



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Arterial angioembolisation versus pre-peritoneal pelvic packing in haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures: a meta-analysis

Migliorini, F.; Cocconi, F.; Schipper, I.; Duis, K. ten; Marzi, I.; Komadina, R.; ... ; Wendt, K.

Citation

Migliorini, F., Cocconi, F., Schipper, I., Duis, K. ten, Marzi, I., Komadina, R., ... Wendt, K. (2023). Arterial angioembolisation versus pre-peritoneal pelvic packing in haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures: a meta-analysis. *European Journal Of Trauma And Emergency Surgery*. doi:10.1007/s00068-023-02389-4

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3762379>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



Arterial angioembolisation versus pre-peritoneal pelvic packing in haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures: a meta-analysis

Filippo Migliorini^{1,2} · Federico Cocconi² · Inger Schipper³ · Kaj ten Duis⁴ · Ingo Marzi⁵ · Radko Komadina⁶ · Frank Hildebrand¹ · Klaus Wendt⁴

Received: 24 July 2023 / Accepted: 23 October 2023
© The Author(s) 2023

Abstract

Introduction Angioembolisation (AE) and/or pre-peritoneal pelvic packing (PPP) may be necessary for patients with complex pelvic fractures who are haemodynamically unstable. However, it remains unclear whether AE or PPP should be performed as an initial intervention and ongoing debates exist. This meta-analysis aimed to compare AE versus PPP in haemodynamically unstable patients with acute pelvic fractures. The primary outcomes of interest were to compare in-hospital mortality rate and number of blood units transfused. Secondary outcomes included evaluating differences in the time from diagnosis to treatment, as well as the length of stay in the intensive care unit (ICU) and hospital.

Methods All clinically relevant studies comparing AE versus PPP in patients with complex pelvic fractures and haemodynamic instability were accessed. The 2020 PRISMA guidelines were followed. In September 2023, the following databases were accessed: PubMed, Web of Science, Google Scholar and Embase, without constraint.

Results Data from 320 patients were collected (AE: 174; PPP: 146). The mean age on admission was 47.4 ± 7.2 years. The mean Injury Severity Score (ISS) on admission was $43.5 + 5.4$ points. Baseline comparability was observed in ISS ($P=0.5$, Table 3) and mean age ($P=0.7$, Table 3). No difference was reported in mortality rate ($P=0.2$) or rate of blood units transfused ($P=0.3$). AE had a longer mean time to the procedure of 44.6 min compared to PPP ($P=0.04$). The mean length of ICU and hospital stay were similar in both groups.

Conclusion Despite the longer mean time from admission to the procedure, no significant differences were found between AE and PPP in terms of in-hospital mortality, blood units transfused, or length of ICU, and hospital stay. These findings should be interpreted considering the limitations of the present study. High-quality comparative research is strongly warranted.

Level of evidence Level IV, meta-analysis.

Keywords Pelvic fractures · Haemorrhage · Pre-peritoneal pelvic packing · Angioembolisation

Introduction

Complex pelvic fractures represent approximately 3% of all skeletal injuries and are associated with significant morbidity and mortality [1, 2]. In addition to peripelvic soft-tissue damage, pelvic fractures may involve the genitourinary system, lower gastrointestinal system, muscles, nerves, or blood vessels [3–7]. Following a proper treatment algorithm, the mortality rate in high-energy pelvic fractures dropped from 66.7% to 18.7% [8]. Haemorrhage is the leading cause of death, with a mortality rate reaching 35% [9, 10]. The

management of haemodynamically unstable pelvic fractures is complex and requires a prompt, well-structured and multidisciplinary approach [11, 12]. The therapeutic algorithm must be individually tailored and adapted to the circumstances and characteristics of the admission centre [13–16]. If possible, an accident history and clinical examination should be obtained from each patient. It should be noted that pelvic instability should only be checked once during the clinical examination, so as not to worsen the injury or increase the haemorrhaging [17, 18]. The methods to ascertain the instability are debated. The validity of conventional radiographs in complex pelvic injuries is unclear; at the same time, the use of computer tomography, albeit useful, could cost important time. Newer types of CT scans located in the

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

shock room could shorten this delay [19–22]. In haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures and free intra-abdominal fluid on FAST (focussed abdominal trauma-specific sonography), immediate exploratory laparotomy may be indicated [23–29]. External fixation may be performed following laparotomy. Stabilisation of the dorsal pelvic ring is a prerequisite for successful pelvic tamponade. In haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures without free intra-abdominal fluid, stabilisation is necessary at first, using a pelvic binder, anteriorly fixing the external fixator, or posteriorly fixing systems such as the pelvic clamp [30–32]. In persistent pelvic haemorrhage, the use of angioembolisation (AE) and/or pre-peritoneal pelvic packing (PPP) could be necessary. However, whether AE or PPP could be performed first is still unclear and debates are ongoing. The present meta-analysis was conducted to compare AE versus PPP in haemodynamically unstable patients with acute pelvic fractures. Primary outcomes of interest were in-hospital mortality and number of blood units transfused. Secondary outcomes of interest were the differences in time elapsed from diagnosis to treatment procedure and length of intensive care unit (ICU) and hospital stay.

Methods

Eligibility criteria

All clinical studies comparing AE versus PPP in patients with complex pelvic fractures and haemodynamic instability and published in peer-reviewed journals were eligible for assessment. Fitting with the author's language capabilities, articles in English, German, Italian, French, and Spanish were considered. Only studies with levels I to IV of evidence, according to the Oxford Centre of Evidence-Based Medicine [33], were considered. Reviews, opinions, letters, and editorials were not considered. Animals, in vitro, biomechanics, computational, and cadaveric studies were not eligible. Missing quantitative data under the outcomes of interests warranted the exclusion of a study.

