

## ISOLATED FRACTURES OF THE ATLAS IN ADULTS

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Standards: There is insufficient evidence to support treatment standards.

Guidelines: There is insufficient evidence to support treatment guidelines.

Options: Treatment options in the management of isolated fractures of the atlas are based on the specific atlas fracture type. It is recommended that isolated fractures of the atlas with an intact transverse atlantal ligament be treated with cervical immobilization alone. It is recommended that isolated fractures of the atlas with disruption of the transverse atlantal ligament be treated with either cervical immobilization alone or surgical fixation and fusion.

### RATIONALE

The atlas vertebra is subject to a variety of acute fracture injuries and may be associated with other cervical fracture and ligamentous traumatic injuries (3,8,25,26,31). While the treatment of atlas fractures in combination with other cervical fracture injuries is most commonly linked to the treatment of the associated injury (8), isolated fractures of the atlas occur with sufficient frequency to warrant review.

The medical literature addressing the management of fractures of the atlas was examined using evidence-based medicine techniques to determine the optimal treatment for isolated atlas fractures including: Isolated anterior or posterior arch fractures, anterior and posterior arch fractures (burst fractures), lateral mass fractures, comminuted fractures, and transverse process fractures.

## **SEARCH CRITERIA**

A National Library of Medicine computerized literature search from 1966 to 2001 was undertaken using Medical Subject Headings in combination with “vertebral fracture”: atlas and human. This strategy yielded 360 references. The abstracts were reviewed and articles addressing clinical management and follow-up of atlas fractures were selected for inclusion. The relative infrequency of these fractures, the small number of collected case series and the numerous case reports with pertinent information required rather broad inclusion and exclusion criteria. Several papers addressing relevant background information such as biomechanics and radiology were included. The bibliographies of the selected papers were also reviewed to provide additional references and to assess completeness of the literature review.

These efforts resulted in 32 manuscripts describing acute traumatic atlas fractures. Ten Class III articles, eight case series and two case reports documenting treatment of patients with atlas fractures are summarized in Evidentiary Table format. The remaining referenced 22 articles are included in the bibliography and contribute to the scientific foundation.

## **SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATION**

Atlas fractures account for approximately 1% to two % of all fractures of the human spinal column and roughly 2% to 13 % of all acute cervical spine fractures.(8,21,30)

The first known fracture of the atlas was demonstrated at autopsy by Cooper in 1822 and has been the subject of a series of historical publications.(28) In 1920, Jefferson reviewed 42 previously described cases of atlas fracture and added four new cases.(15) While his paper documents a variety of atlas fracture patterns, it is best known for the characterization of the “Jefferson fracture”, a burst fracture injury of the atlas ring.(10) In 1945 Hinchey and Bickel

added 112 cases of atlas fracture to the literature. Sherk and Nicholson summarized an additional 73 cases in 1970.(30)

Spence et al, in 1970 reported their findings of a study of the mechanism of atlas fracture and potential rupture of the transverse atlantal ligament.(31) Using ten cadaveric specimens, the authors studied the application of force required to fracture C1 and to rupture the transverse ligament (range 38 - 104 kg, mean 58 kg). The sum of the excursion of the C1 lateral masses over the C2 lateral masses following traumatic injury ranged from 4.8 to 7.6 mm (mean 6.3 mm). The authors concluded that if the sum of lateral mass displacement (LMD) of C1 over C2 on the anterior-posterior radiographic image is greater than 6.9 mm, then the transverse atlantal ligament is "probably torn". In a follow-up clinical and biomechanical study, Fielding et al confirmed these findings.(5) These two studies, completed in the pre-MRI era, are the basis for the widely quoted "rules of Spence" (i.e., > 6.9 mm LMD = transverse atlantal ligament disruption) offered to assist in the management of patients with isolated atlas fractures. Subsequently, Heller et al reported their observations on 35 open mouth odontoid films using calibration markings to assess radiographic magnification.(12) They found an 18% magnification factor on open mouth odontoid view x-rays. Applying this information to the evaluation of atlas burst fractures by means of the "rules of Spence" suggests that the sum of the lateral mass displacement measurement indicating atlantal transverse ligament disruption should be increased from 6.9 mm to 8.1 mm. This study pointed out the difficulty in using plain radiographic measurements to assess the integrity of the transverse atlantal ligament following acute traumatic atlas fracture.

