## • 临床研究 •

# 三种固定方法治疗儿童肱骨髁上骨折的临床对照试验

方汉民,马少云,曹建斌,黄辉春,莫卫海 (广东省中医院珠海医院骨一科,广东 珠海 519015)

【摘要】目的: 探讨不同固定方法治疗儿童移位肱骨髁上骨折临床疗效及其临床适应证。方法: 137例儿童移位肱骨髁上骨折患者, 男 85例, 女 52例; 年龄 3~ 12岁。分别采用交叉克氏针内固定 (A组)38例, 小夹板外固定 (B组)67例, 石膏托外固定 (C组)32例。观察 3组骨折愈合时间、肘内翻的发生率及肘关节伸屈功能并进行比较。结果: 本组随访 6个月~ 5年, 平均 29个月, 参照 Flymn疗效评价标准: A组, 优 29例, 良 7例, 差 2例, 优良率为94.74%; B组, 优 12例, 良 49例, 差 6例, 优良率为91.04%; C组, 优 9例, 良 16例, 差 7例, 优良率为78.13%。 A组疗效分别与 RC组比较, 差异有统计学意义 (P<0.05); B组与 C组疗效比较, 差异无统计学意义 (P>0.05)。结论:三种固定方法以闭合克氏针固定疗效最佳, 但三种固定方法各有其适应证: 对无移位或轻度移位的肱骨髁上骨折可采用石膏托固定或小夹板固定; 对严重移位或旋转, 极不稳定型骨折可采用闭合交叉克氏针穿针固定或小夹板固定。临床应根据骨折类型、皮肤条件以及是否合并有神经血管损伤来合理选择最佳治疗方案。

【关键词】 肱骨骨折; 骨折固定术; 儿童; 临床对照试验

A controlled clinical trial on three methods for the treatment of displaced humeral supracondylar fractures in children

FANGH an min, MA Shao yun, CAO Jian-bin, HUANGHui-chun, MO Wei hai Department of First Orthopaedics, the Affiliated Zhuhai Hospital of Guangdong TCM Hospital Zhuhai 519015 Guangdong, China

ABSTRACT Objective To investigate the rapeutic effects and indications of three different methods for the treatment of displaced humeral supracondylar fractures in children Methods One hundred and thirty-seven children (85 males and 52 & males ranging in age from 3 to 12 years) with displaced hum enal supracondylar fractures were treated with three methods, irr cluding patients in Group A treated with closed reduction and percutaneous crossed-pin fixation, patients in Group B treated with manual reduction and immobilization in splints, and patients in Group C treated with manual reduction and immobilization in plaster cast The healing time of fractures incidence rates of cubitus varus as well as extension and flexion functions of elbow joint of patients in three groups were analyzed and therapeutic effects of three groups were compared **Results** All the patients were followed up and the dunation of follow-up ranged from 6 m on this to 5 years, with an average of 29 m on this According to Flynn criteria, in Group A, 29 patients got excellent results, 7 good, 2 fair, the excellent and good rate was 94. 74%; in Group B, above data were 12, 49, 6 and 91.04%; while in Group C, the data were 9, 16, 7 and 78, 13% respectively. The result of star tistical analysis demonstrated that the difference of the predicts between Group A and Group B was significant (P < 0.05) and that the difference between Group A and Group C was also significant (P < 0.05), but the difference between Group B and Group C was not significant (P > 0.05). Conclusion Stable fractures which have no displacement or little displacement can be treated with manual reduction and immobilization in splints or plaster cast Percutaneous crossed pin or splint fixation is preferred for the treatment of those unstable fractures. The key point of the treatment is rational selection of three different ways for the treatment of displaced hum eral supracondy lar fractures in children according to the type of fractures and dam ages of skin and tissue and whether complications with nerve and vascular dam ages