Search strategy

This study was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: the 2020 PRISMA statement [34]. The PICO algorithm was preliminarily established:

- P (Problem): Haemodynamically unstable patients with acute pelvic fractures
- I (Intervention): Pre-peritoneal pelvic packing
- C (Comparison): Arterial angioembolisation

- O (Outcomes): Mortality rate and blood units transfused, time elapsed from admission to treatment, length of ICU stay and hospitalisation.

In September 2023, PubMed, Web of Science, Google Scholar and Embase were accessed with no time constraints. The following matrix of keywords used in each database to accomplish the search was: pelvic OR pelvis AND fractures AND haemodynamic OR haemodynamically OR unstable OR instability OR bleeding OR haemorrhage AND peritoneal AND pelvic packing AND/OR arterial angioembolisation AND/OR versus AND survivorship OR mortality OR dead AND blood units AND transfused OR transfusion AND treatment OR management AND ICU OR intensive care unit OR hospitalisation OR outcome. The Boolean operator AND/OR was used for the database search. No additional filters were used in the database search.

Selection and data collection

Two authors (F.M. and F.C.) independently performed the database search. All the resulting titles were screened by hand and, if suitable, the abstract was accessed. The full text of the abstracts matching the topic was accessed. If the full text was not accessible or available, the article was not considered for inclusion. A cross-reference of the bibliography of the full-text articles was also performed for inclusion. Disagreements were debated and solved by a third author (K.W.).

Data items

Two authors (F.M. and F.C.) independently performed data extraction. The following data at baseline were extracted: author, year of publication and journal, country, study design, Injury Severity Score (ISS) [35], number of patients and related mean age. The primary outcomes of interest were to compare AE versus PPP in mortality rate and blood units transfused. Secondary outcomes of interest were to evaluate differences in time elapsed from diagnosis to treatment and length of ICU and hospital stay.

Methodological quality assessment

The risk of bias was evaluated following the guidelines in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [36]. The Risk of Bias in Nonrandomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) was used to assess the methodological quality assessment [37]. This scoring was conducted by two reviewers (F.M. and F.C.) independently. The quality of evidence of collective outcomes was evaluated using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) system [38, 39].

Synthesis methods

The statistical analyses were performed by the main author (F.M.) following the recommendations of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [40]. IBM SPSS software version 25 was used for descriptive statistics and the assessment of baseline comparability. Mean and standard deviations were used. To assess baseline comparability the two-tailed unpaired *t* test was performed, with values of $P > 0.05$ considered satisfactory. To compare AE versus PPP, a meta-analysis was conducted using the software Review Manager 5.3 (The Nordic Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark). For continuous data, the inverse variance method with mean difference (MD) effect measure was used. For binary data, the Mantel–Haenszel method with odds ratio (OR) effect measure was used. The CI was set at 95% in all the comparisons. Heterogeneity was evaluated through Higgins- I^2 and χ^2 tests. If $P_{\chi^2} > 0.05$, no statistically significant heterogeneity was found. If $P_{\chi^2} < 0.05$, the heterogeneity of the Higgins- I^2 was evaluated. Values of Higgins- $I^2 > 60\%$ indicate high heterogeneity. A fixed-effect model was set as default. When high heterogeneity was detected, a random model effect was used. Forest and funnel plots of each comparison were performed. Overall values of $P < 0.05$ were considered statistically significant.

Results

Study selection

The literature search resulted in 4285 articles. Of them, 1538 were excluded as they were duplicates. An additional 2356 studies were excluded for reasons of not matching the topic ($N = 2101$), study design ($N = 193$), combining several procedures ($N = 56$), uncertain results ($N = 3$) and language limitations ($N = 3$). A further nine studies were excluded as they did not report quantitative data under the outcomes of interest. Finally, five studies were included in the present meta-analysis. The results of the literature search are shown in Fig. 1.

Risk of bias assessment

The ROBINS-I was applied to investigate the risk of bias of non-RCTs. The overall risk of bias was moderate (Table 1).




Fig. 1 PRISMA flow chart of the literature search

Study characteristics and results of individual studies

Data from 320 patients were collected (AE: 174; PPP: 146). The mean age on admission was 47.4 ± 7.2 years. The mean ISS on admission was $43.5 + 5.4$ points. The generalities and demographics of the included studies are shown in Table 2.

Baseline comparability

On admission, ISS and mean age were comparable for both groups (Table 3).

AE angioembolisation; PPP peritoneal pelvic pack; MD mean difference; ISS Injury Severity Score

Mortality rate

No difference was reported in mortality rate ($P = 0.2$, Fig. 2).

Blood units transfused

No difference was reported in the transfused blood unit rate ($P = 0.3$, Fig. 3).

