

# 1 **Pattern, treatment modalities and radiological outcome of** 2 **pediatric femoral shaft fractures treated in Northern** 3 **,Tanzania**

4  
5 **Shindo I. Kilawa<sup>1,3\*¶</sup>, Anthony J. Pallangyo<sup>1,3¶</sup>, Elifuraha G. Maya<sup>1,3</sup>, Rogers J.**  
6 **Temu<sup>1,3¶</sup>, Faiton N. Mandari<sup>1,3</sup>, Frank I. Olotu<sup>4¶</sup>, Estomick K. Ofunguo<sup>5</sup>, Adnan M.**  
7 **Sadiq<sup>2</sup> Honest H. Massawe<sup>1,3</sup>, Octavian Shirima<sup>1,3</sup> and Reginald Shoo<sup>1,3¶</sup>.**

- 8 1. Department of Orthopedics and Traumatology, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre,  
9 Moshi, Tanzania.
- 10 2. Department of Radiology, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre, Moshi Tanzania.
- 11 3. Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Moshi, Tanzania.
- 12 4. Department of Physiotherapy, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre, Moshi,  
13 Tanzania.
- 14 5. Department of Orthopedics and Traumatology, Mawenzi Regional Referral Hospital,  
15 Moshi, Tanzania.

16

17 \* Corresponding author: Shindo Isack Kilawa

18 Email addresses: [shindoisaac8@gmail.com](mailto:shindoisaac8@gmail.com) (SIK)

19

20 [mayaegm@gmail.com](mailto:mayaegm@gmail.com) (EGM)

21 [tonnypallangyo@gmail.com](mailto:tonnypallangyo@gmail.com) (AJP)

22 [drtemurj@gmail.com](mailto:drtemurj@gmail.com) (RJT)

23 [raymondshoo@yahoo.com](mailto:raymondshoo@yahoo.com) (RS)

24 [faiton.mandari@gmail.com](mailto:faiton.mandari@gmail.com) (FNM)

25 [hnstlord@yahoo.com](mailto:hnstlord@yahoo.com) (HHM)

26 [frankolutu2045@gmail.com](mailto:frankolutu2045@gmail.com) (FIO)

27 [adnan.radiologist@gmail.com](mailto:adnan.radiologist@gmail.com) (AMS)

28 [kuringeo@gmail.com](mailto:kuringeo@gmail.com) (EKO)

29 [Octaalex1955@gmail.com](mailto:Octaalex1955@gmail.com) (OAS)

30

31 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

32 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 33 Abstract

34 **Background:** Femoral shaft fracture is among the most common causes of paediatric  
35 hospitalisation, mortality and morbidity worldwide. There is no clear option that is preferable  
36 to other treatment modalities, especially between 5 to 16 years and published studies are  
37 scarce on radiological outcomes in Sub-Saharan Africa. This study aimed to determine the  
38 pattern, treatment modalities and radiological outcome of the paediatric femoral fractures  
39 treated at KCMC.

40

41 **Methodology:** A cross-sectional study was conducted for all children with femoral shaft  
42 fractures treated at Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018 to 31<sup>st</sup>  
43 December 2022. The approval to conduct the research was obtained from Kilimanjaro  
44 College Research Ethics and Review Committee (CRERC) with ethical clearance Reg NO  
45 PG 88/2022. In our study we used secondary data and the permission to conduct the research  
46 was obtained from KCMC, hence no formal consent was required from patients/parents. The  
47 data was accessed from the files and Electronic Health Management system (EHMS) from  
48 01/04/2023 to 31/07/2023. The radiological outcome; shortening, angulations in six weeks  
49 and fracture union, 12 weeks post-management were reviewed with the involvement of a  
50 consultant radiologist and the orthopaedic surgeon to obtain the precise information and were  
51 recorded on the extraction sheet.

52

53 **Results:** This study included 230 study participants who met the inclusion criteria. The mean  
54 age of participants was 9.1 (5.1) years, 41.3% were aged 6 – 12 years, 82.2% were males,  
55 45.7% were involved in a MTC, and 83.5% had no health insurance. The commonest fracture  
56 type was 92.6% closed, 48.7% transverse, and 65.0% right side. Non-operatively was used in  
57 50.9% of which 76.8% were treated with late hip Spica. Of those treated operatively, 61.1%  
58 were plating.

