

World Journal of *Orthopedics*

World J Orthop 2022 February 18; 13(2): 122-211



MINIREVIEWS

- 122 Developments in diagnosis and treatment of paediatric septic arthritis
Donders CM, Spaans AJ, van Wering H, van Bergen CJ

ORIGINAL ARTICLE**Retrospective Cohort Study**

- 131 All-epiphyseal versus trans-epiphyseal screw fixation for tillaux fractures: Does it matter?
Heldt B, Roepe I, Guo R, Attia E, Inneh I, Shenava V, Kushare I

Retrospective Study

- 139 Femoroacetabular offset restoration in total hip arthroplasty; Digital templating a short stem *vs* a conventional stem
de Waard S, Verboom T, Bech NH, Sierevelt IN, Kerkhoffs GM, Haverkamp D

Clinical Trials Study

- 150 Periprosthetic joint infections in femoral neck fracture patients treated with hemiarthroplasty – should we use antibiotic-loaded bone cement?
Crego-Vita D, Aedo-Martín D, Garcia-Cañas R, Espigares-Correa A, Sánchez-Pérez C, Berberich CE

Observational Study

- 160 Bone mineral density in fracture neck of femur patients: What's the significance?
Elamin Ahmed H, Al-Dadah O

Prospective Study

- 171 Liverpool carpal tunnel scoring system to predict nerve conduction study results: A prospective correlation study
Chan Y, Selvaratnam V, Manickavasagar T, Shetty V, Sahni V
- 178 Clinical efficacy of the Ankle Spacer for the treatment of multiple secondary osteochondral lesions of the talus
Dahmen J, Altink JN, Vuurberg G, Wijdicks CA, Stufkens SA, Kerkhoffs GM

SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

- 193 COVID-19 pandemic: An update on the reaction attitude of the spine societies and their members worldwide
Ramieri A, Alshafeei O, Trungu S, Raco A, Costanzo G, Miscusi M

SCIENTOMETRICS

- 201 Assessing the academic achievement of United States orthopaedic departments
Trikha R, Olson TE, Chaudry A, Ishmael CR, Villalpando C, Chen CJ, Hori KR, Bernthal NM

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Orthopedics*, Alessandro Ramieri, MD, PhD, Professor, Research Fellow, Surgeon, SAIMALAL, Sapienza Rome University, Rome 00100, Italy. alexramieri@libero.it

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of *World Journal of Orthopedics (WJO, World J Orthop)* is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of orthopedics with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJO mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of orthopedics and covering a wide range of topics including arthroscopy, bone trauma, bone tumors, hand and foot surgery, joint surgery, orthopedic trauma, osteoarthritis, osteoporosis, pediatric orthopedics, spinal diseases, spine surgery, and sports medicine.

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The *WJO* is now abstracted and indexed in PubMed, PubMed Central, Emerging Sources Citation Index (Web of Science), Scopus, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), China Science and Technology Journal Database (CSTJ), and Superstar Journals Database. The 2021 edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2020 Journal Citation Indicator (JCI) for *WJO* as 0.66. The *WJO*'s CiteScore for 2020 is 3.2 and Scopus CiteScore rank 2020: Orthopedics and Sports Medicine is 87/262.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: *Ying-Yi Yuan*; Production Department Director: *Xiang Li*; Editorial Office Director: *Jin-Lei Wang*.

NAME OF JOURNAL

World Journal of Orthopedics

ISSN

ISSN 2218-5836 (online)

LAUNCH DATE

November 18, 2010

FREQUENCY

Monthly

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Massimiliano Leigheb

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

<http://www.wjgnet.com/2218-5836/editorialboard.htm>

PUBLICATION DATE

February 18, 2022

COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

PUBLICATION ETHICS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

ONLINE SUBMISSION

<https://www.f6publishing.com>

Prospective Study

Liverpool carpal tunnel scoring system to predict nerve conduction study results: A prospective correlation study

Yuen Chan, Veenesh Selvaratnam, Tharjan Manickavasagar, Vishwanath Shetty, Vishal Sahni

Specialty type: Surgery**Provenance and peer review:**

Invited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind**Peer-review report's scientific quality classification**

