

Why Don't We Care About the Deltoid Ligament

Sean T. Grambart DPM FACFAS Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs, Des Moines University, College of Podiatric Medicine and Surgery Past-President, American College of Foot and Ankle Surgeons

Disclosure



- Bespa Global, Partner
- Orthosolutions, Design Team
- ACFAS Speaker







What Camp are You In??



- No Reason to Repair the Deltoid
- Deltoid repair should be performed in all patients with bimalleolar equivalent ankle fractures
- Repair the deltoid only if medial-sided exposure is already required to clear soft tissue from the medial gutter
- Deltoid ligament repair among high-level athletes and only after arthroscopic confirmation of complete deltoid ligament rupture.
- Repair only among those who are intraoperatively unstable after ORIF







- Ankles with SER-IV injuries
- Ankles with ORIF
- Ankles with ORIF and deltoid repair



ournal of Orthopaedics 17 (2020) 87–90



ournal of Orthopaedics 17 (2020) 87–90



Biomechanical Effect on Joint Stability of Including Deltoid Ligament Repair in an Ankle Fracture Soft Tissue Injury Model With Deltoid and Syndesmotic Disruption



Purpose
Quantify the biomechanical effect of deltoid ligament repair in an ankle fracture soft tissue injury model

Methods

- 9 cadaveric specimens with each leg was tested under 5 conditions
- Intact, syndesmosis and deltoid ligament sectioned, syndesmosis fixed, deltoid repaired, both the syndesmosis and deltoid ligament repaired
- Anterior, posterior, lateral, and medial drawer and rotational stresses were applied to the foot and the resulting talus displacement was documented

lococain et al. Foot and Ankle International, 2020



| Biomechanical Effect o Including Deltoid Ligar Ankle Fracture Soft Ti With Deltoid and Synd | - | FASST | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| | | Displacement, mr | , Mean \pm SD | |
| Operative Condition | Anterior Drawer | Posterior Drawer | Medial Drawer | Lateral Drawer |
| Intact | 4.3 ± 1.2 | 4.2 ± 0.9 | 4.1 ± 1.4 | 5.3 ± 1.6 |
| Both syndesmosis and deltoid transected | 7.7 ± 2.6 | 6.4 ± 2.8 | 4.7 ± 0.8 | 7.0 ± 2.2 |
| Syndesmosis fixation alone | 5.9 ± 2.1 | 5.4 ± 2.7 | 4.3 ± 1.4 | 5.8 ± 2.0 |
| Deltoid ligament repair alone | 4.7 ± 1.1* | 5.0 ± 1.8 | 4.6 ± 1.1 | 6.2 ± 1.9 |
| Both syndesmosis and deltoid stabilized | 3.9 ± 1.5* | 4.2 ± 1.0* | 3.92 ± 1.07 | $5.2 \pm 2.0^{\circ}$ |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ococain et al Foot and Ankle Internation | nal 2020 | | | |

| But, what do we see clinically? | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Short-Term Results of a Ruptured Deltoid Ligament Repair During an Acute Ankle Fracture Fixation



Retrospectively evaluated 78 consecutive cases of a ruptured deltoid ligament with an associated ankle fracture

All of the ankle fractures were treated with a plate and screw fixation

Group 1: 37 fractures

ORIF with syndesmotic fixation and no deltoid repair

Group 2: 41 fractures

ORIF with syndesmotic fixation, <u>continued instability</u> of the deltoid that underwent repair of the deltoid

