

Patient Weight-bearing after Pelvic Fracture Surgery A Systematic Review of the Literature: What is the Modern Evidence Base?

Mark Rickman¹, Bjorn-Christian Link², Lucian B Solomon³

ABSTRACT

Background: Little attention in the literature appears to have been paid to the issue of postoperative weight-bearing protocols for different injury patterns after pelvic fracture surgery. The primary aim of this study is to review the currently available literature to define the level of available evidence used to inform surgical decisions on weight-bearing after pelvic fracture surgery. Secondary aims are to assess the published methods of fracture classification, surgical management, and assessment or reporting of patient outcomes.

Methods: A systematic review of the English language literature from 1990 to 2016 was undertaken. Eligible papers were all papers reporting minimum 6-month outcomes following surgery for pelvic fractures in adults. Exclusion criteria included pathological fractures or those resulting from penetrating injury, solely osteoporotic fractures, or series with less than 6 months of follow-up data.

Results: There is very little published scientific data to inform the treating surgeon on postoperative weight-bearing protocols after pelvic fracture surgery, with no randomized trials and only 1 paper out of 122 stating this as a primary aim. More than half of the papers published did not state what postoperative protocol was employed. There is no standardization of outcome measures, with less than 20% of papers using the most common validated outcome scoring system; in contrast, there is good agreement on the use of either the Tile (75%) or Burgess and Young (20%) classification.

Limitations: Due to the lack of published studies looking at the topic of postoperative weight-bearing after pelvic fractures, no specific recommendations are possible. As large numbers of papers were included, they were not individually assessed for bias.

Conclusion: A review of postoperative weight-bearing regimes reveals a nonexistent scientific evidence base from which to make recommendations, although a consensus strategy has been identified. Future research needs to be directed at this topic, as has already been the case in numerous other fracture areas, since the advantages of early mobility are potentially significant. The reported methodology for assessing and reporting patient outcomes after pelvic fracture surgery reveals no consistent standards, and the majority of papers use no specific outcome scoring system.

Keywords: Pelvic fracture, Pelvis, Rehabilitation, Weight-bearing.

Strategies in Trauma and Limb Reconstruction (2019): 10.5005/jp-journals-10080-1414

INTRODUCTION

Surgery for pelvic fractures has become more common over the last three decades, as a result of improvements in all aspects of care for the traumatically injured patient. For all but the most severe cases, there has been a steady improvement in mortality rates,¹ and interest has increased in improving clinical outcomes for these patients. Modern fracture management is becoming more focused on techniques that facilitate early physiological rehabilitation, including early mobility and weight-bearing where possible. This is most commonly appreciated in the management of elderly trauma patients and, especially, the neck of femur fracture patients, but also applies to most other fracture regions, and has been one of the drivers for implant change and development.

Tradition dictates that the majority of patients following pelvic fracture surgery are kept nonweight-bearing, or, at least, minimal weight-bearing for several weeks, although protocols vary significantly from institution to institution. As a result, the primary aim of this paper is to interrogate the published literature in an attempt to identify the evidence base that exists to guide postoperative management, and, specifically, weight-bearing protocols, after pelvic fracture surgery. Secondary aims are to review the methods reported within the published literature to classify pelvic ring fractures and report clinical outcomes.

¹⁻³Centre for Orthopaedic and Trauma Research, Discipline of Orthopaedics and Trauma, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia; Department of Orthopaedics and Trauma, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Adelaide, Australia

Corresponding Author: Mark Rickman, Centre for Orthopaedic and Trauma Research, Discipline of Orthopaedics and Trauma, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia; Department of Orthopaedics and Trauma, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Port Road, Adelaide, Australia, Phone: +61 870741990, e-mail: mark.rickman@sa.gov.au

How to cite this article: Rickman M, Link B-C, Solomon LB. Patient Weight-bearing after Pelvic Fracture Surgery—A Systematic Review of the Literature: What is the Modern Evidence Base? *Strategies Trauma Limb Reconstr* 2019;14(1):45–52.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None

METHODS

A systematic review of the literature was carried out using the methods described in Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA).² The search terms used included "pelvic fracture," "pelvis fracture," "pelvic trauma," and "pelvic ring" for all databases, and results were limited to papers

published between 1 January 1990 and 31 December 2016. Results were also limited to English language literature only, and human subjects. Pubmed was used as the main search engine for Medline, and further searches were performed using the Scopus and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials.

