

DAFTAR REFERENSI

1. Herring, J.A. Tachdjian's Pediatric Orthopaedics 5th Edition Volume 1. Elsevier Saunders. 2014. p. 1265 – 1305.
2. Hussein Y.T. et al. Comparative study of surgical treatment of supracondylar humerus fractures Gartland's extension type III in children by closed reduction and pinning versus open reduction and pinning methods. *Int J Adv Res Biol Sci.* 2018.; 5(10): 162–8
3. Choi P.D. et al. Percutaneous pinning of supracondylar fractures of the humerus. In: *Operative techniques in pediatric surgery*, Flynn J.M. (Eds). Lippincott Williams and Wilkins. 2011. P. 25 – 32.
4. Flynn J.M. et al. The operative managements of pediatric fractures of the upper extremity. *J. Bone Joint Surg. Am.* 2002 .84:2078-2089,
5. Dabis J, Daly K, Gelfer Y . Supracondylar Fractures of the Humerus in Children- Review of Management and Controversies. *Orthop Muscular Syst .* 2016. 5: 206
6. Ozan F. et.al. Type III Supracondylar Humerus Fracture in Children : Open reduction and Pinning. *Journal of Clinical and Analytical Medicine.* 2015. p. 783-7
7. Smajic N. et.al. Correlation Between Bauman's and Carrying Angle in Children with Supracondylar Fracture of Humerus. *Med Arh.* 2013 Jun ; 67(3): 195-7
8. Biradar RK, Khan SA. Intraoperative assessment of Baumann's angle and carrying angles are very good prognostic predictors in the treatment of type III supracondylar humerus fractures in children. *Al Ameen J Med Sci* 2017; 10(1) : 64-70
9. Goldfarb CA et al. Elbow Radiographic Anatomy: Measurement Techniques and Normative Data. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2012 September ; 21(9): 1236–1246.
10. Shrestha AK. et.al. Functional and radiological outcome after closed reduction and percutaneous pinning versus open reduction internal fixation

in displaced supracondylar fractures in children. Journal of Society of Surgeons of Nepal. 2016. p. 21-7

11. Ozkoc G. et.al. Displaced supracondylar humeral fractures in children : open reduction vs. closed reduction and pinning. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg (2004) 124 : 547-551
12. James D. Gajendran M. Paraseth TK. Functional and radiological correlation in surgically managed severe supracondylar humerus fracture in a pediatric cohort using pediatric outcomes data collection instrument upper extremity scale : A report from a level V trauma center in rural Central India. Chrismed Journal of Health Research. 2017. p.43-8
13. Gowda PM. Mohammed N. A Study of Supracondylar Fractures of Humerus in Children by Open Reduction and Internal Fixation with Kirschner Wires. Indian Journal of Clinical Practice, vol. 25 No.6, November 2015. P.572-6
14. Pathania VP. Dubey N. Gupta S. Treatment of Displaced Supracondylar Fracture of Humerus in Children by Lateral Entry Pinning versus Cross Pinning. International Journal of Scientific Study. Vol.4. 2016. p. 70-4
15. Marquis CP. Et.al. Supracondylar fractures of the humerus. Current Orthopaedics. 2008. p.62-9
16. Kumar V. Singh A. Fracture Supracondylar Humerus : A Review. Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research. 2016. Vol. 10(12). p. 1-6
17. Brubacher JW. Dodds SD. Pediatric supracondylar fractures of the distal humerus. Current Rev Musculoskeletal Med. 2008. p.190-6
18. Vaquero A. et.al. Management of supracondylar fractures of the humerus in children. EOR. Volume 3. 2018. p.526-40
19. Hasegawa M. et.al. Reliability and Validity of Radiographic Measurement of the Humerus-Elbow-Wrist Angle in Healthy Children. JBJS Open Access. 2017. p.1-7
20. Ersan O. Et.al. Treatment of supracondylar fractures of the humerus in children through an anterior approach is a safe and effective method. International Orthopaedics (SICOT). 2009. 33. P.1371-5

21. Omid R. Choi PD. Skaggs DL. Supracondylar Humeral Fractures in Children. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2008 ; 90. p.1121-32
22. Tiwari A. Surgical management for late presentation of supracondylar humeral fracture in children. *Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery.* 2007 ;15(2). p.177-82
23. Pretorius JL. et.al. Outcome of displaced supracondylar fractures in children after manipulation and backslab. *SA Orthopaedic Journal Summer.* Vol 14. No.4. 2015. p.35-41
24. Ozkul E. et.al. Surgical treatment outcome for open supracondylar humerus fractures in children. *Acta Orthop. Belg.* 2013. p.509-13
25. Kim TJ. Sponseller PD. Pediatric Supracondylar Humerus Fracture. *J Hand Surg Am.* Vol. 39. 2014. p. 2308-11
26. Maity A. Saha D. Roy DS. A prospective randomised, controlled clinical trial comparing medial and lateral entry pinning with lateral entry pinning for percutaneous fixation of displaced extension type supracondylar fractures of the humerus in children. *Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research.* 2012. p.1-8
27. Vikas. Singh J. Verka PS. Relevance of baumann's angle with complications after management of supracondylar fractures of humerus in children. *Indian Journal of Orthopaedics Surgery.* 2016 ;2(4). p.356-61
28. C. David. et.al. Child Development and Pediatric Sport and Recreational Injuries by Age. *Journal of Athletic Training.* 2014;49(6). p.780-5
29. Simic IM. et.al. Radiographic Assesment in The Treatment of Supracondylar Humerus Fractures in Children. *Acta Inform Med.* 2012 Sep; 20(3). p.154-9
30. Bojovic N. Supracondylar fracture of the humerus in children. *Acta Medica Medianae.* Vol 51(3). 2012. p. 5-12

