

**Research Article****Comparative study between pedicled and propeller flaps  
for the coverage of tibial wounds****Muhammad Shehzad, Abbas Ali  
and Syed Bilal Aftab Hashmi**<sup>1</sup>Post Graduate Resident, Nishtar Hospital Multan<sup>2</sup>Medical Officer, BHU Tormik Skardu Baltistan<sup>3</sup>Medical Officer, BHU, Shaheedan, Bhakkar**ABSTRACT**

**Objective:** To compare the primary success rate (flap survival) of pedicled versus propeller flaps for coverage of tibial wounds.

**Materials & Methods:** This comparative study was conducted Department of Surgery Nishtar Hospital, Multan from January 2017 to June 2017.

**Results:** The mean age of patients in group A was  $32.48 \pm 10.84$  years and in group B was  $33.56 \pm 10.13$  years. Out of 60 patients, 42 (70.0%) were males and 18 (30.0%) were females with male to female ratio of 2.3:1. The mean size of wound in group A was  $24.80 \pm 10.33$  cm<sup>2</sup> and in group B was  $26.48 \pm 12.10$  cm<sup>2</sup>. The mean duration of wound in group A was  $11.88 \pm 5.27$  days and in group B was  $12.72 \pm 6.02$  days. Primary success rate of Group A (pedicled flap) was 27 (90.0%) while in Group B (propeller flap) was 19 (63.33%) with p-value = 0.013.

**Conclusion:** This study concluded that primary success rate (flap survival upto 2 months) of pedicled flaps is higher compared to propeller flaps in tibial wounds coverage and should be used routinely in our general practice in order to reduce the morbidity of these particular patients.

**Keywords:** Tibial, wounds, coverage, flaps, survival

**INTRODUCTION:**

The purpose of lower extremity re-construction is coverage of open wounds of leg to give individuals a healed wound and to let them resume to their routine life. Open wounds and defects in the lower extremity results from tumor re-section, trauma, diabetes and peripheral vascular disease; because of many reasons, these wounds needs re-construction. Firstly, any exposed bone which is not surrounded by vascularized soft tissue is at higher risk of bone necrosis, sepsis and osteomyelitis.<sup>1-3</sup>

Due to defects of tissue, poor circulation and inadequate and tight local tissues, management of

soft tissue around the lower 3<sup>rd</sup> of the leg and foot poses a considerable challenge to the reconstructive surgeon.<sup>4,5</sup>

A durable flap having very good texture of skin, good arc rotation arc, reliable vascularity, ease of dissection and minimum morbidity of donor site is the most desired option for the coverage of these defects.<sup>6</sup>

In routine practice, there is a variety of pedicled or muscular flaps for the re-construction of defects of soft tissues of lower limb. These techniques are not used commonly by orthopedic surgeons because of lack of familiarization with these

techniques and problems occurred from the donor site.<sup>1-2</sup> Conventional reconstructive options include split skin grafting, local random fasciocutaneous flaps, Ponten's super flap, cross leg fasciocutaneous flap, pedicled muscular or musculocutaneous flaps, microvascular free tissue transfer or perforator flaps.<sup>7</sup>

After the introduction of microsurgery, transfer of tissue becomes one of the acceptable reconstructive option for the lower limb in the areas where local flaps are not available.<sup>8</sup> With the development of perforator flaps, newer and more reliable flaps have become available for the reconstruction of lower limb.<sup>9</sup>

Although, perforator propeller flaps are safe, effective and simple, post-operative engorgement does not occur, attractive in shape, and particularly suitable for soft tissue coverage of lower leg and foot defects but pedicled perforator flaps have several obvious advantages over propeller flaps.<sup>10</sup> Additionally, there is no need for special instrumentation and no requirement for transfer of patients to specialist centers.<sup>11</sup>

As there was very scarce literature available regarding comparison of primary success rate of tibial wounds coverage by pedicled versus propeller flaps, so the rationale of this study was to compare the primary success rate (in terms of flap survival) of pedicled versus propeller flaps for tibial wounds coverage. Moreover, the results of this study provide us with a better technique for tibial wounds coverage, so that particular technique can be recommended and routinely applied in our clinical practice to attain the better results and reduce patient's morbidity.

### **Research methodology:**

This comparative study was conducted Department of Surgery Nishter Hospital, Multan from January 2017 to June 2017. Total 60 patients with wounds ( $\leq 50\text{cm}^2$ ) exclusively involving tibia of  $\leq 1$  month duration, having age from 15-60 years either male or female were selected. Patients with chronic osteomyelitis, fractures with segmental bone loss, mal-aligned bone fixation, patients with polytrauma, patients with peripheral

vascular disease and patients of ischemic heart disease were excluded.

