Saad R, Ghanem W, Ezzeddine H, et al. Six Weeks in Orthopedics: Biological Basis, Clinical Practice, and Evidence for a Universal Benchmark. *Orthopedic Reviews*. 2026;18. doi:10.52965/001c.156461

General

Six Weeks in Orthopedics: Biological Basis, Clinical Practice, and Evidence for a Universal Benchmark

Rita Saad, MD[1], Wendy Ghanem, MD[1], Hady Ezzeddine, MD[1], Johnny Saadeh, MD[1], Elyssa Kiwan, MD[1], Majed Ali, MD[1], Emanuel-Youssef Dib, MD[1], Alexandre El Hajj[1], Mohamad Badra, MD[1], Ramzi Moucharafieh, MD[1]

[1] Department of Orthopedics and Traumatology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Balamand, Beirut, Lebanon

Keywords: Bone healing, fracture management, rehabilitation, six-week benchmark, orthopedic outcomes

https://doi.org/10.52965/001c.156461

Orthopedic Reviews

Vol. 18, 2026

The six-week mark is a widely recognized benchmark in orthopedic practice, guiding fracture management, rehabilitation, and postoperative care. Though often viewed as conventional, this timeframe reflects biological healing, clinical observations, and practical considerations.

Historically, uncomplicated fractures were noted to achieve sufficient stability by six weeks, enabling cast removal, mobilization, and weight-bearing. Advances in bone biology confirmed that, around this time, soft cartilaginous callus transitions to mineralized woven bone, providing measurable structural integrity. Radiographs often demonstrate bridging callus, correlating with clinical readiness for progressive loading.

Clinically, six weeks frequently marks the shift from immobilization to motion and load-bearing. In upper-limb fractures, studies support early mobilization when fixation is stable, with six weeks serving as a common rehabilitation reference. In lower-limb fractures, randomized trials show safe progression to full weight-bearing by this point under radiographic guidance. The same interval is relevant in venous thromboembolism prevention, with guidelines recommending extended prophylaxis for up to 35 days after major orthopedic surgery.

Beyond biology and safety, the six-week milestone offers practical benefits: it standardizes follow-up, facilitates complication detection, and streamlines patient communication. Telemedicine has further validated this timeframe for remote monitoring.
Nevertheless, variability in healing exists, influenced by age, comorbidities, smoking, and bone quality. Emerging tools—biomarkers, wearables, and artificial intelligence—may enable individualized recovery timelines.

In conclusion, the six-week interval represents a convergence of biological healing and clinical pragmatism. While reliable for most patients, its future lies in refinement into a personalized standard of care.

1. INTRODUCTION

In orthopedic practice, particularly in fracture management, decisions regarding immobilization, weight-bearing, and rehabilitation, are often based on predictable timeframes. Among these, the six-week mark has become a particularly reliable benchmark for managing sports injuries, arthroplasty, and trauma. The use of this timeframe in modern medicine results from a culmination of historical observations matched with biological plausibility, rather than an arbitrary standard.[1]

Historically, clinical observations indicated that uncomplicated fractures typically achieved sufficient biomechanical stability within approximately six weeks, allowing for safe mobilization, cast removal, and the initiation of weight-bearing. This observation, reproduced across diverse injuries and patient populations, gradually evolved to become a standarized knowledge. In addition, it allowed for development of a reproducible framework, that balanced patient safety with the need to avoid complications of prolonged immobilization.[2]

Later, advances in technology and notably in imaging, provided a biological explanation for these observations: by the end of the first month post injury, most fractures start to transition from cartilaginous soft callus to mineralized woven bone, resulting in significant improvement of structural integrity.[3] In fact, radiographs at around that period often demonstrate bridging calluses and cortical continuity, findings that align with clinical readiness for mobilisation, activity, and gradual weight bearing.[4] While complete

remodeling and restoration of pre-injury strength require months, six weeks represent the earliest point at which structural integrity is consistently detectable.

In addition to biological factors, the six-week timeframe allows for rehabilitation and safety considerations. In fact, mobilization at an early stage increases the risk of fixation failure or refracture, whereas prolonged immobilization predisposes patients to joint stiffness, muscle wasting, and thromboembolic complications. Therefore, this interval comes out as a middle ground between the requirements of biological healing, and optimal functional recovery.[5]

The six-week benchmark is therefore not an arbitrary convention, but the outcome of a gradual convergence of clinical experience, biological evidence, and patient-centered outcomes. The six-week interval is a cornerstone of orthopedic management, shaping timelines for fracture immobilization, surgical rehabilitation, and postoperative anticoagulation. This article explores the historical roots, biological basis, and evidence-based guidelines that reinforce this timeframe, with emphasis on fracture healing, functional recovery, and venous thromboembolism (VTE) prevention.

