

1 **Casting without Reduction versus Closed Reduction with or without Fixation in the Treatment**  
2 **of Distal Radius Fractures in Children: A Study Protocol for a Randomized Non-Inferiority Trial**

3  
4 *Background*

5  
6 Fractures are prevalent in the pediatric population. It is estimated that one in three children will  
7 sustain at least one fracture before adulthood, of which distal metaphyseal radius fractures are  
8 the most frequent[1, 2]. Current treatments include *in situ* cast immobilization, or reduction  
9 with or without fixation with K-wires, decided upon angulation and displacement. Traditionally,  
10 specific deformity limits are tolerated, given the child's age and gender, however, these limits  
11 lack supportive evidence. Further, treatment agreement, even between experienced pediatric  
12 orthopedic surgeons, is minimal[3].

13  
14 Distal radius fractures have a remarkable remodeling potential. The remodeling rate is higher  
15 when the angulation is more severe, and it progressively decreases as the alignment  
16 approaches to normal[4]. Observational designs have shown that fractures up to 29 degrees of  
17 angulation and 19 mm of shortening immobilized *in situ* regain complete alignment about a  
18 year after injury[5]. Even shorter times to proper alignment are reported in younger children[5].  
19 Additionally, Crawford et al. describe a series of children treated with cast immobilization  
20 without restoring the length of the radius, achieving neutral ulnar variance at follow-up[6].  
21 Furthermore, when alignment is lost, typical radius morphology is present within three years

22 even when the fracture is immobilized without any attempt to regain alignment[7]. Hence,  
23 casting without reduction is considered a suitable treatment.

24

25 Some specialized centers reserve distal radius corrective osteotomy solely for fracture  
26 malunion in children approaching the end of growth or with associated physal arrest. It is also  
27 the treatment of choice for children with congenital dysplastic conditions of the bone[8].

28

### 29 *Functional evaluation*

30

31 Upper extremity functionality refers to reaching, grasping, and manipulating objects with the  
32 intention to perform daily life activities[9]. Most of the instruments that assess upper extremity  
33 functionality in the pediatric population are specific to patients with longitudinal deficiencies,  
34 amputations, or neurodevelopmental disorders. Specific instruments for adults have also been  
35 published, however, several items refer to tasks that a 5-year-old child might not be able to  
36 properly execute.

37

38 The physical functioning domain of the PROMIS scales is available for assessing functionality of  
39 children without disabilities since 2011[10]. It is a precise and easy-to-administer outcome  
40 measurement instrument in children with orthopedic conditions. Children aged 8 years  
41 onwards are able to, effortlessly, answer the questionnaire by themselves. A parent-proxy  
42 version is available for younger children. The upper extremity functionality is a subdomain of

43 the physical functioning domain. It comprises 29 Liker-type questions with five categories that  
44 enquire about the difficulty of carrying out activities during the past week.

45

46 The trial's primary goal is to establish whether upper extremity's functionality of children who  
47 sustained a distal metaphyseal fracture of the radius and were treated with *in situ* cast  
48 immobilization, is not worse than the functionality of children treated with closed reduction  
49 and cast immobilization, with or without fixation, measured at 6 months with the PROMIS  
50 scale. Secondly, range of motion (ROM), alignment, complications and further treatments  
51 will also be compared. Results may contribute to not only strengthening the evidence of secure  
52 shortening and angulation boundaries, aiding the clinician with evidence-based decision, but  
53 risks and costs may also be questioned, when encountering these kinds of fractures.

54

## 55 **Methods**

56

### 57 *Study design and procedures*

58

59 This is a randomized non-inferiority trial that will take place at Instituto Roosevelt in Bogota–  
60 Colombia, a single institution that focuses on providing treatment for children with orthopedic  
61 and neuromuscular conditions. Two accepted treatments for metaphyseal distal radius  
62 fractures will be compared: cast immobilization without reduction as the experimental  
63 intervention, and closed reduction and immobilization with or without percutaneous fixation as  
64 the control intervention. Acutely, conventional oral analgesics will be routinely provided,

65 afterwards, the principal researcher will invite children and parents to enter into the trial upon  
66 confirming admission criteria. Informed consent, along with informed assent, will be signed.

67

68 *Inclusion criteria*

69

70 Children between 5 to 10 years of age with a proven acute (i.e., within 14 days after injury)  
71 metaphyseal fracture of the distal radius (23-M 2-3 or 23r-M 2-3 according to the AO pediatric  
72 classification) will be regarded as eligible for the trial. Fracture shortening and angulation must  
73 range from 0 to 10 mm and 10 to 20 degrees in the oblique plane, respectively.

