Hypothesis

Dual-Column Locking Plate Fixation for AO/OTA 33C3 Distal Femur Fractures: A Hypothesis on Enhanced Mechanical Stability and Healing

Raunak Satia[1],
Rajeev Joshi[1],
Sahil Sanghavi[1],
Mahavir Dugad[1],
Darshan Sonawane[1],
Ashok Shyam[1],
Parag Sancheti[1]

[1]Department of Orthopaedics, Sancheti Institute of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

Address of Correspondence
Dr. Raunak Satia,
Department of Orthopaedics, Sancheti Institute of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
E-mail: raunaksatia670@yahoo.com

Abstract

Background: Distal femur fractures that involve severe metaphyseal and articular comminution (AO 33-C3) remain a major therapeutic challenge. The distal fragment's short bone stock, frequent osteoporotic bone in older patients, and the complexity of intra-articular fracture patterns increase the risk of loss of reduction, varus collapse and nonunion when fixation is inadequate. Lateral locked plating is widely used and often effective, but in fractures with medial column deficiency or large medial condylar (Hoffa) fragments the lateral construct may behave as a cantilever and be prone to mechanical failure. Contemporary biomechanical and clinical series suggest that adding a medial locking plate restores a two-column support, increases construct stiffness and may reduce mechanical complications in selected, high-risk fractures.

Hypothesis: For skeletally mature patients with AO 33-C3 distal femur fractures and/or clear medial column deficiency, supplementing lateral locked plating with a medial distal femoral locking plate will improve mechanical stability, increase the likelihood of timely radiographic union and reduce rates of varus collapse or implant failure, without an unacceptable rise in wound or soft-tissue complications. When combined with meticulous surgical technique and structured rehabilitation, dual-column fixation should permit safer early joint motion and improved patient-centred functional recovery.

Clinical importance: Identifying fractures that truly lack medial support and applying targeted medial augmentation can meaningfully change outcomes — converting a fragile single-sided construct into a balanced dual-column fixation. For surgeons, the practical benefits are fewer mechanical revisions, more reliable maintenance of alignment, and a better platform for early mobilization. These advantages must be weighed against longer operative time, added implant cost and the need for careful soft-tissue handling to limit wound problems.

Future research: Larger matched-cohort or randomized studies are needed to define precise thresholds of medial bone loss or fragment size that justify medial plating, to compare dual plating with other augmentation strategies, and to analyze cost-effectiveness and standardized rehabilitation protocols.

Keywords: Distal femur fracture, AO 33-C3, Medial plate, Lateral locking plate, Dual plating, Nonunion, Hoffa fragment.


Dr. Raunak Satia

Dr. Rajeev Joshi

Dr. Sahil Sanghavi

Dr. Mahavir Dugad


Dr. Darshan Sonawane


Dr. Ashok Shyam


Dr. Parag Sancheti

DOI: https://doi.org/10.13107/jmt.2024.v10.i01.222

Background

Fractures of the distal femur present a difficult problem for trauma surgeons because they combine an anatomically complex articular surface with often poor bone quality and limited distal bone stock. The injury shows a bimodal distribution — high-energy fractures in younger adults and low-energy osteoporotic fractures in older patients — and accounts for a small proportion of overall fractures but a disproportionate burden of disability when healing or alignment fails [1–4].

Treatment goals are consistent: restore articular congruity, correct alignment and rotation, preserve limb length, and enable early knee motion. Historically, treatment ranged from conservative management to a variety of internal fixation solutions including blade plates and intramedullary devices; modern locked plating technology gave surgeons a fixed-angle option that improved fixation in osteoporotic bone and allowed percutaneous (biologic) techniques in many cases [5–7]. Despite this progress, complex intra-articular injuries with metaphyseal comminution (AO 33-C3) and fractures with medial column deficiency remain at risk for mechanical failure after lateral locking plate fixation alone. Problems such as varus collapse, screw toggle, plate breakage and nonunion have been reported when medial support is absent [8–11].

Biomechanical studies show that constructs which provide a medial buttress — either by adding a medial plate or combining a lateral plate with an intramedullary device — markedly increase axial stiffness and reduce displacement under cyclic loading compared with a lone lateral plate in comminuted models [12–14]. Clinically, several retrospective series and single-centre reports describe improved union rates and fewer revisions when a medial plate is added for clearly indicated fractures, although the level of evidence remains limited [11, 15, 16].