2. BIOLOGICAL RATIONALE FOR SIX WEEKS

Bone healing is a complex physiological process that aims to restore both the structural and functional integrity of bone following fracture. It occurs in three overlapping phases: inflammation, reparation, and remodeling phases. Each phase involves distinct cellular and molecular events, which together determine the timeline of recovery and mechanical stability of the bone.[6]

The process begins with the inflammatory phase (days 0–7). After a fracture, bone architecture is damaged, and vascular supply is disrupted, resulting in loss of stability, and impaired oxygen and nutrient delivery to the injury site.

Within minutes following injury, a hematoma forms at the fractured site, which serves as a temporary scaffold helping to achieve hemostasis. In addition, the formed clot releases cytokines, allowing for the recruitment of cells essential for repair. Platelets, along with inflammatory cells including neutrophils, lymphocytes, and macrophages, migrate and release multiple cytokines and growth factors, such as platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α), transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), bone morphogenic proteins (BMPs), and a number of interleukins (IL-1, IL-6, IL-10, IL-11, Il-12, IL-23). These signaling molecules serve two main purposes: not only do they regulate the inflammatory response needed to clear necrotic tissue, but they also recruit mesenchymal stem cells and osteoprogenitors from the periosteum and bone marrow for reconstruction. At the same time, new capillaries begin to form, laying the groundwork for the vascular supply needed in later phases. Although no new bone is formed at this stage, it remains an essential phase, as it sets the foundation for subsequent tissue formation and structural recovery.[6-8]

The reparative phase (weeks 2–6) follows. It marks the period in which new tissue begins to form, allowing the fracture to gain significant structural integrity. During this phase, fibroblasts and recruited mesenchymal stem cells differentiate into chondrocytes. These cells will begin producing a soft fibrocartilaginous callus that fills the fracture gap through a process called chondrogenesis. As vascularization takes place, oxygen and nutrient delivery increases, favoring the differentiation of mesenchymal cells and fibroblasts into osteoblasts, which will gradually replace chondrocytes. This process is heavily mediated by bone morphogenic proteins (BMPs) and fibroblast growth factors (FGFs). Osteoblasts in turn, begin depositing woven bone into the fracture gap, while chondrocytes undegro hypertrophy followed by apoptosis, and are gradually replaced by bone through a process called endochondral ossification. This transition from soft cartilage to hard woven bone is gradual, but critically essential, as it transforms a pliable, weak callus into a hard callus that stabilizes the fracture.[3, 7,8]

By six weeks, radiographs of uncomplicated fractures frequently show bridging callus and early cortical continuity, indicating that the fracture has reached sufficient mechanical stability to permit cautious mobilization and progression of rehabilitation. Biomechanical studies have shown that during this stage, the developing callus begins to assume a significant load-bearing role, with measurable increases in stiffness and strength corresponding to the degree of mineralization and trabecular organization within the repair tissue.[3,8] Marsell and Einhorn demonstrated that callus stiffness and resistance to torsional forces progressively increase between 4 and 6 weeks, correlating with the transition from cartilaginous to woven bone.[3] Similarly, Einhorn and Gerstenfeld noted that by this phase, the fracture site achieves partial mechanical competence, approximately 30–50% of the intact bone's strength, sufficient to maintain alignment under functional loading but still vulnerable to excessive stress.[8] This period therefore represents the biological and biomechanical basis behind the widely used six-week benchmark, marking the shift from biological vulnerability to functional stability.

The remodeling phase (months to years) is the final stage, during which the structurally weaker woven bone is slowly replaced by organized lamellar bone, restoring the original architecture and strength of the bone. Osteoclasts resorb excess and disorganized callus, while osteoblasts deposit organized bone matrix, reconstructing the medullary canal and optimizing mechanical properties. This remodeling process is influenced by mechanical loading and can continue for months to years after initial fracture, ensuring that the repaired bone regains normal structural and functional integrity.[6,8]

3. FUNCTIONAL RECOVERY AND REHABILITATION

Across orthopedics, the six-week interval often coincides with sufficient biologic callus consolidation to permit safer motion and load progression. While rehabilitation deci-

sions should ideally be criteria-based, factoring pain, clinical stability, and radiographic evidence of bridging calluses, several consistent clinical patterns emerge around this benchmark.[4]

3.1. UPPER LIMB: TRANSITIONING OUT OF IMMOBILIZATION AND RESTORING MOTION

By four to six weeks, once tenderness has subsided and radiographs demonstrate early callus bridging, many stable upper-limb fractures transition from rigid immobilization to mobilization. For example, in distal radius fractures, the British Orthopedic Association Standards for Trauma (BOAST) recommends considering approximately four weeks of immobilization for stable patterns, with earlier mobilization following surgical fixation.[9]

Similarly, structured rehabilitation may begin once clinical stability is confirmed, often within the first three weeks after surgical repair. Early initiation of therapy, including active range-of-motion exercises, has been shown to improve short- and long-term outcomes for pain, wrist mobility, grip strength, and functional recovery.[10] Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) show that, after operative fixation of the distal radius, initiating early supervised mobilization or manual therapy can improve short-term wrist range of motion and some functional measures without increasing complication rates in many cohorts.[11,12]

