

Functional Outcomes of Primary Arthrodesis versus Open Reduction and Internal Fixation in the Treatment of Lisfranc Injuries

Arun Aneja, Zsombor Tamas Gal, Ashley Nicole Dawson, Chandler Ryan Sneed, Tyler D Kalbac, Richard Wes Pectol¹, Matthew William Kavolus², Jarod Taylor Griffin, Arjun Srinath

¹University of Kentucky, ²Wellstar Atlanta Medical Center

INTRODUCTION:

The lack of data regarding functional outcomes of midfoot primary arthrodesis (PA) and open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) contributes to significant debate regarding the optimal method of treatment for Lisfranc injuries. Although PA is associated with lower rates of secondary procedure and posttraumatic arthritis, its impact on foot functionality has come into question due to sacrifice of tarsometatarsal (TMT) mobility. The authors hypothesize that there is no significant difference between patient recorded outcome measures (PROMs) among patients receiving PA and ORIF for the treatment of Lisfranc injuries.

METHODS: A retrospective cohort study of patients surgically treated for Lisfranc injuries between January 2010 and January 2019 at a Level I trauma center was undertaken. Retrospective chart review was utilized to obtain patient demographics, comorbidities, procedural information, complications, and additional treatments. Responding by survey, patients reported their functional competency in performing daily and sports-related activities via the validated Foot and Ankle Ability Measure (FAAM) instrument. For each patient, scores for the Activities of Daily Living (ADL) and Sports sections were calculated. Patients also reported their perceived current level of function on a percent scale with respect to functionality prior to TMT injury.

RESULTS: Thirty-two patients underwent PA, and 49 patients underwent ORIF. There were no significant differences between age ($P=0.08$), incidence of high energy injury mechanisms ($P=0.24$), or comorbidities among PA and ORIF groups. There were no significant differences in FAAM scores among PA and ORIF groups. The average ADL scores for PA (69.78 ± 18.61) and ORIF (73.53 ± 25.60) were not significantly different ($P=0.48$), nor were the average Sports scores for PA (45.81 ± 24.65) and ORIF (56.54 ± 31.13) groups ($P=0.11$). Furthermore, perceived levels of ADL ($P = 0.32$) and Sports ($P = 0.81$) function, compared to pre-injury levels, were also not significantly different between the two groups.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: This analysis of PROMs revealed no significant difference in the ability to participate in ADLs and sports between PA and ORIF groups. These results align with our hypothesis and suggest that despite sacrificing TMT joint mobility, functional outcomes of patients receiving PA were not significantly different from those receiving ORIF for Lisfranc injuries.