Eligibility Criteria

Participants

Skeletally mature patients suffering from an acute traumatic pelvic fracture, either alone or as a part of a multiple injury scenario.

Intervention

Operative management of the pelvic fracture.

Comparison

No comparison was required as all patients were included as one study group.

Outcomes

Results reported in any form, with a minimum follow-up period of 6 months from injury. Formal outcome scores were recorded, but studies were included where the only outcomes were descriptive rather than formal. Descriptions of postoperative weight-bearing regimes were recorded where given.

Exclusion Criteria

The major exclusions were abstracts and conference proceedings, review papers, and case reports. A series of pathological or specific osteoporotic fractures, as well as injuries secondary to penetrating trauma, were excluded to keep the pathology as uniform as possible. Reports with less than 6 months outcome data were excluded.

Review Process

The method of acquisition of the final list of included papers is shown in Figure 1. References were copied into the reference management software from all three searches, and duplicates were removed.

The abstracts were read in full, and papers included or excluded according to the above criteria. Any ambiguity at this stage resulted

in the paper being sourced rather than rejected. The resulting list of papers was then sourced in full and read by two of the authors. Further papers were removed at this stage for a variety of reasons, such as registry reviews, technical papers, cadaveric studies, short follow-up not stated in the abstract, and theory-only papers with no clinical information. The final list of included papers was then analyzed independently by two of the authors and a table created collating data on patient numbers, injury types and classifications, methods of treatment, post-operative protocols, and assessment of outcomes. Any conflicts in inclusions were solved by discussion and, where necessary, arbitration with the third author.

RESULTS

The initial search generated a collection of 7,590 articles. Limiting the selection to the English language resulted in 6,925 papers. Removing duplicate returns from the three databases searched, and applying exclusion criteria to the abstracts resulted in a group of 386 included abstracts. After all papers were sourced in full and read, further papers were removed according to the exclusion criteria leaving a final cohort of 122 papers³⁻¹²⁴ (see the method as described in Fig. 1).

The 122 papers covered a total number of 7,799 patients, with a mean of 64 and a median of 32 per paper (range 9-1,409). There were no prospective randomized trials identified, and only 13 papers^{11,12,14,37,66,77,104-106,120,121,123,125} included comparative cohorts, the remaining 109 papers all being case or cohort series.

Assessment of weight-bearing protocols after surgery revealed the following:

- There was only one paper⁷ where the stated main aim of the paper is to assess the effects of weight-bearing on patients' outcomes; this was restricted to vertically stable but rotationally unstable fracture types managed with external fixation.
- Sixty-three papers (52%) did not state what amount of postoperative weight-bearing was allowed.
- Thirty-three papers (27%) had patients touch- or nonweight-bearing for a mean of 9 weeks.^{4,5,9,11,12,17,25,28,29,32,36,37,39,40,43,52,54,58,59,61,74,77,81,85,89,95,111,113,114,121,126-128}
- Nineteen papers (15%) had patients partially weight-bearing for a mean of 8 weeks.^{16,24,45,57,61,63,66,75,76,82,118,119,123,124,129-133}




Fig. 1: Paper verification/exclusion process

Table 1: Injury classifications reported

Type A	Tile classification	
	Type B	Type C
765 patients (12.7%)	1,917 patients (31.9%)	3,328 patients (55.4%)
	Burgess and Young classification	
APC1—22 patients (1.6%)	APC2—374 patients (26.9%)	APC3—198 patients (14.2%)
LC1—124 patients (8.9%)	LC2—254 patients (18.2%)	LC3—119 patients (8.5%)
	Vert. shear—263 patients (18.9%)	
	Combined—38 patients (2.7%)	

- Seven papers (8.3%) allowed full weight-bearing as tolerated in at least some patients,^{7,8,20,78,88–90} while two papers described enforced bedrest for 6 weeks.

Regarding injury classification, the most commonly used system was that of Tile¹³⁴ (used in 92 papers), followed by the Burgess and Young classification¹³⁵ (used in 24 papers). Eleven papers did not formally classify the injury type. The breakdown of injury types is given in Table 1.