Grade A (Excellent): 0

Grade B (Very good): 0

Grade C (Good): C, C

Grade D (Fair): 0

Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: Aman M,
Kanchanasurakit S**Received:** March 25, 2021**Peer-review started:** March 25, 2021**First decision:** June 16, 2021**Revised:** June 30, 2021**Accepted:** January 18, 2022**Article in press:** January 18, 2022**Published online:** February 18, 2022**Yuen Chan**, Department of Trauma and Orthopaedics, Mersey Deanery, Prescot L35 5DR, Merseyside, United Kingdom**Veenesh Selvaratnam**, Department of Trauma and Orthopaedics, Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester M13 9WL, United Kingdom**Tharjan Manickavasagar, Vishwanath Shetty, Vishal Sahni**, Department of Trauma and Orthopaedics, Southport and Ormskirk NHS Trust, Southport L39 2AZ, United Kingdom**Corresponding author:** Yuen Chan, FRCS, MBChB, MSc, Surgeon, Department of Trauma and Orthopaedics, Mersey Deanery, Warrington Rd, Rainfall, Prescot L35 5DR, Merseyside, United Kingdom. y.chan1@nhs.net**Abstract****BACKGROUND**

Carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) is one of the most common peripheral nerve compressive neuropathies. The clinical symptoms and physical examinations of CTS are widely recognised, however, there is still debate around what is the best approach for assessment of CTS. Clinical assessment is still considered the gold standard, however, controversies do exist regarding the need for investigations such nerve conduction studies (NCS) to aid with management decisions.

AIM

To correlate the severity of NCS results to a scoring system which included symptoms, signs and risk factors.

METHODS

This was a prospective correlation study. We scored patients' signs and symptoms using our CTS scoring system. This was then correlated with the findings of the NCS. The scoring system included - four symptoms (2 Katz hand diagrams - one for tingling and one for numbness; nocturnal paresthesia and bilateral symptoms) and four clinical signs (weak thumb abduction test; Tinel's sign; Phalen sign and hypoalgesia in median nerve territory) and two risk factors (age more than 40 years and female sex). We classified the NCS results to normal, mild, moderate and severe.

RESULTS

There were 61 scores in 59 patients. The mean scores for the categories were as

follows: 6.75 for normal NCS; 5.50 for mild NCS; 9.17 for moderate NCS and 9 for severe NCS. All scores of 8 or more matched with NCS results of moderate and severe intensity apart from three scores which were greater than seven that had normal NCS. Eta score was 0.822 for the CTS score being the dependent value and the NCS category being the independent variable showing a strong association between the scoring system and the NCS group.

CONCLUSION

We feel that this simple scoring system can be used to predict and correlate the severity of NCS in patients with CTS.

Key Words: Carpal tunnel syndrome; Nerve; Compression neuropathy; Median nerve; Scoring

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: The use of our simple scoring method can help determine if patients with carpal tunnel syndrome need nerve conduction studies. Patients scoring less than 8 may have mild or moderate carpal tunnel syndrome and in these patients we recommend the use of nerve conduction studies. In patients scoring 8 or more, we do not recommend the use of nerve conduction studies for the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome.

Citation: Chan Y, Selvaratnam V, Manickavasagar T, Shetty V, Sahni V. Liverpool carpal tunnel scoring system to predict nerve conduction study results: A prospective correlation study. *World J Orthop* 2022; 13(2): 171-177

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/2218-5836/full/v13/i2/171.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.5312/wjo.v13.i2.171>

INTRODUCTION

Carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) is one of the most common peripheral nerve compressive neuropathies. The prevalence of CTS in the United Kingdom is 7%-16%. A General Practice Research Database found that 88 men and 193 women present as new cases per 100000 population per year[1]. The clinical symptoms and physical examinations are widely recognised, however there is still debate around what is the best approach for the assessment of carpal tunnel syndrome. Clinical assessment is considered the gold standard; however, controversies exist regarding the need for investigations such as nerve conduction studies (NCS) to aid with management decisions[2].