59 The majority had good radiological outcomes with acceptable solid union, angulation and  
60 shortening. Those patients who were not operated had 94% lower odds of satisfactory  
61 radiological outcomes than those who were operated ( AOR=0.06, 95% CI: 0.01 – 0.27 and  
62  $p<0.001$ ) whereas other factors were not statistically significant.

63

64 **Conclusion:** The majority of the study participants were male and were involved in MTC as  
65 the commonest mechanism of injury. Most had closed fractures that mainly presented on the

66 right side and transverse fractures were the most common type. The hip Spica was common  
67 non-operatively option; however, plating was the most common operative option. Treatment  
68 modality substantially affected radiological outcomes and was statistically significant.  
69 **The keywords:** Paediatric, Femur, Fractures, patterns, radiological outcomes and malunion

## 70 **Introduction**

71 PFSF is among the most common causes of paediatric hospitalisation, morbidity, and  
72 mortality worldwide (1,2). It is relatively uncommon as compared to the adult population,  
73 although it's occurrence poses a high burden in morbidity in terms of cost and time of  
74 treatment(3). Paediatric femoral shaft fracture affects children's life individually, socially,  
75 educationally and emotionally, (4) and also can contribute to long-term disability (5).

76 Femoral shaft fractures in paediatrics account for about 1.6% of all paediatric fractures  
77 globally (6–8). Paediatric femoral shaft fractures commonly affect children aged 2 to 12  
78 years (5) with boys more commonly affected than girls (7,9).

79 Falls and motor traffic crushes are the most common mechanism of injury (10,11) but depend  
80 on the child's age (9). Falls were the most common mechanism of injury in younger children,  
81 while motor traffic accidents were the most common in older children and adolescents (8).

82 Treatment of PFSF aims to restore limb function and return to normal activities as soon  
83 as possible(12). There is an increasing trend towards operative modalities with  
84 increased technologies (3). There is no clear option that is preferable to other treatment  
85 modalities, especially between 5 to 16 years, although several studies recommend the use  
86 of flexible or Elastic nails (13,14).

87 Regardless of several modalities of treatment, complications including malunion is common,  
88 especially for non-operative treatment like hip spica (15).

89 Generally, a scarcity of published studies on radiological outcomes has been observed,  
90 especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, henceforth this study was conducted to determine the  
91 patterns, treatment modalities, and radiological outcomes of paediatric femoral fractures  
92 treated at KCMC.

93

## 94 **Material and methodology**

### 95 **Study design and setting**

96 This hospital-based cross-sectional study was conducted at Kilimanjaro Christian Medical  
97 Centre in Moshi district-kilimanjaro, North-eastern Tanzania from January 2018 to December  
98 2022.

99 KCMC is among the largest referral teaching Hospitals in Tanzania owned by the Institution  
100 of Good Samaritan Foundation with a capacity of 696 normal beds plus 145 canvas making a

101 total of 841 beds, serving patients from all regions of the northern part and some from the  
102 central part of Tanzania as well nearby countries.

### 103 **Study population**

104 The study population was all paediatric patients with femur fractures who were treated at  
105 Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre during the study period.

### 106 **Inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria**

107 This study recruited all paediatric patients with femoral shaft fractures treated at KCMC from  
108 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022 and excluded those with pathological fractures,  
109 infected open wounds, Neuromuscular disorders, missing information, and who died before  
110 discharge.

### 111 **Sample size and sampling technique**

112 The minimum sample size was 225 patients calculated using the single proportion with an  
113 assumption of 18% prevalence obtained from the study done at KCMC (16); however, this  
114 study enrolled 230 study participants.

$$115 \quad n = \frac{z^2 p(1-p)}{d^2}$$

116

117 Where P= 0.18, Z =1.96 and d =0.05

$$118 \quad n = \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.18(1 - 0.18)}{0.05^2}$$

119 Therefore the estimated sample size (n) was 225; this study enrolled 230 study participants.

120

121 A non-probability, convenient sampling technique was used, hence all paediatric patients  
122 with femoral shaft fractures treated at KCMC and registered in admission and trauma registry  
123 books during the study period were included in the study.

### 124 **Study variables**

125 Radiological outcome was the dependent variable whereas age, sex, residence, location at the  
126 time of injury, mechanism of injury, patterns of fracture and treatment modalities were used  
127 as independent variables.