The surgical management was varied across all types and is shown in Table 2. Table 3 shows the weight-bearing protocols employed for each Tile injury classification, and Table 4 shows the same weight-bearing data against the method of fixation.

Outcome measurements were highly varied across the papers with no standard method adopted. One hundred and three papers (85%) used radiological methods as well as clinical to judge outcomes, 5 papers did not report specific outcome measures, and 65 papers gave specific nonvalidated clinical outcome measures such as pain, walking distance, and gait. Regarding validated scoring systems, the most commonly used system was the Majeed¹³⁶ or the Lindahl¹³⁷ version of it, but only 24 papers (19.7%) used either method. Ten papers (8.2%) reported SF-36 scores, and there were less than five papers using any other specific outcome scoring method.

There was no clear correlation between the fracture types treated and the weight-bearing protocols reported, or any apparent trend in the management over time. There was, however, a slight trend in the management of type C fractures; of those papers reporting nonweight-

Table 2: Surgical management reported

Type of surgical procedure	Number of patients	Percentage of patients
Ant ORIF and post percutaneous	792	18.5
Posterior percutaneous alone	641	15
Ant and post ORIF	638	14.9
Anterior ORIF alone	548	12.8
Anterior Ex x alone	400	9.4
Ex x plus posterior percutaneous	393	9.2
Posterior ORIF alone	387	9.0
Other	235	5.5
Ant and post percutaneous	183	4.3
Anterior percutaneous alone	56	1.3

Table 3: Cross table showing weight-bearing employed against Tile injury classification

Tile classification	Full weight	Partial weight	Non or touch weight
A	1	1	2
B	3	10	11
C	3	13	25

Table 4: Cross table showing weight-bearing employed against type of surgical fixation—percentage of patients for each fixation method

Fixation	Weight-bearing employed		
	Non or touch weight	Partial weight	Full weight
1	80	5	15
2	59	41	0
3	44	56	0
4	71	27	2
5	0	100	0
6	7	89	4
7	45	34	21
8	78	19	3
9	14	86	0
Fixation method:			
1	Anterior ORIF only		
2	Anterior ORIF plus percutaneous posterior		
3	Posterior ORIF only		
4	ORIF front and back		
5	Anterior percutaneous only		
6	Posterior percutaneous only		
7	Ex x alone		
8	Ex x plus posterior fixation		
9	Front and back percutaneous		

bearing protocols, 86% included type C fractures, the figure being 84% for partial weight-bearing protocols but only 33% for full weight-bearing. The same figures for type B injuries were 56% for non- and full weight-bearing, and 68% for partial weight-bearing protocols.

Looking specifically at the subset of papers reporting only Tile type C fractures (vertically unstable as well as rotationally unstable), there were 1,433 patients in 33 papers, with a mean of 44 per paper. Within this group, 22% underwent anterior open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) plus percutaneous posterior fixation, 19% had percutaneous posterior fixation only, and 35% had an open posterior procedure, with or without anterior fixation. No patients were managed with external fixation alone. Eleven papers did not state how patients were mobilized after surgery. Fourteen of the remaining papers reported non- or touch weight-bearing for a mean of 9.5 weeks. Six papers employed partial weight-bearing for the same time period, and two papers allowed full weight-bearing after fixation.^{20,78}

DISCUSSION

This systematic review of the available English literature publications on outcomes after surgically managed pelvic fractures

