ANATOMICAL "SAFE ZONES" FOR HARDWARE PLACEMENT IN COMPLEX PELVIC AND SPINAL FRACTURES: A 2026 CLINICAL REVIEW

Rohit Krishnan M K
Assistant Department of Anatomy
Fergana Medical Institute of Public Health Fergana, Uzbekistan
rohitkrishna743@gmail.com

Abstract: *Surgical management of complex pelvic and spinal fractures has evolved significantly with the integration of patient-specific morphometry and advanced navigation technologies. The identification of "safe zones"—anatomical corridors that permit stable hardware fixation while avoiding critical neurovascular structures—is the cornerstone of successful outcomes. In 2026, research has shifted from generalized anatomical guidelines to high-precision, AI-driven, and gender-specific models. This review synthesizes current evidence on the Ramadanov–Zabler Safe Zone for sacroiliac fixation, infra-acetabular corridors, and the refined precision of robotic-assisted pedicle screw placement in the spine.*

Keywords: *Safe zones, pelvic fractures, spinal fixation, sacroiliac screws, pedicle screws, robotic-assisted surgery, CT-based navigation.*

1. Introduction

The pelvis and spine represent some of the most anatomically challenging regions for internal fixation due to the high density of critical structures—including major arteries, nerve roots, and the spinal cord—within narrow osseous pathways. Complex fractures often distort this anatomy, making traditional "freehand" techniques risky. As of 2026, the standard of care increasingly relies on the definition of patient-specific "safe zones" to minimize iatrogenic injury and hardware failure.

2. Pelvic Safe Zones: Sacroiliac and Acetabular Fixation

Pelvic fractures, particularly those involving the posterior ring, require precise stabilization.

2.1 The Ramadanov–Zabler Safe Zone

A landmark development in 2025–2026 is the **Ramadanov–Zabler Safe Zone** for sacroiliac (SI) screw placement. Utilizing high-resolution 3D CT-based computational modeling, researchers have identified specific regions of higher bone density that provide optimal structural integrity for percutaneous fixation.

Corridor Characteristics: The S1 corridor is identified as the primary safe pathway, though its morphology is highly variable.

Precision and Safety: Clinical imaging in 2025 demonstrated that targeting these high-density regions via 3D segmentation significantly reduces cortical breaches and neurovascular injuries compared to traditional fluoroscopy-guided methods.

2.2 Infra-acetabular Corridors

Fixation of acetabular fractures often involves infra-acetabular (IA) screws. Research published in late 2025 has established gender-specific safe zones for these trajectories:

Gender Dimorphism: Studies indicate that while 97% of males possess a reliable IA corridor for a 3.5-mm screw, only 91% of females do, with female corridor volumes being significantly smaller (9.2 cm^3 vs 16 cm^3).

Entry Points: The entry point for IA screws is located at a mean distance of 53.11 mm from the pubic symphysis, with males having a significantly shorter distance than females.

3. Spinal Safe Zones: Pedicle and Lateral Mass Fixation

In spinal trauma, the pedicle remains the primary "safe" corridor for posterior stabilization, though its narrow margins (often <2 mm medially) demand extreme precision.

3.1 Cervical Spine Precision For the upper cervical spine, the optimal screw insertion point for C1 via the posterior arch is located approximately 21–23 mm lateral from the posterior tubercle. Establishing these specific working areas has been shown to minimize screw malposition in a region where vertebral artery injury is a catastrophic risk.

3.2 Robotic and AI-Assisted Navigation

By 2026, the use of **Robotic AI-assistance** has become a primary method for ensuring screws remain within safe zones.

Accuracy: Meta-analyses in 2025/2026 indicate that robotic-assisted (RA) surgery achieves higher accuracy rates (Gertzbein-Robbins Grade 0/1) compared to manual or standard fluoroscopy methods.

Path Planning: Modern systems use "Anatomical Feature Constrained Path Planning," which automatically proposes an insertion path that balances cortical safety with maximum vertebral-screw interface strength, achieving success rates of up to 98%.

4. Technological Advancements in Safe Zone Identification

Traditional 2D fluoroscopy is rapidly being replaced by 3D-based technologies that allow for real-time visualization of safe zones.

3D Printing Navigation: Experimental studies using 3D-printed navigation modules for SI screws have achieved 100% successful placement with no misplacements.

CT-like MRI: To reduce radiation exposure, 2025 research has validated the use of **CT-like 3D MRI** for robotic registration, proving that accurate pedicle screw placement is possible without preoperative CT scans.

Augmented Reality (AR): AR platforms now provide better accuracy than traditional navigation by projecting the "safe zone" directly onto the surgical field, aiding in the guidance of tools in real-time.

5. Clinical Implications and Complications

Despite these advancements, hardware failure remains a risk, with reoperation rates for spinal implants varying from 0.5% to over 60% depending on the complexity of the case.

Risk Factors: Sacral dysmorphism and narrow corridors significantly increase the risk of perforation during SI screw insertion.

Long-term Stability: The choice of "safe zone" also affects long-term biomechanical stability. For example, lag screw placement in femoral fractures must target the middle of the fracture to minimize "cut-out" risk.

6. Conclusion

The "safe zones" of 2026 are no longer static anatomical descriptions but dynamic, patient-specific corridors defined by AI and high-resolution imaging. The shift toward personalized morphometric analysis—typified by the Ramadanov–Zabler zone and robotic-assisted spinal planning—has transformed high-risk orthopedic procedures into standardized, precision-driven surgeries. Future research will likely focus on further reducing radiation while maintaining these high levels of intraosseous accuracy.

References

1. Ramadanov, N., & Zabler, S. (2025). Ramadanov–Zabler Safe Zone for Sacroiliac Screw Placement: A CT-Based Computational Pilot Study. Journal of Clinical Medicine.
2. Zhang, H., et al. (2025). Comparison of robotic AI-assisted and manual pedicle screw placement in thoracolumbar fractures. Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology.
3. Liu, Y., et al. (2025). Defining safe zones for the infra-acetabular screw: A gender-specific morphometric analysis. ScienceDirect.
4. Sakamoto, A., et al. (2026). AI-guided Spinal Screw Planning for Cervical Spine Procedures: A 2026 Perspective. Spine.
5. Chen, X., et al. (2025). Robotic pedicle screw placement with 3D MRI registration: A radiation-free alternative. The Spine Journal.

6. Wang, Q., et al. (2025). Anatomical Feature Constrained Path Planning for Robot-Assisted Pedicle Screw Placement. Springer: Chinese Journal of Mechanical Engineering.

7. Miller, A. N., & Routt, M. L. C. (2022). Variations in sacral morphology and implications for iliosacral screw fixation. JAAOS.

8. Taoka, T., et al. (2025). Evaluated Trends in Lumbosacral-Pelvic Fixation Strategies. PubMed.