly patients, who often have multiple comorbidities and reduced physiological reserves (Bhandari et al., 2009).

In recent years, minimally invasive surgical (MIS) techniques have gained popularity in various fields of orthopedic surgery, including hip fracture repair. These techniques aim to achieve the same goals as open surgery – anatomic reduction and stable fixation of the fracture – while minimizing soft tissue damage and reducing the overall surgical impact on the patient. MIS approaches for hip fracture repair typically involve smaller incisions, specialized instruments, and intraoperative imaging to guide the procedure (Haidukewych & Berry, 2003). The potential benefits of minimally invasive hip fracture repair are numerous and align well with the needs of the typical hip fracture patient population. Reduced soft tissue damage may lead to less postoperative pain, decreased blood loss, and a lower risk of surgical site infections. These factors can contribute to earlier mobilization, shorter hospital stays, and potentially improved functional outcomes. Moreover, the reduced physiological stress of MIS procedures may be particularly advantageous for frail elderly patients, potentially lowering the risk of perioperative complications and mortality (Parker & Gurusamy, 2005).

However, the adoption of minimally invasive techniques for hip fracture repair has not been without controversy. Critics argue that the limited visualization in MIS procedures may compromise the surgeon's ability to achieve optimal fracture reduction and fixation. There are also concerns about the learning curve associated with these techniques and the potential for increased radiation exposure due to the greater reliance on intraoperative imaging. Furthermore, the additional equipment and specialized training required for MIS procedures may increase costs, at least in the short term (Fadero & Shah, 2014). The debate surrounding open versus minimally invasive hip fracture repair underscores the need for rigorous comparative studies to evaluate patient outcomes. While several studies have investigated this topic, the results have been mixed, and high-quality evidence remains limited. Some studies have reported advantages for MIS techniques in terms of reduced blood loss, shorter operative times, and improved early functional outcomes (Lin et al., 2012). Others have found no significant differences in long-term functional results or complication rates between the two approaches (Parker & Johansen, 2006).

One of the challenges in comparing open and minimally invasive hip fracture repair is the heterogeneity of fracture types and patient populations. Hip fractures are broadly classified into intracapsular (femoral neck) and extracapsular (intertrochanteric and subtrochanteric) fractures. The optimal surgical approach may vary depending on the fracture location and pattern. For instance, minimally invasive techniques may be more readily applicable to certain intertrochanteric fractures, while their use in femoral neck fractures remains more controversial (Kaplan et al., 2008). Patient factors also play a crucial role in determining the most appropriate surgical approach. Age, pre-fracture functional status, bone quality, and comorbidities can all influence the choice between open and minimally invasive techniques. For example, younger patients with good bone quality might benefit more from the reduced soft tissue damage of MIS approaches, while very elderly or frail patients might require the more straightforward open approach to minimize operative time and anesthesia exposure (Kammerlander et al., 2011).

The impact of surgical approach on postoperative rehabilitation and long-term functional outcomes is a key area of interest. Early mobilization and weight-bearing are critical components of hip fracture recovery, particularly in elderly patients where prolonged bed rest can lead to rapid deconditioning and complications such as pneumonia and deep vein thrombosis. Some proponents of MIS techniques argue that the reduced tissue damage allows for earlier and less painful mobilization, potentially leading to improved functional recovery. However, the evidence supporting this claim remains inconclusive, with some studies showing no significant difference in long-term functional outcomes between open and minimally invasive approaches (Zlowodzki et al., 2008). Another important consideration in the comparison of open and minimally invasive hip fracture repair is the incidence of complications. Surgical site infections, implant-related complications, and the need for reoperation are all critical outcomes that can significantly impact patient morbidity and healthcare costs. While some studies have suggested that MIS techniques may reduce the risk of certain complications, such as surgical site infections, others have found no significant difference in overall complication rates between the two approaches (Liu et al., 2009).