Key words Humeral fractures,

Fracture fixation, Child Controlled clinical trials

Zhongguo Gushang/Ch in a JO rhop& Traum a 2007, 20(12): 823-825 www. zgg szz com

自 2000年 1月至 2006年 3月,137例儿童移位肱骨髁上

骨折, 经闭合手法准确整复, 采用不同固定方法治疗取得良好 疗效, 报告如下。

1 资料与方法

1.1 一般资料与分组 本组 137例符合下述标准: ①年龄 3~12岁; ②X线片均见移位性肱骨髁上骨折(单侧); ③闭合

通信作者: 方汉民 Ted 0756-8218082 E-maid flm ys 684793@ sina

通信地址:广东省珠海市吉大水湾路 388号德馨苑 8栋 5A室 3~12万;②X 线片均见移位性胍育脒工育 折 (早週); ジロJ i © 1994-2010 China Academic Journal Electronic Publishing House. All rights reserved. http://www.cnki.net 性骨折; ④有明显外伤病史并排除病理性骨折; ⑤住院时间不 少于 2周;⑥入院后均采用手法闭合复位;⑦伤后至复位时间 3 h~ 5 d 根据不同固定方法分组治疗: 经皮穿针克氏针固 定(A组)、夹板固定(B组)、石膏固定(C组)。 A组 38例, 男 22例, 女 16例; 年龄 4~11岁, 平均(6.10±0.46)岁; 左侧 17例, 右侧 21例; 车祸伤 8例, 跌伤 25例, 击伤 5例; 伸直型 27例, 屈曲型 11例; 术前伴尺神经损伤麻痹 6例, 11例桡动 脉搏动减弱、指温下降, 9例出现张力性水疱。 B组 67例, 男 42例, 女 25例; 年龄 3~12岁, 平均(6.60±0.55)岁; 左侧 34例, 右侧 33例; 车祸伤 12例, 跌伤 47例, 击伤 8例; 伸直型 49例, 屈曲型 18例; 无合并神经血管损伤症状。 C组 32例, 男 21 例, 女 11 例; 年龄 3~11 岁, 平均(6.50 ±0.32)岁; 左侧 15例, 右侧 17例; 车祸伤 7例, 跌伤 20例, 击伤 5例; 伸直型 19例, 屈曲型 13例; 术前伴尺神经损伤麻痹 5例, 桡动脉搏 动减弱 5例, 6例出现张力性水疱。经统计学处理( $x^2$ 或方差 分析),3组性别、年龄、骨折类型差异无统计学意义,具有可 比性 (P> 0.05)。

#### 1.2 治疗方法

1.2.1 整复方法 所有患者均行手法复位,在臂丛或全麻下,仰卧位。复位步骤:①牵引纠正重叠移位。②纠正旋转移位。③矫正侧方移位。④纠正前后移位。复位后骨擦音与屈伸肘关节时的阻抗力消失或基本消失时为止, X 线透视观察,骨折断端复位,对位对线理想。

1.2.2 固定方法 ①经皮穿针交叉克氏针固定(A组):透视下,骨折复位成功后,选直径 1.0~ 1.5 mm 克氏针 2枚,分别与肱骨呈 20°角在外髁处进针,与肱骨干呈 45°角在肱骨内上髁进针,前后方与肱骨干呈一致。穿过对侧皮质骨约 0.2 cm,交叉克氏针固定。②夹板固定(B组):术前预制树皮小夹板4块,骨折手法复位成功后,在骨折远端后侧及内髁处各放置1个梯形垫,肱骨外髁上方放置1个塔形垫,肘窝上方放置1个小平垫,内侧垫宜低于骨折线,而外侧垫应稍高于骨折线,上内、外、前后侧夹板超肘关节固定, 用"8"字形绷带固定。③长臂石膏固定(C组):长臂石膏托外固定于前臂旋前位、过度屈肘约150°,2周后改前臂旋后、屈肘90°石膏托固定,3~4周拍X线片复查后解除石膏固定,嘱其肘关节屈伸功能锻炼。

1.2.3 术后处理 完成固定后即摄肘关节正侧位 X 线片, 复位固定满意后即行主动伸屈手指、握拳等活动、肢体肿胀严 重者予抗炎消肿、改善微循环等治疗。术后及时调整外固定的松紧度,摄片复查骨折的对位对线情况,一般固定 3~4周,达临床愈合后,解除外固定,进行功能锻炼。

