CORRESPONDENCE



Letter to the editor concerning "Association of hardware removal with secondary osteonecrosis following femoral neck fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis"

Wenkai Shao^{1†}, Ping Wang^{1†}, Bo Wang², Lin Zou¹ and Yong Feng^{1*}



The article "Association of hardware removal with secondary osteonecrosis following femoral neck fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis" by Jiang et al. aroused our interest considerably [1]. The authors should be praised for their comprehensive and well-structured meta-analysis, which revealed that hardware removal can lead to a higher occurrence of femoral head osteonecrosis (ONFH) in fracture-healed individuals who received internal fixation for femoral neck fracture. However, the research raises a few insightful queries that will benefit readers with clarifications.

First, only four databases were searched by the authors: PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library. However, there were other more essential electronic databases (including CENTRAL, Medline, ScienceDirect, and clinicaltrials.gov) that could help in collecting more worthwhile research. Also, the search strategy needs to be improved to ensure that few findings

[†]Wenkai Shao and Ping Wang contributed equally to the manuscript.

¹ Department of Orthopedics, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China ² Department of Rehabilitation, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan No. 1 Hospital, Wuhan, China are overlooked. Authors are encouraged to utilize a combination of MeSH terms and entry terms.

Second, a random-effects model is more appropriate considering the moderate to high heterogeneity of the pooled data. With a random-effects model, the pooled analysis found no statistically significant difference in the risk of ONFH in the hardware removed group relative to the hardware retained group (OR 0.72, 95% CI: 0.30-1.74, I² 72%), and deletion of Ai did not reverse the outcome (OR 0.51, 95% CI: 0.24-1.05, I² 53%). Based on multivariate logistic regression analysis, the results of the pooled analysis showed no significant differences in ONFH risk compared the two groups (OR 2.05, 95% CI: 0.86-4.88, I² 59%), and the less robust results were shown after sensitivity analysis (OR 1.61, 95% CI: 1.01-2.57, I² 11%).

Finally, despite performing a sensitivity analysis in view of the moderate to high heterogeneity, the authors still fail to explain the source of heterogeneity for several indicators. In addition to the age listed above, gender, various underlying diseases, and type of fracture may all contribute to the study of heterogeneity. Actually, in patients who have had internal fixation, stress shielding may increase the risk of fracture and femoral head necrosis [2, 3]. Zielinski et al. concluded that hardware removal had positive effects on patients' quality of life [4]. Therefore, we should proceed with care when interpreting the results and anticipate further high-quality research.



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

^{*}Correspondence:

Yong Feng

fengyong@hust.edu.cn

We extend our sincere gratitude to the authors once more for their exceptional effort and sincerely hope that it will prove beneficial to the readers.

Acknowledgements

None

Author contributions

WKS and PW wrote the manuscript. BW and LZ performed statistical analyses and interpreted the results. YF had the responsibility of reviewing and modifying the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82270935).

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they are no competing interests.

Received: 16 December 2023 Accepted: 19 December 2023 Published online: 08 January 2024

References

- Jiang Q, Deng Y, Liu Y, Zhao Z, Chen Y, Bai X, Hong H. Association of hardware removal with secondary osteonecrosis following femoral neck fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Orthop Surg Res. 2023;18(1):931.
- Vos D, Hanson B, Verhofstad M. Implant removal of osteosynthesis: the Dutch practice. Results of a survey. J Trauma Manag Outcomes. 2012;6(1):6.
- Eberle S, Wutte C, Bauer C, von Oldenburg G, Augat P. Should extramedullary fixations for hip fractures be removed after bone union? Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon). 2011;26(4):410–4.
- Zielinski SM, Heetveld MJ, Bhandari M, Patka P, Van Lieshout EM. Implant removal after internal fixation of a femoral neck fracture: effects on physical functioning. J Orthop Trauma. 2015;29(9):e285-292.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