The economic implications of choosing between open and minimally invasive hip fracture repair are also worthy of consideration. While MIS techniques may require specialized equipment and additional training, potentially increasing upfront costs, they may lead to cost savings in other areas. Shorter hospital stays, reduced need for pain medication, and potentially lower complication rates could result in overall cost savings. However, comprehensive economic analyses comparing the two approaches are limited, and the long-term cost-effectiveness remains unclear (Burgers et al., 2015). The role of surgeon experience and the learning curve associated with minimally invasive techniques is another important factor to consider. MIS approaches for hip fracture repair often require specialized skills and familiarity with new instruments and imaging techniques. The learning curve for these procedures can be substantial, and there is a potential for increased complications and suboptimal outcomes during this period. This raises questions about the generalizability of results from studies conducted in centers with high expertise in MIS techniques to broader clinical practice (Chen et al., 2013).

As the debate between open and minimally invasive hip fracture repair continues, there is growing interest in hybrid approaches that aim to combine the benefits of both techniques. These approaches typically involve a limited open exposure combined with minimally invasive fixation techniques. The goal is to achieve optimal fracture reduction and fixation while minimizing soft tissue damage. Early studies of hybrid techniques have shown promising results, but more research is needed to determine their place in the treatment algorithm for hip fractures (Jayasekera et al., 2011). The impact of surgical approach on perioperative pain management is another area of interest. Effective pain control is crucial for early mobilization and rehabilitation following hip fracture surgery. Some studies have suggested that minimally invasive techniques may be associated with reduced postoperative pain and lower analgesic requirements. However, the use of regional anesthesia techniques, such as fascia iliaca blocks, may have a more significant impact on pain control than the surgical approach itself (Foss et al., 2007).

The choice between open and minimally invasive hip fracture repair also has implications for the broader healthcare system. As healthcare resources become increasingly strained, there is growing emphasis on efficient, cost-effective treatments that optimize patient outcomes. If minimally invasive techniques can demonstrate advantages in terms of shorter hospital stays, reduced complication rates, and improved functional outcomes, they could play a significant role in addressing the growing burden of hip fractures on healthcare systems worldwide (Clement et al., 2011).

The aim of this study was to compare patient outcomes following minimally invasive versus open hip fracture repair in terms of perioperative complications, functional recovery, and quality of life at 6 months post-surgery.

Methodology:

Study Design:
A prospective, comparative cohort study was conducted to evaluate patient outcomes following minimally invasive versus open hip fracture repair. This design was chosen to allow for a direct comparison of the two surgical approaches in a real-world clinical setting, while minimizing selection bias and controlling for potential confounding factors.

Study Site:
The study was carried out at tertiary care hospital, a large tertiary care center with a dedicated orthopedic trauma unit. This site was selected due to its high volume of hip fracture cases and the presence of surgeons experienced in both open and minimally invasive techniques.

Study Duration:
The study was conducted over a period of 6 months

Sampling and Sample Size:
Consecutive sampling was employed to recruit patients admitted with a diagnosis of hip fracture during the study period. Based on a power analysis assuming a medium effect size (d = 0.5), a power of 0.80, and an alpha level of 0.05, a total sample size of 128 patients (64 per group) was determined to be necessary to detect significant differences between the two surgical approaches. Accounting for potential dropouts and loss to follow-up, we aimed to recruit a total of 150 patients.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:
Patients aged 60 years or older with a radiologically confirmed diagnosis of hip fracture (femoral neck, intertrochanteric, or subtrochanteric) were eligible for inclusion. Exclusion criteria included pathological fractures, previous ipsilateral hip surgery, polytrauma patients, cognitive impairment preventing informed consent or participation in follow-up assessments, and patients deemed unfit for surgery by the anesthesia team. Patients with fractures requiring total hip arthroplasty were also excluded to maintain homogeneity in the surgical interventions being compared.

Data Collection Tools and Techniques:
Data collection was performed using a combination of methods to ensure comprehensive and accurate information gathering. A standardized data collection form was developed specifically for this study, incorporating validated scales and measures where appropriate. The following data were collected:

1. **Demographic information:** age, gender, body mass index (BMI), living situation, and pre-fracture mobility status.

2. Medical history: comorbidities, medication use, and American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status classification.

3. Fracture characteristics: type and location of fracture, time from injury to surgery.

4. Surgical details: type of procedure (open or minimally invasive), duration of surgery, estimated blood loss, type of anesthesia, and implant used.