Table 1 ROBINS-I of non-RCTs

Authors, year	Confounding	Selection of participants	Classification of interventions	Deviations from intervention	Missing data	Measurement of outcomes	Selection of reported results	Overall
Cheng et al., 2015 [41]	High	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate
Kim et al. 2023 [42]	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High	High	High	High	Moderate
Li et al. 2016 [43]	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Osborn et al. 2009 [44]	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Tai et al. 2011 [45]	Moderate	High	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate

Table 2 Study characteristics and patient group demographics

Authors, year	Journal	Country	Design	Definition of haemodynamic instability (at admission)	Group	ISS	Patients (n)	Mean age
Cheng et al. 2015 [41]	Emerg Med J	China	Prospective	SBP < 90 mm/Hg despite 2 L of crystalloids	AE	45	76	46.84
					PPP	40	49	45.37
Kim et al. 2023 [42]	Asian J Surg	South Korea	Retrospective	SBP < 90 mmHg and peripheral vasoconstriction, altered consciousness; and/or dyspnoea or (b) as SBP > 90 mmHg but requiring vasopressors; and/or base excess > 5 mmol/L and/or shock index > 1 and/or blood transfusion units of > 4/24 h	AE	34.8	38	56.7
					PPP	39.2	37	58.9
Li et al. 2016 [43]	Injury	China	Prospective	SBP < 90 mm Hg despite 4 U PRBCs	AE	43	27	40
					PPP	48	29	43
Osborn et al. 2009 [44]	Injury	USA	Prospective	SBP < 90 mm Hg despite 4 PRBCs	AE	45.9	20	39.5
					PPP	54.7	20	37.9
Tai et al. 2011 [45]	J Trauma	China	Retrospective	SBP < 90 mm Hg despite 2 L crystalloid	AE	42.3	13	44.8
					PPP	42	11	51.2

RCT randomised controlled trial; ISS Injury Severity Score; SBP systolic blood pressure; PRBC packed red blood cells

Table 3 Baseline comparability

Endpoint	AE (N = 174)	PPP (N = 146)	MD	P
ISS	42.2 ± 4.4	44.8 ± 6.5	2.6	0.5
Mean age	45.6 ± 7.0	47.3 ± 8.1	1.4	0.7

Quality of the recommendations

GRADE found a low quality of the recommendations (Fig. 4).





Fig. 2 Meta-analysis of the comparison: rate of blood units transfused




Fig. 3 Meta-analysis of the comparison: rate of blood units transfused

Pre-peritoneal pelvic packing versus arterial angioembolisation in haemodynamically unstable patients with acute pelvic fractures			
*P (Problem): Haemodynamically unstable patients with acute pelvic fractures; †I (Intervention): Pre-peritoneal pelvic packing; ‡C (Comparison): Arterial angioembolisation; ††O (Outcomes): Mortality rate and blood units transfused, time elapsed from admission to treatment, length of ICU stay and hospitalization.			
Outcome № of participants (studies)	Impact	Certainty	
Mortality № of participants: 106 (4 studies)	High heterogeneity in patient selection, trauma aetiology and classification, eligibility, management algorithm, associated treatments (laparotomy, external fixation) and associated injuries. The overall quality of evidence of collective outcomes is poor	LOW	
Blood units transfusion assessed with: units per patient № of participants: 320 (4 studies)	High heterogeneity in patient selection, trauma aetiology and classification, eligibility, management algorithm, associated treatments (laparotomy, external fixation) and associated injuries. The overall quality of evidence of collective outcomes is poor	LOW	

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High certainty: we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.
Moderate certainty: we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.
Low certainty: our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.
Very low certainty: we have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

Fig. 4 The overall quality of evidence of collective outcomes according to the GRADE approach was low

Endpoints	Patients	95% CI	EE	Model	I ² (%)	P
Time to procedure	155	2.44–86.85	44.64	Random	78	0.04
ICU stay	96	1.65 to - 0.49	0.58	Fixed	0	0.3
Hospital stay	165	7.89 to - 11.38	1.74	Fixed	0	0.7

CI confidence interval; EE estimated effect; ICU intensive care unit

The secondary outcome of interest

AE demonstrated a greater mean time to procedure of 44.6 min (P=0.04) compared to PPP. The mean length of ICU and hospital stay were similar. These results are shown in Table 4.

Discussion

According to the main findings of the present study, AE and PPP in haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures are associated with similar in-hospital mortality rates and numbers of blood units transfused. No difference was found in the length of ICU stay or hospitalisation between AE and PPP. AE requires a longer time from admission to the procedure. PPP is performed without delay

by the surgical team itself, but for AE interventional radiologists should be available.

Depending on the setting, the initial application of the pelvic binder (prehospital), pelvic clamp (emergency room) or external fixator (surgical theatre) in patients with unstable pelvic fractures and haemodynamic instability is recommended [46]. A prompt ventral external fixation is a fast procedure that leads to immobilisation of the pelvis and prevents further dislocation of the bony fragments but cannot exert sufficient dorsal compression. The pelvic clamp enables direct compression in the area of the dorsal pelvic ring and is, therefore, used to stabilise vertically unstable C injuries. However, to avoid iatrogenic injuries, such as ileal perforation or overcompression, especially in the case of lack of experience, its use has declined [47, 48].

Pelvic bleeding can be attributed to several sources: the presacral venous plexus, the pelvic bone itself and the pelvic

arteries [49–52]. In the management of complex pelvic fractures with severe haemorrhage, haemostasis using PPP plays an important role. PPP only makes sense in connection with mechanical stabilisation, such as with a pelvic clamp or external fixator. This is especially true for the dorsal ring, as the stability provided to the anterior ring by an external fixator is less relevant for the effectiveness of PPP. In most cases, complex pelvic fractures are associated with venous bleeding, particularly from the presacral venous plexus, which can generally be controlled with PPP. The surgical access is achieved using an approximately 8-cm-long infra-umbilical longitudinal or transverse incision just above the pubis in the direction of the umbilicus; the linea alba is opened longitudinally. No preparation is necessary below the fascia, and the bladder can be lifted from the fractured site. Lap pads are inserted into the retroperitoneal space along the iliac vessels on each side. These are clamped between the posterior and anterior pelvic rings. Since the source of bleeding is the retroperitoneal part of the pelvis, no laparotomy is required. The duration of the procedure for an experienced surgeon should be about 20 min. Traditionally, every 24 or 48 h, the abdominal laparotomic pads shall be changed, which also allows a second-look surgery [44]. Following the acute care, further inpatient care takes place in the ICU and, if necessary, second- or third-look surgeries after 48 or 72 h [53, 54]. If the patient continues to bleed, additional AE should be considered.

