# Effect of Low Molecular Weight Heparin on Fracture Healing in a Stabilized Rat Femur Fracture Model

David J. Hak,<sup>1</sup> Rena L. Stewart,<sup>2</sup> Scott J. Hazelwood<sup>1</sup>

1Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of California, Davis, 4860 Y Street, Suite 3800, Sacramento, California 95817

2Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, Indiana

The purpose of this studywas to evaluate the effect of low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) on fracture healing in a standard stabilized rat femur fracture model. A closed, mid-diaphyseal transverse fracture was created in the right femur of Long-Evans rats after insertion of a 0.8-mm K-wire into the medullarycanal. Animals were randomized to receive either LMWH (70 units/kg dalteparin) oraninjection of normal saline daily for 2 weeks. Animals were sacrificed at 2, 3, and 6 weeks. Fracture healing was assessed by radiographs, histology, and mechanical testing. There were no significant differences between the control and LMWH groups in the percentage of animals with radiographic bridging callus at each time point. Histologicappearance of fracture healing was similar between the control and LMWH groups. There were no significant differences in the normalized mechanical properties of the control and LMWH groups at 2 and 3 weeks. At 6 weeks, the percent torque of the LMWH group was significantly greater than the control group ( $\mathbf{p}=0.0072$ ), however, there was no significant difference in the stiffness and energy absorption. Dalteparin, at the dosage used in this study, did not impair fracture healing in this standard stabilized rat femur fracture model.

## INTRODUCTION

Despite common usage, little is known about the effect of low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) on fracture healing. Street and colleagues have reported a significant delay in fracture healing following the administration of LMWH in an unstabilized rabbit rib fracture model. $_1$  Both standard heparin and LMWH have been shown to have deleterious effects on bone, causing osteoporo-sis, stimulating bone resorption, increasing calcium loss, and decreasing bone turnover. $_{2-9}$  Concern has also been raised that the impairment of bone formation by heparin may adversely effect integra-tion of porous ingrowth prostheses.  $_{10}$ 

Thromboembolic complications are the most common preventable cause of mortality and mor-bidity in the trauma patient.  $_{11-17}$  For this reason, the vast majority of trauma patients with orthope-dic injuries receive some form of thromboembolism prophylaxis, eitherbymechanical or pharmacolo-gical means, or both. Decisions regardling

throm-boembolism prophylaxis often requires physicians to weigh complex risks and benefits of different treatment options. A recent meta-analysis compared the efficacy ofheparin, warfarin, and LMWH and found LMWH to be superior in preventing thromboembolism. LMWH is easily administered and requires little or no laboratory monitoring. Therefore, LMWH has become a popular method of thromboembolism prophylaxis in the trauma patient. Because large numbers of trauma patients with lower extremity and pelvic fractures routinely receive LMWH prophylactically, it is imperative to consider whether LMWH may have an adverse impact on fracture healing.

## **METHODS**

Male Long-Evans rats, with a mean age of 13 weeks (range, 12–15weeks) and a mean bodyweight of 391 g (range, 346–434 g), were used. The study protocol was approved by the local Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, and all animal experimentation was carried out with adherence to NIH and the Committee guide-lines. All surgical procedures were performed under sterile operating conditions with the rats under general anesthesia (4% halothane inhalation followed by intra-peritoneal injection of 80 mg/kg ketamine hydrochloride and 8 mg/kg xylazine hydrochloride). A 1-cm lateral parapatellar incision was made and the patella displaced laterally to expose the distal femoral condyle of the right hind limb. A 0.8-mm diameter K-wire (Synthes, Paoli, PA) was inserted into the femoral canal in a retrograde fashion starting from the trochlear groove and advan-cing proximally through the greater trochanter until the distal end was flush with the femoral condyle. A small incision was then made over the greater trochanter and the K-wire was cut flush with the proximal end of the femur. The wounds were then irrigated and closed using 4.0 nylon suture. A closed, transverse, mid-shaft fracture was then created in the pinned femur using a three-point bending apparatus with a drop weight as describedbyBonnarens and Einhorn.20

Radiographs were taken immediately postoperatively to verifyproper intramedullary wire placement and fracture configuration. Any rats with comminuted frac-tures were excluded from the study. Animals were permitted full weight bearing and unrestricted movement upon awakening from anesthesia. Postoperative pain was controlled using a peritoneal injection of 0.05 mg/kg buprenorphine hydrochloride initially and oral buprenor-phine suspended ingelatin twice daily for 2 days.