78. Schildhauer TA, Bellabarba C, et al. Decompression and lumbopelvic fixation for sacral fracture-dislocations with spino-pelvic dissociation. *J Orthop Trauma* 2006;20:447–457. DOI: 10.1097/00005131-200608000-00001.
79. Schweitzer D, Zylberberg A, et al. Closed reduction and iliosacral percutaneous fixation of unstable pelvic ring fractures. *Injury* 2008;39:869–874. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2008.03.024.
80. Shuler TE, Boone DC, et al. Percutaneous iliosacral screw fixation: early treatment for unstable posterior pelvic ring disruptions. *J Trauma* 1995;38:453–458. DOI: 10.1097/00005373-199503000-00031.
81. Soultanis K, Karaliotas GI, et al. Lumbopelvic fracture-dislocation combined with unstable pelvic ring injury: one stage stabilisation with spinal instrumentation. *Injury* 2011;42:1179–1183. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2010.06.002.
82. Starr AJ, Nakatani T, et al. Superior pubic ramus fractures fixed with percutaneous screws: what predicts fixation failure? *J Orthop Trauma* 2008;22:81–87. DOI: 10.1097/BOT.0b013e318162ab6e.
83. Starr AJ, Walter JC, et al. Percutaneous screw fixation of fractures of the iliac wing and fracture-dislocations of the sacro-iliac joint (OTA Types 61-B2.2 and 61-B2.3, or Young-Burgess "lateral compression type II" pelvic fractures). *J Orthop Trauma* 2002;16:116–123. DOI: 10.1097/00005131-200202000-00008.
84. Stover MD, Sims S, et al. What is the infection rate of the posterior approach to type C pelvic injuries? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2012;470:2142–2147. DOI: 10.1007/s11999-012-2438-9.
85. Suzuki T, Hak DJ, et al. Outcome and complications of posterior transiliac plating for vertically unstable sacral fractures. *Injury* 2009;40:405–409. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2008.06.039.
86. Suzuki T, Shindo M, et al. Long-term functional outcome after unstable pelvic ring fracture. *J Trauma* 2007;63:884–888. DOI: 10.1097/01.ta.0000235888.90489.fc.
87. Taguchi T, Kawai S, et al. Operative management of displaced fractures of the sacrum. *J Orthop Sci* 1999;4:347–352. DOI: 10.1007/s007760050115.
88. Tan GO, He JL, et al. Lumbopelvic fixation for multiplanar sacral fractures with spinopelvic instability. *Injury* 2012;43:1318–1325. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2012.05.003.
89. Tee SS, Hyzan Y, et al. Functional outcome of open reduction and internal fixation of pelvic ring injuries. *Med J Malaysia* 2000;55(Suppl C):49–58.
90. Tornetta P, 3rd, Dickson K. Outcome of rotationally unstable pelvic ring injuries treated operatively. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1996;147:147–151. DOI: 10.1097/00003086-199608000-00018.
91. Totterman A, Glott T, et al. Unstable sacral fractures: associated injuries and morbidity at 1 year. *Spine* 2006;31:E628–E635. DOI: 10.1097/01.brs.0000231961.03527.00.
92. Totterman A, Glott T, et al. Pelvic trauma with displaced sacral fractures: functional outcome at one year. *Spine* 2007;32:1437–1443. DOI: 10.1097/BRS.0b013e318060a68f.
93. Tucker MC, Nork SE, et al. Simple anterior pelvic external fixation. *J Trauma* 2000;49:989–994. DOI: 10.1097/00005373-200012000-00002.
94. Vaidya R, Colen R, et al. Treatment of unstable pelvic ring injuries with an internal anterior fixator and posterior fixation: initial clinical series. *J Orthop Trauma* 2012;26:1–8. DOI: 10.1097/BOT.0b013e318233b8a7.
95. Vaidya R, Kubiak EN, et al. Complications of anterior subcutaneous internal fixation for unstable pelvis fractures: a multicenter study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2012;470:2124–2131. DOI: 10.1007/s11999-011-2233-z.
96. Vaidya R, Oliphant BW, et al. Sequential reduction and fixation for windswept pelvic ring injuries (LC3) corrects the deformity until healed. *Int Orthop* 2013;37:1555–1560. DOI: 10.1007/s00264-013-1891-8.
97. Vallier HA, Cureton BA, et al. Functional outcomes in women after high-energy pelvic ring injury. *J Orthop Trauma* 2012;26:296–301. DOI: 10.1097/BOT.0b013e318221e94e.
98. Van den Bosch EW, Van der Kleyn R, et al. Functional outcome of internal fixation for pelvic ring fractures. *J Trauma* 1999;47:365–371. DOI: 10.1097/00005373-199908000-00026.
