

# Conventional a.p.-radiographs are not reliable in detecting acetabular and proximal femur fractures in the elderly

Andreas Schicho, Kevin Seeber, Peter H Richter, Florian Gebhard

## ABSTRACT

Blunt pelvic traumata are common injuries especially among elderly patients. It is well known, that standard x-ray diagnostics fail to detect all fractures. We set up a retrospective study to gain a profound knowledge of the actual informative value of a single, plain a.p. pelvic radiograph in these injuries for detecting acetabular and proximal femoral fractures as a standardized starting point in the radiologic work-up. We analysed the radiological reports, all validated by a board certified radiologist, for patients aged 75 years and older who had a blunt pelvic trauma and had both a standard a.p. pelvic x-ray and pelvic CT scan in the emergency department over a 3-year period. In 233 patients aged 75 years and older, we found 35 acetabular fractures. The calculated specificity of the plain x-ray was high (97.3%), but sensitivity was rather low (66.6%). The positive and negative predictive value were 85.7% and 92.4%, respectively. The number of proximal femur fractures found in CT was comparable (n = 46; prevalence 19.8%). The calculated sensitivity was 82.6%, specificity 93.0%, positive predictive and negative predictive values were 74.5% and 95.6%. We thus recommend the a.p. radiograph as the first step in the diagnostic pathway. But according to the crucial clinical assessment, a CT scan should be obtained whenever in doubt of the reliability of the plain x-ray, especially in elderly patients.

Department for Orthopaedic Trauma  
Ulm University, Germany Albert-Einstein-Allee 23 D-89081 Ulm, Germany

### Address for correspondence:

Andreas Schicho,  
Department for Orthopaedic Trauma  
Ulm University, Germany Albert-Einstein-Allee 23 D-89081 Ulm, Germany  
andreas.schicho@googlemail.com

Received: July 28, 2015

Accepted: September 01, 2015

Published: September 16, 2015

**KEY WORDS:** Anterior pelvic ring; imaging; proximal femur fracture; acetabular fracture; sensitivity

## INTRODUCTION

Acetabular and proximal femur fractures are common injuries especially among elderly patients, which is a steadily growing part of population in western societies(1). The average physical activity in the elderly is continuously rising(2), paralleling the rising incidence of osteoporosis with age(3,4). In case of blunt pelvic trauma, the clinical examination is usually followed by a gradual radiologic work-up. It is well known, that standard x-ray diagnostics fail to detect all fractures(5). Detailed knowledge of sensitivity and negative predictive value of plain a.p. pelvic x-ray is important to opt for or against the gradual radiologic work up with additional views or the nowadays easily available CT scan, or even MRI scan in select cases(6). We set up a retrospective study to gain a profound knowledge of the actual informative value of single, plain a.p. pelvic radiographs in blunt pelvic traumata for detecting acetabular and proximal femoral fractures.

## METHOD

We analysed the radiological reports, all validated by a board certified radiologist, for patients aged 75 years and older who had a blunt pelvic trauma and had both a standard a.p. pelvic x-ray and pelvic CT scan in the emergency department over a 3-year period in our german level I trauma center. Patients with only either x-ray or CT scan were disregarded, and histories of inadequate or no trauma were excluded. Age and gender were recorded and cases were analysed overall and according to the following age groups 76-80, 81-85, 86-90, 91-

95 and 96+. The intrinsic test characteristics (sensitivity and specificity) and the performance in the selected population (positive and negative predictive values) were calculated according to standard formulas. The study was approved by the ethic's committee prior to data retrieval and analysis (No. 183/14).

## RESULTS

In 233 patients aged 75 years and older, we found 35 acetabular fractures in plain x-ray with 198 x-rays showing no bony lesion. Thereof, 30 x-rays were correct positive, 5 false positive, 15 false negative and 183 correct negative. Summed up, 45 patients actually had an acetabular fracture in the CT scan, equalling a prevalence of 19.3% in our study population. The calculated specificity of the plain x-ray was high (97.3%), but sensitivity was rather low (66.6%). The positive and negative predictive value were 85.7% and 92.4%, respectively (Tab. 1).

The number of proximal femur fractures found in CT was comparable (n = 46; prevalence 19.8%) with 38 x-rays being correct positive, 13 false positive, 8 false negative and 174 correct negative. The calculated sensitivity was 82.6%, specificity 93.0%, positive predictive and negative predictive values were 74.5% and 95.6% (Tab. 1).

Age distribution of both, acetabular and proximal femur fractures, show a peak around 80 years of age with a maximum of n = 13 for acetabular fractures between 76 and 80 years and a maximum of n = 18 for proximal femur

fractures between 81 and 85 years of age. These amounts equal an age group prevalence of 25.5% for acetabular fractures and 27.7% for proximal femur fractures (Tab. 2).

**Tab. 1.** Sensitivity and specificity of plain x-ray for acetabular and proximal femur fractures

	Acetabulum (%)	Proximal femur (%)
<i>Intrinsic characteristics</i>		
Sensitivity	66.6	82.6
Specificity	97.3	93.0
<i>Performance in the population</i>		
Positive predictive value	85.7	74.5
Negative predictive value	92.4	95.6

**Tab. 2.** Age distribution of acetabular and proximal femur fractures

Age	# Acetabulum (n)	%	# Proximal femur (n)	%	All (n)
76-80	13	25,5	4	7,8	51
81-85	15	23,1	18	27,7	65
86-90	11	14,9	16	21,6	74
91-95	4	11,8	6	17,6	34
96+	2	22,2	2	22,2	9
All (n)	45		46		233

## DISCUSSION

Both acetabular and proximal femur fractures must not be missed in the diagnostic work up of blunt pelvic trauma in elderly patients, since immobilization directly causes relevant mortality(7), which is preventable with the help of different therapeutic strategies. While proximal femur fractures mostly are an indication for surgical intervention with prosthesis, intramedullary nailing or open reduction internal fixation with plates, cable wires and screws, a significant proportion of acetabular fractures can be admitted to a conservative treatment regime when controlled radiographically on a regular basis.