In lesser cases, pelvic haemorrhages are of arterial origin [55, 56]. In the middle part of the superior and inferior pubic rami, along the ischial ramus, in the apex of the greater sciatic notch and the vicinity of the ventral part of the sacroiliac joint, lie the arteries which run close to the bone, and fractures in this location are most at risk of arterial haemorrhage [57–60]. Therefore, vertically displaced fractures in these areas are worthy of strict follow-ups. AE is an appropriate procedure to control arterial bleeding in patients with pelvic fractures; early AE within 3 h correlates significantly with better patient outcomes [3, 61–64]. AE should be performed in the event of haemodynamic instability and persistent bleeding despite pelvic stabilisation and the absence of significant alternative sources of bleeding. For a successful AE, an arterial blush of contrast media should be visible in the initial CT [65–67]. If suspicion of arterial bleeding persists after performing the AE, pelvic packing and stabilisation are warranted. If arterial bleeding persists, a repeated angiography and, if necessary, AE is indicated [68, 69].

Longer time from indication to procedure in patients who undergo AE compared to PPP was evidenced in the present meta-analysis. This finding concurs with those reported by previous reports. Moreover, between-studies time to AE was highly heterogeneous, ranging from 45 to 130 min. Indeed, AE can only be performed in dedicated centres with specially trained staff [4, 70], whilst PPP can

be quickly performed in the emergency department. Goldensluger et al. [71] found no difference in patients who had undergone PPP in the emergency department versus the operating room in mortality, transfused blood units, surgical site infections or length of hospitalisation. Hauschild et al. [72] compared PPP versus PPP followed by AE (PPP combined with AE) in haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures: no patients (0 of 17) allocated to PPP combined with AE died from haemorrhage compared to 24% (32 of 135) who underwent PPP in isolation [72]. However, patients who underwent PPP combined with AE required a greater number of blood transfusions and showed a higher incidence of adult respiratory distress syndrome plus a tendency towards increased multiple organ failures [72]. It remains unclear whether these results are influenced by the greater arterial haemorrhages observed in patients who underwent PPP combined with AE or by the AE in isolation. On the other hand, Ming Hsu et al. [30] compared PPP combined with AE ($N = 14$) versus AE in isolation ($N = 10$): despite the combined group having a higher Injury Severity Score at admission, this group showed a lower rate of mortality and blood transfusion requirement compared to the AE-only group. Similar survivorship, blood units transfused, and length of ICU and hospital stay were evidenced between AE and PPP.

The present meta-analysis has several limitations. The retrospective design of most studies increases the risk of selection bias and negatively impacts the reliability of the present results. Moreover, the limited sample size and the number of included studies also have a negative impact on the validity of the present conclusions. The definition of haemodynamic instability was highly heterogeneous amongst the included studies, as was the time to admission to the emergency department. Data on blood pressure were not available in most studies. Between and within studies, different devices of external fixation (e.g. external fixator frame, pelvic C-clamp) were used. The therapeutic algorithm of haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures was highly heterogeneous and patients before haemorrhage control underwent different emergency advanced life-support protocols. Given the lack of information in most studies on the therapeutic algorithms used, subgroup comparisons were not conducted. Moreover, some authors included patients who had undergone laparotomy before pelvic haemorrhage control. The type of fractures included for analysis was often biased and a formal classification was not used in most studies. Finally, the dynamics of the traumas, the presence of open or closed fractures and other associated injuries were seldom described and poorly standardised. Given these evident limitations, solid recommendations cannot be inferred. International consensus on the proper management algorithm is strongly required. The dynamics of the instability of patients with severe pelvic

trauma are challenging to analyse in a meta-analytic fashion. This dynamic cannot be reflected by a single blood pressure value and leads to the risk of bias. If the patient is continuously unstable and not responding to resuscitation (non-responder), most surgeons would choose PPP, which is immediately available. However, if the unstable patient responds to resuscitation (transient responder), the interventional radiologist has time to wait until AE is possible. Therefore, haemodynamic instability and the response to resuscitation is a dynamic situation, leading to the optimal surgical/interventional treatment. Concluding, the choice between PPP and AE is complex and requires additional investigation. The management of haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures is challenging and debated. If the cause of instability is the complex pelvic fracture and devices of external fixation are not enough to control haemostasis, the surgeon should opt between PPP and AE. Formal recommendations cannot be inferred from this study design. The nature of the bleeding (venous and/or arterial), the surgeon experience, the availability of interventional radiologists and trained staff in a timely fashion, fracture type and trauma dynamics, comorbidities and patient characteristics must be considered. Internationally accepted protocols are strongly required to establish the most appropriate algorithm to manage haemodynamically unstable patients with complex pelvic fractures.

Conclusion

Despite a longer mean time to procedure, there were no significant differences between AE and PPP in terms of in-hospital mortality rate, blood units transfused or length of stay in the ICU or hospital. These results must be interpreted in light of the limitations of the present study.