## 128 **Data collection tools, methods and procedures**

129 The data collection tools used were the structured extraction sheet and a Modified  
130 RUST score(reference Appendix 1). The data was accessed from the files and Electronic  
131 Health Management system (EHMS) from 01/04/2023 to 31/07/2023. We identified all  
132 children admitted and registered in the admission books in the orthopaedic department. Their  
133 identification numbers were used to trace for their initial x-rays, control x-rays and follow-up  
134 x-rays of at least  $\geq 6$  weeks.

135 Those patients with available x-rays in radiological systems (OHIF/DICOM) and hard copies  
136 with consideration of inclusion and exclusion criteria were traced and reviewed to obtain  
137 demographic information, clinical characteristics and mode of treatment from the EHMS and  
138 medical records files.

139 The principal investigator and assistant researchers reviewed the initial and follow-up x-rays  
140 with the involvement of a consultant radiologist and the orthopaedic surgeon to obtain precise  
141 information regarding the pattern of fracture, classification of fractures and radiological  
142 outcome that were recorded on a structured extraction sheet.

143 The anterior-posterior and lateral view x-ray of the full-length femur after bridging callus  
144 formation before full healing and remodelling were used to measure shortening and  
145 angulation by using the measurement in the system, ruler and goniometer (protractor) for the  
146 hard copies x-rays.

147 Based on previous studies, we defined malunion as a healed fracture with a shortening of  
148 greater than 2cm and greater than 15 degrees recurvatum or procurvatum or greater than 10  
149 degrees valgus or varus (17).

150 We assessed the union rate after three months using a modified RUST score; a score of 11 to  
151 16 was considered a reasonable union rate.

152 Table 1: Satisfaction radiological outcomes parameter.

Parameters	Acceptable or satisfactory
Anterior or posterior angulation	$\leq 15$ degrees
Valgus or Varus	$\leq 10$ degrees
Shortening	$\leq 2$ cm
Modified RUST Score	11 to 16

153

154 Satisfactory radiological outcomes refer to all acceptable parameters. Therefore, if any of the  
155 parameters above are unacceptable, the outcome were considered unsatisfactory.

156

## 157 **Data management and analysis plan**

158 The obtained information was documented on the structured extraction sheets daily basis and  
159 cross-checked to ensure completeness and minimise errors before data analysis.

160 The complete data were entered, processed and analysed using SPSS version 25. Cleaned  
161 data, and new variables were created and categorised where necessary. Descriptive statistics  
162 were summarised using frequency and proportion for categorical variables and measures of  
163 central tendency with respective measures of dispersion for continuous variables.

164 Fisher's exact test establishes a relationship and comparison between treatment options,  
165 radiological outcomes and explanatory variables.

166 Logistic regression was performed to obtain an odds ratio (ORs) with a 95% confidence  
167 interval (CI) for the association between a set of explanatory variables and radiological  
168 outcomes. Those with a p-value less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

## 169 **Ethical consideration**

170 The approval to conduct the research was obtained from Kilimanjaro College Research  
171 Ethics and Review Committee(CRERC) with ethical clearance Reg NO PG 88/2022.

172 In our study we used secondary data and the permission to conduct the research was obtained  
173 from Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center administration hence no formal informed consent  
174 was required as we didn't meet with patients during the data collection. No patient  
175 identifying information such as file numbers and patient names were used insteady we used  
176 coding numbers.

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

## 189 RESULTS

### 190 Demographic characteristics of the study participants

191 This study included a total of 230 study participants. The study participant's mean (SD) age  
192 was 9.1 (5.1) years. The majority of the study participants, 95 (41.3%), were aged 6 – 12  
193 years, 189 (82.2%) were males, 155 (67.4%) were residing in rural areas, 119 (51.7%) were on  
194 the street at the time of injury, 192 (83.5%) had no health insurance support. Some children  
195 had associated injuries.—This is summarised in Table 2.