1. 2. 4 中药熏洗 拆除固定后中药熏洗,药用自制骨外洗 方: 莪术 10 g 宽筋藤 10 g 鸡血藤 20 g 川芎 15 g 续断 15 g 苏木 20 g 大黄 10 g 桑枝 30 g 桑寄生 30 g 伸筋草 30 g 威灵仙 30 g 固定拆除后即可进行熏洗,上述药物煎汤后倒入木盆中,于盆上放置横木,将患肢放在横木架上进行熏洗,外盖毛巾,不使热气外透,待药液温度适中时,可将患肢放入盆中浸泡,每日 2次,7 d为 1个疗程。

1.3 观察项目与方法 以 3组治疗后骨折临床愈合、肘关节屈伸功能及肘内翻的发生率作为观察指标。方法: 通过 X 线片及临床体征了解骨折临床愈合情况; 通过对 3组骨折治疗后最后 1次拍摄健侧与患侧的 X 线片测量肘关节提携角(carrying angle, C角),比较健侧与患侧 C角变化来观察肘内翻发生率; 通过比较健侧与患侧肘关节伸屈活动度,来了解治疗后肘关节伸屈功能,肘关节伸屈活动受限在  $10^\circ$  以内评为优,肘关节伸屈活动受限在  $10^\circ$  ~  $30^\circ$  评为良,肘关节伸屈活动受限超过  $30^\circ$ 以上评为差。

1.4 疗效评定方法 参照 F lymn等 [1] 疗效评价标准, 自拟标准如下: 优, 骨折解剖复位或近解剖复位, 骨折愈合, 肘关节活动正常, 提携角正常; 良, 骨折对位满意, 骨折愈合, 肘关节伸屈活动受限在 30°以内, 提携角减少在 20°以内; 差, 骨折畸形愈合, 肘关节内翻畸形, 肘关节伸屈活动受限超过 30°, 提携角减少在 20°以上。

#### 2 结果

本组随访 6个月~5年,平均 29个月。并发症:3组均未发生缺血性肌挛缩;11例神经损伤者,2~5个月后均恢复;16例桡动脉搏动减弱或触摸不清、指温下降者,在复位后症状缓解,未发现血管损伤;7例并发克氏针孔皮肤不同程度感染,但无骨感染,拔克氏针后经伤口换药愈合好;15例患肢出现张力性水疱,经穿刺抽出液体,红汞外涂症状消失。3组骨折愈合时间、肘内翻发生率、肘关节功能及疗效结果见表1。典型病例见图 1~3。

表 1 3组骨折愈合时间、肘内翻、肘关节功能及疗效的比较(例)

Tab 1 Comparison of healing tine cubitus varus and joint functions in three groups (cases)

		_									
组别	病例数 (例)	肘内翻		肘关节屈伸功能				疗效			
		例数	发生率(%)	优	良	差	优良率(%)	优	良	差	优良率(%)
克氏针内固定组	38	2	5. 26 <sup>△</sup>	23	9	6	84. 21☆	29	7	2	94. 74 <b>*</b>
夹板固定组	67	6	8. 96 <sup>△ △</sup>	13	45	9	86. 57☆☆	12	49	6	91. 04★★
石膏固定组	32	10	31. 25^ ^ ^	8	14	10	68. 75☆ ☆☆	9	16	7	78. 13 <b>**</b> *

注: A 组与 B组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 0.09, P > 0.05, B 组与 C组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 7.93, P < 0.05, A 组与 C组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 8.26, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, B 与 C组比较,  $^{\triangle}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, A 与 B组比较,  $^{2}$  = 8.20, P < 0.05, B 与 C组比较,  $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$   $^{2}$   $^{2}$  = 8.20,  $^{2}$ 

Note  $^{\triangle}$  Compared between Group A and Group B( $^{\chi2}$ = 0.09 P>0.05);  $^{\triangle}$  Compared between Group B and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 7.93 P<0.05);  $^{\triangle}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 8.26 P<0.05);  $^{\otimes}$  Compared between Group A and Group B( $^{\chi2}$ = 8.26 P<0.05);  $^{\otimes}$  Compared between Group A and Group B( $^{\chi2}$ = 8.26 P<0.05);  $^{\otimes}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 8.26 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 8.26 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.27 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.28 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared between Group A and Group C( $^{\chi2}$ = 9.29 P<0.05);  $^{\chi2}$  Compared