The animals were randomized to either the LMWH group, receiving 70 units/kg dalteparin sodium (Fragmin, Pfizer, New York,NY), or to the control group, receiving thesame volume of normalsaline. The subcutaneous injections were administered once daily to alternate sites of the anterior abdominal wall for 14 days beginning on postoperative day 1. Animals were maintained for intervals of 2, 3, and 6 weeks. Euthanization was carried out with inhalation of carbon dioxide gas.

# Radiologic Evaluation

Standardized radiographs (Faxitron, Wheeling, IL) were performed using constant settings with the animal anesthetized and positioned pronewith both hind limbs fully abducted. They were obtained immediately post-operatively to confirm satisfactory fracture configuration and proper K-wire position. Similar radiographs were taken at the time of sacrifice, and fracture union was evaluated by two, blinded, independent observers. Fracture union was defined as the presence of bridging callus alongopposite cortices. In five cases when the reviewers differed in their interpretation, the classification of healed versus not healed was made by consensus agreement.

## Histological Evaluation

Four animals from each group and time point were randomly selected for histological analysis. The frac-tured femur was harvested and fixed in 4% paraformaledhyde in 0.1 M phosphate buffer for 24 h at 48C, and then defatted in methanol, decalcified with 10% formic acid in citrate for 4 days, and embedded in paraffin. All specimens had adequate soft callus to maintain the position of the proximal and distal fragments. Speci-mens were sectioned longitudinally in 4-tm sections and stained with hematoxolin and eosin. The degree of fracture healing was evaluated using a five-point qualitative scale proposedbyAllen et al.<sub>21</sub> According to this classification system, grade 4 represents com-plete bony union, grade 3 represents an incomplete bony union (presence of a small amount of cartilage in the callus), grade 2 represents a complete cartilaginous union (well-formed plate of hyaline cartilage uniting the fragments), grade 1 represents an incomplete cartilagi-nous union (retention of fibrous elements in the cartilaginous plate), and grade 0 indicates the formation of a pseudoarthrosis (most severe form of arrest in fracture repair).

## Mechanical Evaluation

The remaining specimens were subjected to mechanical testing. Following euthanasia, both the fractured femur and the intact femur on the contralateral side were dissected free of surrounding soft tissue and the intramedullary K-wire was removed. Sufficient soft callus was present in all specimens to maintain the relationship between the proximal and distal fragments. The specimens were centered in two colinerally positioned cylindrical pots and imbedded in Wood's metal (Alfa Aesar, Ward Hill, MA). The distal end of the femur was first positionedbycentering the long axis of the bone and securing it with Wood's metal. A custom jig was then used to position the proximal end of the femur for imbedding in the second cylindrical pot. The speci-mens were then mounted in a Frankel-Bursteinaxial torsion machine modified to operate under computer control.22 The standard swinging-pendulum mechanism was replaced with a

stepper motor (model 083062-1-8- 031-010, Parker Compumotor, Rohnert Park, CA). Rotational displacement was measured with a precision potentiometer (model 793341-14092, Gould Instrument Division, Cleveland, OH), and torque was measured with a 0.7 Nm torque cell (model 2105, Eaton Corpora-tion, Troy, MI). Specimens were tested in torsion at a rate of 50 degrees per minute through an arc of 45 degrees. Rotational displacement and torque data were collected at 60 Hertz using a digital data acquisition system (model K500A, Keithley Instruments, Cleveland, OH). Maximum torque to failure was measured directly from the data, and the torsional stiffness was calculated from the regression of the linear portion of the torque versus the angular displacement curve. The energy absorption to maximum torque was calculated as the area under the curve to the maximum value. All biomechanical measurements were repeated on the intact, contralateral femur in an identical manner. For each animal, the stiffness, maximum torque to failure, and energy absorption to maximum torque were each calculated as a percentage of the intact femur to allow for accurate comparison between animals.

# Statistical Analysis

A two-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the normalized data of the biomechanical properties to account for individual animal differences. The factors were the time point (2, 3, and 6 weeks) and the experimental group (control or LMWH). Significance was defined as  $\boldsymbol{p}$  values less than 0.05. When appro-priate, a Bonferroni-Dunn post hoc test was performed to determine differences between the factors at each time point.

#### **RESULTS**

Nine animals were excluded from the study. One animal died of unknown causes on postoperative day 1, and four others died of anesthetic complica-tions while undergoing radiographs. Four other animals were excluded because the the initial postoperative radiograph showed fracture comminution. No clinical evidence of infection was noted in any animals during this study.