Author contributions FM: literature search, methodological quality assessment, statistical analysis, writing (original draft); FC: literature search, methodological quality assessment; IS: writing (revision); KtD: writing (revision); IM: writing (revision); RK: writing (revision); FH: writing (revision); KW: supervision, project administration, writing (revision). All authors agree to the final version being published and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Availability of data and materials The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are available throughout the manuscript.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no competing interest for this article.

Ethical approval This study complies with ethical standards.

Consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent to publish Not applicable.

Registration and protocol The present review is not registered.

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/>.

References

1. Ghosh S, Aggarwal S, Kumar V, Patel S, Kumar P. Epidemiology of pelvic fractures in adults: our experience at a tertiary hospital. *Chin J Traumatol*. 2019;22(3):138–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjtee.2019.03.003>.
2. Farid AR, Stearns SA, Atarere JO, Suneja N, Weaver MJ, Von Keudell AG. Trends in non-operative management of low-energy pelvic fracture: an analysis of the Nationwide Inpatient Sample. *J Orthop*. 2023;43:101–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2023.07.028>.
3. Agolini SF, Shah K, Jaffe J, Newcomb J, Rhodes M, Reed JF 3rd. Arterial embolization is a rapid and effective technique for controlling pelvic fracture hemorrhage. *J Trauma*. 1997;43(3):395–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005373-199709000-00001>.
4. Miller PR, Moore PS, Mansell E, Meredith JW, Chang MC. External fixation or arteriogram in bleeding pelvic fracture: initial therapy guided by markers of arterial hemorrhage. *J Trauma*. 2003;54(3):437–43. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.TA.0000053397.33827.DD>.
5. Koraitim MM. Complex pelvic fracture urethral distraction defects revisited. *Scand J Urol*. 2014;48(1):84–9. <https://doi.org/10.3109/21681805.2013.817484>.
6. Durrant JJ, Ramasamy A, Salmon MS, Watkin N, Sargeant I. Pelvic fracture-related urethral and bladder injury. *J R Army Med Corps*. 2013;159(Suppl 1):i32–39. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jramc-2013-000025>.
7. Yang K, Ye J, Fan W, Yang Y. Complex pelvic fracture complicated with large soft-tissue defects in the lower limbs: a case report and literature review. *Asian J Surg*. 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asjsur.2022.12.056>.
8. Bosch U, Pohlemann T, Haas N, Tscherne H. Classification and management of complex pelvic trauma. *Unfallchirurg*. 1992;95(4):189–96.
9. Smith W, Williams A, Agudelo J, Shannon M, Morgan S, Stahel P, Moore E. Early predictors of mortality in hemodynamically unstable pelvis fractures. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2007;21(1):31–7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOT.0b013e31802ea951>.
10. Burgess AR, Eastridge BJ, Young JW, Ellison TS, Ellison PS Jr, Poka A, Bathon GH, Brumback RJ. Pelvic ring disruptions: effective classification system and treatment protocols. *J Trauma*. 1990;30(7):848–56.