74

75 *Exclusion criteria*

76

- 77 • Polytrauma (Injury Severity Score  $\geq$  16)
- 78 • A concomitant fracture in the same limb
- 79 • Pathologic/open fracture
- 80 • Neuromuscular/metabolic bone diseases
- 81 • Concomitant neurologic/vascular lesions
- 82 • Longitudinal limb deficiency
- 83 • Previous infection/fracture in the fractured radius

84

85 *Randomization*

86

87 Randomization will be performed centrally by the Instituto Roosevelt Medical Research  
88 Department. Therefore, allocation will be concealed to the orthopedic surgeons. The Big Stick  
89 Design (BSD) with a maximum tolerated imbalance of 2 will be the methodology for  
90 randomization. The BSD has a very low probability of correctly guessing the allocation of the  
91 next child compared to other designs[11]. The R and RStudio statistical software, specifically the  
92 randomizeR package version 4.1, will be used[12].

93

#### 94 *Interventions*

95

96 Patients will be allocated in a 1:1 ratio to either the experimental or control group. In the  
97 former, fractures will be immobilized without reduction. In the latter, fractures will be reduced  
98 and immobilized. Provided instability, K-wires will be used. Instability is considered when, after  
99 reduction, alignment is lost: a new displacement or angulation larger than 50% and 10 degrees,  
100 respectively. General anesthesia will be mandatory exclusively for the control group. Discharge  
101 within two hours is the standard practice for both procedures. Plain radiographs will be  
102 obtained immediately after the intervention, at two weeks, three-, and nine-months during  
103 follow-up. Casts and K-wires will be removed at 6 weeks.

104

#### 105 *Endpoints and follow up*

106

107 Children will be evaluated at about two and six weeks, three, six, and nine months after  
108 randomization. The primary endpoint is the upper extremity function assessed with the

109 PROMIS Pediatric Physical Function v2.0 at six months. Parents will serve as proxies of children  
110 <8 years with the proper format of the scale. From 8 years of age onwards, children will  
111 personally answer the questionnaire.

112  
113 The secondary outcomes are the ROM, ulnar variance, and fracture alignment in the sagittal  
114 and coronal planes. Plain radiographs of the wrist at two weeks, three and nine months and a  
115 standard goniometer will be used. Additionally, general anesthesia-related adverse effects,  
116 pressure ulcers according to the National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel, the number of days of  
117 required oral analgesics and Dahl classification of pin tract infections will also be registered[13].  
118 Further treatments such as radius osteotomy due to deformity, pseudoarthrosis cure, and  
119 remanipulation will also be recorded. Figure 1 depicts the flow of the study.

120

#### 121 *Power analysis and sample calculation*

122

123 In a personal communication, Dr. Calfee provided PROMIS range scores (36 to 39), variability  
124 (SD=10) and the minimally clinical important difference (MCID; 3 to 5) in children who have  
125 sustained an upper extremity fracture[14]. Therefore, assuming a non-inferiority threshold of 5,  
126 the trial requires a sample of 126 children (63 per group) to demonstrate no meaningful  
127 difference in the primary outcome (one-tailed  $\alpha=0.05$ ,  $\beta=0.2$ ). The sample will be inflated to  
128 152 (20%) due to the anticipation of loss to follow-up.

129

#### 130 *Data management*

131

132 Participant's information will be recorded in the REDCap software. Registries will be password-  
133 protected with access granted just to the principal researcher and the study conductor. Data  
134 will be kept at the Instituto Roosevelt Medical Research Department. After completing the  
135 study, data will be preserved for two years, then all non-anonymized documents will be  
136 discarded.

137

138 *Statistical analysis*

139

140 Customary descriptive statistics will be used whether the variables are continuous or  
141 categorical. The intention-to-treat principle will be followed in this trial. Authors of the scale in  
142 the Northwestern University will standardize PROMIS scores once data gathering is completed,  
143 afterwards, the primary outcome will be evaluated with a t-test. The non-inferiority threshold  
144 will be compared to the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval of the mean difference.  
145 Secondary outcomes measured with continuous variables (i.e., ROM, ulnar variance, fracture  
146 alignment and number of days with oral analgesia) will be compared with the t-test or Mann-  
147 Whitney's U conforming to the distribution of the variables. Categorical outcomes will be  
148 compared with the Fisher's exact test (i.e., anesthesia-related adverse effects, pressure ulcers,  
149 pin tract infections, radius osteotomies, pseudoarthrosis, and remanipulations). Early  
150 termination of the trial is unlikely; therefore, interim analyses are not considered: given the  
151 proposed design, neither superiority nor futility of the experimental treatment is expected.

152

153 *Schedule*

154

155 Recruitment commenced in June 2021. The principal researcher personally interviews parents  
156 and children and the trial's general characteristics are completely explained. Benefits, such as a  
157 close follow-up (e.g., radiographs, pain, functionality) are also explained. Authors expect an  
158 average of ten patients monthly, therefore, recruitment and analysis should be complete by  
159 June 2023.