Hadley et al reported a series of 57 patients with atlas fractures representing 6.6 % of their series of cervical fractures in 1988. They managed 32 patients with isolated atlas fractures, none of whom sustained neurological injury.(8) The authors based their treatment recommendations on the degree of LMD in each patient. Twelve patients had non-displaced atlas fractures. Of these, ten

were treated with a rigid collar, one with a soft collar and one with a suboccipital-mandibular immobilizer (SOMI). The duration of treatment for these patients was 8-12 weeks. Fifteen patients had LMD of less than seven mm. Eight were treated with a rigid collar, three with a SOMI and four with a halo immobilization brace for a duration of 10-12 weeks. The remaining five patients had LMD greater than seven mm and were managed with a halo orthosis. These five patients were treated for a duration of 12-16 weeks. Of the 32 patients, 29 were available for long-term follow-up, median 40 months. Three complained of neck pain. All were successfully treated. No patient required subsequent surgical fixation. The authors concluded that isolated fractures of the atlas are effectively managed with external immobilization alone for a period of 12 weeks (median duration). Atlas fractures with a LMD greater than 6.9 mm required more rigid immobilization (halo orthosis), than those with LMD less than 6.9 mm (cervical collar). Levine and Edward described their experience with 34 patients with isolated atlas fractures in 1991. They followed a similar treatment algorithm with similar success.(21)

Fowler et al reported a series of 48 consecutive atlas fracture patients representing 5.5% of all cervical fractures in their experience.(6) In their series, 33% of their patients had other associated cervical spine fractures. Atlas fractures were divided into burst (n = 30), posterior arch (n = 17) and anterior arch fractures (n = 1). None of the patients with an isolated atlas fracture presented with neurologic deficit. These authors suggested treatment with closed traction reduction of isolated atlas fractures if the LMD is greater than 7.0, followed by immobilization in a rigid collar. No patient in this series underwent surgical fixation. All were effectively treated with this management scheme at last follow up, although the duration of treatment was not specified. In 1991 Kesterson et al reported their series of 17 cases of atlas fractures.(16) Thirteen were isolated atlas fractures and were considered stable. All were successfully managed with rigid cervical immobilization (nine collar, one SOMI, one halo, two Minerva). Again, the duration of treatment

was not specified. Several other authors have described the successful treatment of isolated atlas fractures with rigid cervical immobilization employing similar management principles (9,13,20,29,32).

Landells and Van Peteghem described a series of thirty-five patients with atlas fractures comprising 4.7 % of their institutional experience with acute cervical fracture injuries.(18) The authors categorized atlas fractures into three types. Type I fractures involved a single arch and occurred in sixteen of their thirty-five patients. Type II fractures were burst fractures and represented 13 of the 35 isolated fractures they treated. Type III fractures were atlas lateral mass fractures identified in six of the 35 patients. The authors used the original "rules of Spence" to assist with the identification of stability and noted four patients with LMD greater than 6.9 mm. Regardless of the fracture type or stability, all fractures except one were initially treated with external immobilization for an unreported length of time. The one exception was a patient with a Type I fracture who underwent early surgery with C1-2 wiring and fusion. The reason for the exception is not made clear in the text. Only one of 34 patients treated with external immobilization required surgery for late instability. The authors observed no relationship between successful treatment and the amount of initial lateral mass displacement. They recommended that atlas fractures be initially treated with rigid external immobilization. They noted that late instability can occur and recommended clinical follow-up of these patients.