196

197 **Table 2: Demographic and clinical characteristics of the study participants (n=230)**

198

Characteristics	n (%)
Age (years) (mean (SD))	9.1 (5.1)
Age (years)	
≤ 2	22 (9.6)
3 to 5	46 (20.0)
6 to 12	95 (41.3)
13 to 18	67 (29.1)
Sex	
Male	189 (82.2)
Female	41 (17.8)
Residence	
Rural	155 (67.4)
Urban	75 (32.6)
Insurance (Yes)	
Yes	38 (16.5)
Location at injury time	
Home	87 (37.8)
Street	119 (51.7)
Hospital	2 (0.9)
Game site	5 (2.2)
School	17 (7.4)
Associated Injuries	
Traumatic brain injury (Yes)	55 (23.9)
Chest injury (Yes)	6 (2.6)
Visceral injury (Yes)	2 (0.9)
Injury on the other limb(Yes)	41 (17.8)



Others (Yes)

23 (10.0)

199

## 200 **The pattern of the paediatric femoral shaft fractures**

201 The pattern of paediatric femoral fracture was as follows; 128 (55.6%) had injured the right-  
202 side limbs, 213 (92.6%) sustained closed injuries, 150 (65.2%) had mid-shaft fractures, 112  
203 (48.7%) had transverse fractures, 105 (45.7%) were involved in motor vehicle crash, 119  
204 (51.7%) Refer to Table 3.

205

206 **Table 3: The pattern of the paediatric femoral shaft fractures treated at KCMC (n=230)**

207

Fracture pattern	n (%)
Injured side	
Right	128 (55.7)
Left	102 (44.3)
Soft tissue status	
Closed	213 (92.6)
Open	17 (7.4)
Fracture location	
Proximal	37 (16.1)
Middle	150 (65.2)
Distal	43 (18.7)
Types of fracture	
Transverse	112 (48.7)
Comminuted	33 (14.4)
Spiral	28 (12.2)
Oblique	54 (23.5)
Segment	3 (1.3)
Mechanism of injury	
Motor traffic crush	105 (45.7)
Fall	86 (37.4)
Non-accident trauma/Assault	7 (3.0)
Heavy objects fall on	24 (10.4)
Birth injury	2 (0.9)
Bike accident	6 (2.6)

208

209

210

211

212  
213  
214  
215

## 216 **The treatment modalities of paediatric femoral shaft fractures**

217 Approximately half of the study participants, 117 (50.9%), were treated non-operatively, and  
218 the remaining treated operatively. The majority of those treated non-operatively, 90 (76.8%),  
219 were treated by late hip spica. The majority of those treated operatively, 69 (61.1%), were  
220 treated by plating.—This is summarised in figures 1 & 2.

221  
222  
223

224 Figure 1: Non-operative treatment options (n= 117)

225  
226  
227  
228  
229

230 Figure 2: Operative treatment options (n=113)

231  
232  
233

234 Figure 3: Showing x-rays of a child, treated with flexible nails,(a) Preoperative,  
235 (b)immediately postoperative, (c)&(d) 6 weeks follow-up-From Digital Imaging and  
236 Communication in Medicine.

237  
238  
239

240 Figure 4: Showing x-rays of child, treated with late hip spica,(a) X-rays on admission and (b)  
241 6-week follow-up X-ray, From Digital Imaging and Communication in Medicine.

242

## 243 **The radiological outcome of the paediatric femoral shaft fractures**

244 Most of our study participants had good radiological outcomes with the solid union in 100%,  
245 acceptable angulation and shortening. However, the minority had malunion in which 0.4%  
246 had valgus, 13% had varus of more than 10 degrees, 6.1% had anterior angulation of more

247 than 15 degrees and none had unacceptable posterior angulation. Only 3.1 % had limb  
248 shortening of more than 2cm, as shown summarised in Table 4

249

250 Table 4: The radiological outcome of the paediatric femoral shaft fractures treated at KCMC

Radiological outcome	n (%)
Limb shortening (cm)	
$\leq 2$	223 (96.9)
$> 2$	7 (3.1)
Coronal angulation in degrees	
Valgus	
$\leq 10$	229 (99.6)
$> 10$	1(0.4)
Varus	
$\leq 10$	199(86.5)
$> 10$	31(13.5)
Sagittal angulation in degrees	
Anterior	
$\leq 15$	216(93.9)
$> 15$	14 (6.1)
Posterior	
$\leq 15$	230(100.0)
$> 15$	0(0.0)

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275

## 276 Factors associated with the radiological outcome of the PFSF

277 Those managed non-operatively had 94% lower odds of satisfactory radiological outcomes  
278 than those operated after adjustment of confounders, which was statistically significant, as  
279 shown in Table.