For patients in sedentary or light office roles, return to modified or full duties after distal radius fracture often occurs shortly after cast or splint removal. A prospective study of professionally active men (aged 20–65) with distal radius fractures reported a median sick leave of 4 weeks, with nearly one-third taking no leave at all. Interestingly, the study found that occupational physical demand was not strongly associated with duration of sick leave. Instead, early post-fracture measures, including self-reported disability (DASH), pain intensity, and physical health status (SF-36 PCS), were the strongest predictors of return-to-work timing, regardless of surgical or non-surgical treatment. Patients with higher early disability or pain levels, or lower physical health scores, tended to require longer recovery before resuming work.[13]

By approximately six weeks, many stable upper-limb fractures demonstrate sufficient biological and mechanical healing to permit progression from protection to functional use.[4,9]

For diaphyseal humeral fractures treated in a functional brace, classic series support early controlled shoulder motion while the brace maintains alignment, demonstrating that safe motion can precede full radiographic union when mechanical stability is adequate.[14] As healing progresses toward six weeks, rehabilitation typically intensifies from protected, active-assisted ROM to active ROM and light strengthening, a transition associated with improved functional recovery in early-mobilization studies. A recent scoping review of early mobilization across orthopedic surgeries found that initiating motion and exercise within the first six weeks improved functional scores and range of motion without increasing complication rates, underscoring the biological and clinical value of this timeframe.[15]

Thus, the six-week biological benchmark provides a useful reference for clinicians, but return-to-work timing must be individualized according to the physical demands of the patient's occupation and the functional recovery achieved.

3.2. LOWER LIMB: PROGRESSING LOAD

In the lower limb, the six-week benchmark often represents the transition from protection to load progression. In ankle fractures treated with open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF), early loading is increasingly supported by high-level evidence. A multicenter RCT (n = 110) demonstrated that early weight-bearing and ankle ROM initiated within the first two weeks after fixation yielded superior functional outcomes at six weeks without higher complication or loss-of-reduction rates compared with cast immobilization and strict non-weight bearing.[16]

More recent evidence from the WAX multicenter RCT demonstrates that initiating early weight-bearing two weeks after unstable ankle fracture surgery is clinically non-inferior, and may even provide superior short-term function, compared with the traditional six-week delayed weight-bearing approach, without increasing complication rates and with potential cost savings.[17]

For hip fractures and arthroplasty, postoperative rehabilitation is considered as important as the surgery itself, with the primary goal being restoration of mobility. Patients who undergo arthroplasty or fixation of an extracapsular fracture can generally mobilize immediately after surgery, as tolerated, without weight restrictions, while those with intracapsular fractures often follow a period of protected weight bearing to reduce the risk of fracture displacement. Intensive, structured physiotherapy is recommended to support rapid progression toward pre-injury mobility and functional independence. Optimizing medical management is also essential to minimizing complications. Despite these measures, many patients do not fully regain their prior level of mobility or independence and may require additional social care support.[18]

Similarly, in femoral shaft fractures stabilized with statically locked intramedullary nailing, classic prospective studies show that immediate weight bearing is safe and does not increase implant failure risk when fixation is stable, demonstrating that load progression can precede full radiographic union if mechanical stability is high.[19]

At around six weeks, if radiographs confirm bridging callus and construct stability is adequate, clinicians commonly advance weight bearing stepwise: from non-weight bearing (NWB) to partial (PWB, e.g., 25–50% body weight), and then to full (FWB) over subsequent weeks. Gait training, closed-chain strengthening, and functional retraining are typically layered into this progression. Where fixation is tenuous, comminution severe, or bone quality poor, transition may be deferred, and assistive devices continue. The 2025 scoping review supports earlier mobilization within the first six weeks but stresses the importance of tailoring protocols to individual stability and comorbidity profiles.[13]

As with the upper limb, mistimed progression carries risks. Advancing load prematurely can result in hardware failure, displacement, or nonunion, while delaying unnec-

essarily prolongs deconditioning, stiffness, and thromboembolic risk.

4. SIX WEEKS IN ANTICOAGULATION PRACTICE

4.1. RISK PERIOD FOR VENOUS THROMBOEMBOLISM (VTE)

VTE is a significant complication of orthopedic surgery, driven by Virchow's triad: tissue trauma, reduced mobility, and a transient hypercoagulable state. In procedures such as joint arthroplasty and hip fracture fixation, endothelial injury from surgery triggers coagulation, immobility hampers venous return, and systemic inflammation promotes thrombosis. Together, these factors create a sustained risk of VTE that extends beyond hospital discharge.[20]

Recent data show that symptomatic deep vein thrombosis (DVT) and pulmonary embolism (PE) predominantly occur in the early post-discharge period, with significant incidence during the first 30 days and a continued, though lower, risk extending into the second month.[21,22] This timing has important implications for prophylaxis: restricting pharmacologic therapy to the hospital stay or just two weeks post-surgery does not protect against the period of highest risk. A six-week prophylaxis window better aligns with the natural course of postoperative thrombotic risk.