Clinically observed atlas fracture patterns can be reproduced in cadaveric experimental models of axial loading.(11) In a series of biomechanical studies, Panjabi and Oda reproduced these atlas fracture patterns with axial loading and found that the burst fracture was associated with post-injury hypermobility at C1-C2. They described a 42 % increase in flexion-extension motion, a 24 % increase in lateral bending and a five % increase in axial rotation.(24-26) They found that in all instances of transverse atlantal ligament disruption, the atlanto-dental interval was greater than

three mm. The authors concluded that the atlanto-dental interval was the most reliable predictor of transverse ligament disruption in adults following acute C1 fracture.

McGuire and Harkey in 1995 described two cases of unstable atlas burst fractures treated with surgical fixation and fusion.(22) The fractures were felt to be unstable based on a predental space greater than five mm, and lateral mass displacement greater than nine mm, respectively. Both were treated with posterior C1-2 transarticular screw fixation and fusion with good result. The authors reported that transarticular screw fixation obviated the need for halo immobilization post-operatively. Several other authors have reported successful surgical fixation and fusion for atlas fractures when associated with disruption of the transverse ligament with resultant instability.(17,18,27) These few patients were treated with posterior C1-C2 wiring and fusion procedures and were managed in rigid orthoses (halo, Guilford brace) for 12-16 weeks post-operatively.

More recently it has been proposed that magnetic resonance imaging is a more sensitive indicator of transverse atlantal ligament disruption than the "rules of Spence".(3,4,7) Dickman et al described two types of isolated transverse atlantal ligament injuries they identified on MR imaging: Type I, in which the substance of the ligament is injured without associated fracture of the atlas, and Type II, which involves an avulsion fracture of the atlas at the insertion of the transverse atlantal ligament.(3) The authors concluded that patients with Type I injuries be treated with early surgical fixation due to the inherent instability at C1-C2 following ligamentous disruption. They favor rigid external immobilization for patients with Type II ligament fracture injures. Applying MR imaging to their series of 39 patients with atlas and/or axis fractures, the authors reported that the use of standard cervical radiographs and the "rules of Spence" would have failed to identify 60% of the fractures they found with associated disruption of the transverse atlantal ligament (as determined by MR).(4)

More recently, Lee, Green and Petrin described 16 patients with atlas fractures.(20) These included six isolated anterior or posterior arch fractures (Landell's Type I), four burst fractures (Landell's Type II) and six lateral mass fractures (Landell's Type III). Twelve of the 16 fracture injuries were isolated atlas fractures and were judged to be stable as determined by integrity of the transverse ligament either by MR imaging or by lateral mass displacement criteria. All 12 were successfully treated with rigid collar immobilization for 10-12 weeks. The authors recommended a treatment algorithm of cervical immobilization for stable atlas fractures, and surgical fixation and fusion for unstable atlas fractures and unstable C1-C2 combination fracture injuries. Their series, however, did not include any patient with an unstable isolated atlas fracture, nor any patient with an isolated atlas fracture who required surgical management.

Unusual isolated atlas fractures have been described in the literature, often as radiographic curiosities.(1,11,14,19,23) In none of the cases in which clinical information was provided, was surgical treatment necessary. Fractures of the transverse process of the atlas have been described, including one of the cases described by Jefferson in 1920.(2,15) Although injury to the vertebral artery has been associated with fractures through the C1 transverse foramen, the bony C1 injury has not required surgical fixation and has been treated with immobilization alone.

## **SUMMARY**

There are no Class I or Class II studies which address the management of patients with isolated atlas fractures. All of the articles reviewed described case series or case reports providing Class III evidence supporting several treatment strategies for patients with acute C1 fracture injuries.

Isolated anterior or posterior atlas arch fractures and fractures of the atlas lateral mass have been effectively treated with external cervical immobilization devices. Rigid collars, SOMI braces

and halo ring-vest orthosis have all been utilized for a duration of treatment of 8-12 weeks with good result. No study has provided evidence for using one of these devices over the other.

Combined anterior and posterior arch fractures of the atlas (burst fractures) with an intact transverse atlantal ligament (implying C1-C2 stability) have been effectively managed with use of a rigid collar, a SOMI brace, or a halo orthosis for a duration of 10-12 weeks.