NCS is the investigation of choice when clinical diagnosis is inconclusive. It is also used to confirm the diagnosis of CTS. NCS have been found to be highly sensitive and specific for the diagnosis of CTS [3]. However, NCS can be painful and expensive. The reported false negative rate of NCS is between 1.5% to 16%[4,5]. The reported false positive rate is up to 46%[6]. The evaluation of NCS for CTS involves the measurement of conduction velocity across the carpal tunnel, as well as determination of the amplitude of sensory and motor responses. Focal demyelination can occur with increased median nerve compression. This results in local conduction block and slowing of motor and sensory conduction across the wrist. The axons of the median nerve can be damaged with even greater compression resulting in reduced amplitudes.

The grading of severity of CTS is as follows: Mild - prolonged sensory nerve action potential (SNAP), and/or slightly reduced SNAP amplitude. Moderate - abnormal median SNAP as above, plus prolonged median motor distal latency. Severe - prolonged median motor and sensory distal latencies, plus either an absent SNAP or low amplitude or absent thenar compound muscle action potential. Needle examination often reveal fibrillation, reduced recruitment, and motor unit potential changes[7,8].

There are validated measures such as the Boston Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Questionnaire which quantify symptoms and disability; however, this does not include clinical examinations. One study found that the clinical-neurophysiologic relationships are very strong when they evaluated the clinical picture with the disability scale of the Boston Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Questionnaire as well as clinical examinations findings. Conversely, the clinical-neurophysiologic relationship is not so clear and simple when they compared it with the symptoms only[9]. Other scoring systems include use of hand diagrams such as the Katz[10] hand diagram (looking at distribution of symptoms in the hand) and the CTS-6 scale (looking at symptoms and examination)[11]. A systematic review found there are limited evidence to support the use of these scoring systems[12].

Numerous patients with CTS have severe symptoms but no NCS changes, therefore we hypothesised that a scoring system combining symptoms, signs and risk factors can help with the diagnosis of CTS. The aim of the study was to correlate the severity of NCS results to a scoring system which included

symptoms, signs and risk factors.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We prospectively collected data for fifty-nine patients who were referred to our hand unit with symptoms of carpal tunnel syndrome. All patients who were referred and diagnosed with CTS clinically were included in the study. Patient with symptoms but diagnosed with other diagnoses were excluded. All patients who clinically showed symptoms of CTS had the ten-point scoring system and NCS carried out. We prospectively collected data for 61 hands (59 patients) over a ten-month period.

We reviewed existing scoring systems and examination signs to develop a scoring system. We developed a 10-point scoring system which included symptoms, signs and risk factors. We scored our patients using the ten-point scoring system. The scoring system included; four symptoms (2 Katz[10] hand diagram – for tingling and numbness, nocturnal paresthesia and bilateral symptoms), four clinical signs (weak thumb abduction test, Tinel's sign, Phalen sign and hypoalgesia in median nerve territory) and two risk factors (age more than 40 years and female sex). We classified the NCS to normal, mild, moderate and severe as described above[8].

This study was conducted prospectively. Local clinical governance approval was obtained. All patients who underwent the ten-point scoring system and had NCS was included. Our ten-point scoring system (Table 1) was applied to patients with symptoms of CTS prior to NCS. The score of the ten-point scoring system was then correlated with the severity results of the NCS. The score was used to correlate with the NCS results but was not used to decide on treatment. As the scoring depended on the signs and symptoms no blinding could be applied to the assessors or the patients. The assessors of clinical signs and symptoms were not involved in the statistical analysis of the results. The data analysis was carried out by a member of authors who were blinded to the patients and tests.

The ten-point scoring system included tingling and numbness on a Katz hand diagram. Nocturnal paresthesia is defined as night numbness and tingling or wakening. Bilateral symptoms imply symptoms involving both hands. Signs included weak thumb abduction; Tinel's sign which is reproduction of the symptoms on tapping over the carpal tunnel; Phalen's sign which is reproduction of the symptoms for CTS on flexion of the wrist for 60 s. Hypoalgesia is defined as reduced sensitivity to a painful stimulus in the median nerve distribution.

