## Operative Management of Stress-Positive Minimally Displaced Lateral Compression Type 1 Pelvic Ring Injuries: Analysis of Outcomes Before and After Implementation of a Departmental Stress Protocol

*Nicholas Jerome Tucker, BS*; Cyril Mauffrey, MD; Joshua A. Parry, MD Denver Health Medical Center, Denver, Colorado, UNITED STATES

**Purpose:** Our objective was to compare the hospital course of patients with minimally displaced (<1 cm) lateral compression type 1 (LC1) injuries treated before and after implementation of a departmental protocol utilizing lateral stress radiographs (LSRs) to determine management.

**Methods:** This retrospective review of a prospectively collected database identified patients with isolated LC1 injuries that were managed before (n = 33) and after (n = 40) implementation of LSR to determine treatment. All patients in the pre-stress cohort were managed nonoperatively, while patients in the LSR cohort were managed operatively if stress-positive ( $\geq$ 1 cm displacement on LSR) and nonoperatively if stress-negative. Primary outcomes were ability to clear physical therapy (PT) for discharge, discharge location, and hospital length of stay (LOS).

**Results:** The pre-stress and LSR protocol groups were similar in demographic/injury characteristics (age, sex, mechanism, American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) score, Nakatani classification, bilateral/unilateral injury, Denis zone, sacral fracture completeness, sacral comminution). The LSR protocol group was more likely to clear PT by discharge (97.5% vs 75.8%, proportional difference [PD]: 21.7%, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 5.1% to 36.8%, P = 0.009), less likely to discharge to a rehabilitation facility (2.5% vs 18.2%, PD: –15.7%, CI: -30.0% to -0.5%, P = 0.04), and had no difference in LOS (median difference [MD]: 0, CI: -1to 1, P = 0.57). 55.0% of LSR protocol patients (n = 22) were stress-negative and managed nonoperatively. 100% of stress-negative patients were able to clear PT by the third day of admission. When compared to patients in the pre-stress group that were able to clear PT by the third day of admission, stress-negative patients did not differ in patient/injury characteristics or primary outcomes. 45.0% of LSR protocol patients were stress-positive (n = 18) and managed operatively. When compared to patients in the pre-stress group who were not able to clear PT by the third day of admission, the operative LSR group was more likely to clear PT (94.4% vs 50.0%, PD: 44.4%, CI: 13.4% to 66.6%, P = 0.006), less likely to discharge to a rehabilitation facility (5.6% vs 37.5%, PD: -31.9%, -55.0% to -2.8%, P = 0.03), and had a trend of a shorter LOS (MD: 1, CI: 0 to 2, P = 0.13).

**Conclusion:** Implementation of a LSR protocol to determine management of minimally displaced stress-positive LC1 injuries was associated with increased rates of operative management, PT clearance by discharge, and a reduction in the number of patients discharging to rehabilitation facilities. Further research is required to determine the implication of the LSR protocol in post-hospital outcomes.

The FDA has stated that it is the responsibility of the physician to determine the FDA clearance status of each drug or medical device they wish to use in clinical practice.