Woo et al. Foot and Ankle International, 2018

| Desult | _ | | | | | | | FASST |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| Results Table I. Operative Information on the Patients in the 2 | | | Table 2. Comparison of Radiologic and Clin | | linical Outco | rries | BESPA Des Contraction by | |
| Groups.* | Group I (n = 37) | Group 2 (n =41) | P Value | Between the 2 Groups.* | Group I (n = 37) | Group 2 (n = 41) | P Value | |
| Sex | 1.00 | | .360 | Radiological outcomes | 1 | | | |
| Male | 27 (73) | 26 (63) | | MCS, mm | | | | |
| Female | 10(27) | 15 (37) | | Preoperative | 7.5 ± 3.4 | 82 ± 35 | 210 | |
| Age. y | 39.4 ± 14.3 | 41.6 ± 15.8 | .460 | Postoperative | 2.9 ± 0.4 | 27±05 | .083 | |
| Affected side | | | 780 | Final follow-up | 3.7 ± 0.6 | 32±05 | .000 | |
| Right | 21 (57) | 22 (54) | | >4 mm at final follow-up | 11 (29.7) | 1 (2.4) | .001 | |
| Left | 16 (43) | 19 (46) | | TFCS, mm | | | | |
| Causative trauma | | | .490 | Preoperative | 5.1 ± 2.3 | 5.4 ± 2.6 | .518 | |
| Slip down | 34 (92) | 35 (85) | | Postoperative | 3.6 ± 0.6 | 3.4 ± 0.8 | .084 | |
| Traffic accident | 3 (8) | 6 (15) | | Final follow-up | 44±12 | 44 ± 1.2 | .906 | |
| Lauge-Hansen classification | | | .150 | TFO, mm | | | | |
| SER | 32 (96) | 30 (73) | | Preoperative | 45 ± 2.1 | 53 ± 28 | .218 | |
| PER | 5 (14) | 11 (27) | | Postoperative | 5.9 ± 1.9 | 6.6±1.9 | .071 | |
| Syndesmotic fixation | | | .090 | Final follow-up | 5.2 ± 1.9 | 57±17 | .432 | |
| Nonfixation | 20 (54) | 14 (34) | | Clinical outcomes | | | | |
| Fixation | 17 (46) | 27 (66) | | AOFAS score | 91.6 ± 4.7 | 92.8 ± 3.9 | 805 | |
| Time to operation, d | 3.1 ± 1.5 | 32±16 | .730 | VAS | 69±64 | 5.8 ± 4.8 | .271 | |
| Operative time, min | 67.8±6.8 | 845±93 | .000 | FFI | 15.4 ± 12.6 | 13.6 ± 7.9 | .706 | |
| Union, wk | 7.2 ± 1.6 | 7.6 ± 1.9 | .250 | Medial side pain, No. (%) | 7 (18.9) | 2 (4.9) | .077 | |
| Follow-up periods, mo | 17.8 ± 8.6 | 16.4 ± 8.0 | .260 | | | | | |

| Results | | | FASST | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Roounto | | | BESPA DE MODELT | | |
| Variable | Syndesmotic Fixation in Group 1 (n = 17) | Syndesmotic Fixation in Group 2 (n = 27) | P Value | | |
| Radiological outcome | | | | | |
| MC5, mm | | | | | |
| Preoperative | 8.2 ± 4.2 | 8.1 ± 3.2 | 230 | | |
| Postoperative | 2.9 ± 0.5 | 2.7 ± 0.5 | .640 | | |
| Final follow-up | 3.7 ± 0.7 | 3.1 ± 0.4 | .020 | | |
| >4 mm at final follow-up, No. (%) | 6 (35.3) | 0 (0.0) | .006 | | |
| TFCS, mm | | | | | |
| Preoperative | 5.9 ± 2.9 | 5.9 ± 3.0 | .480 | | |
| Postoperative | 3.7 ± 0.7 | 2.9 ± 0.5 | .280 | | |
| Final follow-up | 4.9 ± 1.3 | 4.4 ± 1.3 | .460 | | |
| TFO, mm | | | | | |
| Preoperative | 4.5 ± 2.1 | 5.3 ± 2.8 | 220 | | |
| Postoperative | 5.7 ± 2.2 | 6.6 ± 1.9 | .050 | | |
| Final follow-up | 5.2 ± 1.9 | 5.7 ± 1.7 | .430 | | |
| Clinical outcome | | | | | |
| AOFAS score | 89.8 ± 3.7 | 93.1 ± 3.9 | .020 | | |
| VAS | 9.4 ± 6.1 | 5.3 ± 4.9 | .040 | | |
| FFI | 21.4 ± 12.0 | 12.5 ± 7.2 | .020 | | |
| Medial side pain, No. (%) | 5 (29.4) | 1 (3.7) | .025 | | |
| Woo et al. Foot and Ankle Internat | tional. 2018 | | | | |



Conclusion



- "Although the clinical outcomes were not significantly different between the 2 groups, we obtained a more favorable MCS and medial stability on the stress gravity mortise view at final follow-up in the deltoid repair group."
- "Therefore, in the case of high-grade unstable fractures of the ankle with syndesmotic instability, a direct repair of the deltoid ligament is adequate for restoring medial stability."

Woo et al. Foot and Ankle International, 2018



JFAS, 2018



- 26 cases in the syndesmosis screw group
- 22 cases in the deltoid repair group
- No statistically significant differences were found in the AOFAS anklehindfoot scale score, SF-36 score, or VAS score between the 2 groups.
- Malreduction rate in the syndesmosis screw group was $\underline{34.6\%}$ and that in the deltoid repair group was $\underline{9.09\%}$

JFAS, 2018

Posttraumatic Ankle Osteoarthritis After Ankle-Related Fractures Monika Horisberger, MD,* Victor Valderrahana, MD, PhD,* and Beat Hintermann, MD?



20.4% incidence of posttraumatic ankle osteoarthritis in patients with an untreated deltoid ligament injury

Between 20.9 year and 47 year latency between initial injury and end stage ankle $\ensuremath{\mathsf{OA}}$

J Orthop Trauma Volume 23, Number 1, January 2009





• After the Fibular and Syndesmotic ORIF







