1 Reliability of Lichtman's classification for Kienböck's disease in 99 sul	bjects
---	--------

 $\mathbf{2}$

- 3 Masaki Shin, M.D., Masahiro Tatebe, M.D., Hitoshi Hirata, M.D., Shukuki Koh, M.D.,
- 4 Takaaki Shinohara, M.D.
- 5 Department of Hand Surgery, Nagoya University School of Medicine,
- 6
- 7 Corresponding author
- 8 Masahiro Tatebe
- 9 Department of Hand Surgery, Nagoya University School of Medicine,
- 10 65 Tsurumaicho, Showaku, Nagoya
- 11 **466-8550**, Japan
- 12 Tel. 52-741-2111, Fax. 52-744-2964
- 13 E-mail: tatebe@med.nagoya-u.ac.jp
- 14
- 15 This study is a retrospective study and the approval was given by the institutional review
- 16 board (IRB).
- 17
- 18
- 19 Key words: Kienböck's disease, wrist, classification

1 Reliability of Lichtman's classification for Kienböck's disease in 99 subjects

 $\mathbf{2}$

3 Abstract

4 Purpose: The objective of this research was to investigate the reliability of Lichtman's

5 classification for Kienböck's disease.

Methods: Interobserver reliability and intraobserver reproducibility were investigated by
interpreting both anteroposterior and lateral X-rays of the wrist joint twice in 99 patients
with Kienböck's disease using the modified Lichtman's classification system. Observers
comprised 3 orthopedic surgeons, and no information was exchanged between
observers either before or during the study.
Results: Intraobserver reliability was moderate (0.313-0.628), and interobserver

12 reliability was fair (Siegel's kappa=0.228).

Conclusion: Low values were obtained regarding interobserver reliability for the modified Lichtman's classification of Kienböck's disease. This classification is thus inadequate for use in clinical settings. A new classification should be established.

16

1 Introduction

 $\mathbf{2}$ Lichtman's classification is frequently used in the assessment and management of 3 Kienböck's disease (1)(2). Radiological assessment, however, is not an easy task and 4 all classification systems used in Kienböck's disease show some degree of inter- and intraobserver variability. In the past, isolated studies have examined the reliability of $\mathbf{5}$ 6 Lichtman's classification of Kienböck's disease, but sample sizes in those reports have 7been relatively small (39, 64, and 48 cases) (3)(4)(5). The purpose of the present study 8 was to assess the reliability of this commonly used classification system, and to 9 determine possible reasons for low reliability associated with Lichtman's classification.

10

11 Materials and methods

12We reviewed radiographs of all patients with Kienböck's disease who were treated in 13our hospital from 1988 to 2007. The inclusion criterion was the availability of complete preoperative radiographs of anteroposterior and lateral views bilaterally. Bilateral cases 14and cases diagnosed based on magnetic resonance imaging alone were excluded. All 15radiographs of the wrist were obtained with the shoulder in 90° of abduction, the elbow 1617in 90° of flexion, the forearm in neutral rotation, and the wrist in neutral alignment, utilizing a wrist support. We included 99 cases in the present study. The observers 18 comprised 3 orthopedic surgeons with 16, 14, and 10 years of experience. These 1920observers assessed Lichtman's classification of radiographs in a blinded manner on two 21separate occasions.

22 We used the modified Lichtman's classification system, consisting of 4 stages, including

1	a subdivision of stage 3 into stage 3a (no carpal collapse) and stage 3b (carpal collapse
2	and fixed scaphoid flexion) (Fig. 1). No information was exchanged between observers
3	either before or during the study. Before carrying out assessments, each observer was
4	asked to read the original article on the classification system. We then determined the
5	inter- and intraobserver reliabilities of the classification system.
6	All study protocols were approved by the institutional review board of our institute.
7	
8	Statistics
9	Kappa statistics were used for the assessment of inter- and intraobserver reliabilities of
10	the modified Lichtman's classification. We also examined inter- and intraobserver
11	correlations between each of the individual radiological parameters using kappa values.
12	According to Landis and Koch (6), a kappa value of 0.21-0.40 is considered "fair",
13	0.41-0.60 "moderate", 0.61-0.80 "substantial" and 0.81-1.0 "excellent".
14	
15	Results
16	Results for intraobserver reproducibility are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. For the
17	modified Lichtman's classification, kappa values ranged from 0.313 to 0.628, indicating
18	moderate agreement. Interobserver reliability for the modified Lichtman's classification
19	showed a kappa value of 0.228 (Siegel's kappa; 95% confidence interval (CI):
20	0.198-0.273) (Table 3). The classifications thus showed fair agreement. Intra- and
21	interobserver agreement for stages 3a and 3b were 75.5% and 65.3%, respectively.
22	Interviews after the examination revealed that the three examiners determined the

1 classifications of stage 3a and 3b by referring to the contralateral side.