Other data collected were age, sex, laterality of hand affected, NCS results and duration of symptoms. It was our common practice in our hospital to refer a patient for a NCS in suspected cases of CTS prior to surgical intervention. All patients in this study were from a single upper limb surgeon's practice. Statistical analysis was done using SPSS. Eta value was used to determine the association between NCS category and CTS score. Eta of 0 is no association and Eta of 1 is perfect association. One way ANOVA test was used to test difference between the groups. The partial Eta squared was used to test how much variability of the scores was accounted for by the NCS severity. Post hoc analysis was carried out to determine which NCS groups have differences between each other. The post hoc analysis used in this study was Scheffe.

RESULTS

There were 61 scores in 59 patients. There were 43 female and 18 male patients. The mean duration of symptoms was 17 mo (range 2-84 mo). Thirty-two were left hands and twenty-nine were right hands. There were 8 patients in the normal NCS category, 14 patients in the mild NCS category, 12 patients in the moderate NCS category and 27 patients in the severe NCS category. The mean age was 60 years (range 37-91 years).

The mean score for the categories were as follows: 6.75 for normal NCS, 5.50 for mild NCS, 9.17 for moderate NCS and 9 for severe NCS. All scores of 8 or more matched with NCS of moderate and severe intensity apart from three scores which were greater than seven that were normal on NCS (Table 2).

One of the three patients who had a score over 7 but had normal NCS was found to have a cervical disc herniation after a magnetic resonance imaging of the cervical spine. This patient underwent cervical disc decompression and had resolution of her symptoms. She did not require a carpal tunnel decompression. The other two patients with a score of 8 and 9 respectively underwent a carpal tunnel decompression despite normal NCS as clinically they were both symptomatic. Both patients reported resolution of symptoms post carpal tunnel decompression.

An Eta coefficient test was performed to determine the strength of correlation between the scores and the NCS categories of normal, mild, moderate and severe. An Eta score was 0.822 for the CTS score being the dependent value and the NCS category being the independent variable shows a strong association between the score and the NCS categories. A one-way ANOVA test showed there were a significant statistical difference between the severity groups ($P < 0.001$). The partial Eta squared was 0.676 meaning that 67.6% of the variability of the CTS score is accounted for by the severity of their CTS.

Table 1 The Liverpool ten-point carpal tunnel syndrome scoring system

	1 point	1 point	0 point
Symptoms			
Tingling (Katz hand diagram)	Classic pattern	Probable pattern	Unlikely pattern
Numbness (Katz hand diagram)	Classic pattern	Probable pattern	Unlikely pattern
Nocturnal paresthesia	Yes		No
Bilateral symptoms	Yes		No
Signs			
Weak thumb abduction	Yes		No
Tinels sign	Yes		No
Phalen’s sign	Yes		No
Hypoalgesia	Yes		No
Risk factors			
Age > 40 yr	Yes		No
Female	Yes		No

Table 2 Correlation between our carpal tunnel syndrome scoring and nerve conduction studies results

Score/NCS	Normal	Mild	Moderate	Severe
0				
1				
2		1		
3				
4		2		
5	2	3		
6	2	4		
7	1	4		
8	2		3	9
9	1		4	9
10			5	9

NCS: Nerve conduction studies.

A post hoc analysis showed there were statistical significance between the CTS scores of patients with normal NCS and patients with moderate and severe NCS ($P < 0.001$). There was statistical significance between the CTS scores of patients with mild NCS compared with CTS scores of patients with moderate and severe NCS ($P < 0.001$). There was no significant statistical difference between CTS scores of patients with moderate NCS findings compared with severe NCS findings ($P < 0.979$).

DISCUSSION

An appropriate diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome is important as it is a common condition. There is no consensus on whether to base treatment decisions on clinical history and assessment only, or NCS should be done in every case. Within the UK, different areas have different rules on diagnosis and treatment. The British Orthopaedic Association guidelines states NCS is not routinely needed and should only be used if clinical examination and history are equivocal, if there is persistent or recurrent carpal tunnel syndrome or if there is an unclear diagnosis suggesting peripheral neuropathy[13].