With an increasing elder population especially in the western societies, the proportion of patients aged 75 years and older will rise in the ED. On one hand, maintaining high activity levels throughout ageing(2) in parallel to decreasing bone stock quality due to osteoporosis will lead to an increase of elderly patients with blunt pelvic trauma(3,4). On the other hand, the burden of higher age with e.g. dementia, frailty, sarcopenia and repetitive falls will add up to the population at risk(8).

As a limitation of the here shown study, suspected acetabular or proximal femur fractures mostly show definite findings in the clinical assessment. Addition of appropriate views in the plain radiographic routine should be mandatory (lateral view for proximal femur fractures; ala and obturator view for

acetabular fractures). With the before mentioned burden of age, this limitation doesn't detract from the meaning of the above stated results; the number of inappropriate clinical findings in the assessment due to dementia or neurologic alterations of other kind is rising, thus making it difficult to localise or focus a suspected lesion. In these cases, with adequate trauma reported, a CT scan should be performed to rule out or identify any fractures. The on-going debate on radiation exposure and gradual diagnostic work-up has to be considered as well(9); both the age of the patient and the limited informative value of plain radiographs have to be taken into account therein.

In comparison to even rather old studies (1982) of the same intent(10), only minimal changes in sensitivity and specificity can be found. For acetabular fractures, sensitivity was 73% and specificity 93% in 1981 compared to 66.6% and 97.3% more than 30 years later. For proximal femur fractures, values were similar as well (sensitivity 85% vs. 82.6%; specificity 89% vs. 93.0%). Regarding the observable changes of questionable relevance, one has to take into account the vast technical progress in both, plain x-ray imaging and reading as well as CT scanning. While the plain radiograph of the pelvis remains one of the standard diagnostic tools in patients with blunt pelvic trauma, the physician in charge has to bear in mind the limited informative value(11) of x-ray even for acetabular and proximal femur fractures.

As a conclusion, we need to encourage the awareness for the low sensitivity of a single, plain a.p. pelvic x-ray for both acetabular and proximal femoral fractures. If no clinical focus for additional views can be distinguished, we recommend the broader use of CT scans whenever in doubt of the reliability of the plain x-ray, especially in elderly patients.

## CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None to declare.

## ETHICAL STANDARDS

The study has been approved by the appropriate ethical committee and has therefore been performed in accordance with the pertinent ethical guidelines (Permission No. 183/14).

## CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to data collection and analysis. AS and KS did the statistical analysis. AS and KS retrieved data and prepared data analysis. AS and PB were involved in the manuscript writing. FG was initiator, supervisor at all stages and did final manuscript proof reading.

## REFERENCES

1. Guggenbuhl P, Meadeb J, Chalès G. Osteoporotic fractures of the proximal humerus, pelvis, and ankle: epidemiology and diagnosis. *Jt Bone Spine Rev Rhum*. 2005 Oct;72(5):372–5.
2. Barnett I, van Sluijs EMF, Ogilvie D. Physical Activity and Transitioning to Retirement. *Am J Prev Med*. 2012 Sep;43(3):329–36.
3. Hernlund E, Svedbom A, Ivergård M, Compston J, Cooper C, Stenmark J, et al. Osteoporosis in the European Union: medical management, epidemiology and economic burden: A report prepared in collaboration with the International Osteoporosis Foundation (IOF) and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industry Associations (EFPIA). *Arch Osteoporos* [Internet]. 2013 Dec [cited 2015 May 1];8(1-2). Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11657-013-0136-1>
4. The EU review panel of the IOF, Svedbom A, Hernlund E, Ivergård M, Compston J, Cooper C, et al. Osteoporosis in the European Union: a compendium of country-specific reports. *Arch Osteoporos* [Internet]. 2013 Dec [cited 2015 May 1];8(1-2). Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11657-013-0137-0>
5. Henes FO, Nüchtern JV, Groth M, Habermann CR, Regier M, Rueger JM, et al. Comparison of diagnostic accuracy of Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Multidetector Computed Tomography in the detection of pelvic fractures. *Eur J Radiol*. 2012 Sep 1;81(9):2337–42.
6. Nüchtern JV, Hartel MJ, Henes FO, Groth M, Jauch SY, Haegele J, et al. Significance of clinical examination, CT and MRI scan in the diagnosis of posterior pelvic ring fractures. *Injury*. 2015 Feb;46(2):315–9.
7. Hill RM, Robinson CM, Keating JF. Fractures of the pubic rami. Epidemiology and five-year survival. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2001 Nov;83(8):1141–4.
8. Soles GLS, Ferguson TA. Fragility fractures of the pelvis. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med*. 2012 Sep;5(3):222–8.
9. Dincer Y, Sezgin Z. Medical Radiation Exposure and Human Carcinogenesis-Genetic and Epigenetic Mechanisms. *Biomed Environ Sci BES*. 2014 Sep;27(9):718–28.
10. Harley J, Mack L, Winquist R. CT of acetabular fractures: comparison with conventional radiography. *Am J Roentgenol*. 1982 Mar 1;138(3):413–7.
11. Scheyerer MJ, Osterhoff G, Wehrle S, Wanner GA, Simmen H-P, Werner CML. Detection of posterior pelvic injuries in fractures of the pubic rami. *Injury*. 2012 Aug 1;43(8):1326–9.

© SAGEYA. This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, noncommercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.  
Source of Support: Nil, Conflict of Interest: None declared