280

281 **Table 5: Factors associated with radiological outcomes of PFSF (n=230)**

Factors	Satisfaction		COR (95% CI)	p-value	AOR (95% CI)	p-value
	No n (%)	Yes n (%)				
Age (years)						
≤ 2	8 (22.2)	14 (7.2)	1		1	
3 to 5	10 (27.8)	36 (18.6)	2.06 (1.67 - 6.28)	0.002	1.72 (0.53 - 5.53)	0.366
6 to 12	12 (33.3)	83 (42.8)	3.95 (1.37 - 11.39)	0.011	1.49 (0.46 - 4.79)	0.511
13 to 18	6 (16.7)	61 (31.4)	5.81 (1.74 - 19.43)	0.004	1.25 (0.25 - 6.24)	0.782
Sex						
Male	30 (83.3)	159 (81.9)	1		1	
Female	6 (16.7)	35 (18.1)	1.10 (0.43 - 2.85)	0.843	0.92 (0.31 - 2.78)	0.886
Insurance						
No	31 (86.1)	161 (82.9)	1		1	
Yes	5 (13.9)	33 (17.1)	1.27 (0.46 - 3.51)	0.644	1.26 (0.40 - 3.93)	0.692
Soft tissue status						
Closed	33 (91.7)	180 (92.8)	1		1	
Open	3 (8.3)	14 (7.2)	0.86 (0.23 - 3.14)	0.814	0.17 (0.02 - 1.23)	0.079
Fracture location						
Proximal	5 (13.9)	32 (16.5)	1		1	
Middle	25 (69.4)	125 (64.4)	0.78 (0.28 - 2.20)	0.641	0.70 (0.22 - 2.19)	0.542
Distal	6 (16.7)	37 (19.1)	0.96 (0.27 - 3.46)	0.955	0.87 (0.21 - 3.68)	0.852
Types of fracture						
Transverse	15 (41.7)	97 (50.0)	1		1	
Comminuted	1 (2.8)	32 (16.5)	4.95 (0.63 - 38.95)	0.129	4.08 (0.47 - 35.19)	0.201
Spiral	7 (19.4)	21 (10.8)	0.46 (0.17 - 1.28)	0.138	0.79 (0.25 - 2.54)	0.701
Oblique	12 (33.3)	42 (21.6)	0.54 (0.23 - 1.25)	0.153	0.51 (0.19 - 1.31)	0.164
Segment	1 (2.8)	2 (1.0)	0.31 (0.03 - 3.62)	0.351	0.19 (0.01 - 4.13)	0.291

Type of

treatment

Operative	4 (11.1)	109 (56.2)	1		1	
Non-operative	32 (88.9)	85 (43.8)	0.09 (0.03 - 0.29)	<0.001	0.06 (0.01 - 0.27)	<0.001

---

282

283

## 284 **Discussion**

285 This study found that the mean age of the study participants was 9.1(5.1 years), with male  
286 predominance and more than three-quarters had no health insurance for support during  
287 management. Regarding treatment, in this study, non-operative treatment was slightly  
288 preferable to approximately more than half of the study participants of which late hip Spica  
289 was the most common of all non-operative modalities.

290 The current practice encourages surgical intervention more than non-operative treatment,  
291 especially in the United Kingdom. These modalities allow early mobilization and shorter  
292 hospital stays (3,12). However, all modalities had a good outcome (11).

293 In our study, almost all participants had good radiological outcomes with solid union in  
294 100%. Nevertheless, those who were managed non-operatively had 94% lower odds of  
295 satisfactory radiological outcomes than those who were operated on.

## 296 **The pattern of the paediatric femoral shaft fractures**

### 297 **Mechanism of Injury**

298

299 This study revealed that the leading mechanism of injury was MTC, relatively similar to the  
300 studies done in India and Nigeria (3,15), hence the community has the responsibility to  
301 protect children from MTC while are on the street, more than half of the study participants  
302 sustained an injury on the street, that can be explained due to significant increase in  
303 motorcycles (Motorbike and motor vehicles) as means of transportation in our country. In  
304 contrast with the studies done in Singapore and Cameroon where falls were reported as a  
305 leading mechanism of injury (9,18).