NCS may not always be positive in patients who are symptomatic. Not every clinician request NCS because of the costs and delays associated with NCS[14]. One study looking at just history and examination findings concluded that the majority of patients who have CTS on the basis of their scoring system, further NCS studies did not change the probability of diagnosing the condition[11]. Another study looked at using a web-based CTS questionnaire prior to the patient's appointment and found that it provided a sufficiently accurate prediction of the likelihood of CTS to help in the initial planning, investigation and treatment of CTS[15].

A CTS scoring can help in planning and streamlining of services which is of significant importance especially in light of the current pandemic. We should aim to get the right diagnosis as effectively and as efficiently as possible and to use resources such as NCS in a cost-effective way.

The reported sensitivity and specificity for each of our sign and symptoms are as follows; classic or probable Katz hand diagram pattern (0.64, 0.73 respectively), nocturnal paraesthesia (0.51, 0.68 respectively), bilateral symptoms (0.61, 0.58 respectively), weak thumb abduction test (0.66, 0.66 respectively), Tinel sign (0.60, 0.80 respectively), Phalen sign (0.91, 0.86 respectively), hypoalgesia in median nerve (0.51, 0.93 respectively), age more than 40 years (0.80, 0.41 respectively)[10,16-21]. Female sex has an increased risk of developing CTS[22]. This may be due to females being over-represented in jobs that have a high risk of developing CTS. When the occupational exposure is truly similar, the risk of developing CTS is similar between both genders. In our cohort, 71% of patients were females. We did not obtain job specifications for our patients.

This study shows our simple ten-point scoring system have a high correlation with the NCS results. Our CTS score differentiated between patients with normal/mild NCS symptoms to patients with moderate/severe NCS findings. The difference is significant between patients with normal/mild NCS findings compared with patients with moderate/severe NCS findings. We have CTS in patients across the range of the CTS scores but the aim of the scoring system is to identify patients who would most likely benefit from NCS prior to carpal tunnel decompression as their clinical findings are equivocal.

We did not find a difference between patients with moderate and severe NCS findings or between patients with normal and mild NCS findings. However, clinically we feel both the moderate and severe group would be treated with a carpal tunnel decompression, therefore it is more important to differentiate between patients with normal and mild vs. moderate and severe NCS. In patients with normal and mild NCS, treatment will also depend on their symptoms. If symptoms are severe then they will more likely receive surgical intervention otherwise they would initially undergo a period of conservative management. Surgical intervention would only be undertaken should the patient fail their trial of conservative management.

The strength of our study is having a scoring system that combines signs, symptoms and risk factors. There are limitations to our study. It was a relatively small number of patients and we would need further studies to validate our scoring system. We did not have the co-morbidities or occupation of the patients and we did not re-do the scores after surgical decompression to see if the score can be used to monitor outcome post CTD. Further studies looking to include these factors would be beneficial.

CONCLUSION

We feel that this simple scoring system can be used to predict and correlate the severity of NCS in patients with CTS. Based on our study, we believe that patients who score less than eight may require NCS to confirm the diagnosis of CTS. However, patient who score more than 7 have a 93% chance of having moderate to severe CTS on NCS. Use of our simple scoring methods can help determine patients with moderate and severe CTS. In this group of patients, we recommend not using NCS. Patients scoring less than 8 may have mild or moderate CTS and, in this group of patients, we recommend the use of NCS. Further studies, looking to validate the scoring system clinically would be useful.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

There is still debate around what is the best approach for assessment of Carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS). Controversies do exist regarding the need for investigations such as the need for nerve conduction studies (NCS) to aid with management decisions.

Research motivation

We hypothesised that a scoring system combining symptoms, signs and risk factors can help with the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome and whether nerve conduction studies would be required.

Research objectives

The aim of the study was to correlate the severity of nerve conduction study results to a scoring system which included symptoms, signs and risk factors.

Research methods

We scored patients' signs and symptoms using our CTS scoring system. This was then correlated with the findings of the NCS. The scoring system included - four symptoms and four clinical signs and two risk factors. We classified the NCS results to normal, mild, moderate and severe.