11. Vardon Bounes F, Ramonda V, Geeraerts T. Severe pelvic trauma: a complex and challenging situation. *Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med*. 2019;38(2):119–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accpm.2019.02.016>.
12. Skitch S, Engels PT. Acute management of the traumatically injured pelvis. *Emerg Med Clin North Am*. 2018;36(1):161–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emc.2017.08.011>.
13. Rondanelli AM, Gomez-Sierra MA, Ossa AA, Hernandez RD, Torres M. Damage control in orthopaedic and traumatology. *Colomb Med (Cali)*. 2021;52(2): e4184802. <https://doi.org/10.25100/cm.v52i2.4802>.
14. Perry K, Mabrouk A, Chauvin BJ. Pelvic ring injuries. In: Ch M, editor. *StatPearls*. Treasure Island: StatPearls; 2023.
15. Slatits P, Eskola A. External fixation of the pelvic girdle as a test for assessing instability of the sacro-iliac joint. *Ann Med*. 1989;21(5):369–72. <https://doi.org/10.3109/07853898909149223>.
16. Shu HT, Mikula JD, Yu AT, Shafiq B. Tranexamic acid use in pelvic and/or acetabular fracture surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Orthop*. 2021;28:112–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2021.11.018>.
17. Li P, Liu F, Li Q, Zhou D, Dong J, Wang D. Role of pelvic packing in the first attention given to hemodynamically unstable pelvic fracture patients: a meta-analysis. *J Orthop Traumatol*. 2022;23(1):29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s10195-022-00647-6>.
18. Chumchuen S, Lertpulpol W, Apivotgaroon A. Open technique for supra-acetabular pin placement in pelvic external fixation: a cadaveric study. *J Orthop Traumatol*. 2022;23(1):14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s10195-022-00635-w>.
19. Gill JR, Murphy C, Quansah B, Carrothers A. Management of the open book APC II pelvis: survey results from pelvic and acetabular surgeons in the United Kingdom. *J Orthop*. 2017;14(4):530–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2017.08.004>.
20. Kortbeek JB, Al-Turki SA, Ali J, Antoine JA, Bouillon B, Brasel K, Breneman F, Brink PR, Brohi K, Burris D, Burton RA, Chapleau W, Cioffi W, Collet-e-Silva-Fde S, Cooper A, Cortes JA, Eskesen V, Fildes J, Gautam S, Gruen RL, Gross R, Hansen KS, Henny W, Hollands MJ, Hunt RC, Jover-Navalon JM, Kaufmann CR, Knudson P, Koestner A, Kosir R, Larsen CF, Livaudais W, Luchette F, Mao P, Mcicker JH, Meredith JW, Mock C, Mori ND, Morrow C, Parks SN, Pereira PM, Pogetti RS, Ravn J, Rhee P, Salomone JP, Schipper IB, Schoettker P, Schreiber MA, Smith RS, Svendsen LB, Taha W, van Wijngaarden-Stephens M, Varga E, Voiglio EJ, Williams D, Winchell RJ, Winter R (2008) *Advanced trauma life support edition, the evidence for change*. *J Trauma* 64 (6):1638–1650. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e3181744b03>
21. Patel S, Ghosh A, Jindal K, Kumar V, Aggarwal S, Kumar P. Spinopelvic fixation for vertically unstable AO type C pelvic fractures and sacral fractures with spinopelvic dissociation: a systematic review and pooled analysis involving 479 patients. *J Orthop*. 2022;29:75–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2022.01.010>.
22. Kuper MA, Trulson A, Stuby FM, Stockle U, Konrads C. Complications of surgical approaches for stabilization of pelvic ring injuries: analysis of pitfalls and how to avoid them. *J Orthop*. 2020;20:261–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2020.05.002>.
23. Ballard RB, Rozycki GS, Newman PG, Cubillos JE, Salomone JP, Ingram WL, Feliciano DV. An algorithm to reduce the incidence of false-negative FAST examinations in patients at high risk for occult injury. Focused assessment for the sonographic examination of the trauma patient. *J Am Coll Surg*. 1999;189(2):145–50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1072-7515\(99\)00121-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1072-7515(99)00121-0). (discussion 150-141).
24. Montoya J, Stawicki SP, Evans DC, Bahner DP, Sparks S, Sharpe RP, Cipolla J. From FAST to E-FAST: an overview of the evolution of ultrasound-based traumatic injury assessment. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg*. 2016;42(2):119–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00068-015-0512-1>.
25. Fornell Perez R. Focused assessment with sonography for trauma (FAST) versus multidetector computed tomography in hemodynamically unstable emergency patients. *Radiologia*. 2017;59(6):531–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rx.2016.11.007>.
26. Lynch T, Kilgar J, Al Shibli A. Pediatric abdominal trauma. *Curr Pediatr Rev*. 2018;14(1):59–63. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1573396313666170815100547>.
27. Ruchholtz S, Waydhas C, Lewan U, Pehle B, Taeger G, Kuhne C, Nast-Kolb D. Free abdominal fluid on ultrasound in unstable pelvic ring fracture: is laparotomy always necessary? *J Trauma*. 2004;57(2):278–85. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ta.0000133840.44265.ca>. (discussion 285-277).
28. Leenellett E, Rieves A. Occult Abdominal Trauma. *Emerg Med Clin N Am*. 2021;39(4):795–806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emc.2021.07.009>.
29. Schellenberg M, Owattanapanich N, Emigh B, Karavites L, Clark DH, Lam L, Inaba K. Contemporary utility of diagnostic peritoneal aspiration in trauma. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2021;91(5):814–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0000000000003232>.
30. Hsu JM, Yadev S, Faraj S. Controlling hemorrhage in exsanguinating pelvic fractures: utility of extraperitoneal pelvic packing as a damage control procedure. *Int J Crit Illn Inj Sci*. 2016;6(3):148–52. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2229-5151.190655>.
31. Pohlemann T, Bosch U, Gansslen A, Tscherne H. The Hannover experience in management of pelvic fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1994;305:69–80.
32. Abrassart S, Stern R, Peter R. Unstable pelvic ring injury with hemodynamic instability: what seems the best procedure choice and sequence in the initial management? *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res*. 2013;99(2):175–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otsr.2012.12.014>.
33. Howick JCI, Glasziou P, Greenhalgh T, Heneghan C, Liberati A, Moschetti I, Phillips B, Thornton H, Goddard O, Hodgkinson M. *The 2011 Oxford CEBM Levels of Evidence*. Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine; 2011.
34. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw JM, Hrobjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S, McGuinness LA, Stewart LA, Thomas J, Tricco AC, Welch VA, Whiting P, Moher D. *The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews*. *BMJ*. 2021;372: n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>.
35. Dehouche N. The injury severity score: an operations perspective. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2022;22(1):48. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-022-01528-6>.
36. Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Chandler J, Welch VA, Higgins JP, Thomas J. Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;10:00142.
37. Sterne JA, Hernan MA, Reeves BC, Savovic J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, Henry D, Altman DG, Ansari MT, Boutron I, Carpenter JR, Chan AW, Churchill R, Deeks JJ, Hrobjartsson A, Kirkham J, Juni P, Loke YK, Pigott TD, Ramsay CR, Regidor D, Rothstein HR, Sandhu L, Santaguida PL, Schunemann HJ, Shea B, Shrier I, Tugwell P, Turner L, Valentine JC, Waddington H, Waters E, Wells GA, Whiting PF, Higgins JP. *ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions*. *BMJ*. 2016;355: i4919. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4919>.
38. Brozek JL, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, Lang D, Jaeschke R, Williams JW, Phillips B, Lelgemann M, Lethaby A, Bousquet J, Guyatt GH, Schunemann HJ, Group GW. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in clinical practice guidelines. Part 1 of 3. An overview of the GRADE approach and grading quality of evidence about interventions. *Allergy*.

