

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	Page
Figure (1): Bones of the elbow	4
Figure (2): Ossification centres of the distal end of the humerus	5
Figure (3): Capsule and ligaments of the elbow joint.	6
Figure (4): Anastamosis around elbow joint	8
Figure (5): Ulnar nerve crossing elbow.	11
Figure (6): Radial nerve crossing elbow	12
Figure (7): Median nerve crossing elbow	13
Figure (8): Brachial artery crossing elbow.	14
Figure (9): a) humeral-ulnar angle b) metaphyseal diaphyseal angle	16
Figure (10): Baumann angle	17
Figure (11): a: Anterior humeral line b: Humerotrochlear angle	18
Figure (12): : Mechanism of injury in extension type of supracondylar fracture of the humerus	20
Figure (13): a): Posteromedially displaced distal fragment with liability to radial nerve injury b): Posterolaterally displaced distal fragment with liability to medial nerve and Brachial artery injury	22
Figure (14): Motor neurological assessment: A) Normal "OK" sign. B) Normal thumb up sign. C) Normal starfish sign. D) Abnormal "OK" sign.	25
Figure (15): Flow chart to guide decision making in cases in which a possible vascular injury is associated with a displaced supracondylar humeral fracture	28
Figure (16) : Fishtail deformity	30
Figure (17): Manipulative reduction of supracondylar fracture of the humerus in children	32
Figure (18): Avoid elbow hyperflexion	32
Figure (19): Skin traction	33
Figure (20): a) Modified Palmer olecranon screw b) Overhead skeletal traction	34

Figures		Page
Figure (21):	Schematic representation of lateral external fixation	35
Figure (22):	Antegrade flexible intramedullary nailing	37
Figure (23):	patient position for closed pinning	38
Figure (24):	skin incision of anterior approach	39
Figure (25):	skin incision of medial approach	40
Figure (26):	skin incision of lateral approach	41
Figure (27):	skin incision of posterior approach.	42
Figure (28):	Distribution of the studied cases according to age	44
Figure (29):	Distribution of the studied cases according to sex	45
Figure (30):	Distribution of the studied cases according to side affected	45
Figure (31):	Distribution of the studied cases according to lag to surgery	46
Figure (32):	Distribution of the studied cases according to Skin condition	47
Figure (33):	skin incision	49
Figure (34):	identification of the ulnar nerve	50
Figure (35):	triceps muscle flap	50
Figure (36):	fixation of the fracture	51
Figure (37):	a. closure of the triceps muscle, b. closure of the skin.	51
Figure (38):	Distribution of the studied cases according to result	55
Figure(39-42):	Case 1	69-71
Figure (43-46):	Case 2	72-73
Figure (47-50):	: Case 3	74-75
Figure (51-54):	: Case 4	76-77

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
Table (I):	Distribution of the studied cases according to age. 44
Table (II):	Distribution of the studied cases according to lag to surgery 46
Table(III):	Flynn's criteria 52
Table (IV):	Distribution of the studied cases according to result. 55
Table (V):	Distribution of the studied cases according to operation time 56
Table (VI):	Distribution of the studied cases according to heal time. 56
Table (VII):	Distribution of the studied cases according to loss of the range of motion after removal of the cast 57
Table (VIII):	Distribution of the studied cases according to loss of the range of motion after the end of follow up. 57
Table (IX):	Distribution of the studied cases according to loss of carrying angle at the end of the follow up 58
Table (X):	Distribution of the studied cases according to infection after removal of the cast 58
Table (XI):	Distribution of the studied cases according to Baumann angle immediately post-operative 59
Table (XII):	Distribution of the studied cases according to frontal humeral line immediately post-operative. 59
Table (XIII):	Distribution of the studied cases according to humerotrochlear angle immediately post- operative 60
Table (XIV):	Distribution of the studied cases according Stability of the k-wires 60
Table (XV):	Distribution of the studied cases according to Baumann angle at the end of the follow up 61
Table (XVI):	Distribution of the studied cases according to frontal humeral line at the end of follow up. 61
Table (XVII):	Distribution of the studied cases according to humerotrochlear angle after the end of follow up. 62
Table (XVIII):	Relation between result with age (years) 63
Table (XIX):	Relation between results with sex 63
Table (XX)	Relation between results with the side affected 64
Table (XXI)	Relation between results with operation time 64
Table (XXII)	Relation between result with heal time 65
Table (XXIII)	Relation between results with time elapsed before surgery 65

Tables		Page
Table (XXIV)	Relation between results with position of the k-wires	66
Table (XXV)	Relation between result and affected baumann's angle at the end of follow up	66
Table (XXVI)	Relation between results and position of the frontal humeral line at the end of follow up	67
Table (XXVII)	Relation between results and humerotrochlear angle at the end of the follow up	67

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SCFH	: Supracondylar fracture humerus
K-wires	: Kirschner wires
FIN	: Flexible Intramedullary Nailing
ROM	: Range of Motion
CT	: Computerized Tomography
CTA	: Computerized Tomographic Angiography
CRPP	: Closed Reduction and Percutaneous Pinning
ORIF	: Open Reduction and Internal Fixation
AP	: Anteroposterior
AVN	: Avascular Necrosis
OR	: Operating Room