Research results

All scores of 8 or more matched with NCS results of moderate and severe intensity apart from three scores which were greater than seven that had normal NCS. Eta score was 0.822 for the CTS score being the dependent value and the NCS category being the independent variable showing a strong association between the scoring system and the NCS group.

Research conclusions

Based on our study, we believe that patients who score less than 8 may require NCS to confirm the diagnosis of CTS. However, patients who score more than 7 have a 93% chance of having moderate to severe CTS on NCS. The use of our simple scoring methods can help determine patients with moderate and severe CTS. In this group of patients, we recommend not using NCS. Patients scoring less than 8 may have mild or moderate CTS and in this group of patients, we recommend the use of NCS.

Research perspectives

The use of our Liverpool carpal tunnel scoring system can have the potential to be used to help determine if NCS is required. Further studies looking into the validation of the scoring system is required.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Chan Y and Selvaratnam V wrote and edited the manuscript and were involved in the analysis of the study; Selvaratnam V, Manickavasagar T, Shetty V, and Sahni V were involved in the collection of data and editing of the manuscript.

Institutional review board statement: This study was approved by Southport and Ormskirk NHS Hospital.

Clinical trial registration statement: A clinical trial registration was not required.

Informed consent statement: The informed consent statement is not applicable for this study.

Conflict-of-interest statement: No conflict of interest.

Data sharing statement: No additional data are available.

CONSORT 2010 statement: The authors have read the CONSORT 2010 statement, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the CONSORT 2010 statement.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Country/Territory of origin: United Kingdom

ORCID number: Yuen Chan 0000-0001-8673-7406; Veesh Selvaratnam 0000-0002-3821-1781; Tharjan Manickavasagar 0000-0002-3725-1415; Vishal Sahni 0000-0003-1117-6530.