Fig. 1. Male 9 years old, right hum enal supracondy lar fracture treated with closed reduction and crossed pin fixation at the 2nd day after fracture. 1a, 1b. Preoperative X-ray of AP and LP showed displaced supracondy lar fracture of right hum enus which was extension style unstable fracture, and obvious collapse of the broken end. 1c, 1d Postoperative X-ray of AP and LP showed displaced supracondy lar fracture of right hum enus which was anatom ical reconstruction after closed reduction and percutaneous crossed-pin fixation. Fig. 2. Female, 6 years old, right hum enal supracondy lar fracture, treated with manual reduction and immobilization in a splint six hours after fracture. 2a, 2b. Preoperative X-ray of AP and LP showed displaced supracondy lar fracture of right hum enus which was extension style unstable fractures and obvious collapse of the broken end. 2c, 2d. Postoperative X-ray of AP and LP showed displaced supracondy lar fracture of right hum enus which was an atom ical reconstruction after manual reduction and immobilization in a splint. Fig. 3. Male, 8 years old, left hum enal supracondy lar fracture, treated with manual reduction and immobilization in a plaster cast 2 hours after fracture. 3a, 3b. Preoperative X-ray of AP and LP showed displaced supracondy lar fracture of left hum enus which was extension style, stable fractures, light collapse. 3c, 3d. Postoperative X-ray of AP and LP showed displaced supracondy lar fracture of left hum enus which was extension style, stable fractures, light collapse. 3c, 3d. Postoperative X-ray of AP and LP showed displaced supracondy lar fracture of left hum enus which was an atom ical reconstruction after manual reduction and immobilization in a plaster cast

### 3 讨论

克氏针、小夹板、石膏托固定是治疗儿童肱骨髁上骨折最常用的方法,可以根据骨折断端稳定性、皮肤条件以及是否合并有神经血管损伤来加以选择:①经皮交叉克氏针固定适合于严重移位性肱骨髁上闭合性骨折,断端极不稳定,或合并有局部皮肤严重损伤者(如多发张力性水疱、皮肤擦损严重者),或合并有神经血管损伤症状者。其优点是固定较为牢固,可以早期进行肘关节伸屈功能锻炼。但克氏针固定较为牢固,可以早期进行肘关节伸屈功能锻炼。但克氏针固定较为容易并发皮肤针口感染,偶尔会出现松脱再移位和尺神经损伤。克氏针固定位置、方向和数量会影响固定的强度<sup>[2]</sup>。②对皮肤条件好(无张力性水疱、皮肤擦损一般或无),无神经血管压迫症状,断端尺侧皮质骨压缩骨折不甚,断端复位后相对稳定骨折则首选小夹板固定。小夹板可以根据患肢肿胀程度适时给以松紧固定,利于早期功能锻炼。但小夹板容易压伤皮肤,固定后一定要密切观察患肢血运感觉,及时调整松紧带。

③石膏固定适用于无移位或移位轻、断端尺侧皮质骨无明显压缩的稳定性骨折,长臂石膏外固定能很好地限制肘关节及前臂的旋转活动,利于骨折端的稳定。但石膏托固定稳定性相对克氏针、小夹板差,可调性差,骨折有再次移位,长时间外固定所造成的肘关节伸屈功能不佳。选用长臂石膏托固定时早期必须尽量屈肘来维持断端稳定,在肿胀期消退后一定要更换石膏托固定。

#### 参考文献

- 1 F lynn JC, M at thew s JG, B enoit RL. B lind p inning of displaced supracondy lar fractures of the hum erus in children Sixteen years experience with long-term follow-up. J Bone Joint Surg(Am), 1974, 56 263-272
- 2 凌强, 李太强, 周荣平, 等. 克氏针交叉固定治疗复杂性肱骨髁上骨折. 实用临床医学. 2006, 7(6): 63-65

(收稿日期: 2006-12-20 本文编辑: 王宏)