Combined anterior and posterior arch fractures of the atlas (burst fractures) with evidence of transverse atlantal ligament disruption have been effectively treated with either rigid immobilization alone (halo orthosis) for a period of 12 weeks, or surgical stabilization and fusion. The type of C1-C2 internal fixation and fusion procedure performed may influence the need for and duration of post-operative immobilization.

Criteria proposed to determine transverse atlantal ligament injury with associated C1-C2 instability include: Sum of the displacement of the lateral masses of C1 on C2 of greater than 8.1 mm on plain films (“rules of Spence” corrected for magnification), a predental space of greater than 3.0 mm in adults, and magnetic resonance imaging evidence of ligamentous disruption or avulsion.

**Table:**

<b>Atlas Fracture Type</b>	<b>Treatment Options</b>
Anterior or posterior arch fractures	Collar
Anterior and posterior arch (burst) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stable (transverse atlantal ligament intact)</li> <li>- Unstable (transverse atlantal ligament disrupted)</li> </ul>	Collar, Halo Halo, C1-2 Stabilization and fusion
Lateral mass fractures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comminuted fracture</li> <li>- Transverse process fractures</li> </ul>	Collar, Halo Collar

## **KEY ISSUES FOR FUTURE INVESTIGATION**

The ability to identify the atlas fracture types at greatest risk of non-union and subsequent instability is a key issue in determining appropriate management. Prospective data collection generating case-control studies at multiple institutions would be feasible and useful in examining this issue. The relative infrequency of isolated atlas fractures would make a randomized study less likely to be implemented. A uniform and clinically useful definition of instability in association with isolated atlas fractures would be of benefit. The subgroup of patients with isolated atlas fractures with transverse ligament disruption that can be managed either by external immobilization alone or surgical fixation and fusion should be examined in terms of long-term success, economic benefit, patient satisfaction and return to pre-injury activities. The relatively few patients with atlas fractures treated with surgical stabilization and fusion described in the literature limits the ability to address these issues at present.

## EVIDENTIARY TABLE

First Author Reference	Description of Study	Data Class	Conclusions
Lee TT et al, 1998, <i>Spine</i>	Retrospective review including 12 cases of isolated atlas fracture	Class III	All treated successfully with external immobilization. Treatment algorithm proposed: Stable - treat with collar 12 weeks Unstable- proposes surgical fixation (Instability defined as lateral mass displacement greater than seven mm or MRI evidence of transverse ligament disruption)
McGuire RA and Harkey HL, 1995, <i>J Spinal Disord</i>	Two cases of unstable atlas burst fracture treated with posterior transarticular screw fixation and fusion	Class III	Considered unstable based on a predental space greater than five mm and a LMD greater than nine mm. Both treated successfully. A cervical collar was used post-operatively.
Levine AM and Edwards CC, 1991, <i>J Bone Joint Surg (Am)</i>	Retrospective review of 34 patients with atlas fractures Median followup 4.5 years	Class III	If lateral mass displacement less than seven mm (collar) and with greater than seven mm either halo alone or reduced in traction and maintained until healed (6 weeks in traction and six weeks in halo) No patients treated surgically
Kesterson L et al, 1991, <i>J Neurosurg</i>	Retrospective review including 13 patients with isolated atlas burst (Jefferson) fracture	Class III	All successfully treated with immobilization.
Fowler JL et al, 1990, <i>J Spinal Disord</i>	Retrospective review of 48 consecutive atlas fractures divided into burst (30), posterior arch (17) and anterior arch fractures (1)	Class III	Authors suggest reduction by traction if LMD greater than 7.0, followed by collar. No patients underwent surgical fixation.
Hadley MN et al, 1988, <i>Neurosurgery</i>	Retrospective review including 32 isolated fractures of the atlas. Median follow-up 40 months on 29 of 32.	Class III	The following treatment patterns were recognized: LMD greater than seven mm (5 patients) treated with Halo, LMD 0 to seven mm (15 patients) - four treated in halo, 11 treated in SOMI, LMD none (12 patients) treated in rigid collar. None of these isolated C1 fractures sustained neurologic injury or required surgery. 3 complained of neck pain otherwise all were successfully treated. Authors recommendation: Isolated C1 fractures can be managed without early surgical fixation. If the LMD is greater than 6.9 mm then Halo immobilization is indicated.