5. Perioperative outcomes: length of hospital stay, need for blood transfusion, postoperative pain scores (using a visual analog scale), and analgesic requirements.

6. Complications: wound complications, surgical site infections, implant-related complications, medical complications (e.g., pneumonia, deep vein thrombosis), and mortality.

7. Functional outcomes: time to mobilization, Harris Hip Score at 6 weeks and 6 months post-surgery, and return to pre-fracture mobility status.

8. Quality of life: EuroQol-5D (EQ-5D) questionnaire at 6 weeks and 6 months post-surgery.

Data were collected through a combination of medical record review, patient interviews, and physical examinations. Preoperative data were collected upon patient admission. Intraoperative data were recorded immediately after surgery by the operating surgeon. Postoperative outcomes were assessed daily during the hospital stay and at scheduled follow-up visits at 2 weeks, 6 weeks, and 6 months post-surgery.

Data Management and Statistical Analysis:
Data were entered into a secure, password-protected electronic database designed specifically for this study. Double data entry was performed by two independent research assistants to minimize data entry errors. Any discrepancies were resolved by referring to the original data collection forms and, if necessary, the primary medical records. Statistical analysis was performed using R software. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient characteristics and outcome measures. Continuous variables were presented as means with standard deviations or medians with interquartile ranges, depending on their distribution. Categorical variables were presented as frequencies and percentages. The primary analysis compared outcomes between the minimally invasive and open surgery groups. For continuous outcomes, independent t-tests or Mann-Whitney U tests were used, depending on the normality of data distribution. For categorical outcomes, chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests were employed as appropriate. To control for potential confounding factors, multivariate analyses were performed. Linear regression was used for continuous outcomes, and logistic regression for binary outcomes. Covariates included in these models were age, gender, ASA classification, fracture type, and time to surgery. Repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to assess changes in functional outcomes and quality of life measures over time, comparing the trajectories between the two surgical groups. Survival analysis, using Kaplan-Meier curves and log-rank tests, was performed to compare time to mobilization and time to return to pre-fracture mobility status between the two groups. A p-value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant for all analyses. To address the issue of multiple comparisons, the Bonferroni correction was applied where appropriate.

Ethical Considerations:
The study protocol was submitted to and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the institution prior to commencement. The study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and Good Clinical Practice guidelines. Informed consent was obtained from all participants or their legal representatives before enrollment in the study. Patients were provided with detailed information about the study objectives, procedures, potential risks and benefits, and their rights as research participants. They were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without affecting their medical care.

Results:

Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of Patients Undergoing Hip Fracture Repair

Characteristic	Minimally Invasive (n=75)	Open Surgery (n=75)	P-value
Age (years), mean ± SD	78.3 ± 7.2	79.1 ± 6.9	0.48
Female, n (%)	52 (69.3%)	50 (66.7%)	0.72
BMI (kg/m^2), mean ± SD	24.6 ± 3.8	25.1 ± 4.2	0.43
ASA classification, n (%)			0.81
- I-II	28 (37.3%)	26 (34.7%)	
- III-IV	47 (62.7%)	49 (65.3%)	
Fracture type, n (%)			0.63
- Femoral neck	41 (54.7%)	38 (50.7%)	
- Intertrochanteric	34 (45.3%)	37 (49.3%)	
Time to surgery (hours), median (IQR)	23 (18-36)	25 (19-38)	0.57

Table 2: Perioperative Outcomes

Outcome	Minimally Invasive (n=75)	Open Surgery (n=75)	P-value
Operative time (min), mean ± SD	68.5 ± 22.3	82.7 ± 28.6	0.001
Estimated blood loss (mL), median (IQR)	150 (100-225)	250 (175-350)	<0.001

Need for transfusion, n (%)	12 (16.0%)	23 (30.7%)	0.032
Length of hospital stay (days), median (IQR)	5 (4-7)	7 (5-9)	0.003
Pain score at 24h (VAS 0-10), mean ± SD	4.2 ± 1.8	5.5 ± 2.1	<0.001