4.2. GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

In recognition of this temporal pattern, the American College of Chest Physicians (ACCP) guidelines recommend extending pharmacologic prophylaxis to up to 35 days in high-risk orthopedic patients.[23] This guidance reflects a substantial shift from older regimens of 10-14 days, acknowledging that VTE risk does not resolve rapidly once the patient is discharged.[24] Reviews further reinforce that patients undergoing total hip or knee arthroplasty, or hip fracture surgery are particularly vulnerable, warranting a full four to five weeks of chemoprophylaxis when bleeding risk allows.[20,25]

Across national and specialty guidelines, the overwhelming majority recommend extended prophylaxis for 28-35 days, with some explicitly extending to six weeks, reflecting international consensus that this duration covers the highest thrombotic risk. Table 1 summarizes the recommendations of major guideline bodies, illustrating the convergence on a 4–6-week window. In addition to chemical thromboprophylaxis, all the bodies recommend mechanical thromboprophylaxis.[26]

As for extended prophylaxis, a meta-analysis of nine major studies with nearly 4,000 patients showed that continuing prophylaxis for 30–42 days after hip or knee arthroplasty significantly lowered the risk of late symptomatic VTE compared with shorter courses, without increasing major bleeding events.[27]

International guidelines recognize the six-week period as a standard benchmark for postoperative anticoagulation. While specific regimens differ, most major organizations recommend extended prophylaxis of 28–35 days, or up to six weeks, after total hip arthroplasty. For instance, ACCP and NICE recommend 28–35 days, Australian guidelines advise 3–6 weeks, with comparable guidance from Canadian, European, and Asian societies.[26] This evidence provides a strong foundation for aligning prophylaxis with the six-week risk window and is particularly persuasive in elderly or less mobile patients, where late events are more likely to occur.

4.3. CONSENSUS AND CONTROVERSIES

While there is agreement on the need for extended prophylaxis, the choice of agent remains debated. Low-molecular-weight heparin (LMWH) and direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) are guideline-endorsed first-line options, but practice varies regionally. In North America, aspirin is increasingly used for lower-risk arthroplasty patients, whereas European guidelines continue to favor anticoagulants for major joint replacements.[20,25]

Although extended prophylaxis is widely endorsed, guidelines vary in their specifics. Some advocate a fixed 35-day duration, others suggest 14–35 days, and certain national recommendations allow shorter courses with a step-down to aspirin, while others favor uninterrupted anticoagulant use. These discrepancies reflect differences in evidence interpretation, clinical culture, and cost considerations. Consequently, while the six-week concept is broadly accepted, precise recommendations remain a matter of debate.[26]

Mechanical methods, including intermittent pneumatic compression and graduated compression stockings, serve as valuable adjuncts. ACCP guidelines recommend their use during hospitalization or when anticoagulation is contraindicated. However, both evidence and guidelines indicate that mechanical prophylaxis alone does not provide adequate protection in high-risk patients. After discharge, pharmacologic prophylaxis remains the mainstay, with mechanical devices reserved for cases where bleeding risk limits anticoagulant use.[23]

4.4. SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Some orthopedic patients have heightened thrombotic risk, underscoring the need for individualized decisions within the six-week framework. Patients with malignancy, for instance, exhibit a hypercoagulable state that elevates postoperative VTE risk. Narrative reviews and guidelines consistently identify cancer as an independent risk factor, supporting the use of more cautious and prolonged prophylaxis.[20,25]

Revision surgeries also present unique risk factors. They often involve longer operative times, increased soft tissue disruption, and indications such as infection or fracture, all of which elevate thrombotic risk. Although randomized data are limited, reviews consistently recommend considering extended prophylaxis for revision arthroplasty within guideline-supported parameters.[20]

Certain patient populations, particularly the elderly and smokers, exhibit biologically delayed healing that may necessitate extended protection. Aging is linked to impaired

Table 1. Summary of international clinical practice guidelines on venous thromboembolism prophylaxis following total hip arthroplasty, highlighting recommended durations of pharmacologic prophylaxis.[26]

Guideline / Society	Country	Year	Recommended Duration	Explanatory Note
American College of Chest Physicians (ACCP)	USA	2012	Minimum **10-14 days**, ideally **up to 35 days**	Foundation guideline, emphasizes extended prophylaxis where bleeding risk permits.
American Society of Hematology (ASH)	USA	2019	Not specified	Endorses DOACs over LMWH, allows aspirin; less emphasis on fixed duration.
American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS)	USA	2011	Not specified	Supports prophylaxis but does not define agent or duration, citing limited evidence.
Thrombosis Canada	Canada	2024	**14-35 days**	Provides agent-specific details, strongly supports extended prophylaxis.
NHS Lanarkshire	UK	2021	**35 days total** (e.g., LMWH 10 days then aspirin 28 days; LMWH 28 days; rivaroxaban 35 days)	Offers practical regimen combinations.
NICE	UK	2018	~**28-35 days** (LMWH + stockings, LMWH → aspirin, or DOACs)	Strongly supports extended prophylaxis, multiple agent options.
Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN)	UK	2014	"Extended prophylaxis" (no fixed days)	Explicitly excludes aspirin monotherapy.
Korean Society of Thrombosis and Hemostasis	South Korea	2014	At least **10-14 days**; longer if risk factors	Risk-stratified approach, wider agent choice including aspirin.
Asian Venous Thrombosis Forum (AVTF)	Asia	2017	Not specified	Recommends early mobilization, individualized use of prophylaxis.
Arthroplasty Society of Australia	Australia	2023	**3-6 weeks**	Explicitly frames the six-week window as standard.
Australia & New Zealand Working Party	Aus/NZ	2005	**28-35 days**	LMWH or fondaparinux as mainstay; clear duration guidance.
Government of Western Australia	Australia	2023	**28-35 days**	Endorses DOACs and aspirin as valid options.

angiogenesis, reduced stem cell activity, and slower bone repair. In a clinical cohort of elderly osteoporotic patients, union times averaged ~19 weeks compared with ~16 weeks in younger individuals, heightening the risk of delayed union and nonunion.[28] Similarly, smoking nearly doubles the risk of nonunion and delays healing by approximately four weeks. In open tibial fractures, mean union times for smokers were around 32 weeks versus 28 weeks for non-smokers, accompanied by a higher risk of infection.[29] Reduced mobility slows venous return, prolonging stasis and extending hypercoagulability. For these patients, completing the full 35-day prophylaxis is crucial, as stopping early leaves them vulnerable during the weeks of highest VTE risk.[25]

5. PRACTICAL AND LOGISTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The six-week milestone in orthopedic fracture management offers significant practical and logistic benefits beyond the biological healing process. The use of this timeframe has become an essential tool for organizing follow-up care, patient communication, teamwork, coordination of multidisciplinary teams and optimal healthcare resource utilization.

5.1. STANDARDIZED FOLLOW-UP AND CLINICAL TIMING

The six-week mark aligns with important clinical events. By this point, early postoperative complications such as wound infection, delayed wound healing, DVTs are either resolved or detectable. For instance, in older adults following distal femur fracture surgery, most DVTs were diagnosed at a median of 6 days post-operatively, while superficial surgical site infections are most commonly identified between post-operative days 11-24.[30]

Radiographically, by approximately 28-35 days post-injury evidence of bone healing begins to appear as the fracture callus transitions from cartilage to woven bone and starts to remodel under biomechanical load, providing a

pivotal opportunity for clinicians to assess healing progression, and to detect complications such as delayed union or infection.[31] In fact, these radiographic findings often prompt clinical action, including additional imaging, intervention, or adjustment to standard rehabilitation protocols, such as changes in immobilization duration, range-of-motion allowances and weight bearing status.[32]

5.2. RISK REDUCTION AND MANAGEMENT OF COMPLICATIONS

Prolonged immobility markedly increases the risk of DVT, while early mobilization provides a protective effect highlighting the significance of the six-week mark as a critical transition point to activity.[33]

A clinical cohort study involving 166 surgically treated tibial shaft fractures found that delayed weight-bearing was a significant independent predictor of impaired healing, while earlier loading was associated with better outcomes.[34] This illustrates that a managed, staged return to load-bearing by six weeks, supports biomechanical integrity and diminishes risks of delayed union. Furthermore, a systematic review of RCTs showed that patients starting early weight-bearing in the postoperative management of ankle fractures demonstrated significantly better functional scores at 6–9 weeks and returned to daily activities 12 days faster, with no increase in complication rates.[35] Similarly, a meta-analysis of early versus delayed weight-bearing following ankle fractures surgery reported improved short- and mid-term outcomes, with no significant differences in long-term ankle function or complication incidence.[36]

Overall, these findings suggest that the six-week mark is still a significant balance point for clinicians to safely advance patients toward weight-bearing to optimize recovery while minimizing both biomechanics and immobility-related risks.

5.3. TELEMEDICINE AND FOLLOW-UP CARE

The six-week checkup is an ideal telemedicine model especially for uncomplicated cases that are stable, enhancing access, convenience, and efficient use of resources. In a randomized pilot trial representing orthopedic trauma patients comparing telemedicine versus in-office follow-up, the satisfaction levels were similar at six weeks and six months. Telemedicine patients avoided taking time off work for visits, and in addition to that, the potential appointment time was significantly lower. Complication rates between telemedicine and the control group were similar.[37]

Similarly, a German RCT for orthopedic and trauma surgery determined that video consultations had similar patient and physician satisfaction as an in-person visit, with no significant concerns, reinforcing that telemedicine is an efficient alternative.[38]

5.4. MULTIDISCIPLINARY COORDINATION & PATIENT ADHERENCE

The six-week visit provides an opportunity for collaboration between surgeons, physiotherapists and educators optimizing treatment plans. In outpatient orthopedic care, a structured interdisciplinary collaboration allows for an increase in diagnostic precision and treatment planning. For instance, a mixed methods study conducted in a shoulder clinic, extending the scope to physiotherapists and orthopedic surgeons, who independently examined patients and agreed on treatment strategies in almost all cases, highlighting the effectiveness of collaboration based on good communication, respect, and shared expertise.[39]

5.5. FUTURE DIRECTIONS & RESEARCH GAPS

Despite its advantages, the six-week method should not be universally applied without question. Healing is highly individualized. In fact, healing timelines are affected by a range of patient-specific factors, including age, comorbidities (e.g., diabetes, osteoporosis), smoking, nutritional status, injury complexity, and the surgical technique use.

To support more individualized care, biochemical age markers show considerable potential as objective indices of appropriate healing over time. In patients with tibia and femur shaft fractures, serum CTX and P1NP, both markers of bone turnover, showed a marked peak at approximately six weeks. Crucially, higher levels at six weeks correlated strongly with successful radiological healing at 12 weeks. Conversely, patients with delayed unions showed significantly lower levels of both CTX and P1NP at six weeks when compared to patients on normal healing trajectories, suggesting CTX and P1NP may serve as early indicators of impaired healing.[40] By incorporating biomarkers like CTX and P1NP into clinical practice, follow up protocols could be more accurate, allowing for earlier mobilization in patients demonstrating adequate biological healing or more cautious progression in those with suboptimal biomarker responses.

Emerging evidence demonstrates that AI-powered wearables are transforming orthopedic recovery monitoring by delivering objective, continuous data that supports more adaptive rehabilitation strategies. For instance, machine learning models utilizing wearable activity data were able to predict functional recovery at 6 weeks post-trauma.[41] In addition, a systematic review of RCTs investigating the effects of wearable-assisted physical activity interventions, such as step counting plus motivational support on patients undergoing total joint arthroplasty found significant improvements in daily step counts at both 6 weeks and 6 months post-operatively in the intervention group compared to usual care.[42] These findings suggest that wearable-based interventions can enhance mobility, patient engagement, and overall recovery.

In addition to wearables, digital healthcare systems that employ augmented reality (AR), have the potential to augment postoperative functional recovery and increase patient engagement, especially in situations of upper-limb rehab. In a RCT, researchers evaluated an augmented re-

ality home-based rehabilitation system against standard brochure-based home exercises and noted that the AR intervention group had a significantly greater improvement in shoulder functional scores (SST, DASH, SPADI, EQ-5D-5L) which lasted through at least 12 weeks. The outcomes of ROM, pain, and strength were similar among groups.[43] Hence, AI may soon enable a personalized recovery protocol by synthesizing sensor data, imaging, and biological markers instead of one-size-fits-all protocols.

CONCLUSION

The six-week benchmark in orthopedics has evolved from a clinical observation into a biologically and practically grounded standard. Historically rooted in the consistent recovery patterns of uncomplicated fractures, it has since been reinforced by advances in imaging, molecular biology, and functional outcome studies. At six weeks, most fractures demonstrate a reliable transition from soft to hard callus, aligning with a period of sufficient mechanical stability for mobilization, progressive loading, and rehabilitation. The same interval also captures the natural risk window for postoperative thromboembolic events, providing a rational basis for extended anticoagulation prophylaxis. Beyond biology, six weeks offers pragmatic advantages: it facilitates structured follow-up, supports multidisciplinary care, and provides a clear communication tool for patients and healthcare teams.

Nevertheless, the six-week standard is not universally applicable. Healing remains highly individualized and influenced by factors such as age, comorbidities, fracture complexity, fixation stability, and lifestyle. Emerging evidence highlights that some patients benefit from earlier mobilization, while others, particularly the elderly, smokers, or those with systemic illness, may require longer protection and delayed progression. Future directions, including the use of biochemical markers, wearables, and artificial intelligence, promise to refine these timelines into more personalized, criteria-driven protocols.

In sum, six weeks represent more than a convenient convention: it is a convergence point of biology, safety, and function. However, its greatest value may lie not as a rigid endpoint, but as a flexible framework around which individualized recovery plans can be built.

Submitted: October 20, 2025 EST. Accepted: November 09, 2025 EST. Published: February 18, 2026 EST.

REFERENCES

1. Fedak KM, Bernal A, Capshaw ZA, Gross S. Applying the Bradford Hill criteria in the 21st century: how data integration has changed causal inference in molecular epidemiology. *Emerg Themes Epidemiol*. 2015;12:14. doi:10.1186/s12982-015-0037-4. PMID:26425136

2. Colton CL. The history of fracture treatment. In: Browner BD, Jupiter JB, Krettek C, Anderson PA, eds. *Skeletal Trauma: Basic Science, Management, and Reconstruction*. 6th ed. Elsevier; 2020:e1-e30.

3. Marsell R, Einhorn TA. The biology of fracture healing. *Injury*. 2011;42(6):551-555. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2011.03.031

4. Eastaugh-Waring SJ, Joslin CC, Hardy JR, Cunningham JL. Quantification of fracture healing from radiographs using the maximum callus index. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2009;467(8):1986-1991. doi:10.1007/s11999-009-0775-0

5. Keene DJ, Williamson E, Bruce J, Willett K, Lamb SE. Early ankle movement versus immobilization in the postoperative management of ankle fracture in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2014;44(9):690-701. doi:10.2519/jospt.2014.5294

6. Claes L, Recknagel S, Ignatius A. Fracture healing under healthy and inflammatory conditions. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2012;8(3):133-143. doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2012.1

7. Sheen JR, Mabrouk A, Garla VV. Fracture healing overview. In: *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing; 2025. Accessed April 8, 2023. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK551678/

8. Einhorn TA, Gerstenfeld LC. Fracture healing: mechanisms and interventions. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2015;11(1):45-54. doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2014.164

9. British Orthopaedic Association. *BOAST 16: The Management of Distal Radial Fractures*. British Orthopaedic Association; 2019. https://www.boa.ac.uk/resource/boast-16-pdf.html

10. Mehta S, Smith J, Patel R, et al. Distal radius fracture rehabilitation: early mobilization and functional outcomes. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2024;54(3):145-156. doi:10.2519/jospt.2024.0301

11. Quadlbauer S, Pezzei C, Jurkowitsch J, et al. Immediate mobilization of distal radius fractures stabilized by volar locking plate results in a better short-term outcome than a five week immobilization: a prospective randomized trial. *Clin Rehabil*. 2021;36(1):69-86. doi:10.1177/02692155211036674

12. Tomruk M, Gelecek N, Basçi O, Özkan MH. Effects of early manual therapy on functional outcomes after volar plating of distal radius fractures: a randomized controlled trial. *Hand Surg Rehabil*. 2020;39(3):178-185. doi:10.1016/j.hansur.2019.12.002

13. Egund L, Önnby K, McGuigan F, et al. Disability and pain are the best predictors of sick leave after a distal radius fracture in men. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2020;30:656-664. doi:10.1007/s10926-020-09880-4

14. Sarmiento A, Zagorski JB, Zych GA, Latta LL, Capps CA. Functional bracing for the treatment of fractures of the humeral diaphysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2000;82(4):478-486. doi:10.2106/00004623-200004000-00003

15. Rhamelani P, Mahdhiya NZ, Yoviana I, Jessica J, Komariah M. Early mobilization in post-orthopedic surgery patients: a scoping review. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2025;18:305-317. doi:10.2147/JMDH.S483232

16. Dehghan N, McKee MD, Jenkinson RJ, et al. Early weightbearing and range of motion versus non-weightbearing and immobilization after open reduction and internal fixation of unstable ankle fractures: a randomized controlled trial. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2016;30(7):345-352. doi:10.1097/BOT.0000000000000572

17. Bretherton CP, Achten J, Jogarah V, et al. Early versus delayed weight-bearing following operatively treated ankle fracture (WAX): a non-inferiority, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2024;403(10446):2787-2797. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00710-4

18. Emmerson BR, Varacallo MA, Inman D. Hip fracture overview. In: *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing; 2025. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK557514/

19. Brumback RJ, Toal TR Jr, Murphy-Zane MS, Novak VP, Belkoff SM. Immediate weight-bearing after treatment of a comminuted fracture of the femoral shaft with a statically locked intramedullary nail. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 1999;81(11):1538-1544. doi:10.2106/00004623-199911000-00005

20. Flevas DA, Megaloikonomos PD, Dimopoulos L, Mitsiokapa E, Koulouvaris P, Mavrogenis AF. Thromboembolism prophylaxis in orthopaedics: an update. *EFORT Open Rev*. 2018;3(4):136-148. doi:10.1302/2058-5241.3.170018

21. Mosher H, Remer HB, Osondu CU, Smidt K, van der Ven A, Suarez JC. Current rates and trends of venous thromboembolism after total hip and knee arthroplasty: an updated analysis utilizing the NSQIP database. *Arthroplast Today*. 2025;33:101737. doi:10.1016/j.artd.2025.101737

22. Zuke WA, Chughtai M, Emara AK, et al. What are drivers of readmission for readmission-requiring venous thromboembolic events after primary total hip arthroplasty? An analysis of 544,443 cases. *J Arthroplasty*. 2022;37(5):958-965.e3. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2022.01.024

23. Falck-Ytter Y, Francis CW, Johanson NA, et al. Prevention of VTE in orthopedic surgery patients: antithrombotic therapy and prevention of thrombosis, 9th ed: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Chest*. 2012;141(2 Suppl):e278S-e325S. doi:10.1378/chest.11-2404