Surgeons weigh the mechanical advantage of a second plate against concerns about increased soft-tissue dissection, operative time, cost and theoretical risks to fragment vascularity. Anatomical and cadaveric work suggest that a medial approach can be performed safely when respecting anatomic safe zones and using minimally invasive techniques where appropriate; vascular compromise does not appear to be a frequent clinical problem when medial fixation is applied judiciously [17–19].

Practical indications emerging from the literature include: large medial condylar (Hoffa) fragments, medial supracondylar bone loss, peri-prosthetic distal femur fractures, nonunion after failed lateral fixation, severe metaphyseal comminution (AO 33-C3) and poor bone quality. In these situations medial augmentation functions as a buttress that offloads the lateral plate and converts a cantilever construct into a dual-column support, which improves survivorship under physiologic loading [15, 20–22].

The present single-centre retro-prospective study reviewed 20 skeletally mature patients with AO 33-C3 distal femoral fractures treated with combined lateral locked plate and medial distal femoral locking plate between October 2019 and October 2021. Outcomes recorded through one year included radiographic union, knee range of motion, HSS knee score, SF-36, time to weight-bearing and complications. Results in this cohort (high union rate, no plate failure, manageable wound issues and a majority achieving good knee ROM and HSS/SF-36 scores) mirror the positive signals seen in other dual-plating series and reinforce the rationale for selective medial augmentation in complex distal femur injuries [1, 11, 16, 23].

Hypothesis and rationale

Primary hypothesis: In skeletally mature patients with AO 33-C3 distal femur fractures and/or medial column deficiency, supplemental medial locking-plate fixation added to a lateral locked plate produces improved mechanical stability that translates into higher union rates, fewer mechanical failures (varus collapse, plate/screw breakage), and at least equivalent — if not superior — functional outcomes compared with expectations from lateral plating alone.

Why this should be true

1. Mechanics. With an absent medial buttress a lateral plate functions as an unsupported cantilever and concentrates bending load on the lateral implant and its distal screws. A medial plate restores the second column and shares axial and bending loads: biomechanical work consistently demonstrates increased axial stiffness and less displacement for dual-plate constructs in comminuted models [12–14].

2. Biology and function. Rigid anatomic fixation that resists collapse permits early controlled knee motion and protects articular reduction. Where lateral fixation alone risks progressive varus or fragment subsidence, medial augmentation allows safe rehabilitation, which is a key determinant of long-term knee mobility and patient-centred outcomes [22, 24].

3. Targeted, not routine, use. Dual plating is not proposed as the default for all distal femur fractures. Its benefit is greatest where medial stability is clearly compromised: medial Hoffa fragments, peri-prosthetic fractures, nonunion after failed lateral fixation, wide metaphyseal bone loss, or severe osteoporotic comminution (AO 33-C3). Carefully selecting cases maximizes gain and minimizes extra soft-tissue exposure [15, 16, 21].

Operational hypotheses for the cohort

- Radiographic union by 12–24 weeks in the majority, with overall union rates comparable to or better than published series of similarly comminuted fractures treated without medial augmentation.
- Low mechanical failure rate (expectation: plate/screw breakage or varus collapse will be uncommon).

• Functional recovery (knee ROM, HSS and SF-36) will be satisfactory in most patients when coupled with structured rehabilitation.
• Complications (wound discharge, superficial infection, and stiffness) will occur but remain manageable without routine implant removal [1, 11, 16, 23].

Endpoints and thresholds

• Primary: clinical and radiographic union at 52 weeks without mechanical failure.
• Secondary: knee ROM at serial intervals, HSS knee score and SF-36 at one year, time to full weight-bearing, and rates of complications requiring reoperation or prolonged wound care.

These endpoints combine mechanical success with outcomes that matter to patients [1,23].

Discussion

The cohort of 20 patients treated with medial plus lateral locking plates demonstrated encouraging outcomes: the large majority achieved radiographic union within expected timeframes, knee ROM of ≥100° in most patients at one year, favorable HSS and SF-36 scores for the cohort, no implant breakage and a modest rate of wound-related complications and stiffness. These findings are consistent with prior clinical reports that reserve medial augmentation for severely comminuted or medial-deficient fractures [16, 23, 24].