## Radiologic Evaluation

A varying degree of callus was seen at 2 weeks, but none of the fractures showed clear evidence of bridging callus in either the control (Fig. 1A) or LMWH group (Fig. 1D). At 3 weeks, one-third (4/12) of the control group (Fig. 1B) and one-third (4/12) of the LMWH group (Fig. 1E) showed clear evidence of bridging callus on opposite cortices. At 6 weeks, 62% (8/13) of control group (Fig. 1C) and 67% (8/12) of LMWH group (Fig. 1F) showed clear evidence of bridging callus on opposite cortices.

# Histological Evaluation

Two weeks following fracture, both control (Fig. 2A) and LMWH (Fig. 2D) specimens had abundant callus formation. Newly formed woven bone (intramembranous ossification) surrounded the fracture peripherally, while abundant nonbrid-ging chondrocytes were present centrally. At 3 weeks, there was increased evidence of endochondral ossification in both the control (Fig. 2B) and LMWH (Fig. 2E) specimens. Chondrocyte areas were smaller, and some specimens showed evidence of partial bone bridging. At 6 weeks, there was further evidence of fracture healing in both the control (Fig. 2C) and LMWH (Fig. 2F) specimens, with complete replacement of chondrocytesby bridging bone in most specimens.

Histological grading of the fracture healing was similar between the control and LMWH groups. At 2 weeks, all specimens in both groups were graded 2. At 3 weeks, the fracture healing grade ranged from 2 to 3, with the mean being 2.5 in both groups. At 6 weeks, the fracture healing grade ranged from 3 to 4, with a control group mean of 3.5 and LMWH group mean of 3.75.

## Mechanical Testing

The means and standard deviations of the max-imum torque to failure, stiffness, and energy absorption to maximum torque are shown in Table 1. The maximum torque and stiffness of the control group fractured femurs increased between each time point, with the mean maximum torque and the mean stiffnessapproaching that of the intact femurs at 6 weeks. In the LMWH group, there was a less dramatic increase between 2 and 3 weeks, butby6 weeks the mean maximum torque and mean stiffness also approached that of the intact femurs. A post hoc power analysis of the mechanical data was performed. The power for the maximum torque and stiffness was >0.9, while the power for energy was 0.42.

To account for variation in animal size, the maximum torque, stiffness, and energy absorption values were normalized by the respective values of the contralateral intact femurs. The mean and standard deviations of the percent maximum torque, percent stiffness, and percent energy were calculated for each group (Fig. 3). There were no significant differences in the normalized mechan-ical properties of the control and LMWH groups at 2 and 3 weeks. At 6 weeks, the percent torque of the LMWH group  $(0.864\pm0.288)$  was significantly greater (p=0.0072) than the control group  $(0.609\pm0.165)$ , however, there was no significant difference in the stiffness and energy absorption.

### **DISCUSSION**

Street et al. reported a significant delay in fracture healing following the administration of enoxaparin in an unstabilized rabbit rib fracture model.¹ Fracture healing was assesed by histology, histo-morphometry, and immunohistochemistry at days 3, 7, and 14, and by mechanical testing at 21 days following fracture. At days 3, 7, and 14, they found fewer proliferating cells and fewer transforming pericytes in the medullary callus of the enoxaparin-treated rabbits. In the enoxaparin group, the histologic grade of fracture healing was reduced at days 7 and 14, and the mechanical properties were weaker at day 21 compared to the control animals. Because of Street and coworkers' finding that low molecular weight heparin impaired fracture healing, we investigated the use of dalteparin in a standard stabilized rat femur fracture model. In contrast to the findings of Street et al., in the current studywe found that administration of LMWH did not have any deleterious effect on fracture healing mechanical properties.

Other previous reports have also described deleterious effects of anticoagulants, in particular heparin, on bone repair. In 1956, Stinchfield et al. demonstrated that daily administration of standard heparin or warfarin significantly impaired fracture repair in rabbit and canine models.9 Several studies have also identified the long-term use of heparin as a risk factor for the development of osteoporosis in humans.2,4,5,7,8 Chowdhury et al. concluded that low doses of standard heparin directly stimulated bone resorption by increasing the number of differentiated osteoclasts and by enhancing the activity of individual osteoclasts.<sup>3</sup>

