

# Can we improve healing in broken shin bones by changing the settings on the surgical frame that is normally used to fix these injuries?

<b>Submission date</b> 06/04/2021	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 21/05/2021	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 21/04/2022	<b>Condition category</b> Musculoskeletal Diseases	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data <input type="checkbox"/> Record updated in last year

## Plain English summary of protocol

### Background and study aims

This study is comparing two methods of fixing broken shin bones. Commonly doctors treat broken shin bones by attaching a frame to the outside of the leg which goes into the bone. This frame is fixed firmly in place, ensuring the broken bone cannot move as it heals. Recent research in animals suggests that better results could be achieved if the frame is kept slightly loose for the first few weeks, allowing for the bone to heal more before it is set firmly in place. This method has been used in humans safely, but so far no one has measured whether it is better or worse than the current treatment.

### Who can participate

Adults (aged 18 or above) with broken shin bones

### What does the study involve?

Patients who agree to take part in the trial will receive either the normal rigid frame, or a frame that is fixed marginally looser initially. Those with the more loose frame will have an x-ray after 2-3 weeks, and at that point they will have their frame tightened. Apart from this, all the patients will receive the normal level of care. Both frames should still allow the patients to walk on the leg as their pain eases. Patients will be seen regularly up until at least 1 year after your injury to see how they are getting on. They will also be asked to complete questionnaires about their experience.

### What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

This study will inform which treatment is the best for people with this potentially life-changing fracture. Participants will not benefit from this study but their contribution will help develop and guide the future treatment. The risks of receiving either treatment are the standard risks of receiving the surgery. The surgeon will be able to discuss the risks of the procedure in depth. The standard risks for any tibial fractures are pain, infection (<3%), delayed/non union (<5%), malunion (<5%). Other risks from having surgery are blood clots, and damage to adjacent structures such as blood vessels, nerves or tendons. Some of these can cause serious or long-lasting problems.

Where is the study run from?  
Hull University Teaching Hospitals (UK)

When is the study running and how long is it expected to run for?  
March 2020 to April 2024

Who is funding the study  
Investigator initiated and funded

Who is the main contact?  
Mr Hemant Kumar Sharma, h.sharma@hull.ac.uk  
Matthew Marples, Matthew.marples@nhs.net

## Contact information

**Type(s)**  
Scientific

**Contact name**  
Prof Hemant Sharma

**ORCID ID**  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3781-1651>

**Contact details**  
Hull Royal Infirmary  
Analby Road  
Hull  
United Kingdom  
HU3 2JZ  
+44 (0)1482875875  
h.sharma@hull.ac.uk

## Additional identifiers

**Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS)**  
Nil known

**Integrated Research Application System (IRAS)**  
289401

**ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT)**  
Nil known

**Protocol serial number**  
IRAS 289401

## Study information

**Scientific Title**

Assessment of bone healing time in tibial fractures; Static vs variable dynamization external fixation

**Acronym**

B-VAST

**Study objectives**

Variable reverse dynamization external fixation for the treatment of tibial fractures will result in improved fracture healing times compared to the standard method of static external fixation.

**Ethics approval required**

Old ethics approval format

**Ethics approval(s)**

Approved 01/04/2021, London - Queen Square Research Ethics Committee (HRA NRES Centre Bristol

3rd floor, Block B, Whitefriars, Lewins Mead, Bristol, BS1 2NT, UK; +44 (0)207 104 8061; queensquare.rec@hra.nhs.uk), REC ref: 21/LO/0181

**Study design**

Interventional randomized controlled trial

**Primary study design**

Interventional

**Study type(s)**

Treatment

**Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied**

Adult patients with tibial fractures

**Interventions**

Patients will be randomly allocated to receive either the intervention (variable reverse dynamization external fixation) or the control (standard static external fixation). This randomisation will be done via computer software, the trial will not be blinded.

Both treatments arms receive the same operation to fix the tibial fracture with an external fixator frame (which is standard practice). The difference between the two treatments is that in the reverse dynamisation group, the frame settings will be different (initially slightly looser, to allow small movements at the fracture site and encourage bone healing). Both groups of patients will still be able to mobilise as pain allows, no cast is required.

At 2 - 3 weeks the patients in the reverse dynamization group will have an extra x-ray to show whether the bone has started to heal, at this point the frame settings will be altered to become rigid like in the other group. All other intervention in the trial will be standard care such as routine follow up, x-rays, and physiotherapy.

**Intervention Type**

Procedure/Surgery

**Primary outcome(s)**

Time to bone healing, measured using the Radiographic union (RUST) score at 3, 6, 12 weeks and every following 6 weeks until radiographically united (RUST score 9 or above)

**Key secondary outcome(s)**

1. Ankle function according to patient measured using Olerud and Molander Ankle score at baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months after frame removal
2. Health-related quality of life measured using EuroQol 5 Dimensions score at baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months after frame removal
3. Knee function according to patient measured using Oxford knee score at baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months after frame removal
4. Complications measured using case report forms and hospital records at 3, 6 and 12 months
5. Resource use and work impact measured using questionnaires and hospital records at 3, 6 and 12 months

**Completion date**

30/04/2024

**Eligibility****Key inclusion criteria**

1. Patients 16 years or older
2. Isolated unilateral or bilateral 41A & B, 42A B&C and 43 A tibial fractures
3. Traverse fractures, short oblique, and fractures with single butterfly
4. Where the treating surgeon believes the patients will benefit from surgical stabilisation

**Participant type(s)**

Patient

**Healthy volunteers allowed**

No

**Age group**

Adult

**Sex**

All

**Key exclusion criteria**

1. More the 28 days since fracture
2. Polytrauma - closed head injury, spinal fractures, pelvis/acetabular fractures, floating knee, femoral fractures, foot/ankle fractures or dislocations, knee dislocation or ligamentous injuries
3. Comminuted and segmental fractures
4. Previous failed fixation
5. Pathologic fracture
6. Patient is/would be unable to understand instructions for treatment
7. Patient declines consent to participate
8. Pregnant

**Date of first enrolment**

30/05/2021

**Date of final enrolment**

30/04/2023

## **Locations**

**Countries of recruitment**

United Kingdom

England

**Study participating centre**

**Hull Royal Infirmary**

Hull University Teaching Hospitals

Trauma and Orthopaedic department

Analby road

Hull

United Kingdom

HU3 2JZ

**Study participating centre**

**James Cook University Hospital**

Trauma & Orthopaedic department

Marlon Road

Middlesbrough

United Kingdom

TS4 3BW

**Study participating centre**

**Northern General Hospital**

Trauma & Orthopaedic department

Herries Road

Sheffield

United Kingdom

S5 7AU

**Study participating centre**

**Leeds General Infirmary**

Trauma & Orthopaedic department

Great George street

Leeds  
United Kingdom  
LS1 3EX

## Sponsor information

### Organisation

Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

## Funder(s)

### Funder type

Other

### Funder Name

Investigator initiated and funded

## Results and Publications

### Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study during this study will be included in the subsequent results publication.

### IPD sharing plan summary

Other

### Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">HRA research summary</a>			28/06/2023	No	No
<a href="#">Participant information sheet</a>	version V4	14/03/2021	21/05/2021	No	Yes
<a href="#">Participant information sheet</a>	Participant information sheet	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes
<a href="#">Protocol file</a>	version V3	14/03/2021	21/05/2021	No	No