S-Editor: Wang JL

L-Editor: A

P-Editor: Wang JL

REFERENCES

- 1 **Latinovic R**, Gulliford MC, Hughes RA. Incidence of common compressive neuropathies in primary care. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2006; **77**: 263-265 [PMID: 16421136 DOI: 10.1136/jnnp.2005.066696]
- 2 **Padua L**, Coraci D, Erra C, Pazzaglia C, Paolasso I, Loreti C, Caliendo P, Hobson-Webb LD. Carpal tunnel syndrome: clinical features, diagnosis, and management. *Lancet Neurol* 2016; **15**: 1273-1284 [PMID: 27751557 DOI: 10.1016/S1474-4422(16)30231-9]
- 3 **Jablecki CK**, Andary MT, Floeter MK, Miller RG, Quartly CA, Vennix MJ, Wilson JR; American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine; American Academy of Neurology; American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. Practice parameter: Electrodiagnostic studies in carpal tunnel syndrome. Report of the American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine, American Academy of Neurology, and the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. *Neurology* 2002; **58**: 1589-1592 [PMID: 12058083 DOI: 10.1212/wnl.58.11.1589]
- 4 **Löscher WN**, Auer-Grumbach M, Trinka E, Ladurner G, Hartung HP. Comparison of second lumbrical and interosseus latencies with standard measures of median nerve function across the carpal tunnel: a prospective study of 450 hands. *J Neurol* 2000; **247**: 530-534 [PMID: 10993495 DOI: 10.1007/s004150070152]
- 5 **Uncini A**, Di Muzio A, Awad J, Manente G, Tafuro M, Gambi D. Sensitivity of three median-to-ulnar comparative tests in diagnosis of mild carpal tunnel syndrome. *Muscle Nerve* 1993; **16**: 1366-1373 [PMID: 8232394 DOI: 10.1002/mus.880161215]
- 6 **Redmond MD**, Rivner MH. False positive electrodiagnostic tests in carpal tunnel syndrome. *Muscle Nerve* 1988; **11**: 511-518 [PMID: 3374521 DOI: 10.1002/mus.880110515]
- 7 **Yazdanpanah P**, Aramesh S, Mousavizadeh A, Ghaffari P, Khosravi Z, Khademi A. Prevalence and severity of carpal tunnel syndrome in women. *Iran J Public Health* 2012; **41**: 105-110 [PMID: 23113142]
- 8 **Stevens JC**. AAEM minimonograph #26: the electrodiagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome. American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine. *Muscle Nerve* 1997; **20**: 1477-1486 [PMID: 9390659 DOI: 10.1002/(sici)1097-4598(199712)20:12<1477::aid-mus1>3.0.co;2-5]
- 9 **Padua L**, Padua R, Lo Monaco M, Aprile I, Tonali P. Multiperspective assessment of carpal tunnel syndrome: a multicenter study. Italian CTS Study Group. *Neurology* 1999; **53**: 1654-1659 [PMID: 10563608 DOI: 10.1212/wnl.53.8.1654]
- 10 **Katz JN**, Stirrat CR, Larson MG, Fossel AH, Eaton HM, Liang MH. A self-administered hand symptom diagram for the diagnosis and epidemiologic study of carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Rheumatol* 1990; **17**: 1495-1498 [PMID: 2273490]
- 11 **Graham B**. The value added by electrodiagnostic testing in the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2008; **90**: 2587-2593 [PMID: 19047703 DOI: 10.2106/JBJS.G.01362]
- 12 **Dabbagh A**, MacDermid JC, Yong J, Macedo LG, Packham TL. Diagnosing Carpal Tunnel Syndrome: Diagnostic Test Accuracy of Scales, Questionnaires, and Hand Symptom Diagrams-A Systematic Review. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2020; **50**: 622-631 [PMID: 32938312 DOI: 10.2519/jospt.2020.9599]
- 13 **British Orthopaedic Association**; Royal College of Surgeons of England. Commissioning Guide: Treatment of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. 2017
- 14 **Hui ACF**, Wong SM, Griffith J. Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *Pract Neurol* 2005; **5**: 210 [DOI: 10.1111/j.1474-7766.2005.00312.x]
- 15 **Bland JD**, Rudolfer S, Weller P. Prospective analysis of the accuracy of diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome using a web-based questionnaire. *BMJ Open* 2014; **4**: e005141 [PMID: 25142261 DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005141]
- 16 **Buch-Jaeger N**, Foucher G. Correlation of clinical signs with nerve conduction tests in the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Hand Surg Br* 1994; **19**: 720-724 [PMID: 7706873 DOI: 10.1016/0266-7681(94)90244-5]
- 17 **Kuhlman KA**, Hennessey WJ. Sensitivity and specificity of carpal tunnel syndrome signs. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 1997; **76**: 451-457 [PMID: 9431262 DOI: 10.1097/00002060-199711000-00004]
- 18 **Heller L**, Ring H, Costeff H, Solzi P. Evaluation of Tinell's and Phalen's signs in diagnosis of the carpal tunnel syndrome. *Eur Neurol* 1986; **25**: 40-42 [PMID: 3940864 DOI: 10.1159/000115985]
- 19 **Golding DN**, Rose DM, Selvarajah K. Clinical tests for carpal tunnel syndrome: an evaluation. *Br J Rheumatol* 1986; **25**: 388-390 [PMID: 3779325 DOI: 10.1093/rheumatology/25.4.388]
- 20 **De Smet L**, Steenwerckx A, Van den Bogaert G, Cnudde P, Fabry G. Value of clinical provocative tests in carpal tunnel syndrome. *Acta Orthop Belg* 1995; **61**: 177-182 [PMID: 8525813]
- 21 **Katz JN**, Larson MG, Sabra A, Krarup C, Stirrat CR, Sethi R, Eaton HM, Fossel AH, Liang MH. The carpal tunnel syndrome: diagnostic utility of the history and physical examination findings. *Ann Intern Med* 1990; **112**: 321-327 [PMID: 2306060 DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-112-5-321]
- 22 **Harris-Adamson C**, Eisen EA, Dale AM, Evanoff B, Hegmann KT, Thiese MS, Kapellusch JM, Garg A, Burt S, Bao S, Silverstein B, Gerr F, Merlino L, Rempel D. Personal and workplace psychosocial risk factors for carpal tunnel syndrome: a pooled study cohort. *Occup Environ Med* 2013; **70**: 529-537 [PMID: 23645610 DOI: 10.1136/oemed-2013-101365]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-3991568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
Help Desk: <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