Lampiran 1 : Rekomendasi persetujuan Etik

Lampiran 2 : Data pasien penelitian

No	Age (yo)	JK	Dominan Hand	Injured Hand	Type	Perform	Baumann angle	Loss of carrying angle (o)	Result
1	5	L	R	R	III	Open	76	2	Excellent
2	10	L	L	R	II	Closed	82	2	Excellent
3	5	L	R	L	III	Open	68	2	Excellent
4	3	L	R	R	II	Closed	62	4	Excellent
5	8	P	R	L	III	Closed	72	2	Excellent
6	6	L	R	R	III	Open	72	2	Excellent
7	7	P	R	R	III	Open	68	12	Fair
8	9	L	R	L	III	Open	68	4	Excellent
9	5	P	R	R	II	Closed	72	6	Good
10	4	P	R	L	III	Open	92	12	Fair
11	7	L	R	L	II	Closed	78	2	Excellent
12	8	L	L	R	III	Open	78	2	Excellent
13	6	L	R	R	III	Open	68	2	Excellent
14	7	P	R	R	III	Open	60	10	Good
15	6	P	R	R	III	CRPP	72	2	Excellent
16	3	P	R	L	II	Closed	66	4	Excellent
17	8	L	R	L	III	Open	62	2	Excellent
18	7	L	R	L	II	Closed	74	0	Excellent
19	5	L	R	L	II	Closed	66	6	Good
20	6	P	R	L	II	Closed	76	0	Excellent
21	10	P	R	L	III	Open	88	16	Poor
22	6	P	R	R	II	Closed	74	0	Excellent
23	3	L	R	L	III	Open	82	12	Fair
24	9	L	R	L	III	Open	76	14	Fair
25	8	L	R	L	III	Open	72	4	Excellent
26	10	L	R	L	III	Open	74	2	Excellent
27	5	P	R	L	III	Open	76	0	Excellent
28	7	L	R	L	III	Open	82	18	Poor
29	6	L	R	L	III	Open	76	2	Excellent
30	4	L	R	L	II	Closed	74	0	Excellent

Lampiran 3. Hasil analisis data

Analisis Data CRPP dan ORIF

Catatan:

- Analisis data menggunakan SPSS versi 25
- Uji statistik yang digunakan adalah *Kappa*, *Fisher Exact*, *Independent-t* dan *Pearson's Correlation*
- Hasil uji statistik signifikan jika nilai $p < 0,05$

Hasil Analisis

1. Diskriptif

Sebaran kategori kareakteristik demografis subyek diperlihatkan pada tabel-tabel berikut.

Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	19	63,3
Female	11	36,7
Total	30	100,0

Age (years)

Age (years)	Frequency	Percent
3-4	5	16,7
5-6	11	36,7
7-8	9	30,0
9-10	5	16,7
Total	30	100,0

Dominan Hand

Dominan Hand	Frequency	Percent
Right	28	93,3
Left	2	6,7
Total	30	100,0

2. Perbandingan CRPP dengan ORIF


Correlation of Radiological Alignment and Functional Outcome

Variables	Statistics	Radiological Alignment (Baumann's Angle)
Functional Outcome	Pearson Correlation	0,491
(Loss of Motion)	P	0,006
	N	30

Pearson's Correlation test

Keterangan:

Terdapat korelasi positif yang signifikan antara Bowmann's Angle dengan skor LM, dimana semakin besar Bowmann's Angle semakin tinggi skor LM ($p < 0,01$)



Correlation of Radiological Alignment and Functional Outcome

Comparison of Baumann Angle with fixation type

Fixation	Mean	SD	p
CRPP	72,3	5,5	0,470
ORIF	74,3	8,3	

Independent-t test

Keterangan:

Mean Bowmann's Angle terlihat lebih tinggi pada ORIF (74,3) dibandingkan pada CRPP (72,3) namun secara statistik tidak signifikan ($p>0,05$). Pada gambar dibawah ini terlihat nilai Bowmann's Angle pada kedua kelompok overlapping, sehingga dianggap tidak berbeda signifikan

Outcome According To Flynn's Criteria and Type of Fixation

Flynn's Criteria for Loss of Motion		Fixation		Total	P
		CRPP	ORIF		
Satisfactory	Excellent	9	8	17	0,255
	Good	3	4	7	
	Fair	0	3	3	
Unsatisfactory	Poor	0	3	3	
Total		12	18	30	

Fisher Exact test

Keterangan:

Tidak terdapat hubungan signifikan antara LM (berdasarkan kriteria Flynn) dengan jenis tindakan ($p>0,05$). Sebagian besar subyek (27 dari 30) pada kedua kelompok sampel termasuk dalam kategori satisfactory

Comparison of Loss of Motion with fixation type

Variabel	Fixation	N	Mean	SD	p
Loss of Motion	CRPP	12	4,1	2,0	0,026
	ORIF	18	8,0	6,5	

Independent-t test

Keterangan:

Mean skor LM signifikan lebih tinggi pada ORIF dibandingkan pada CRPP, yaitu 8,0 dibandingkan 4,1 ($p<0,05$)

Hasil diatas diperlihatkan pada gambar berikut.