Why might dual plating work clinically? Mechanically it reduces bending stresses on the lateral plate and distributes load across both columns; biologically it allows more reproducible maintenance of articular reduction and alignment, enabling earlier controlled motion that reduces stiffness. Biomechanical and cadaver studies support these mechanics, and accumulated clinical series suggest fewer catastrophic failures in appropriately selected patients [12–14, 20].

However, limitations require emphasis. The present study is a small, non-randomized, retro-prospective series without a matched lateral-only comparator; thus selection bias is inherent — surgeons tended to choose medial augmentation for fractures judged most unstable. This limits causal inference about superiority. Also, sample size restricts precise estimation of complication rates. Published literature is similarly dominated by retrospective series and biomechanical work; randomized data are scarce [9, 20].

Practical lessons for surgeons follow:

• Select patients carefully. Reserve medial augmentation for AO 33-C3 fractures with clear medial column deficiency, large medial condylar (Hoffa) fragments, peri-prosthetic fractures, nonunion after failed lateral plating, and severe osteoporotic metaphyseal comminution. Routine dual plating where not indicated adds exposure without clear benefit [15, 16, 21].
• Respect soft tissues. A single longitudinal medial incision or minimally invasive medial plate insertion reduces soft-tissue morbidity compared with extensive dissection. Anatomical studies define safe zones; strict surgical technique and gentle handling of soft tissues reduce wound complications [17, 18].
• Stage rehabilitation. Encourage early controlled knee motion but delay unprotected full weight-bearing until radiographic consolidation (bridging on at least three cortices). Individualize protocols for elderly/osteoporotic patients. Structured physiotherapy mitigates long-term stiffness [22, 24].
• Plan for cost and time. Dual plating increases implant use and OR time; however, if it reduces the need for costly revisions, it may be cost-effective for high-risk fractures — a question for formal health-economic study [20, 25].

From a research standpoint, the field needs larger comparative cohorts or randomized trials to determine thresholds of medial bone loss or fragment size where medial augmentation meaningfully changes outcomes. Biomechanical refinements (optimal plate placement and screw strategies in osteoporotic bone) and standardization of postoperative protocols would also enhance evidence-based practice [12, 25].

Clinical importance

For practising orthopaedic surgeons: medial plate augmentation is a practical option when the medial column is compromised. It restores a mechanical buttress, decreases bending load on the lateral implant, and can reduce the risk of varus collapse and nonunion in AO 33-C3 and other high-risk patterns. Appropriate case selection, careful soft-tissue technique (or minimally invasive medial insertion), and a rehabilitation plan that encourages early controlled motion but delays full weight-bearing until radiographic healing produce the best outcomes. The technique should be seen as a targeted adjunct in a surgeon's toolkit rather than as routine for all distal femur fractures [15, 17, 22].

Future directions

Priority research includes multicentre, matched-cohort or randomized comparisons of lateral-only versus lateral+medial fixation for comparable AO 33-C3 fractures, cost-effectiveness analyses, and biomechanical work to optimize plate placement and screw patterns for osteoporotic bone. Registry data for peri-prosthetic fractures and standardized rehabilitation trials would also clarify best practice and help develop evidence-based algorithms for when to add medial fixation [20, 25].

References

1. Arneson TJ, Melton LJ, Lewallen DG. Epidemiology of diaphyseal and distal femoral fractures in Rochester, Minnesota, 1965–1984. Clin Orthop. 1988; 234:188–94.
2. Schandelmaier P, Partenheimer A, Koenemann B. Distal femoral fractures and LISS stabilization. Injury. 2001; 32 Suppl 3:SC55–63.
3. Nasr AM, McLeod I, Sabboubeh A, Maffulli N. Conservative or surgical treatment of distal femoral fractures: a retrospective