306 However, the mechanism of injury depends on the child's age (8,9). Falls were the leading  
307 mechanism of injury in younger children, while motor traffic accidents were the most  
308 common in older children and adolescents (8).

## 309 **The Location of Fracture and Type of Fracture**

310  
311 In this study, the mid-shaft was the most common location of the fracture similarly observed  
312 in the study done by Hoffman et al and Guifo et al (9,19) and the majority had a closed  
313 fracture, similarly reported in Nigeria, and Tanzania (3,16).

314 Transverse followed by an oblique fracture was the most common of fracture as similarly  
315 reported by other studies done in Singapore and Nepal (14,18). This is due to the direct  
316 impact on the femur due to MTC as the most common mechanism of injury. This was  
317 observed differently in the study by Rush et al, where spirals followed by transverse were the  
318 most common, the study involved only 10 participants younger than one year old (20).

## 319 **The treatment modalities of paediatric femoral shaft fractures**

320 The mode of treatment of paediatric femur fracture remains in debate in several studies, there  
321 is no ideal modality as in adults. In this study, non-operative treatment was commonly used  
322 in managing femoral shaft fractures in children, accounting for 50.9%, and mostly were on  
323 late hip Spica. Similar observations were seen in other studies (14,16,21)

324 Several studies favour the use of flexible nails at ages 6 to 12 years. Flexible nails can  
325 prevent fracture rotation and maintain the length and alignment at the fracture site depending  
326 on fracture pattern (14). However, in our study, only 2.7% were managed with flexible nails  
327 and all had good radiological outcomes. There is a need to adopt the use of flexible nails in  
328 our setting regardless of minimal differences in outcome

## 329 **The radiological outcome of the paediatric femoral shaft fractures**

330 In our study, almost all study participants had good radiological outcomes with a solid union  
331 in 100% and the majority had acceptable angulation and shortening, similarly as reported in  
332 other studies (3,9,10,14,18,20). The good radiological outcome after femoral shaft  
333 management is generally explained by the potential ability to remodel in paediatric  
334 regardless of malaligned fracture.

335  
336 This study found that treatment options were statistically significantly associated with  
337 satisfaction with radiological outcomes while other factors were not. Those who were  
338 managed non-operatively had 94% lower odds of satisfactory radiological outcomes than  
339 those operated, which favour operative management similarly as in other studies, however,

340 they found age has a strong effect on the outcome (10). Differently, a randomized controlled  
341 trial done by Shemshakij in Iran reported treatment options were not statistically significantly  
342 associated with radiological outcomes (22).

343

## 344 **Study Limitations and Strengths**

345 **The Study limitations:**-This was a single-centre study, done retrospectively,with too  
346 small numbers of different ages and too short follow-up time, hence encountered  
347 incompleteness of patient information, incredibly initial, post-definitive treatment and follow-  
348 up x-rays.

349

350 **The study strength:** The sample size was adequate to meet the goal as expected after  
351 sample size calculation, baseline information was obtained well and observed confidentiality.

352

## 353 **Conclusion**

354 The majority of the study participants were male and involved in MTC as the leading  
355 mechanism of injury. Most of the study participants had closed fractures that mainly  
356 presented on the right side, in which transverse fractures were the leading type, followed by  
357 oblique fractures.

358 Non-operative was preferable to operative treatment, and the hip spica was the most common  
359 in non-operative modalities; however, the plating was the most common operative option.

360 There was not much difference in radiological outcome regardless of the modality of  
361 treatment used; however, Treatment options were statistically significantly associated with  
362 satisfaction with radiological outcomes.

## 363 **Recommendations**

364 Proper implementation of road traffic policies to reduce MTC injuries should be addressed,  
365 as the study found that motor traffic crashes are a significant cause of injury.

366 In the future, prospective or multicenter-based study studies should be done to compare  
367 treatment modalities used and radiological outcomes that will involve all children as others  
368 might have been treated at other facilities and bone settlers.

369  
370  
371  
372  
373

## 374 **Acknowledgements**

375 I am grateful to the almighty God who protected me throughout my life, especially during my  
376 Orthopedic and Traumatology studies training. I sincerely thank Tumaini University, and  
377 Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College for their acceptance and assistance in my  
378 daily studies.