All the selected patients were randomly divided into two groups A & B. After adequate debridement, soft tissue coverage was provided by distally based pedicled flap followed by split thickness skin graft in group A patients while with propeller flaps in group B patients. Post operatively, operated leg was elevated to reduce edema and pain. Flap monitoring was done 2 hourly for the first 24-48 hrs for colour, temperature, turgor and capillary refill and if remained uneventful, patients were discharged on 7<sup>th</sup> post-operative day. All patients were then followed after one week of discharge and then fortnightly for at least 2 months at which final outcome was recorded. Final success rate in terms of flap survival was noted at the end of 2<sup>nd</sup> month. Flap survival was deemed as yes if covering flap had survived as a whole without necrosis (wound having dead, discolored and soft tissue with a very foul odor) or dehiscence (opening of wound along surgical site) upto 2 months and deemed as no if there was complete or partial flap necrosis or dehiscence upto 2 months. All the collected data was entered in pre-designed proforma.

Statistical analysis was performed by using SPSS version 20.0. Mean and standard deviation was calculated for age, size of wound and duration of wound. Frequency and percentage was calculated for gender and primary success rate (yes/no). The primary success rate of the two study groups was compared for difference. Chi Square test was applied to compare the primary success rate. P value  $\leq 0.05$  was considered as significant. Confounders like age, gender, size of wound, duration of wound were controlled through stratifications and post-stratification chi square was applied to see their effect on outcome. P-value  $\leq 0.05$  was taken as significant.

### **RESULTS:**

Age range in this study was from 15-60 years with mean age of  $33.12 \pm 10.39$  years. The mean age of patients in group A was  $32.48 \pm 10.84$  years and in group B was  $33.56 \pm 10.13$  years.

Mean size of wound was  $25.64 \pm 11.16 \text{ cm}^2$ . The mean size of wound in group A was  $24.80 \pm 10.33 \text{ cm}^2$  and in group B was  $26.48 \pm 12.10 \text{ cm}^2$ . Mean duration of wound was  $12.30 \pm 5.61$  days. The mean duration of wound in group A was  $11.88 \pm 5.27$  days and in group B was  $12.72 \pm 6.02$  days.

Primary success rate of Group A (pedicled flap) was 27 (90.0%) while in Group B (propeller flap) was 19 (63.33%). Statistically significant difference of success rate between the both groups was noted with p-value = 0.013. (Table 1)

Patients of both groups were divided into to three age groups i.e. age group 15-30 years, age group 31-45 years and age group 46-60 years. In age group 15-30 years, primary success rate was noted in 14 (93.33%) patients and 08 (61.54%) patients of study group A & B respectively. Statistically significant difference of primary success rate between group A and B was noted with p value 0.041. In age group 31-45 years, primary success rate was noted in 10 (90.91%) patients and 08 (66.67%) patients of study group A & B respectively. Statistically insignificant difference of primary success rate between group A and B was noted with p value 0.159. In age group 46-60 years, primary success rate was noted in 03 (75.0%) patients and 03 (60.0%) patients of study group A & B respectively. Statistically insignificant difference of primary success rate between group A and B was noted with p value 0.635. (Table 2)

Primary success rate was noted in 20 (90.91%) male patients of group A and 13 (65.0%) male patients of group B. Difference of success rate

between the male patients of both study groups was statistically significant with p value 0.041. In female patients of group A, primary success rate was 07 (87.50%) in female patients of group B, primary success rate was 06 (60.0%) but the difference was statistically insignificant with p value 0.196. (Table 3)

Distribution of patients according to their wound size was done and two groups was made i.e. wound size  $\leq 25 \text{ cm}^2$  and wound size  $>25\text{-}\leq 50 \text{ cm}^2$ . In patients with wound size  $\leq 25 \text{ cm}^2$ , primary success rate was noted in 17 (89.47%) patients of group A and 14 (73.33%) patients of group B but the difference was statistically insignificant with p value 0.335. In patients with wound size  $>25\text{-}\leq 50 \text{ cm}^2$ , primary success rate was noted in 10 (90.91%) patients of group A and 05 (41.67%) patients of group B and the difference was statistically significant with p value 0.013. (Table 4)

Division of patients according to duration of wound was done and two groups was made i.e.  $\leq 15$  days group  $>15\text{-}\leq 30$  days group. In  $\leq 15$  days group, primary success rate was noted in 19 (95.0%) patients of group A and 18 (81.82%) patients of group B. Statistically insignificant difference of primary success rate between the both groups was noted with p value 0.124.