study with minimum five-year follow-up. Acta Orthop Belg. 2000; 66:477–83.
4. Martinet O, Cordey J, Harder Y. The epidemiology of fractures of the distal femur. Injury. 2000; 31 Suppl 3:C62–3.
5. Bezwada HP, Neubauer P, Baker J, Israelite CL, Johanson NA. Periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures following total knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty. 2004; 19(4):453–8.
6. Müller ME, Allgöwer M, Schneider R, Willenegger H. Manual of Internal Fixation. 3rd ed. Berlin: Springer; 1992.
7. Zlowodzki M, et al. Operative treatment of distal femoral fractures: review of fixation techniques and outcomes. J Orthop Trauma. 2006; 20(5):366–71.
8. Hartin G, et al. intramedullary nailing versus condylar blade plating for distal femoral fractures: randomized trial. ANZ J Surg. 2006; 76(5):290–4.
9. Kregor PJ, Stannard J, Zlowodzki M. Distal femoral fracture fixation utilizing modern techniques (LISS). Injury. 2001; 32 Suppl 3:SC55–63.
10. Kubiak EN, Fulkerson E, Strauss E, et al. The evolution of locked plates. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2006; 88:189–200.
11. Ely L Steinberg, Jacov Elis, Yohai Steinberg, Moshe Salai, Tomer Ben-Tov. A double-plating approach to distal femur fractures. Injury. 2017; 48(10):2260–5.
12. Park K-H, Oh C-W, Park I-H, et al. Additional fixation of medial plate over unstable lateral locked plating for distal femur fractures: a biomechanical study. Injury. 2019; 50:1593–8.
13. Fontenot PB, Diaz M, Stoops K, et al. Supplementation of lateral locked plating for distal femur fractures: a biomechanical study. Orthop Trauma. 2019; 33(12):642–8.
14. Wright DJ, DeSanto D, McGarry M, and Lee TQ, Scolaro J. Supplemental fixation of supracondylar distal femur fractures: biomechanical comparison of dual-plate and plate-nail constructs. J Orthop Trauma. 2020; 34(8):434–440.
15. Bologna MG, Garay M, Shields KJ, et al. Dual plate fixation in comminuted distal femur fractures improves union rates. J Orthop. 2019; 18:76–79.
16. Imam MA, Torieh A, Matthana A. Utilization of dual plating for distal femoral fractures. Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol. 2018; 28(1):121–130.
17. Sirisreetreerux N, Shafiq B, and Osgood GM, Hasenboehler EA. Medial knee approach: an anatomical study of minimally invasive plate osteosynthesis for distal femoral condylar fractures. J Orthop Trauma. 2016; 30(11):e357–e361.
18. Jiamton C, Apivatthakakul T. Safety and feasibility of MIPO on the medial side of the femur: a cadaveric and CT angiographic study. Injury. 2015; 46(11):2170–6.
19. Rollick NC, Gadinsky NE, Klinger CE, et al. Effects of dual plating on distal femoral vascularity. J Trauma. (As cited).
20. Zhibiao B, Shichang G, Zhenming H, Anlin L. Clinical efficacy comparison of lateral versus lateral+medial double-plating fixation of distal femoral fractures. Sci Rep. 2018; 8:4863.
21. Ebraheim NA, Buchanan GS, Liu X, et al. Treatment of distal femur nonunion following initial fixation with a lateral locking plate. Orthop Surg. 2016; 8(3):323–33.
22. Kiyono M, Noda T, Nagano H, et al. Clinical outcomes of locking compression plates for distal femoral fractures: retrospective cohort. J Orthop Surg Res. 2019; 14:384.
23. Çiçek H, Tuhanioğlu Ü, Oğur H, Seyfettinoğlu F, Bozkurt M. Double locking plate fixation for osteoporotic periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures. Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc. 2018; 52:92–96.
24. Firat A, Bilgehan T, Tamer S, Mustafa O. Biomechanical comparison of medial versus lateral sided plating in femoral fractures. Acta Ortop Bras. 2018; 26(4):265–270.
25. Bai Z, Gao S, Hu Z, Lian A. Comparison of clinical efficacy: lateral vs lateral+medial double-plating of distal femoral fractures. Sci Rep. 2018; 8:4863.

Conflict of Interest: Nil

Source of Support: None

Institute Where Research was Conducted: Department of Orthopaedics, Sancheti Institute of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Shivajinagar, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
University Affiliation: MUHS, Nashik, Maharashtra, India.
Year of Acceptance of Thesis: 2022

How to Cite this Article: Satia R, Joshi R, Sanghavi S, Dugad M, Sonawane D, Shyam A, Sancheti P. Dual-Column Locking Plate Fixation for AO/OTA 33C3 Distal Femur Fractures: A Hypothesis on Enhanced Mechanical Stability and Healing. Journal of Medical Thesis. January-June 2024; 10(1):50-53.