Several studies have suggested that LMWH may have less deleterious effects on bone homeostasis. In fetal rat calvaria culture, LMWH produced significantly less calcium loss than heparin.<sup>23</sup> Matzsch et al. demonstrated that LMWH stimulated bone resorption to a lesser degree than did heparin, although overall density decreased to a similar extent with both agents.7 In a study comparing 28 days of injection of either heparin or a LMWH (dalteparin), the rats treated with standard heparin showed a significant reduction in osteoid surface and mineral appostion rates, and seven of eight rats suffered spontaneous femoral fractures. In contrast, the rats treated with the LMWH showed minimal decreases in bone indices and no fractures.<sup>24</sup> Variable effects have been shown with different LMWH formulations. In one study, fondaparinux was shown to have higher mitochondrial activity and protein synthesis in osteoblasts compared to enoxaparin and unfractio-nated heparin.<sup>10</sup> While LMWH maynot produce osteoporosis to the same extent as standard heparin, concern remains regarding the effect of LMWH on bone healing. At supertherapeutic doses, LMWH has been shown to decrease cancel-lous bone volume as demonstrated by a lack of normal remodeling and repair in an in vitro bone nodule assay.<sup>25</sup> Supertherapeutic doses have also been shown to decrease the osteoid surface area and to decrease alkaline phosphatase activity in a dose-dependent manner.<sup>26</sup>

Because LMWH has a faster onset of action compared to warfarin, it is not surprising that a higher rate of surgical site hematomas has been observed with the use of LMWH in total hip arthroplasty.<sup>27</sup> The early use of LMWH in patients with fractures may preumably lead to a larger fracture site hematoma. It is generally accepted that fracture site hematoma plays a beneficial role in fracture healing. Mizuno et al. has shown that fracture site hematoma has osteogenic potential.<sup>28</sup> Several studies have shown that evacuation of this hematoma can be deleterious on fracture healing, especially when performed several days following fracture after the inflammatory phase has ended.<sup>29,30</sup> In contrast, Street et al. has shown that the high potassium concentration of fracture site hematoma is cytotoxic to endothelial cells and osteoblasts.<sup>31</sup> Only after these cytotoxic elements undergo resporption can the angiogenic and osteo-genic cytokines present in fracture hematoma function. Brighton and Hunt have described an area of architectural disruption and cell degrada-tion that diminishes with the distance from the hematoma.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, increased fracture site hematoma volume may have deleterious effects of fracture healing. Whereas in this studywe were unable toquantifyfracture hematoma volume, we did not observe any detrimental impact of short term administration of LMWH on fracture healing.

This studyhas anumber of limitations. Since the optimal duration of prophylaxis following trauma is undefined, we arbitrarily chose 14 days of LMWH administration to model its short term prophylactic use following pelvic or lower extremity trauma. We did not perform a dose-response study examining higher doses of dalteparin. The dose of dalteparin used in this study was based on the standard human dose and adjusted for animal weight. However, because of differences in metabolism, a higher dose may be required to obtain equivalent antithrombotic efficacy.<sup>33</sup> The standard prophylac-tic dose of dalteparin is 5,000 units daily, which for a 70-kg adult is approximately 70 units/kg. In comparison, Street et al., using a rabbit model, selected a daily enoxaparin dose of 2 mg, which based on animal weight was roughly 1 mg/kg. That dose is somewhat greater than the standard daily prophylactic enoxaparin dose of 40 mg, which equates to 0.57 mg/kg for a standard 70-kg adult. We did not evaluate any coagulation parameters during the study to determine what effect, if any, the administered dose of dalteparin was having on the animals coagulation system. We were also unable to quantifythe size of fracture site hema-toma to determine whether this was effected by the administration of dalteparin. While we examined the histology qualitatively, we did not perform a quantitative histomophometric analysis of the fracture callus. In the prior study, in which LMWH was found to delay fracture repair, enoxaparin was used, whereas in this investigation, we used dalteparin. While low molecular weight heparins have a similar mechanism of action, minor varia-tions between the different available products could affect their impact on fracture healing. Finally, there is no evidence that our standard rat femur fracture model offers any

applicability to human fracture healing.


#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This work was supported by a grant from the Orthopaedic Trauma Association.