- 2009;64(5):669–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1398-9995.2009.01973.x>.
39. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, Guyatt GH, Harbour RT, Haugh MC, Henry D, Hill S, Jaeschke R, Leng G, Liberati A, Magrini N, Mason J, Middleton P, Mrukowicz J, O'Connell D, Oxman AD, Phillips B, Schunemann HJ, Edejer T, Varonen H, Vist GE, Williams JW Jr, Zaza S, Group GW. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2004;328(7454):1490. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.328.7454.1490>.
 40. Higgins JPT TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (2022) *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.2. Cochrane 2021. www.training.cochrane.org/handbook. Accessed Feb 2022
 41. Cheng M, Cheung MT, Lee KY, Lee KB, Chan SC, Wu AC, Chow YF, Chang AM, Ho HF, Yau KK. Improvement in institutional protocols leads to decreased mortality in patients with haemodynamically unstable pelvic fractures. *Emerg Med J*. 2015;32(3):214–20. <https://doi.org/10.1136/emerm-2012-202009>.
 42. Kim MJ, Lee SH, Jang JY, Lee JG. Comparison of mortality among hemorrhage-control methods performed for hemodynamically unstable patients with traumatic pelvic fractures: a multicenter study. *Asian J Surg*. 2023;46(1):444–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asjsur.2022.05.085>.
 43. Li Q, Dong J, Yang Y, Wang G, Wang Y, Liu P, Robinson Y, Zhou D. Retroperitoneal packing or angioembolization for hemorrhage control of pelvic fractures—Quasi-randomized clinical trial of 56 haemodynamically unstable patients with Injury Severity Score \geq 33. *Injury*. 2016;47(2):395–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2015.10.008>.
 44. Osborn PM, Smith WR, Moore EE, Cothren CC, Morgan SJ, Williams AE, Stahel PF. Direct retroperitoneal pelvic packing versus pelvic angiography: a comparison of two management protocols for haemodynamically unstable pelvic fractures. *Injury*. 2009;40(1):54–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2008.08.038>.
 45. Tai DK, Li WH, Lee KY, Cheng M, Lee KB, Tang LF, Lai AK, Ho HF, Cheung MT. Retroperitoneal pelvic packing in the management of hemodynamically unstable pelvic fractures: a level I trauma center experience. *J Trauma*. 2011;71(4):E79–86. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e31820ced0>.
 46. Sharma S, Aggarwal S, Patel S, Kumar V, Jindal K, Sinha A. INFIX-safe and effective surgical option for complex fracture patterns of the anterior pelvic ring: a prospective single center study. *J Orthop*. 2021;23:142–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2021.01.004>.
 47. Rossaint R, Bouillon B, Cerny V, Coats TJ, Duranteau J, Fernandez-Mondejar E, Hunt BJ, Komadina R, Nardi G, Neugebauer E, Ozier Y, Riddez L, Schultz A, Stahel PF, Vincent JL, Spahn DR, Task Force for Advanced Bleeding Care in T. Management of bleeding following major trauma: an updated European guideline. *Crit Care*. 2010;14(2):R52. <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc8943>.
 48. Tiemann AH, Bohme J, Josten C. Use of the pelvic clamp in polytraumatized patients with unstable disruption of the posterior pelvic ring. Modified technique—risks—problems. *Orthopade*. 2006;35(12):1225–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00132-006-1008-9>.
 49. Filiberto DM, Fox AD. Preperitoneal pelvic packing: Technique and outcomes. *Int J Surg*. 2016;33(Pt B):222–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2016.05.072>.
 50. Schweigkofler U, Wohlrath B, Paffrath T, Flohe S, Wincheringer D, Hoffmann R, Trentzsch H. Recommendations for releasing the pelvic binder after a non-invasive pelvic stabilisation procedure under emergency room conditions. *Z Orthop Unfall*. 2016;154(5):470–6. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-105768>.
 51. Euler E, Nast-Kolb D, Schweiberer L. Acetabular and pelvic fractures in multiple trauma. *Orthopade*. 1997;26(4):354–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00003391>.
 52. Pavic R, Margetic P. Emergency treatment for clinically unstable patients with pelvic fracture and haemorrhage. *Coll Antropol*. 2012;36(4):1445–52.
 53. Hak DJ, Smith WR, Suzuki T. Management of hemorrhage in life-threatening pelvic fracture. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2009;17(7):447–57. <https://doi.org/10.5435/00124635-200907000-00005>.
 54. Rixen D, Steinhausen E, Dahmen J, Bouillon B, German Society of Trauma S. S3 guideline on treatment of polytrauma/severe injuries. Initial surgical phase: significance—possibilities—difficulties? *Unfallchirurg*. 2012;115(1):22–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00113-011-2104-9>.
 55. Starr AJ, Griffin DR, Reinert CM, Frawley WH, Walker J, Whitlock SN, Borer DS, Rao AV, Jones AL. Pelvic ring disruptions: prediction of associated injuries, transfusion requirement, pelvic arteriography, complications, and mortality. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2002;16(8):553–61. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005131-200209000-00003>.
 56. Hundesmarck D, Hietbrink F, Leenen LPH, Heng M. Pelvic packing and angio-embolization after blunt pelvic trauma: a retrospective 18-year analysis. *Injury*. 2021;52(4):946–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2020.11.039>.
 57. Kachlik D, Vobornik T, Dzupa V, Marvanova Z, Toupal O, Navara E, Stevulova N, Baca V. Where and what arteries are most likely injured with pelvic fractures?: The influence of localization, shape, and fracture dislocation on the arterial injury during pelvic fractures. *Clin Anat*. 2019;32(5):682–8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.23372>.
 58. Bilhim T, Pereira JA, Fernandes L, Rio Tinto H, Pisco JM. Angiographic anatomy of the male pelvic arteries. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2014;203(4):W373–382. <https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.13.11687>.
 59. de Assis AM, Moreira AM, de Paula Rodrigues VC, Harward SH, Antunes AA, Srougi M, Carnevale FC. Pelvic arterial anatomy relevant to prostatic artery embolisation and proposal for angiographic classification. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2015;38(4):855–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00270-015-1114-3>.
 60. Shrestha R, Shrestha S, Sitaula S, Basnet P. Anatomy of internal iliac artery and its ligation to control pelvic hemorrhage. *JNMA J Nepal Med Assoc*. 2020;58(230):826–30. <https://doi.org/10.31729/jnma.4958>.
 61. Kuo LW, Yang SJ, Fu CY, Liao CH, Wang SY, Wu SC. Relative hypotension increases the probability of the need for angioembolisation in pelvic fracture patients without contrast extravasation on computed tomography scan. *Injury*. 2016;47(1):37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2015.07.043>.
 62. Parker W, Despain RW, Bailey J, Elster E, Rodriguez CJ, Bradley M. Military experience in the management of pelvic fractures from OIF/OEF. *BMJ Mil Health*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjmilitary-2020-001469>.
 63. Mann SM, Banaszek D, Lajkosz K, Brogly SB, Stanojev SM, Evans C, Bardana DD, Yach J, Hall S. High-energy trauma patients with pelvic fractures: management trends in Ontario. *Canada Injury*. 2018;49(10):1830–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2018.06.044>.
 64. Choi D, Cho WT, Song HK, Kwon J, Kang BH, Jung H, Jung K. Management strategy for open pelvic fractures: a 11-year single-centre, retrospective observational study. *Injury*. 2023;54(4):1156–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2023.02.040>.
 65. Girard E, Abba J, Cristiano N, Siebert M, Barbois S, Letoublon C, Arvieux C. Management of splenic and pancreatic trauma. *J*