$>15\text{-}\leq 30$  days group, primary success rate was noted in 08 (80.0%) patients of group A and 01 (12.50%) patients of group B. Statistically significant difference of primary success rate between the both groups was noted with p value 0.036. (Table 5)

**Table 1:** Comparison of success rate between both groups

Study Group	Primary success rate		P value
	Yes	No	
A	27 (90)	03 (10)	<b>0.015</b>
B	19 (63.33)	11 (36.67)	

**Table 2:** Age distribution

Age groups	Group A		Group B		P-value
	Primary success rate		Primary success rate		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
<b>15-30</b>	14 (93.33%)	01 (6.67%)	08 (61.54%)	05 (38.46%)	<b>0.041</b>
<b>31-45</b>	10 (90.91%)	01 (9.09%)	08 (66.67%)	04 (33.33%)	<b>0.159</b>
<b>46-60</b>	03 (75.0%)	01 (25.0%)	03 (60.0%)	02 (40.0%)	<b>0.635</b>

**Table 3:** Gender distribution

Gender	Group A		Group B		P-value
	Primary success rate		Primary success rate		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Male	20 (90.91%)	02 (9.09%)	13 (65.0%)	07 (35.0%)	<b>0.041</b>
Female	07 (87.50%)	01 (12.50%)	06 (60.0%)	04 (40.0%)	<b>0.196</b>

**Table 4:** Distribution according to wound size

Size of wound	Group A		Group B		P-value
	Primary success rate		Primary success rate		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
≤25 cm <sup>2</sup>	17 (89.47%)	02 (10.53%)	14 (73.33%)	04 (26.67%)	<b>0.335</b>
>25-≤50 cm <sup>2</sup>	10 (90.91%)	01 (9.09%)	05 (41.67%)	07 (58.33%)	<b>0.013</b>

**Table 5:** Distribution according to duration of wound.

Duration of wound	Group A		Group B		P-value
	Primary success rate		Primary success rate		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
≤15 days	19 (95.0%)	01 (5.0%)	18 (81.82%)	04 (18.18%)	<b>0.124</b>
>15-≤30 days	08 (80.0%)	02 (20.0%)	01 (12.50%)	07 (87.50%)	<b>0.036</b>

**DISCUSSION:**

There are a number of methods for achieving closure of open tibial fractures, including direct suturing, split-thickness skin-graft, local muscle flap, local fasciocutaneous flap or free vascularized tissue transfer. So, we have conducted this study to compare the primary success rate (flap survival upto 2 months) of pedicled versus propeller flaps for coverage of tibial wounds.

In our study, primary success rate (covering flap had survived as a whole without necrosis (wound having dead, discolored and soft tissue with a very foul odor) or dehiscence (opening of wound along surgical site) upto 2 months) of Group A (pedicled flap) was 27 (90.0%) while in Group B (propeller flap) was 19 (63.33%). Georgescu AV et al<sup>12</sup> has shown success rate of propeller flaps in terms of flap survival as 72% while Tintle SM et al<sup>13</sup> in their study has shown the success rate of pedicled flaps as 97% in soft tissue coverage of distal tibial wounds. In a study done by Zayakova YK et al<sup>14</sup> on 11 pedicled flaps patients, successful results were observed in 10 (83.33%) cases.

In a meta analysis of 50 articles documented success rate of sural flaps as 82%.<sup>15</sup> Similarly in an retrospective analysis of sural flap, the rate of complication was 59% (41/70 flaps), partial and complete necrosis in 17% 19% flaps.<sup>16</sup>

In another study, Akhtar S et al<sup>17</sup> reported flap survival rate in 78.5% patients, partial and complete necrosis in 16.5% patients and 9.5% patients.

Ashfaq F et al<sup>18</sup> in their study had used distally based pedicled flap to cover defects of ankle and foot in five cases and a total complication rate of 60% was observed. There was one (20%) total flap loss and two partial flap necrosis (40%). Complication rate is similar to Baumeister, SP et al<sup>19</sup> who critically examined complications of sural flap in 70 consecutive cases and found 59% complication rate with 19% rate of total flap necrosis and 17% partial flap necrosis. One study from Rawalpindi, Pakistan has compared medial plantar artery flap to sural flap for coverage of heel defects and found former to be better in terms of weight bearing, early mobilization and less complications.<sup>20</sup> So, on the whole it is concluded that primary success rate (flap survival) of pedicled flaps is higher compared to propeller flaps in tibial wounds coverage and should be used routinely in our general practice in order to reduce the morbidity of these particular patients.

