

# Are We Aware of the Risks of Children's Fractures From Bunk Beds?

Monica Y\*

Department of Medical Science, Bhutan

## Abstract

Children frequently suffer trauma as a result of falls from heights. On the other hand, BBR fractures are poorly understood. We were interested in learning more about the most common BBR fracture types and age ranges. Methods and Materials: From January 2014 to December 2021, we examined the medical records and imaging procedures of patients under the age of 18 who were treated in our department for a bunk bed injury. Demographic data were used to evaluate the age groups, mechanisms, types, and anatomical regions of fractures. 162 patients, ranging in age from 0 to 15, were included, with 59.9% being men. There were 80 fractures, representing 49.4 percent, and 49 contusions and abrasions, representing 30.2%. 44.8 percent of children under the age of three, 50.8 percent of children under the age of five, 58.5 percent of children under the age of six, and 28.5 percent of children under the age of ten were affected by BBR fractures. The clavicle (n = 13, 16.3 percent), humerus (n = 10, 12.5 percent), foot (n = 8, 10 percent), hand (n = 5, 6.3 percent), lower leg (n = 5, 6.3 percent), and skull (n = 5, 6.3 percent) were the most common fractures. One hundred twenty (79.6%) were closed fractures, 21 (13.0%) were open fractures, and 11 (6.9%) were fractures with internal fixation (n = 5) being the most common types. Parents ought to be aware that children and adolescents, particularly those under the age of 10, suffer a significant amount of severe trauma from bunk beds. Information and techniques for preventing BBR fractures that are supported by evidence would be beneficial to caregivers.

**Keywords:** Children; Mechanism; Fracture; Surgery

**Introduction:**

The majority of pediatric trauma visits to the emergency room are caused by falls from heights. For instance, an estimated 23,000 children between the ages of 6 and 9 in the United States receive treatment each year for injuries brought on by bunk beds. In industrialized nations, bunk beds are frequently installed in homes to save space in crowded urban areas. Even though guardrails and mandatory product safety standards have been established, serious injuries are still frequently reported. The US Consumer Product Safety Commission has recommended that the upper bunk be marked with a warning in order to prevent children under the age of six from using it. However, previous research has demonstrated that the majority of injuries to bunk beds (BBRs) still occur in this age group. Upper extremity fractures, which occur in two-thirds of BBR falls, account for up to 40% of all injuries [1-4]. Nearly six times as likely are these children to require hospitalization. However, there are not many data on BBR fractures.

**Findings:**

For instance, in addition to fractures of the upper or lower limbs, we discovered seven skull fractures, or 6% of the body. who found the same amount of skull fractures. A total of seven of the 218 children, or 3.2 percent, were able to recover from their skull fractures without experiencing any complications or neurological issues. Due to their higher center of gravity, young children typically fall head first, causing serious injuries. These injuries are now and again remembered to be undeniable. Because bunk beds caused children such severe trauma, standards were established decades ago. However, severe BBR injuries have been documented in previous reports. The purpose of this retrospective study was to investigate BBR fractures at tertiary trauma centers.

We found that 162 patients underwent imaging after a BBR injury. Men experienced 59.9% of all cases, according to the literature [7].

The incidence of fractures following an injury to a bunk bed ranges from 10% to 40%, according to reports; However, there are still relatively few papers that provide in-depth information on BBR fractures. We

found that 49% of the patients in our cohort broke something. Because we only included children on whom an imaging procedure was carried out, our number of fractures was higher than that of previous publications and could not be compared. In contrast, the majority of recent studies that look at all BBR injuries are not this way. assert that based on our findings, 78% of fractures affected the upper extremities. In 2008, 572,580 children and adolescents under the age of 21 who went to the emergency room for BBR issues were examined by the authors. 68% of those patients broke their upper limbs, and 19.9% of those patients broke something else. In addition, described the 40% fracture rate in Canada's emergency room visits for BBR injuries between 1990 and 2009. With 411 affecting the upper extremities and 340 causing a fracture, over 80% of the 934 incidents involving upper bunks were related to fractures. In our cohort, forearm fractures accounted for 43% of all fractures, followed by clavicle (16%), humerus (13%), foot (10%), hand (6%), lower leg (6%), skull (6%), and the femur in one child [8,9]. Lower-extremity injuries, such as strains and sprains, were more common in jumps from the bunk bed. On the other hand, the physiological attempts to absorb a fall with outstretched arms may have increased the risk of upper-extremity fractures, as previously discussed in studies on bunk bed injuries [10].

## Conclusion

The majority of children in this retrospective study broke their bones after being hurt on a bunk bed. Caregivers would benefit from information and strategies for preventing BBR fractures based on evidence.

## References

1. Lipsky BA, Pecoraro RE, Larson SA, Hanley ME, Ahroni JH (1990) Outpatient management of uncomplicated lower-extremity infections in diabetic patients. *Arch Intern Med* 150(4): 790-797.
2. Breen JD, Karchmer AW (1995) Staphylococcus aureus infections in diabetic patients. *Infect Dis Clin North Am* 9(1): 11-24.
3. Porrini E, Ruggenenti P, Mogensen CE, Barlovic DP, Praga M, et al. (2015) Non-proteinuric pathways in loss of renal function in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 3: 382-391.
4. Harjutsalo V, Groop PH (2014) Epidemiology and risk factors for diabetic kidney disease. *Adv Chronic Kidney Dis* 21: 260-266.
5. Hudish LI, Reusch JE, Sussel L (2019) Cell dysfunction during progression of metabolic syndrome to type 2 diabetes. *J Clin Invest* 129: 4001-4008.
6. Jung CH, Son JW, Kang S, Kim WJ, Kim H, et al. (2021) Diabetes fact sheets in Korea, 2020: An appraisal of current status. *Diabetes Metab J* 45: 1-10.
7. Koumakis E, Gossec L, Elhai M, Burki V, Durnez A, et al. (2012) Heel pain in spondyloarthritis: results of a cross-sectional study of 275 patients. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 30(4): 487-491.
8. Ozaras N, Havan N, Poyraz E, Rezvani A, Aydın T (2016) Functional limitations due to foot involvement in spondyloarthritis. *J Phys Ther Sci* 28(7): 2005-2008.
9. Hyslop E, McInnes IB, Woodburn J, Turner DE (2010) Foot problems in psoriatic arthritis: high burden and low care provision. *Ann Rheum Dis* 69(5): 928-963.
10. Malhotra R, Chan CS, Nather A (2014) Osteomyelitis in the diabetic foot. *Diabet Foot Ankle* 5: 24445-24456.