24. Geerts WH, Pineo GF, Heit JA, et al. Prevention of venous thromboembolism: the Seventh ACCP Conference on Antithrombotic and Thrombolytic Therapy. *Chest*. 2004;126(3 Suppl):338S-400S. doi:10.1378/chest.126.3_suppl.338S

25. Kahn SR, Shivakumar S. What's new in VTE risk and prevention in orthopedic surgery. *Res Pract Thromb Haemost*. 2020;4(3):366-376. doi:10.1002/rth2.12323

26. Rigney BP, Storme JG, Garbuz DS, Sheridan GA. Persistent lack of international consensus for venous thromboembolism prophylaxis recommendations following total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. Published online 2025. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2025.06.055

27. Eikelboom JW, Quinlan DJ, Douketis JD. Extended-duration prophylaxis against venous thromboembolism after total hip or knee replacement: a meta-analysis of the randomized trials. *Lancet*. 2001;358(9275):9-15. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(00)05249-1

28. Clark D, Nakamura M, Miclau T, Marcucio R. Effects of aging on fracture healing. *Curr Osteoporos Rep*. 2017;15(6):601-608. doi:10.1007/s11914-017-0413-9

29. Pearson RG, Clement RG, Edwards KL, Scammell BE. Do smokers have greater risk of delayed and non-union after fracture, osteotomy and arthrodesis? A systematic review with meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(11):e010303. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010303

30. Onizuka N, Farmer S, Wiseman JM, Alain G, Quatman-Yates CC, Quatman CE. Timing of complications following surgery for distal femur fractures in older adults. *Geriatr Orthop Surg Rehabil*. 2023;14:21514593231195539. doi:10.1177/21514593231195539

31. Einhorn TA. The science of fracture healing. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2005;19(10 Suppl):S4-S6. doi:10.1097/00005131-200511101-00002

32. Bosch TP et al. Routine 6-weeks outpatient visit in patients treated surgically for upper extremity fractures: is it truly necessary? *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*. 2025;34(2):507-515. doi:10.1016/j.jse.2024.04.025

33. Li L, Huang Y, He J, Zheng Q. Early rehabilitation nursing prevents postoperative DVT and promotes limb function recovery in patients with traumatic fracture. *Am J Transl Res*. 2025;17(4):2665-2677. doi:10.62347/WLTS7477. PMID:40385019

34. Houben IB, Raaben M, Van Basten Batenburg M, Blokhuis TJ. Delay in weight bearing in surgically treated tibial shaft fractures is associated with impaired healing: a cohort analysis of 166 tibial fractures. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol*. 2018;28(7):1429-1436. doi:10.1007/s00590-018-2190-2

35. Sharma T, Farrugia P. Early versus late weight bearing and ankle mobilization in the postoperative management of ankle fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Foot Ankle Surg*. 2022;28(7):827-835. doi:10.1016/j.fas.2022.03.003

36. Wu F, Liu P, Ou Z, Zhou S, Zhang C. Early versus delayed weightbearing for postoperative ankle fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2025;145(1):402. doi:10.1007/s00402-025-06016-2

37. Sathiyakumar V, Apfeld JC, Obremskey WT, Thakore RV, Sethi MK. Prospective randomized controlled trial using telemedicine for follow-ups in an orthopedic trauma population: a pilot study. *J Orthop Trauma*. 2015;29(3):e139-e145. doi:10.1097/BOT.0000000000000189

38. Muschol J, Heinrich M, Heiss C, et al. Assessing telemedicine efficiency in follow-up care with video consultations for patients in orthopedic and trauma surgery in Germany: randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res*. 2022;24(7):e36996. doi:10.2196/36996

39. Madsen MN, Kirkegaard ML, Klebe TM, et al. Inter-professional agreement and collaboration between extended scope physiotherapists and orthopaedic surgeons in an orthopaedic outpatient shoulder clinic: a mixed methods study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2021;22(1):4. doi:10.1186/s12891-020-03831-z

40. Stewart CC, O'Hara NN, Bzovsky S, et al. Bone turnover markers as surrogates of fracture healing after intramedullary fixation of tibia and femur fractures. *Bone Joint Res*. 2022;11(4):239-250. doi:10.1302/2046-3758.114.BJR-2021-0226.R1

41. Braun BJ, Histing T, Menger MM, et al. Wearable activity data can predict functional recovery after musculoskeletal injury: feasibility of a machine learning approach. *Injury*. 2024;55(2):111254. doi:10.1016/j.injury.2023.111254

42. Master H, Bley JA, Coronado RA, et al. Effects of physical activity interventions using wearables to improve objectively measured and patient-reported outcomes in adults following orthopaedic surgical procedures: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(2):e0263562. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0263562

43. Shim GY, Kim EH, Baek YJ, et al. A randomized controlled trial of postoperative rehabilitation using digital healthcare system after rotator cuff repair. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2023;6(1):95. doi:10.1038/s41746-023-00842-7