99. Van Loon P, Kuhn S, et al. Radiological analysis, operative management and functional outcome of open book pelvic lesions: a 13-year cohort study. *Injury* 2011;42:1012–1019. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2010.11.057.
100. van Veen IH, van Leeuwen AA, et al. Unstable pelvic fractures: a retrospective analysis. *Injury* 1995;26:81–85. DOI: 10.1016/0020-1383(95)92181-9.
101. Wang S, Zhang P, et al. Anterior internal fixation to treat vertical unstable pelvic fracture. *Chin J Traumatol* 2002;5:59–61.
102. Zamzam MM. Unstable pelvic ring injuries. Outcome and timing of surgical treatment by internal fixation. *Saudi Med J* 2004;25:1670–1674.
103. Ziran BH, Smith WR, et al. Iliosacral screw fixation of the posterior pelvic ring using local anaesthesia and computerised tomography. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2003;85:411–418. DOI: 10.1302/0301-620X.85B3.13119.
104. Zwingmann J, Sudkamp NP, et al. Intra- and postoperative complications of navigated and conventional techniques in percutaneous iliosacral screw fixation after pelvic fractures: results from the German Pelvic Trauma Registry. *Injury* 2013;44:1765–1772. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2013.08.008.
105. Bi C, Wang Q, et al. Treatment of unstable posterior pelvic ring fracture with pedicle screw-rod fixator vs locking compression plate: a comparative study. *Med Sci Monit* 2016;22:3764–3770. DOI: 10.12659/MSM.900673.
106. Elzohairy MM, Salama AM. Open reduction internal fixation vs percutaneous iliosacral screw fixation for unstable posterior pelvic ring disruptions. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2017;103(2):223–227.
107. Höch A, Schneider I, et al. Lateral compression type B 2-1 pelvic ring fractures in young patients do not require surgery. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2016;1–7.
108. Hoskins W, Bucknill A, et al. A prospective case series for a minimally invasive internal fixation device for anterior pelvic ring fractures. *J Orthop Surg Res* 2016;11(1):135. DOI: 10.1186/s13018-016-0468-9.
109. Oh HK, Choo SK, et al. Stoppa approach for anterior plate fixation in unstable pelvic ring injury. *Clin Orthop Surg* 2016;8:243–248. DOI: 10.4055/cios.2016.8.3.243.
110. Sobhan MR, Abrisham SMJ, et al. Spinopelvic fixation of sacroiliac joint fractures and fracture-dislocations: a clinical 8 years follow-up study. *Archives of Bone and Joint Surgery* 2016;4:381–386.
111. Leung KS, Chien P, et al. Operative treatment of unstable pelvic fractures. *Injury* 1992;23:31–37. DOI: 10.1016/0020-1383(92)90122-9.
112. Arazi M, Kutlu A, et al. The pelvic external fixation: the mid-term results of 41 patients treated with a newly designed fixator. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2000;120:584–586. DOI: 10.1007/s004020000142.
113. Chiu FY, Chuang TY, et al. Treatment of unstable pelvic fractures: use of a transiliac sacral rod for posterior lesions and an external fixator for anterior lesions. *J Trauma* 2004;57:141–144. DOI: 10.1097/01.TA.0000123040.23231.EB.
114. Shirahama M. Surgical treatment of vertically unstable sacral fractures using a new plate. *Kurume Med J* 2005;52:9–18. DOI: 10.2739/kurumemedj.52.9.
115. Ayoub MA. Vertically unstable sacral fractures with neurological insult: outcomes of surgical decompression and reconstruction plate internal fixation. *Int Orthop* 2009;33:261–267. DOI: 10.1007/s00264-007-0468-9.
116. Uchida K, Kokubo Y, et al. Fracture of the pelvic ring: a retrospective review of 224 patients treated at a single institution. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol* 2011;21:251–257. DOI: 10.1007/s00590-010-0706-5.
117. Bates P, Gary J. Percutaneous treatment of pelvic and acetabular fractures in obese patients. *Orthop Clin North Am* 2011;42:55–67. DOI: 10.1016/j.ocl.2010.08.004.
118. Ayoub MA. Type C pelvic ring injuries in polytrauma patients: can percutaneous iliosacral screws reduce morbidity and costs? *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol* 2012;22:137–144. DOI: 10.1007/s00590-011-0811-0.
119. Choy WS, Kim KJ, et al. Anterior Pelvic Plating and Sacroiliac Joint Fixation in Unstable Pelvic Ring Injuries. *Yonsei Med J* 2012;53:422–426. DOI: 10.3349/ymj.2012.53.2.422.