- Visc Surg. 2016;153(4 Suppl):45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviscsurg.2016.04.005>.
66. Alarhayem AQ, Myers JG, Dent D, Lamus D, Lopera J, Liao L, Cestero R, Stewart R, Eastridge BJ. “Blush at first sight”: significance of computed tomographic and angiographic discrepancy in patients with blunt abdominal trauma. *Am J Surg.* 2015;210(6):1104–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2015.08.009>. (discussion 1110–1101).
 67. Marzi I, Lustenberger T. Management of bleeding pelvic fractures. *Scand J Surg.* 2014;103(2):104–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1457496914525604>.
 68. Lustenberger T, Wutzler S, Stormann P, Laurer H, Marzi I. The role of angio-embolization in the acute treatment concept of severe pelvic ring injuries. *Injury.* 2015;46(Suppl 4):S33–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-1383\(15\)30016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-1383(15)30016-4).
 69. Rossaint R, Afshari A, Bouillon B, Cerny V, Cimpoesu D, Curry N, Duranteau J, Filipescu D, Grottke O, Gronlykke L, Harrois A, Hunt BJ, Kaserer A, Komadina R, Madsen MH, Maegele M, Mora L, Riddez L, Romero CS, Samama CM, Vincent JL, Wiberg S, Spahn DR. The European guideline on management of major bleeding and coagulopathy following trauma: sixth edition. *Crit Care.* 2023;27(1):80. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-023-04327-7>.
 70. Totterman A, Dormagen JB, Madsen JE, Klow NE, Skaga NO, Roise O. A protocol for angiographic embolization in exsanguinating pelvic trauma: a report on 31 patients. *Acta Orthop.* 2006;77(3):462–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17453670610046406>.
 71. Goldenshluger M, Chaushu H, Ron G, Fogel-Grinvald H, Mandler S, Miller L, Horesh N, Segal B, Rimon U, Klein Y. Extra peritoneal packing for exsanguinating pelvic hemorrhage: should we do it in the emergency department? *Isr Med Assoc J.* 2021;23(10):639–45.
 72. Hauschild O, Aghayev E, von Heyden J, Strohm PC, Culemann U, Pohlemann T, Suedkamp NP, Schmal H. Angioembolization for pelvic hemorrhage control: results from the German pelvic injury register. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2012;73(3):679–84. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e318253b5ba>.

Authors and Affiliations

Filippo Migliorini^{1,2}  · Federico Cocconi² · Inger Schipper³ · Kaj ten Duis⁴ · Ingo Marzi⁵ · Radko Komadina⁶ · Frank Hildebrand¹ · Klaus Wendt⁴

✉ Filippo Migliorini
migliorini.md@gmail.com

Federico Cocconi
federico.cocconi@gmail.com

Inger Schipper
I.B.Schipper@lumc.nl

Kaj ten Duis
k.ten.duis@umcg.nl

Ingo Marzi
marzi@trauma.uni-frankfurt.de

Radko Komadina
radko.komadina@gmail.com

Frank Hildebrand
fhildebrand@ukaachen.de

Klaus Wendt
k.w.wendt@planet.nl

¹ Department of Orthopaedics, Trauma and Reconstructive Surgery, RWTH University Hospital, Pauwelsstraße 30, 52074 Aachen, Germany

² Department of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, Academic Hospital of Bolzano (SABES-ASDAA), Teaching Hospital of the Paracelsus Medical University, 39100 Bolzano, Italy

³ Department of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

⁴ Department of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

⁵ Department of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, University Hospital Frankfurt, Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany

⁶ Department of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, Medical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia