

---

## Contents

---

<b>Preface</b> . . . . .	xi
Abhishek KUMAR and Priya BATA	
<b>Chapter 1. AI-Assisted Comparison of Volar Plating with and Without Carpal Tunnel Release in Distal Radius Fractures</b> . . . . .	1
Abhishek SHARMA and Paresh V. PATIL	
1.1. Introduction. . . . .	2
1.2. Literature review. . . . .	4
1.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	6
1.3.1. Study setting and ethical approval . . . . .	6
1.3.2. Study population and sample size . . . . .	6
1.3.3. Inclusion criteria . . . . .	7
1.3.4. Exclusion criteria . . . . .	7
1.3.5. Study Groups . . . . .	8
1.3.6. Preoperative assessment. . . . .	8
1.3.7. Trauma-surgery interval. . . . .	8
1.3.8. Observation and result . . . . .	9
1.4. Discussion . . . . .	18
1.5. Conclusion . . . . .	20
1.6. References . . . . .	20
<b>Chapter 2. Trigger Digits: Steroid Injection Versus Percutaneous Release Using AI-Based Outcome Analysis.</b> . . . . .	23
Anshuraj JAGDALE and Jineshwar S. KAPALE	
2.1. Introduction. . . . .	23
2.2. Literature review. . . . .	26

---

2.3. Conservative management: LSI . . . . .	27
2.4. PR: technique and outcomes . . . . .	27
2.5. Comparative efficacy: steroid injection versus PR . . . . .	28
2.6. Complications and safety considerations . . . . .	29
2.7. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews . . . . .	29
2.8. Clinical implications and future directions . . . . .	29
2.9. Materials and methods . . . . .	30
2.9.1. Materials and method of selection . . . . .	30
2.9.2. Conduction of study . . . . .	30
2.9.3. Sample size . . . . .	31
2.9.4. Statistical analysis . . . . .	32
2.10. Observation and results . . . . .	32
2.10.1. Age distribution . . . . .	32
2.10.2. Sex distribution . . . . .	33
2.10.3. Side distribution . . . . .	34
2.10.4. Pre-operative analysis of Green's grading . . . . .	34
2.10.5. Finger involvement . . . . .	35
2.10.6. Efficacy of treatment modalities . . . . .	36
2.10.7. Recurrence rate post-treatment . . . . .	37
2.10.8. Longevity of symptom relief within the follow-up period . . . . .	38
2.10.9. Tendon release assessment in the PR group . . . . .	39
2.11. Complications . . . . .	40
2.11.1. Tendon/neurovascular bundle injury . . . . .	40
2.11.2. Infection rate . . . . .	41
2.11.3. Post-treatment functional outcome assessment . . . . .	41
2.12. Discussion . . . . .	42
2.13. Conclusion . . . . .	43
2.14. References . . . . .	44
<b>Chapter 3. Rigid Versus Hybrid Fixation in Both-Bone Forearm Fractures: An AI-Supported Comparative Study . . . . .</b>	<b>47</b>
Manthana Ramakrishna Vittal VERMA and Paresh V. PATIL	
3.1. Introduction . . . . .	47
3.2. Literature review . . . . .	49
3.2.1. Evolution of forearm fracture management . . . . .	49
3.2.2. Rigid fixation using plate osteosynthesis . . . . .	50
3.2.3. IMN of forearm bones . . . . .	50
3.2.4. Hybrid fixation: concept and rationale . . . . .	51
3.2.5. Comparative studies: rigid versus hybrid fixation . . . . .	51
3.2.6. Functional outcomes and complications . . . . .	51
3.2.7. Role of advanced and AI-assisted analysis . . . . .	52

3.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	52
3.3.1. Duration of study . . . . .	52
3.3.2. Ethical approval . . . . .	53
3.3.3. Study population . . . . .	53
3.3.4. Inclusion criteria . . . . .	53
3.3.5. Sample size . . . . .	54
3.3.6. Observation and results . . . . .	55
3.4. Discussion . . . . .	66
3.5. Conclusion . . . . .	67
3.6. References . . . . .	68
<b>Chapter 4. Fracture Healing After Cephalomedullary Nailing with Zoledronic Acid: An AI-Driven Comparison . . . . .</b>	<b>71</b>
Mrunal PATEL and Pradeep N. KULKARNI	
4.1. Introduction . . . . .	71
4.2. Literature review . . . . .	74
4.2.1. CMN and fracture healing . . . . .	74
4.2.2. BPs and fracture healing . . . . .	74
4.2.3. Mechanisms of ZA in bone healing . . . . .	75
4.2.4. Clinical implications for CMN with ZA . . . . .	76
4.2.5. AI-driven comparative approaches in orthopedic outcomes . . . . .	76
4.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	77
4.3.1. Sample size . . . . .	77
4.3.2. Enrolment criteria . . . . .	78
4.3.3. Study tool . . . . .	78
4.4. Observation and results . . . . .	79
4.4.1. AO Type 2 (comminuted, non-articular) . . . . .	86
4.5. Discussion . . . . .	90
4.6. Conclusion . . . . .	91
4.7. References . . . . .	91
<b>Chapter 5. Alpha-Blockers in Cervical Radiculopathy: An AI-Guided Efficacy Study . . . . .</b>	<b>95</b>
Nidhi Vipul SHAH and Pradeep N. KULKARNI	
5.1. Introduction . . . . .	95
5.2. Literature review . . . . .	97
5.2.1. Cervical radiculopathy: epidemiology and etiology . . . . .	97
5.2.2. Pathophysiology of cervical radiculopathy . . . . .	98
5.2.3. Clinical presentation and diagnostic approaches . . . . .	98
5.2.4. Conventional treatment modalities – NSAIDs . . . . .	99
5.2.5. Cervical traction . . . . .	99

5.2.6. Interventional pain management techniques . . . . .	99
5.2.7. Epidural steroid injections and selective nerve root blocks . . . . .	99
5.2.8. Physiological pain portal block (Alpha Portal Block) . . . . .	100
5.2.9. Alpha Portal Block in cervical radiculopathy . . . . .	100
5.2.10. Role of AI in outcome analysis . . . . .	100
5.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	101
5.3.1. Sample size calculation (explained) formula used. . . . .	101
5.3.2. Exclusion criteria . . . . .	101
5.4. Observation and results . . . . .	102
5.5. Discussion . . . . .	107
5.6. Conclusion . . . . .	108
5.7. References . . . . .	109
<b>Chapter 6. Suprapatellar Versus Infrapatellar Tibial Nailing: AI-Assisted Outcome Comparison</b> . . . . .	113
Nikhil DUDHANI and Nitin S. PATIL	
6.1. Introduction. . . . .	114
6.2. Literature review. . . . .	116
6.2.1. Epidemiology and management of tibial shaft fractures . . . . .	116
6.2.2. IP tibial nailing . . . . .	116
6.2.3. SP tibial nailing . . . . .	117
6.2.4. Comparative studies: SP versus IP approach. . . . .	117
6.2.5. Role of AI in orthopedic outcome analysis. . . . .	118
6.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	118
6.3.1. Study design. . . . .	118
6.3.2. Study setting. . . . .	119
6.3.3. Study duration. . . . .	119
6.3.4. Inclusion criteria . . . . .	119
6.3.5. Exclusion criteria . . . . .	119
6.4. Observation and results. . . . .	120
6.5. Discussion . . . . .	127
6.6. Conclusion . . . . .	128
6.7. References . . . . .	129
<b>Chapter 7. AI-Based Functional Outcome Comparison of Nails in Unstable Intertrochanteric Femur Fracture</b> . . . . .	133
Chintalapuri Pranay Bhargav REDDY and Vikash A. SATRE	
7.1. Introduction. . . . .	133
7.2. Literature review. . . . .	136
7.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	138
7.3.1. Study configuration and design. . . . .	138
7.3.2. Quantity of the sample. . . . .	138

7.3.3. Sampling method . . . . .	139
7.3.4. Inclusion criteria . . . . .	139
7.3.5. Exclusion criteria . . . . .	140
7.3.6. Ethical considerations . . . . .	140
7.3.7. Surgical procedure . . . . .	140
7.4. Observation and results . . . . .	140
7.4.1. Age distribution . . . . .	140
7.5. Discussion . . . . .	147
7.6. Conclusion . . . . .	148
7.7. References . . . . .	149
<b>Chapter 8. Dynamic Condylar Screw Versus Long PFN in Subtrochanteric Fractures: An AI-Enhanced Study . . . . .</b>	<b>153</b>
Rutul D. PATEL and Nitin S. PATIL	
8.1. Introduction. . . . .	154
8.2. Literature review. . . . .	156
8.2.1. Subtrochanteric femur fractures . . . . .	156
8.2.2. Evolution of surgical management. . . . .	156
8.2.3. DCS. . . . .	157
8.2.4. LPFN . . . . .	157
8.2.5. Comparative studies: DCS versus long PFN . . . . .	157
8.2.6. The role of AI in fracture outcome analysis . . . . .	158
8.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	158
8.3.1. Study design. . . . .	158
8.3.2. Ethical approval. . . . .	158
8.3.3. Study duration. . . . .	159
8.3.4. Sample size . . . . .	159
8.4. Observation and results. . . . .	160
8.5. Discussion . . . . .	170
8.6. Conclusion . . . . .	171
8.7. References . . . . .	172
<b>Chapter 9. Mid-Shaft Humerus Fractures: AI-Supported Comparison of Fixation Methods . . . . .</b>	<b>175</b>
Syed Nadeem AHAMED and Jineshwar S. KAPALE	
9.1. Introduction. . . . .	175
9.2. Literature review. . . . .	178
9.2.1. Operative fixation: overview and evolution . . . . .	178
9.2.2. Comparative evidence: plating versus nailing . . . . .	179
9.2.3. Minimally invasive plating and bridge techniques . . . . .	180
9.2.4. Functional outcomes and patient-reported measures . . . . .	180

9.2.5. Complications and risk profiles . . . . .	180
9.2.6. Current gaps and future directions . . . . .	180
9.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	181
9.3.1. Study design . . . . .	181
9.3.2. Study site . . . . .	181
9.3.3. Study duration . . . . .	181
9.3.4. Sample size calculation . . . . .	182
9.3.5. Sample size of approximately 35 for each group . . . . .	182
9.3.6. Exclusion criteria . . . . .	183
9.3.7. Surgical procedures . . . . .	183
9.4. Observation and results . . . . .	183
9.5. Discussion . . . . .	191
9.6. Conclusion . . . . .	192
9.7. References . . . . .	192
<b>Chapter 10. ACL Reconstruction Using Peroneus Longus Versus Hamstring Graft: An AI-Based Outcome Study . . . . .</b>	<b>195</b>
Viradraj Shrinivas DESHMUKH and Nishant GAONKAR	
10.1. Introduction . . . . .	195
10.2. Literature review . . . . .	198
10.2.1. HT graft . . . . .	199
10.2.2. Flap of PLT grafts . . . . .	199
10.2.3. Comparative studies between PL and hamstring grafts . . . . .	199
10.2.4. Application of AI in outcome evaluation . . . . .	200
10.3. Materials and methods . . . . .	200
10.3.1. Study design . . . . .	200
10.3.2. Sample size calculation . . . . .	200
10.3.3. Sample selection and randomization . . . . .	202
10.3.4. Methods of data collection . . . . .	203
10.4. Observation and results . . . . .	203
10.5. Discussion . . . . .	210
10.6. Conclusion . . . . .	211
10.7. References . . . . .	211
<b>List of Authors . . . . .</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>Index . . . . .</b>	<b>219</b>