379 I also thank the Department of Radiology, Registry and ICT for supporting my research  
380 activities. I want to thank my fellow residents, nurses, medical attendants, intern doctors, and  
381 medical doctor students for their tireless support and input.

382 I also thank my lovely sons Isaac and Collins and my lovely wife Miss Irene, who had to  
383 suffer his father's absence during my studies. I also thank my lovely father, Mr Isack Kilawa,  
384 and my beloved late mother Mrs Luciana Isack, who raised and gave support since my birth.

385 I want to thank my Research Assistants, Dr Irene Tendwa and Irene Rabieth. I will be selfish  
386 of good if I don't extend my gratitude to all who ever supported me during my training, either  
387 directly or indirectly.

388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404



405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414

## References

415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452

1. WHO. INJURIES VIOLENCE THE FACTS The magnitude and causes of injuries. Geneva World Heal Organ [Internet]. 2014;20. Available from: [www.who.int/healthinfo/global\\_burden\\_disease/projections/en/](http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/projections/en/)
2. Lodamo T, Worku A, Desta T, Shimelis T, Wondwossen Elssa N. PATTERN OF PEDIATRIC FEMUR SHAFT FRACTURES IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL, ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA. Vol. 58, Ethiop Med J. 2020.
3. SE I, J C. Femoral Fractures in Children Treated in a Regional Trauma Center in Nigeria. Int J Crit Care Emerg Med [Internet]. 2019 Mar 14;5(2). Available from: <https://www.clinmedjournals.org/articles/ijccem/international-journal-of-critical-care-and-emergency-medicine-ijccem-5-070.php?jid=ijccem>
4. Kumar R, Kumari A, Pandit A. Evaluation of outcome of titanium elastic nailing (TEN) versus hip spica cast in the treatment of femoral shaft fractures in children. Int J Orthop Sci [Internet]. 2018 Oct 1;4(4):149–54. Available from: <http://www.orthopaper.com/archives/?year=2018&vol=4&issue=4&ArticleId=1138>
5. Madhuri V, Dutt V, Gahukamble AD, Tharyan P. Interventions for treating femoral shaft fractures in children and adolescents. Evidence-Based Child Heal A Cochrane Rev J [Internet]. 2014 Dec 15;9(4):753–826. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ebch.1987>
6. Tisherman RT, Hoellwarth JS, Mendelson SA. Systematic review of spica casting for the treatment of paediatric diaphyseal femur fractures. J Child Orthop [Internet]. 2018 Apr 1;12(2):136–44. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1302/1863-2548.12.170201>
7. Akinyoola A, Orekha O, Taiwo F, Odunsi A. Outcome of non-operative management of femoral shaft fractures in children. African J Paediatr Surg [Internet]. 2011 Jan;8(1):34. Available from: <http://www.afrijpaedsurg.org/text.asp?2011/8/1/34/78666>
8. Engström Z, Wolf O, Hailer YD. Epidemiology of pediatric femur fractures in children: the Swedish Fracture Register. BMC Musculoskelet Disord [Internet]. 2020 Dec 1;21(1):796. Available from: <https://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12891-020-03796-z>
9. Guifo ML, Tochie JN, Oumarou BN, Moulion JR, Bang AG, Ndoumbe A, et al. Paediatric fractures in a sub-saharan tertiary care center: a cohort analysis of demographic characteristics, clinical presentation, therapeutic patterns and outcomes. Pan Afr Med J [Internet]. 2017 May 18;27. Available from: <http://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/27/46/full/>
10. Sela Y, Hershkovich O, Sher-Lurie N, Schindler A, Givon U. Pediatric femoral shaft fractures: treatment strategies according to age - 13 years of experience in one medical

- 453 center. *J Orthop Surg Res* [Internet]. 2013 Dec 17;8(1):23. Available from: [https://josr-](https://josr-online.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1749-799X-8-23)  
454 [online.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1749-799X-8-23](https://josr-online.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1749-799X-8-23)
- 455 11. Vitiello R, Lillo M, Donati F, Masci G, Noia G, Santis V De, et al. Locking plate  
456 fixation in pediatric femur fracture: Evaluation of the outcomes in our experience.  
457 *Acta Biomed* [Internet]. 2019;90(4):110–5. Available from:  
458 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32934867>
- 459 12. Khoriaty Achraf, Jones C, Gelfer Y, Trompeter A. The management of paediatric  
460 diaphyseal femoral fractures: a modern approach. *Strateg Trauma Limb Reconstr*  
461 [Internet]. 2016 Aug 31;11(2):87–97. Available from:  
462 <https://www.stlrjournal.com/doi/10.1007/s11751-016-0258-2>
- 463 13. Gyaneshwar T, Nitesh R, Sagar T, Pranav K, Rustagi N. Treatment of pediatric  
464 femoral shaft fractures by stainless steel and titanium elastic nail system: A  
465 randomized comparative trial. *Chinese J Traumatol* [Internet]. 2016 Aug 1;19(4):213–  
466 6. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S100812751630058X>
- 467 14. Panthi S, Shrestha R, Pradhan J, Neupane B, Bhusal I, Karki A. Diaphyseal Femur  
468 Fracture in Paediatric Age group: Outcome with fixation by Elastic Nailing System.  
469 *Eur J Med Sci* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 27;3(1):1–5. Available from:  
470 <https://www.europasianjournals.org/ejms/index.php/ejms/article/view/258>
- 471 15. Singh Sandhu K, Kaur M, Singh H, Sandhu A. Evaluation of outcome, safety, and  
472 efficacy of diaphyseal fracture of femur and tibia in children-treated by Titanium  
473 Elastic Nailing System (TENS). Vol. 08, *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical*  
474 *Medicine*. Patiala-India; 2021.
- 475 16. Albert P, Honest M. Epidemiology and Associated Injuries in Pediatric Femoral Shaft  
476 Fracture Treated at a Limited Resource Zonal Referral Hospital in Northern Tanzania.  
477 *Ann Orthop Musculoskelet Disord*. 2021 Mar 15;4(1):1028.
- 478 17. E DT, C ER, E AF. Pattern and Treatment of Femoral Shaft Fracture in a Tertiary  
479 Hospital: One Year Retrospective Review. *SAS J Surg*. 2022 May 13;8(5):374–84.
- 480 18. Lee Y, Lim K, Gao G, Mahadev A, Lam K, Tan S, et al. Traction and Spica Casting  
481 for Closed Femoral Shaft Fractures in Children. *J Orthop Surg* [Internet]. 2007 Apr 4  
482 [cited 2022 Apr 23];15(1):37–40. Available from:  
483 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/230949900701500109>
- 484 19. Hoffmann CR, Traldi EF, Posser A. EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDY OF CHILDREN  
485 DIAPHYSEAL FEMORAL FRACTURES. *Rev Bras Ortop* (English Ed [Internet].  
486 2012 Mar;47(2):186–90. Available from:  
487 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2255497115300847>
- 488 20. Rush JK, Kelly DM, Sawyer JR, Beaty JH, Warner WC. Treatment of Pediatric Femur  
489 Fractures With the Pavlik Harness. *J Pediatr Orthop* [Internet]. 2013 Sep;33(6):614–7.  
490 Available from: [www.pedorthopaedics.com](http://www.pedorthopaedics.com)
- 491 21. Ricardo Hoffmann C, Franceschini Traldi E, Posser A. EPIDEMIOLOGICAL  
492 STUDY OF CHILDREN DIAPHYSEAL FEMORAL FRACTURES [Internet].  
493 Brazil; 2011 May. Available from: [www.scielo.br/rbort](http://www.scielo.br/rbort)
- 494 22. Shemshaki HR, Mousavi H, Salehi G, Eshaghi MA. Titanium elastic nailing versus hip  
495 spica cast in treatment of femoral-shaft fractures in children. *J Orthop Traumatol*  
496 [Internet]. 2011 Mar 22;12(1):45–8. Available from:  
497 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10195-011-0128-0>
- 498  
499  
500  
501

502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
  
509

510 **Appendix I: A modified RUST score tool for assessment of fracture union**

511 Modified RUST score  
512

Radiographic Criteria

Score per Cortex	Callus	Fracture Line
1	Absent	Visible
2	Present	Visible
3	Bridging	Visible
4	Remodelled	Invisible

513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
  
519  
  
520  
  
521  
  
522

A score done to each (anterior, posterior, medial, lateral) RUST score is the sum of all cortex scores, with four as a minimum and 16 as a maximum score (Litrenta et al.,2015).

523

524

525

526

527

528

529 **Appendix II: Ethical Clearance.**

530