120. Khaled SA, Soliman O, et al. Functional outcome of unstable pelvic ring injuries after iliosacral screw fixation: single vs two screw fixation. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2014;41:387–392. DOI: 10.1007/s00068-014-0456-x.
121. Lybrand K, Kurylo J, et al. Does removal of the symphyseal cartilage in symphyseal dislocations have any effect on bony alignment and implant failure? *J Orthop Trauma* 2015;29:470–474. DOI: 10.1097/BOT.0000000000000376.
122. Sullivan MP, Scolaro JA, et al. Isolated pelvic ring injuries: functional outcomes following percutaneous, posterior fixation. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol* 2015;25:1025–1030. DOI: 10.1007/s00590-015-1631-4.
123. Zhu L, Wang L, et al. Treatment of pelvic fractures through a less invasive ilioinguinal approach combined with a minimally invasive posterior approach. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2015;16:167. DOI: 10.1186/s12891-015-0635-x.
124. Ayoub MA, Gad HM, et al. Standalone percutaneous transiliac plating of vertically unstable sacral fractures: outcomes, complications, and recommendations. *Eur Spine J* 2016;25:1153–1162. DOI: 10.1007/s00586-015-3976-0.
125. Hoch A, Schneider I, et al. Lateral compression type B 2-1 pelvic ring fractures in young patients do not require surgery. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2018;44(2):171–177.
126. Lindahl J, Hirvensalo E. Outcome of operatively treated type-C injuries of the pelvic ring. *Acta Orthop* 2005;76:667–678. DOI: 10.1080/17453670510041754.
127. Moed BR, Whiting DR. Locked transsacral screw fixation of bilateral injuries of the posterior pelvic ring: initial clinical series. *J Orthop Trauma* 2010;24:616–621. DOI: 10.1097/BOT.0b013e3181df97eb.
128. Putnis SE, Pearce R, et al. Open reduction and internal fixation of a traumatic diastasis of the pubic symphysis: One-Year Radiological and Functional Outcomes. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2011;93-B:78–84. DOI: 10.1302/0301-620X.93B1.23941.
129. Gänsslen A, Hildebrand F, et al. Supraacetabular external fixation for pain control in geriatric type B pelvic injuries. *Acta Chir Orthop Traumatol Cech* 2013;80(2):101–105.
130. Gänsslen A, Hüfner T, et al. Percutaneous iliosacral screw fixation of unstable pelvic injuries by conventional fluoroscopy. *Oper Orthop Traumatol* 2006;18:225–244. DOI: 10.1007/s00064-006-1173-3.
131. Hamad A, Pavlou G, et al. Management of pubic symphysis diastasis with locking plates: a report of 11 cases. *Injury* 2013;44:947–951. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2012.12.018.
132. Osterho G, Ossendorf C, et al. Posterior screw fixation in rotationally unstable pelvic ring injuries. *Injury* 2011;42:992–996. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2011.04.005.
133. Bi C, Wang Q, et al. Treatment of Unstable Posterior Pelvic Ring Fracture with Pedicle Screw-Rod Fixator vs Locking Compression Plate: A Comparative Study. *Med Sci Monit* 2016;22:3764–3770. DOI: 10.12659/MSM.900673.
134. Pennal GF, Tile M, et al. Pelvic disruption: assessment and classification. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1980;12–21. DOI: 10.1097/00003086-198009000-00004.
135. Burgess AR, Eastridge BJ, et al. Pelvic ring disruptions: effective classification system and treatment protocols. *J Trauma* 1990;30:848–856. DOI: 10.1097/00005373-199007000-00015.
136. Majeed SA. Grading the outcome of pelvic fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1989;71:304–306. DOI: 10.1302/0301-620X.71B2.2925751.
137. Lindahl J, Hirvensalo E, et al. Failure of reduction with an external fixator in the management of injuries of the pelvic ring. Long-term evaluation of 110 patients. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1999;81:955–962.
138. Hontzsch D, Schaser KD, et al. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the angular stable locking system in patients with distal tibial fractures treated with intramedullary nailing: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2014;96:1889–1897. DOI: 10.2106/JBJS.M.01355.
139. Thewlis D, Callary SA, et al. Peak loading during walking is not associated with fracture migration following tibial plateau fracture: a preliminary case series. *J Orthop Res* 2015;33:1398–1406. DOI: 10.1002/jor.22905.
140. Segal D, Mallik AR, et al. Early weight bearing of lateral tibial plateau fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1993;232–237. DOI: 10.1097/00003086-199309000-00032.