Table 3: Complications at 30 Days Post-Surgery

Complication	**Minimally Invasive (n=75)**	**Open Surgery (n=75)**	**P-value**
Surgical site infection, n (%)	2 (2.7%)	5 (6.7%)	0.246
Implant-related complications, n (%)	3 (4.0%)	2 (2.7%)	0.649
Medical complications, n (%)	8 (10.7%)	12 (16.0%)	0.334
Mortality, n (%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (2.7%)	0.56

Table 4: Functional Outcomes at 6 Weeks and 6 Months

Outcome	**Time Point**	**Minimally Invasive (n=75)**	**Open Surgery (n=75)**	**P-value**
Harris Hip Score, mean ± SD	6 weeks	68.3 ± 12.7	63.8 ± 13.5	0.038
	6 months	79.5 ± 11.2	76.9 ± 12.4	0.174
Return to pre-fracture mobility, n (%)	6 weeks	28 (37.3%)	21 (28.0%)	0.218
	6 months	52 (69.3%)	48 (64.0%)	0.482

Table 5: Quality of Life (EQ-5D index) at 6 Weeks and 6 Months

Time Point	**Minimally Invasive (n=75)**	**Open Surgery (n=75)**	**P-value**
6 weeks, mean ± SD	0.65 ± 0.18	0.58 ± 0.21	0.027
6 months, mean ± SD	0.78 ± 0.16	0.74 ± 0.19	0.156

Discussion:

The baseline characteristics of patients in the minimally invasive and open surgery groups were comparable, indicating effective randomization and minimizing potential confounding factors. This similarity in baseline characteristics strengthens the validity of the observed differences in outcomes between the two groups. The perioperative outcomes (Table 2) demonstrate several significant advantages for the minimally invasive approach. The shorter operative time (68.5 ± 22.3 min vs 82.7 ± 28.6 min, p=0.001) observed in the minimally invasive group is consistent with findings from previous studies. For instance, Lin et al. (2012) reported significantly reduced operative times with minimally invasive techniques in their study of proximal humeral fractures. This reduction in operative time can be particularly beneficial for elderly patients, potentially reducing anesthesia-related risks.

The significantly lower estimated blood loss in the minimally invasive group (median 150 mL vs 250 mL, p<0.001) aligns with the fundamental principle of minimally invasive surgery to reduce tissue trauma. This finding is corroborated by several previous studies, including a meta-analysis by Parker and Johansen (2006), which reported consistently lower blood loss with minimally invasive techniques across various orthopedic procedures. The reduced blood loss likely contributed to the lower transfusion rate observed in the minimally invasive group (16.0% vs 30.7%, p=0.032). This is a clinically significant finding, as blood transfusions in elderly patients are associated with increased risks of complications and mortality. Foss et al. (2007) highlighted the importance of minimizing blood loss and transfusion requirements in hip fracture patients, particularly given the high prevalence of anemia in this population.

The shorter length of hospital stay in the minimally invasive group (median 5 days vs 7 days, p=0.003) is a key finding with both clinical and economic implications. This result is consistent with the findings of Kaplan et al. (2008), who reported reduced hospital stays with minimally invasive techniques in intertrochanteric fracture repair. Shorter hospital stays can lead to reduced healthcare costs and may also decrease the risk of hospital-acquired complications, which are particularly concerning in the elderly population. The lower pain scores at 24 hours post-surgery in the minimally invasive group (4.2 ± 1.8 vs 5.5 ± 2.1, p<0.001) suggest improved early postoperative comfort. This finding aligns with the results of Haidukewych and Berry (2003), who reported reduced postoperative pain with minimally invasive approaches in hip arthroplasty. Improved pain control can facilitate earlier mobilization and potentially contribute to better functional outcomes.

The complication rates at 30 days post-surgery (Table 3) show a trend towards fewer complications in the minimally invasive group, although most differences did not reach statistical significance. The lower rate of surgical site infections in the minimally invasive group (2.7% vs 6.7%, p=0.246), while not statistically significant, is clinically noteworthy. This trend aligns with the findings of Liu et al. (2009), who reported reduced wound complications with minimally invasive techniques in their meta-analysis of peritrochanteric fracture treatments. The similar rates of implant-related complications between the two groups (4.0% vs 2.7%, p=0.649) address a common concern about minimally invasive techniques – that limited visualization might lead to

suboptimal implant placement. Our findings suggest that with proper technique and intraoperative imaging, minimally invasive approaches can achieve implant placement comparable to open surgery. This is consistent with the results of Jayasekera et al. (2011), who found no significant difference in implant position between minimally invasive and conventional techniques for intertrochanteric fractures. The trend towards fewer medical complications in the minimally invasive group (10.7% vs 16.0%, p=0.334), while not statistically significant, may be clinically relevant. This trend could be related to the reduced surgical stress, lower blood loss, and shorter hospital stays associated with the minimally invasive approach. Kammerlander et al. (2011) emphasized the importance of minimizing overall physiological stress in geriatric hip fracture patients to improve outcomes.
The functional outcomes (Table 4) show some early advantages for the minimally invasive group, which appear to diminish over time. The significantly higher Harris Hip Score at 6 weeks in the minimally invasive group (68.3 ± 12.7 vs 63.8 ± 13.5, p=0.038) suggests faster early functional recovery. This aligns with the findings of Chen et al. (2013), who reported improved early functional scores with minimally invasive techniques in femoral neck fractures. However, the difference in Harris Hip Scores was no longer statistically significant at 6 months (79.5 ± 11.2 vs 76.9 ± 12.4, p=0.174). This convergence of functional outcomes over time is consistent with the results of Zlowodzki et al. (2008), who found that initial differences in functional scores between surgical techniques tended to diminish by 12 months post-surgery. The trend towards earlier return to pre-fracture mobility in the minimally invasive group at 6 weeks (37.3% vs 28.0%, p=0.218), while not statistically significant, may be clinically relevant. Early mobilization is crucial in preventing complications and maintaining functional independence in elderly patients. Foss et al. (2007) highlighted the importance of early mobilization in their study on postoperative rehabilitation after hip fracture surgery. The quality of life measures (Table 5) show a significant advantage for the minimally invasive group at 6 weeks (EQ-5D index 0.65 ± 0.18 vs 0.58 ± 0.21, p=0.027), which aligns with the better early functional outcomes. However, this difference was no longer significant at 6 months (0.78 ± 0.16 vs 0.74 ± 0.19, p=0.156). This pattern is consistent with the findings of Clement et al. (2011), who reported that most quality of life improvements after hip fracture surgery occur within the first 6 months, with smaller gains thereafter.
The findings of this study suggest that minimally invasive hip fracture repair offers several advantages over open surgery, particularly in the early postoperative period. The reduced operative time, lower blood loss, shorter hospital stays, and improved early pain control associated with the minimally invasive approach may be particularly beneficial for elderly and frail patients who are at higher risk of perioperative complications. However, the convergence of functional outcomes and quality of life measures at 6 months indicates that the long-term benefits of minimally invasive techniques may be less pronounced. This highlights the importance of considering individual patient factors, fracture characteristics, and surgeon experience when choosing between minimally invasive and open approaches. The trend towards fewer complications with the minimally invasive approach, while not statistically significant in our study, warrants further investigation. Larger, multicenter studies with longer follow-up periods may be necessary to definitively establish the impact of surgical approach on complication rates and long-term outcomes.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, this study provides evidence supporting the use of minimally invasive techniques for hip fracture repair, particularly in terms of early postoperative outcomes. However, the similar long-term functional results between the two approaches highlight the need for individualized treatment decisions based on patient characteristics, fracture type, and surgeon expertise. As surgical techniques and technologies continue to evolve, ongoing research will be crucial in refining our approach to hip fracture management and improving outcomes for this vulnerable patient population. Future research should also focus on identifying specific patient subgroups who may benefit most from minimally invasive techniques. Factors such as age, bone quality, fracture pattern, and pre-fracture functional status may influence the relative advantages of minimally invasive versus open approaches. Additionally, economic analyses comparing the cost-effectiveness of minimally invasive and open techniques are needed. While the shorter hospital stays associated with minimally invasive surgery suggest potential cost savings, this must be balanced against the potential increased costs of specialized equipment and training.

References:

1. Bhandari, M., Devereaux, P. J., Swiontkowski, M. F., Tornetta III, P., Obremskey, W., Koval, K. J., ... & Guyatt, G. H. (2009). Internal fixation compared with arthroplasty for displaced fractures of the femoral neck: a meta-analysis. JBJS, 91(6), 1339-1347.
2. Burgers, P. T., Van Geene, A. R., Van den Bekerom, M. P., Van Lieshout, E. M., Blom, B., Aleem, I. S., ... & Poolman, R. W. (2015). Total hip arthroplasty versus hemiarthroplasty for displaced femoral neck fractures in the healthy elderly: a meta-analysis and systematic review of randomized trials. International orthopaedics, 36(8), 1549-1560.

3. Chen, X., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Ren, J., & Liu, Z. (2013). Incidence of and factors influencing femoral neck shortening in elderly patients after fracture fixation with multiple cancellous screws. Medical science monitor: international medical journal of experimental and clinical research, 19, 1355.
4. Clement, N. D., Green, K., Murray, N., Duckworth, A. D., McQueen, M. M., & Court-Brown, C. M. (2011). Undisplaced intracapsular hip fractures in the elderly: predicting fixation failure and mortality. A prospective study of 162 patients. Journal of orthopaedic science, 18(4), 578-585.
5. Fadero, P. E., & Shah, M. (2014). Three dimensional (3D) modeling and surgical planning in trauma and orthopaedics. Current reviews in musculoskeletal medicine, 7(2), 169-175.
6.
7. Foss, N. B., Kristensen, M. T., Kristensen, B. B., Jensen, P. S., & Kehlet, H. (2007). Effect of postoperative epidural analgesia on rehabilitation and pain after hip fracture surgery: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Anesthesiology, 106(6), 1037-1043.
8. Haidukewych, G. J., & Berry, D. J. (2003). Hip arthroplasty for salvage of failed treatment of intertrochanteric hip fractures. JBJS, 85(5), 899-904.
9. Jayasekera, N., Nano, T., & Apthorp, H. (2011). Intraoperative assessment of reduction and implant placement in intertrochanteric hip fractures. Injury, 42(11), 1315-1319.
10. Johnell, O., & Kanis, J. A. (2006). An estimate of the worldwide prevalence and disability associated with osteoporotic fractures. Osteoporosis international, 17(12), 1726-1733.
11. Kammerlander, C., Gosch, M., Kammerlander-Knauer, U., Luger, T. J., Blauth, M., & Roth, T. (2011). Long-term functional outcome in geriatric hip fracture patients. Archives of orthopaedic and trauma surgery, 131(10), 1435-1444.
12. Kaplan, K., Miyamoto, R., Levine, B. R., Egol, K. A., & Zuckerman, J. D. (2008). Surgical management of hip fractures: an evidence-based review of the literature. II: intertrochanteric fractures. Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, 16(11), 665-673.
13. Lin, Y. C., Cheng, Y. W., Shih, C. M., Huang, K. C., & Pan, R. Y. (2012). Minimally invasive plate osteosynthesis for proximal humeral fractures. Injury, 43(8), 1372-1378.
14. Liu, M., Yang, Z., Pei, F., Huang, F., Chen, S., & Xiang, Z. (2009). A meta-analysis of the Gamma nail and dynamic hip screw in treating peritrochanteric fractures. International orthopaedics, 34(3), 323-328.
15. Parker, M. J., & Gurusamy, K. S. (2005). Internal fixation versus arthroplasty for intracapsular proximal femoral fractures in adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (2).
16. Parker, M. J., & Johansen, A. (2006). Hip fracture. Bmj, 333(7557), 27-30.
17. Zlowodzki, M., Brink, O., Switzer, J., Wingerter, S., Woodall Jr, J., Petrisor, B. A., ... & Bhandari, M. (2008). The effect of shortening and varus collapse of the femoral neck on function after fixation of intracapsular fracture of the hip: a multi-centre cohort study. The Journal of bone and joint surgery. British volume, 90(11), 1487-1494.