

Radiological results of Radial Head Replacement. A long-term comparative study

Blanca Díez Sánchez, Pablo Sanchez-Urgelles, Luis Palacios-Díaz, Samuel A Antuna

INTRODUCTION: Radial head replacement (RHR) is indicated in comminuted fractures, specially those associated with elbow or forearm instability. Despite satisfactory long-term clinical outcomes, some patients present with concerning radiographic findings. The aim of this study was to compare the long-term radiological results of two RHR designs and to correlate them to clinical findings

METHODS: One hundred thirty-four patients (54 men and 80 women) with a mean age of 54 years (range, 18-90) who received a RHR (84 spacer design, 50 anatomic model) in the context of acute elbow instability were followed for a mean of 88 months (range, 24-204). Radiological analysis included detection of technical implantation errors (poor position and inappropriate choice of implant size), lucent lines around the stem, stress shielding, heterotopic ossifications and degenerative changes. These findings were correlated to clinical outcomes according to the MEPS, Oxford, and DASH scores

RESULTS:

Radiographically, technical errors, including overstuffing, malrotation and inadequate cortical contact, were more prevalent in patients with an anatomic RHR (17 vs 7, $p < 0.001$). These findings were related to greater pain ($p = 0.04$) and worse DASH scores ($p = 0.03$). Radiolucent lines were present in 58 spacer RHR (69%), being complete in 31 patients, with only half of them being progressive. Twelve anatomic RHR (24%) showed radiolucencies, being complete and progressive in all of them. Complete lucent lines were not always associated with worse clinical outcomes. Stress-shielding was found in 22 anatomic RHR (44%), with no relation to clinical outcomes. Twelve patients with a spacer and 5 with an anatomic implant showed heterotopic bone around the radial neck that was significantly associated to greater rotational stiffness ($p < 0.001$). Implant oversizing and loosening were the most common causes leading to implant removal of the anatomic design, with significant differences with respect to the spacer (8 vs 4, $p = 0.02$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:

To date, no previous study has performed such a comprehensive radiological analysis of the surgical technique of RHR and the consequences of technical errors on clinical outcomes. Radiolucencies do not generally imply worse clinical outcomes, but they have different meanings. In the spacer model, they are expected and have not caused pain or implant failure. Some of the complete radiolucencies present during follow-up were not observed on final radiographs. In the anatomic model, almost one-fifth of the lines caused pain and revision surgery. However, most anatomic RHR with complete loosening function optimally in the long term, probably acting as a spacer in a stable elbow.

Anatomic RHR has a high risk of radiographic technical mistakes that correlate to poorer clinical outcomes. Compared to the spacer RHR, they have also a higher rate of radiographic changes leading to revision surgery, mainly due to overstuffing

and

loosening.