160 O?

161 *Declarations*

162

163 Both, Instituto Roosevelt and Pontificia Universidad Javeriana Ethics Committees, evaluated  
164 and accepted trial's protocol, research manual, consent and assent forms, and information  
165 brochures (approval No. 2021012101-002 and FM-CIE-0416-21, respectively). The datasets used  
166 and/or analyzed during the current trial will be available from the corresponding author upon  
167 reasonable request. Authors declare no competing interests. No funding to declare.

168 Acknowledgments: None. Authors' contributions: MGR: conception and design, data  
169 acquisition, analysis and interpretation, drafting of the manuscript and approval of the final  
170 version. CMP: critically revised the manuscript, drafting of the manuscript and approval of the  
171 final version

172

173 **Discussion**

174



175 This is the protocol of the first randomized trial that intends to compare functional outcomes of  
176 non-reduced versus reduced distal radius fractures in children. To authors knowledge, medical  
177 literature lacks experimental designs that take into account shortening and angulation in this  
178 age group.

179

180 The principal strength of this trial is the objective evaluation of functional outcomes with a  
181 scale constructed with modern measurement theory which is appropriate for the pediatric  
182 population, including previously healthy children who sustained a fracture of the wrist. In  
183 addition to functional recovery, anatomical parameters, as well as complications due to  
184 treatment will also be recorded.

185

186 The limitations of this trial are the lack of blindness for obvious reasons, and generalizability.  
187 Children will be recruited and treated in a specialized center. In most of authors' country  
188 institutions that deal with fractures in children a pediatric orthopedic surgeon is not available.  
189 The allocation will be open-labeled for patients, parents, and medical staff, this scenario may  
190 affect participants' feelings of well-being. However, results analyses will be blinded.

191

## 192 **References**

193

194 1. Christoffersen T, Ahmed LA, Winther A, Nilsen OA, Furberg AS, Grimnes G, et al. Fracture  
195 incidence rates in Norwegian children, The Tromsø Study, Fit Futures. Arch Osteoporos.  
196 2016;11. doi:10.1007/s11657-016-0294-z.

197 2. Joeris A, Lutz N, Blumenthal A, Slongo T, Audigé L. The AO Pediatric Comprehensive  
198 Classification of Long Bone Fractures (PCCF): Part I: Location and morphology of 2,292 upper  
199 extremity fractures in children and adolescents. *Acta Orthop.* 2017;88:123–8.

200 3. Dua K, Stein MK, O’Hara NN, Brighton BK, Hennrikus WL, Herman MJ, et al. Variation Among  
201 Pediatric Orthopaedic Surgeons When Diagnosing and Treating Pediatric and Adolescent Distal  
202 Radius Fractures. *J Pediatr Orthop.* 2019;39:306–13.

203 4. Friberg KSI. Remodelling after distal forearm fractures in children: I. The effect of residual  
204 angulation on the spatial orientation of the epiphyseal plates. *Acta Orthop.* 1979;50:537–46.

205 5. Do TT, Strub WM, Foad SL, Mehlman CT, Crawford AH. Reduction versus remodeling in  
206 pediatric distal forearm fractures: a preliminary cost analysis. *J Pediatr Orthop B.* 2003;12:109–  
207 10915.

208 6. Crawford SN, Lee LSK, Izuka BH. Closed treatment of overriding distal radial fractures without  
209 reduction in children. *J Bone Jt Surg - Ser A.* 2012;94:246–52.

210 7. Roth KC, Denk K, Colaris JW, Jaarsma RL. Think twice before re-manipulating distal  
211 metaphyseal forearm fractures in children. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2014;;1699–707.

212 8. Mader K, Gausepohl T, Pennig D. Shortening and deformity of radius and ulna in children:  
213 Correction of axis and length by callus distraction. *J Pediatr Orthop Part B.* 2003;12:183–91.

214 9. Wallen M, Stewart K. Grading and Quantification of Upper Extremity Function in Children  
215 with Spasticity. *Semin Plast Surg.* 2016;30:5–13.

216 10. DeWitt E, Stucky B, Thissen D, Irwin DE, Langer M, Varni JW. Construction of the Eight Item  
217 PROMIS Pediatric Physical Function Scales: Built Using Item Response Theory. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
218 2011;64:794–804.

219 11. Zhao W, Weng Y, Wu Q, Palesch Y. Quantitative comparison of randomization designs in  
220 sequential clinical trials based on treatment balance and allocation randomness. *Pharm Stat.*  
221 2012;11:39–48. doi:10.1002/pst.493.

222 12. Team RC, Computing RF for S. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.  
223 2021. <https://www.r-project.org/>.

224 13. Edsberg L, Black J, Goldberg M, McNichol L, Moore L, Sieggreen M. Revised National  
225 Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel Pressure Injury Staging System Revised Pressure Injury Staging  
226 System. 2016;43 December:585–97.

227 14. Gerull WD, Okoroafor UC, Guattery J, Goldfarb CA, Wall LB, Calfee RP. Performance of  
228 Pediatric PROMIS CATs in Children With Upper Extremity Fractures. *Hand.* 2020;15:194–200.  
229