## REFERENCES

- 1. Street JT, McGrath M, O'Regan K, et al. 2000. Thrombo-prophylaxis using a low molecular weight heparin delays fracture repair. Clin Orthop 381:278–289.
- 2. Avioli LV. 1975. Heparin-induced osteopenia:anappraisal. Adv Exp Med Biol 52:375–387.
- 3. Chowdhury MH, Hamada C, Dempster DW. 1992. Effects of heparin on osteoclast activity. J Bone Miner Res 7:77 1–777.
- 4. de Swiet M, Ward PD,FidlerJ,et al. 1983. Prolonged heparin therapy in pregnancy causes bone demineraliza-tion. Br J Obstet Gynaecol 90:1129–1134.
- 5. Griffith GC, Nichols G Jr, Asher JD, et al. 1965. Heparin osteoporosis. JAMA 193:85–88.
- 6. Jaffe MD, Willis PW III. 1965. Multiple fractures asso-ciated with long-term sodium heparin therapy. JAMA 193:152–154.
- 7. Matzsch T, Bergqvist D, Hedner U, et al. 1990. Effects of low molecular weight heparinand unfragmented heparin on induction of osteoporosis in rats. Thromb Res 63:505–509.
- 8. Mutoh S, Takeshita N, Yoshino T, et al. 1993. Character-ization of heparin-induced osteopenia in rats. Endocrinol-ogy 133:2743–2748.
- 9. Stinchfield RA, SankaranB, Samilson R. 1956. The effect of anticoagulation therapy on bone repair. J Bone Joint Surg[Am] 38:270–282.
- Matziolis Gm Perka C, Disch A, Zippel H. 2003. Effects of fondaparinus compared with dalteparin, enoxaparinand unfractionated heparin on human osteoblasts. Calcif Tissue Int 73:370–379.
- 11. Fitts WT, Lehr HB, Bitner RL, et al. 1964. An analysis of 950 fatal injuries. Surgery 56:663–668.
- 12. Geerts WH, CodeKI,JayRM, et al. 1994. A prospective studyof venous thromboembolism after major trauma. N Engl J Med 331:1601–1606.
- 13. Knudson MM, Collins JA, Goodman SB. 1992. Throm-boembolism following multiple trauma. J Trauma 32:1–11.
- 14. MontgomeryKD, Geerts MD, Potter HF, et al. 1996. Thromboembolic complications in patients with pelvic trauma. Clin Orthop 329:68–87.
- 15. O'MalleyKF, Ross SE. 1990. Pulmonary embolism in major trauma patients. J Trauma 30:748–750.
- 16. Sevitt S, Gallagher NG. 1961. Venous thrombosis and pulmonaryembolism: a clinico-pathological studyin injured and burn patients. Br J Surg 48:475–489.
- 17. Shackford SR, Davis JW, Hollingsworth-Fridlund P, et al. 1990. Venous thromboembolism in major trauma. Am J Surg 159:365–369.
- 18. Palmer AJ, Koppenhagen K, Kircholf B, et al. 1997. Efficacyand safety of low molecular weight heparin, unfractionated heparinand warfarin for thromboembolism prophylaxis in orthopaedic surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. Haemostasis 27:75–84.
- 19. Geerts WH, Jay RM, CodeKI,et al. 1996. A comparison of low-dose heparin with low-molecular-weight heparin as prophylaxis against venous thrombosis after major trauma. N Engl J Med 335:710–717.
- 20. Bonnarens F, Einhorn T. 1984. Production of a standard closed fracture in laboratory animal bone. J Orthop Res 2:97–101.
- 21. Allen HL, Wase A, BeanWT. 1980. Indomethicinand aspirin: effects of nonsteroidalanti-