First Author Reference	Description of Study	Data Class	Conclusions
Landells CD and VanPeteham PK, 1988, <i>Spine</i>	Retrospective review of 35 patients with fracture of the atlas.	Class III	The authors outline a classification scheme: Type I - single arch (16)- most prevalent and most often associated with other fractures Type II - burst fracture (13) - most often in isolation only one of 13 with deficit, Type III - lateral mass fracture (6) Treatment not standard but 34 patients were treated with rigid external immobilization. Only one patient treated with early surgery (Type I fracture treated with C1-2 fusion). One patient required surgery in followup. 56 % of patients reported significant symptoms at one year (neck pain, scalp dysesthesias). Authors argue for conservative measures with traction and immobilization with careful follow-up.
Segal LS et al , 1987, <i>J Bone Joint Surg (Am)</i>	Retrospective review including eight isolated atlas fracture. Median follow-up 46 months.	Class III	Two of four patients with a comminuted fracture, described as a unilateral avulsion of the transverse ligament attachment and adjacent arch fracture, developed a non-union and remained symptomatic at follow-up. The authors recommend these patients be considered for the "most effective immobilization". None of the patients underwent surgical fixation.
Kornberg M , 1986, <i>Orthop Rev</i>	Report of single case of unstable atlas burst fracture.	Class III	Author feels fusion appropriate for unstable burst fractures of the atlas (LMD - greater than 6.9 mm) and describes a case of posterior arch disruption in which they were still able to perform C1-2 posterior fusion as one arch remained connected to lateral mass.
Schlicke LH and Callahan RA, 1981, <i>Clin Orthop</i>	Report of a single case of unstable atlas burst fracture.	Class III	Case of unstable burst fracture of the atlas with LMD of 12 mm. The authors propose a treatment algorithm of considering surgery for disruption of the transverse ligament (LMD greater than 6.9 mm).

## REFERENCES

- 1 Barker EG, Jr., Krumpelman J, Long JM: Isolated fracture of the medial portion of the lateral mass of the atlas: a previously undescribed entity. *Am J Roentgenol* 126:1053-8, 1976.
- 2 Contostavlos DL: Massive subarachnoid hemorrhage due to laceration of the vertebral artery associated with fracture of the transverse process of the atlas. *J Forensic Sci* 16:40-56, 1971.
- 3 Dickman CA, Greene KA, Sonntag VK: Injuries involving the transverse atlantal ligament: classification and treatment guidelines based upon experience with 39 injuries (see comments). *Neurosurgery* 38:44-50, 1996.
- 4 Dickman CA, Sonntag VK: Injuries involving the transverse atlantal ligament: classification and treatment guidelines based upon experience with 39 injuries (letter, comment). *Neurosurgery* 40:886-7, 1997.
- 5 Fielding JW, Cochran GVB, Lawsing JF et al.: Tears of the transverse ligament of the atlas: a clinical and biomechanical study. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery* 56-A:1683-1691, 1974.
- 6 Fowler JL, Sandhu A, Fraser RD: A review of fractures of the atlas vertebra. *J Spinal Disord* 3:19-24, 1990.
- 7 Greene KA, Dickman CA, Marciano FF et al.: Transverse atlantal ligament disruption associated with odontoid fractures. *Spine* 19:2307-14, 1994.
- 8 Hadley MN, Dickman CA, Browner CM et al.: Acute traumatic atlas fractures: management and long term outcome. *Neurosurgery* 23:31-5, 1988.
- 9 Han SY, Witten DM, Mussleman JP: Jefferson fracture of the atlas. Report of six cases. *J Neurosurg* 44:368-71, 1976.