 $\mathbf{2}$

3 Discussion

4	Radiography is the most commonly performed investigation when assessing the
5	severity of Kienböck's disease. In 1977, Lichtman proposed a classification system to
6	assess the severity of this disease (1). The original classification was based on
7	anteroposterior radiographs. Lichtman's classification is well-accepted, with most
8	reports depending on this classification (7)(8), while clinical results have shown no
9	correlation with radiographic stage (9)(10). For the original Lichtman's classification,
10	Jensen et al. reported poor reliability from a study of 48 cases (5) and Jafarnia et al.
11	reported good reliability from a study of 64 cases (4). For modified Lichtman's
12	classification, Goldfarb et al. reported reliability/reproducibility in 39 cases using an
13	additional criterion (subdividing stage 3 radioscaphoid angle based on a cutoff of 60°)
14	(3). Sample sizes in those reports were relatively small. The most important aspect of
15	the present study was the thorough and systematic analysis of the reliability of
16	Lichtman's classification systems in a relatively large sample of 99 patients with
17	Kienböck's disease.
18	An ideal radiological classification system should aid in assessing the severity of the
19	disease and help in deciding on treatment and prognosis. Furthermore, the
20	classification system should offer reasonable inter- and intraobserver reliabilities and
21	should not use obscure measurements. While various classifications have been
22	proposed in the past to achieve these goals, no ideal classification system for

Kienböck's disease has yet been established (1)(11)(12). The present study included complete radiographs from 99 patients with Kienböck's disease, and the reliabilities of the classification systems for this disease were assessed. The results showed that the modified Lichtman's classification offers only "fair" interobserver reliability even with experienced orthopedic surgeons.

6 According to the current results, one cause of disagreement arises from the 7 identification of stages 3a and 3b. Abe et al. recently reported that a cortical ring sign indicates only scaphoid flexion (13). All three observers in the present study referred to 8 9 the contralateral side to determine the classification of stages 3a and 3b, but these 10 stages do not indicate a pathological condition and the cutoff between 3a and 3b thus has little clinical relevance. The controversy resides in stage 3a and 3b for both 11 12radiological and pathological status, which might be a reason for the lack of a correlation 13with clinical results. Moreover, our findings revealed low interobserver reliability in all stages. For differentiating between stages 3 and 4, computed tomography (CT) may be 1415useful to evaluate degenerative joint changes. However, we did not use CT in the present study, which may partly explain the poor reliability. We do not recommend using 1617the modified Lichtman's classification system to aid in treatment decision-making. Most 18 surgeons base treatment plans on the results of CT and MRI and any new classification 19system should include findings from plain radiography, CT, and MRI.

20

21 Conclusion

22 The modified Lichtman's classifications showed only "fair" agreement even for

- 1 orthopedic experts. A new classification system should be established, based not only
- 2 on plain radiography, but also on CT and MRI.

3

1 References

2	1.	Lichtman DM, Mack GR, MacDonald RI, Gunther SF, Wilson JN. Kienbock's
3		disease: the role of silicone replacement arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg 1977;
4		59A: 899-908.
5	2.	Alexander AH, Turner MA, Alexander CE, Lichtman DM Lunate silicone
6		replacement arthroplasty in Kienböck's disease: a long-term follow-up. J Hand
7		Surg. 1990;15A :401-7.
8	3.	Goldfarb CA, Hsu J, Gelberman RH, Boyer MI. The Lichtman classification for
9		Kienbock's disease: an assessment of reliability. J Hand Surg. 2003; 28A : 74-80.
10	4.	Jafarnia K, Collins ED, Kohl HW 3rd, Bennett JB, Ilahi OA. Reliability of the
11		Lichtman classification of Kienbock's disease. J Hand Surg. 2000; 25A: 529-34.
12	5.	Jensen CH, Thomsen K, Holst-Nielsen F. Radiographic staging of Kienbock's
13		disease. Poor reproducibility of Stahl's and Lichtman's staging systems. Acta
14		Orthop Scand. 1996; 67: 274-6.
15	6.	Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical
16		data. Biometrics. 1977; 33: 159-74.
17	7.	Allan CH, Joshi A, Lichtman DM. Kienbock's disease: diagnosis and treatment. J
18		Am Acad Orthop Surg. 2001; 9: 128-36.
19	8.	Beredjiklian PK. Kienböck's disease. J Hand Surg. 2009; 34A: 167-75.
20	9.	Nakamura R, Imaeda T, Miura T. Radial shortening for Kienbock's disease: factors
21		affecting the operative result. J Hand Surg 1990; 15B:40-45.
22	10.	Iwasaki N, Minami A, Oizumi N, Yamane S, Suenaga N, Kato H.Predictors of

1		clinical results of radial osteotomies for Kienbock's disease. Clin Orthop Relat Res.
2		2003; 415:157-62.
3	11.	Stahl F. On lunatomalacia (Kienbock's disease). A clinical and roentgenological
4		study, espwcially on its pathogenesis and the late results of immobilization
5		treatment. Acta Chir Scand 1947; 126 (suppl):61-69.
6	12.	Decoulx P, Marchand M, Minet P, Razemon JP. Kienbock's disease in miners;
7		clinical & pathogenic study with analysis of 1330 x-rays of the wrist. Lille Chir.
8		1957; 12: 65-81. French
9	13.	Abe Y, Doi K, Hattori Y. The clinical significance of the scaphoid cortical ring sign:
10		a study of normal wrist X-rays. J Hand Surg Eur Vol. 2008; 33: 126-9.
11		

- 1 Figure legend
- $\mathbf{2}$
- 3 Figure 1. Lichtman's classification. A: stage 1, B: stage 2, C: stage 3a, D: stage 3b, E:
- 4 stage 4.



- 5 6
- _

T	Table 1. Modified Lichtman's classification, kappa values for intraobserver reliability								
	Observer No.	observed % agreement	Kappa value (95%Cl)						
	1	62.6	0.313 (0.138-0.488)						
	2	76.8	0.628 (0.495-0.761)						
	3	66.7	0.505 (0.367-0.643)						
•		No. 4. 40							

1	Table 1.	Modified I	_ichtman's	classification:	kappa	values fo	or intraobserve	er reliability
T				oluconnoution,	nuppu	valueo ie		or ronability

2 Years of experiences observer No. 1: 16 year, No.2: 14 years, No.3: 10 years.

1 Table 2. Intraobserver classification

2 Observer 1

		2 nd examination				total
	Stage	2	3a	3b	4	
⊿ st	2	0	3	0	0	3
I	3a	1	29	12	0	42
examination	3b	1	16	33	2	52
	4	0	0	2	0	2
total		2	48	47	2	99

3

4 Observer 2

		2 nd examination				total
	Stage	2	3a	3b	4	
⊿ st	2	6	2	0	0	8
I	3a	2	29	6	0	37
examination	3b	1	10	36	1	48
	4	0	1	0	5	6
total		9	42	42	6	99

$\mathbf{5}$

6 Observer 3

		2 nd examination				total
	Stage	2	3a	3b	4	
∎ st	2	17	8	5	0	30
I	3a	2	29	8	0	39
examination	3b	1	6	19	0	26
	4	0	1	2	1	4
total		20	44	34	1	99

7

1 Table 3. interobserver classification

$\mathbf{2}$

3 Observer 1 and 2

		Observer 2				total
	Stage	2	3a	3b	4	
	2	2	0	1	0	3
Observer 1	3a	5	23	14	0	42
	3b	1	13	33	5	52
	4	0	0	0	1	2
total		8	37	48	6	99

5 Observer 2 and 3

		Observer 2				total
	Stage	2	3a	3b	4	
Observer 3	2	7	15	8	0	30
	3a	0	19	20	0	39
	3b	1	3	18	4	26
	4	0	0	2	2	4
total		8	37	48	6	99

7 Observer 1 and 3

		Observer 3				total
Observer 1	Stage	2	3a	3b	4	
	2	3	0	0	0	3
	3a	14	22	5	1	42
	3b	13	16	20	3	52
	4	0	1	1	0	2
total		30	39	26	4	99