141. Kenwright J, Richardson JB, et al. Axial movement and tibial fractures. A controlled randomised trial of treatment. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1991;73:654–659. DOI: 10.1302/0301-620X.73B4.2071654.
142. Helfet DL, Borrelli J Jr., et al. Stabilization of acetabular fractures in elderly patients. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1992;74:753–765. DOI: 10.2106/00004623-199274050-00015.
143. La amme GY, Hebert-Davies J, et al. Internal fixation of osteopenic acetabular fractures involving the quadrilateral plate. *Injury* 2011;42:1130–1134. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2010.11.060.
144. Daurka JS, Pastides PS, et al. Acetabular fractures in patients aged > 55 years: a systematic review of the literature. *Bone Joint J* 2014;96-B:157–163. DOI: 10.1302/0301-620X.96B2.32979.
145. Rickman M, Young J, et al. Managing acetabular fractures in the elderly with fixation and primary arthroplasty: aiming for early weightbearing. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2014;472:3375–3382. DOI: 10.1007/s11999-014-3467-3.
146. Hutt JR, Ortega-Briones A, et al. The ongoing relevance of acetabular fracture classification. *Bone Joint J* 2015;97-B:1139–1143. DOI: 10.1302/0301-620X.97B8.33653.
147. The management of hip fracture in adults NICE clinical Guidelines, No 124, National Clinical Guideline Centre (UK), 2011.
148. Rickman M, Young J, et al. The management of complex acetabular fractures in the elderly with fracture fixation and primary total hip replacement. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2012;38:511–516. DOI: 10.1007/s00068-012-0231-9.
149. Cole RJ, Bindra RR, et al. Radiographic evaluation of osseous displacement following intra-articular fractures of the distal radius: reliability of plain radiography vs computed tomography. *J Hand Surg* 1997;22:792–800. DOI: 10.1016/S0363-5023(97)80071-8.
150. Mears DC, Velyvis JH. Acute total hip arthroplasty for selected displaced acetabular fractures: two to twelve-year results. *The J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2002;84-A:1–9. DOI: 10.2106/00004623-200201000-00001.
151. Mouhsine E, Garofalo R, et al. Acute total hip arthroplasty for acetabular fractures in the elderly: 11 patients followed for 2 years. *Acta Orthop Scand* 2002;73:615–618. DOI: 10.3109/17453670209178024.
152. Herscovici D Jr., Lindvall E, et al. The combined hip procedure: open reduction internal fixation combined with total hip arthroplasty for the management of acetabular fractures in the elderly. *J Orthop Trauma* 2010;24:291–296. DOI: 10.1097/BOT.0b013e3181b1d22a.
153. Tannast M, Najibi S, et al. Two to twenty-year survivorship of the hip in 810 patients with operatively treated acetabular fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2012;94:1559–1567. DOI: 10.2106/JBJS.K.00444.
154. Moed BR, McMichael JC. Outcomes of posterior wall fractures of the acetabulum. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2007;89:1170–1176. DOI: 10.2106/JBJS.F.00473.
155. Onsten I, Berzins A, et al. Accuracy and precision of radiostereometric analysis in the measurement of THR femoral component translations: human and canine in vitro models. *J Orthop Res* 2001;19:1162–1167. DOI: 10.1016/S0736-0266(01)00039-0.
156. Bragdon CR, Malchau H, et al. Experimental assessment of precision and accuracy of radiostereometric analysis for the determination of polyethylene wear in a total hip replacement model. *J Orthop Res* 2002;20:688–695. DOI: 10.1016/S0736-0266(01)00171-1.
157. Bragdon CR, Estok DM, et al. Comparison of two digital radiostereometric analysis methods in the determination of femoral head penetration in a total hip replacement phantom. *J Orthop Res* 2004;22:659–664. DOI: 10.1016/j.orthres.2003.09.004.
158. Solomon LB, Callary SA, et al. Weight-bearing-induced displacement and migration over time of fracture fragments following split depression fractures of the lateral tibial plateau: a case series with radiostereometric analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2011;93:817–823. DOI: 10.1302/0301-620X.93B6.26122.
159. Solomon LB, Stevenson AW, et al. The accuracy and precision of radiostereometric analysis in monitoring tibial plateau fractures. *Acta Orthop* 2010;81:487–494. DOI: 10.3109/17453674.2010.487930.