- 10 Hays MB, Alker GJ, Jr.: Fractures of the atlas vertebra. The two-part burst fracture of Jefferson. *Spine* 13:601-3, 1988.
- 11 Hays MB, Bernhang AM: Fractures of the atlas vertebra. A three-part fracture not previously classified. *Spine* 17:240-2, 1992.
- 12 Heller JG, Viroslav S, Hudson T: Jefferson fractures: the role of magnification artifact in assessing transverse ligament integrity. *J Spinal Disord* 6:392-6, 1993.
- 13 Highland TR, Saliccioli GG: Is immobilization adequate treatment of unstable burst fractures of the atlas? A case report with long-term follow-up evaluation. *Clin Orthop*, \_\_:196-200, 1985.
- 14 Jakim I, Sweet MB, Wisniewski T et al.: Isolated avulsion fracture of the anterior tubercle of the atlas. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 108:377-9, 1989.
- 15 Jefferson G: Fractures of the atlas vertebra: report of four cases and a review of those previously reported. *British Journal of Surgery* 7:407-422, 1920.
- 16 Kesterson L, Benzel E, Orrison W et al.: Evaluation and treatment of atlas burst fractures (Jefferson fractures). *J Neurosurg* 75:213-20, 1991.
- 17 Kornberg M: Atypical unstable burst fracture of the atlas. Treated by primary atlantoaxial fusion. *Orthop Rev* 15:727-9, 1986.
- 18 Landells CD, Van Peteghem PK: Fractures of the atlas: classification, treatment and morbidity. *Spine* 13:450-2, 1988.
- 19 Lee C, Woodring JH: Unstable Jefferson variant atlas fractures: an unrecognized cervical injury. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 12:1105-10, 1991.
- 20 Lee TT, Green BA, Petrin DR: Treatment of stable burst fracture of the atlas (Jefferson fracture) with rigid cervical collar. *Spine* 23:1963-7, 1998.
- 21 Levine AM, Edwards CC: Fractures of the atlas. *J Bone Joint Surg (Am)* 73:680-91, 1991.

- 22 McGuire RA, Jr., Harkey HL: Primary treatment of unstable Jefferson's fractures. *J Spinal Disord* 8:233-6, 1995.
- 23 Merianos P, Tsekouras G, Koskinas A: An unusual fracture of the atlas. *Injury* 22:489-90, 1991.
- 24 Oda T, Panjabi MM, Crisco JJD et al.: Multidirectional instabilities of experimental burst fractures of the atlas. *Spine* 17:1285-90, 1992.
- 25 Oda T, Panjabi MM, Crisco JJD et al.: Experimental study of atlas injuries. II. Relevance to clinical diagnosis and treatment. *Spine* 16:S466-73, 1991.
- 26 Panjabi MM, Oda T, Crisco JJD et al.: Experimental study of atlas injuries. I. Biomechanical analysis of their mechanisms and fracture patterns. *Spine* 16:S460-5 1991.
- 27 Schlicke LH, Callahan RA: A rational approach to burst fractures of the atlas. *Clin Orthop* \_\_:18-21 1981.
- 28 Segal LS, Grimm JO, Stauffer ES: Non-union of fractures of the atlas. *J Bone Joint Surg (Am)* 69:1423-34, 1987.
- 29 Seljeskog EL: Non-operative management of acute upper cervical injuries. *Acta Neurochir* 41:87-100, 1978.
- 30 Sherk HH, Nicholson JT: Fractures of the atlas. *J Bone Joint Surg (Am)* 52:1017-24, 1970.
- 31 Spence KF, Jr., Decker S, Sell KW: Bursting atlantal fracture associated with rupture of the transverse ligament. *J Bone Joint Surg (Am)* 52:543-9, 1970.
- 32 Zimmerman E, Grant J, Vise WM et al.: Treatment of Jefferson fracture with a halo apparatus. Report of two cases. *J Neurosurg* 44:372-5, 1976.