- inflammatory agents on the rate of fracture repair in the rat. Acta Orthop Scand 51:595–600.
- 22. Burstein AH, Frankel VH. 1971. A standard test for laboratory animal bone. J Biomech 4: 155–158
- 23. Shaughnessy SG, Young E, Descamps P, et al. 1995. The effect of low molecular weightand standard heparin on calcium loss from fetal rat calvaria. Blood 86:1368–1373.
- 24. Nishiyama M, Fumiaki I, Arao U. 1997. Low-molecular-weight heparin (dalteparin) demonstrated a weaker effect on rat bone metabolism compared to heparin. Jpn J Pharmacol 74:59–68.
- 25. Bhandari M, HirshJ,Weitz JL, et al. 1998. Theeffects of standardand low molecular weight heparin on bone nodule formation in vitro. Thromb Haemost 80:413–417.
- 26. Muir JM, Hirsh J, Weitz JI, et al. 1997. A histomorpho-metric comparison of the effects of heparin and low-molecular weight heparin on cancellous bone in rats. Blood 89:3236–3242.
- 27. Francis CW, Pellegrini VD Jr, TottermanS, et al. 1997. Prevention of deep-vein thrombosis after total hiparthro-plasty. Comparison of warfarin and dalteparin. J Bone Joint Surg [Am] 79:1365–1372.
- 28. Mizuno K, Mineo K, Tachibana T, et al. 1990. The osteogenetic potential of fracture haematoma. Subperios-teal and intramuscular transplantation of the haematoma. J Bone Joint Surg[Br] 72:822–829.
- 29. Grundnes O, Reikera°sO. 1993. The importance of the hematoma for fracture healing in rats. Acta Orthop Scand 64:340–342.
- 30. Park S-H, Silva M, Bahk W-J, et al. 2002. Effect of repeated irrigation and debridement on fracture healing in ananimal model. J Orthop Res 20:1197–1204.
- 31. StreetJ, Winter D, Wang JH, et al. 2000. Is human fracture hematoma inherently angiogenic? Clin Orthop 378:224–237.
- 32. Brighton CT, Hunt RM. 1991. Early histological and ultrastructural changes in medullary fracture callus. J Bone Joint Surg[Am] 73:832–847.
- 33. Malm K, Dahlba¨ck B, Arnljots B. 2003. Low-molecular-weight heparin (dalteparin) effectively prevents thrombo-sis in a rat model of deeparterial injury. Plast ReconstrSurg 111: 1659–1666.




 $\label{eq:Figure 1.} \textbf{Figure 1.} \quad \text{Representative radiographs of controls (A-C) and LMWH-treated animals (D-F) obtained at 2 weeks (A, D), 3 weeks (B, E), and 6 weeks following surgery (C, F).$ 





**Figure 2.** Representative histological sections of controls (A-C) and LMWH-treated animals (D-F) at 2 weeks (A,D), 3 weeks (B,E), and 6 weeks (C,F). A similar pattern of fracture healing was seen in the control and LMWH groups.

Table 1. Mechanical Test Values and Standard Deviations of Fractured and Intact Femurs at 2, 3, and 6 Weeks

Time from Fracture	Specimen and Sample Size	Maximum Torque to Failure (Nm)	Stiffness (Nm/rad)	Energy Absorption to Maximum Torque (Nm rad)
2 weeks	Control—fracture $(n=7)$	$0.077 \pm 0.036$	$0.217 \pm 0.109$	$0.016 \pm 0.012$
	Control—intact $(n=7)$	$0.360\pm0.049$	$2.157\pm0.952$	$0.039 \pm 0.011$
	LMWH—fracture $(n=10)$	$0.110\pm0.052$	$0.505\pm0.396$	$0.024 \pm 0.026$
	LMWH—intact $(n = 10)$	$0.313\pm0.090$	$1.683 \pm 0.0500$	$0.055 \pm 0.025$
3 weeks	Control—fracture $(n=8)$	$0.156\pm0.054$	$0.795\pm0.485$	$0.030\pm0.015$
	Control—intact $(n=8)$	$0.403\pm0.037$	$3.292\pm0.831$	$0.042 \pm 0.012$
	LMWH—fracture $(n=8)$	$0.125\pm0.056$	$0.695 \pm 0.559$	$0.018 \pm 0.013$
	LMWH—intact $(n=8)$	$0.348 \pm 0.82$	$2.084 \pm 0.828$	$0.035\pm0.009$
6 weeks	Control—fracture $(n=9)$	$0.285\pm0.094$	$2.020\pm1.700$	$0.030\pm0.015$
	Control—intact $(n=9)$	$0.461 \pm 0.052$	$2.390 \pm 0.858$	$0.057 \pm 0.013$
	LMWH—fracture $(n=8)$	$0.343\pm0.111$	$2.113\pm1.177$	$0.042 \pm 0.019$
	LMWH—intact $(n=8)$	$\boldsymbol{0.402 \pm 0.049}$	$\boldsymbol{2.638 \pm 1.336}$	$\boldsymbol{0.042 \pm 0.009}$







**Figure 3.** Biomechanical properties of the control and LMWH group normalized by the respective values of the intact femurs. (A) Percent maximum torque (maximum torque to failure of fractured femur/nonfractured intact femur  $\times 100$ ). (B) Percent stiffness (stiffness of fractured femur/nonfractured intact femur  $\times 100$ ). (C) Percent energy (energy absorption to maximum torque/nonfractured intact femur  $\times 100$ ). The only significant difference between the LMWH and control groups was seen in the percent maximum torque at 6 weeks (\*p = 0.0072).