**CONCLUSION:**

This study concluded that primary success rate (flap survival upto 2 months) of pedicled flaps is higher compared to propeller flaps for the

coverage of tibial wounds. So, we recommend that pedicled flaps should be used routinely in our general practice for coverage of tibial wounds instead of propeller flaps in order to reduce the morbidity of these particular patients.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Harris AM, Althausen PL, Kellam J, Bosse MJ, Castillo R, Lower Extremity Assessment Project (LEAP) Study Group. Complications following limb-threatening lower extremity trauma. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2009;23:1-6.
2. Saddawi-Konefka D, Kim HM, Chung KC. A systematic review of outcomes and complications of reconstruction and amputation for type IIIB and IIIC fractures of the tibia. *PlastReconstr Surg*. 2008;122:1796-805.
3. Scher KS, Steele FJ. The septic foot in patients with diabetes. *Surgery*. 1988;104:661-66.
4. Fracalvieri M, Bogetti P, Verna G, Carlucci S, Favi R, Bruschi S. Distally based fasciocutaneous flap for foot reconstruction: a retrospective review of 10 years experience. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2008;29:191-8.
5. Ajmal S, Khan MA, Khan RA, Shadman M, Yousof K, Iqbal T. distally based suralfasciocutaneous flap for soft tissue reconstruction of the distal leg, ankle and foot defects. *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad*. 2009;21(4):19-23.
6. Xu G, Jin LL. The coverage of skin defects over the foot and ankle using the distally based suralneurocutaneous flaps: experience of 21 cases. *J PlastReconstrAesthet Surg*. 2008;61:575-7.
7. Mukherjee MK, Parwaz MA, Chakravarty B, Langer V. Perforator flap: A novel method for providing skin cover to lower limb defects. *Med J Armed Forces India*. 2012;68(2012):328-34.
8. Hong JP. The use of supermicrosurgery in lower extremity reconstruction: the next step in evolution. *PlastReconstr Surg*. 2009;123:230-5.
9. Sasidaran R, Zain MAM, Basiron NH, Ajik S. Propeller Flaps in Lower Limb Reconstruction: Case Series. *Anaplastology*. 2013;2(3):1-4.
10. Dong KX, Xu YQ, Fan XY, Xu LJ, Su XX, Long H, et al. Perforator Pedicled Propeller Flaps for Soft Tissue Coverage of Lower Leg and Foot Defects. *Orthopaedic Surg*. 2014;6:42-6.
11. Quaba O, Quaba A. Pedicled Perforator Flaps for the Lower Limb. *SeminPlast Surg*. 2006;20(2):103-11.
12. Georgescu AV, Matei IR, Capota IM. The use of propeller perforator flaps for diabetic limb salvage: a retrospective review of 25 cases. *Diabet Foot Ankle*. 2012;3:doi: 10.3402/dfa.v3i0.18978.
13. Tintle SM, Gwinn DE, Andersen RC. Soft Tissue Coverage of Combat Wounds. *J SurgOrthopaed Adv*. 2010;19(1):29-34.
14. Zayakova YK. Application of pedicle flaps for wound coverage of lower leg. *J IMAB*. 2013;19(1):382-86.
15. Follmar KE, Baccarani A, Steffen P, Baumeister L, Levin S, Erdmann D. The distally based sural flap. *PlastReconstr Surg*. 2007;119:138-48.
16. Baumeister SP, Spierer R, Erdmann D et al. A realistic complication analysis of 70 sural artery flaps in a multimorbid patient group. *PlastReconstr Surg*. 2003;112:129-40.
17. Akhtar S, Hameed A. Versatility of the suralfasciocutaneous flap in the coverage of lower third leg and hind foot defects. *J PlastReconstrAesthet Surg*. 2006;59:839-45.
18. Ashfaq F, Ghani S, Sadiq M, Beg MSA, Bhatti MA. Avoiding complications in soft tissue coverage of lower extremity:

- an audit and review of literature. Pak J Surg. 2010; 26(4):274-79.
19. Baumeister SP, Spierer R, Erdmann D, Sweis R, Levin LS, Germann GK. A realistic complication analysis of 70 sural artery flaps in a multimorbid patient group. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2003 Jul;112(1):129-40.
  20. Rashid M, Hussain SS, Aslam R, Illahi I. A comparison of two fasciocutaneous flaps in the reconstruction of defects of the weight-bearing heel. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak*. 2003 Apr;13(4):216-8.