Reliability of commonly used classification systems of trochanteric fractures of the proximal femur and evaluation of CT in improving the interobserver agreement

Dr Mihir Thanvi¹, Dr Anil Kumar Gupta², Dr Naveen Goyal², Dr Rahul Agarwal¹, Dr. Ritesh Agarwal¹, Dr. Chinmaya Sharma¹

¹M.S. Orthopaedics, Senior resident, Department of Orthopaedics, SMS Medical College, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India
²M.S. Orthopaedics, Consultant Orthopaedic Surgeon, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

*Corresponding author
Dr Anil Kumar Gupta
Email: drguptzari2004@yahoo.co.in

Abstract: Objective and Aim of the study was to assess the interobserver reliability of two frequently used classifications for trochanteric femur fractures, the Boyd-Griffin classification and the AO/ASIF classification. Furthermore, the change in the level of agreement after addition of CT to plain radiograph was also evaluated. Fracture patterns of 31 consecutive patients with trochanteric fracture of the proximal femur were analyzed by four different observers (two radiologists and two orthopaedic surgeons) using plain X-Rays (Standard AP & Lateral views) and with combination of CT Scans. The level of agreement was then analyzed. The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using BG system was 0.05 and 0.42. The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using AO/ASIF without sub-groups was 0.17 and 0.54. The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using AO/ASIF with sub-groups was 0.02 and 0.27. The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using Boyd-Griffin system was 0.00 and 0.27. The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using AO/ASIF excluding sub-systems was 0.15 and 0.65. The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using AO/ASIF with sub-groups was ~ 0.12 and 0.29. We found a ‘slight’ reliability for the Boyd-Griffin classification and only a ‘fair’ reliability for the AO/ASIF classification. Furthermore, our study showed that the reliability of the AO/ASIF classification improved when subgroups of the classification were not provided. Addition of computed tomography to the plain radiographs has improved observer reliability from ‘moderate’ to ‘substantial’ levels in comparison to radiographs alone.

Keywords: Trochanteric fractures, Classification, Reliability

INTRODUCTION

An ideal fracture classification system should provide information on fracture geometry and more importantly, it should guide the treatment & prognosis. In order to use it for research purpose the classification should have a high degree of reliability.

Trochanteric femoral fracture treatment is considered to be a common practice in orthopaedic traumatology and the fracture account for about half of all hip fractures.

The reliability of the two frequently used classifications, the Boyd-Griffin classification and the AO/ASIF classification, have been assessed in a limited number of studies. The Boyd-Griffin classification [1] is a very basic classification with only 4 types & describes the location of the fracture line. A more recently developed AO/ASIF classification [2] is designed to provide prognostic information on achieving and maintaining reduction of the fracture in addition to the fracture pattern. In the more complex type of trochanteric fractures adequate radiological evaluation could be the answer to evaluate an adequate treatment plan and a reliable fracture classification. The value of computed tomography (CT) has been studied for different type of fractures with complicated fracture patterns such as tibial plateau or calcaneal fractures and proved to be superior to plain radiography [3-7]. However, for trochanteric fractures of higher complexity improvement of the reliability of fracture classifications was never assessed with CT in a clinical study. It is possible that better understanding of the fracture type and improved preoperative planning will result in higher agreement and improved clinical outcome [8].

The goal of this study is to assess the interobserver reliability of two frequently used classifications for trochanteric femur fractures, the Boyd-Griffin classification and the AO/ASIF classification. Furthermore, the change in the level of agreement after addition of CT to plain radiograph was also evaluated.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We enrolled 31 consecutive patients with trochanteric fractures...
fracture of the proximal femur. The AP (antero-posterior) view was taken in 15-degree internal rotation to offset the femoral anteversion and a lateral view followed by a CT scan. The scans were analysed by four different observers – two Radiologists and two Orthopaedic surgeons. They were asked to classify the fracture pattern according to the Boyd-Griffin classification and the AO/ASIF classification. Initially only the X-Ray films were provided and later CT Scans were also provided to mark the change of opinion with addition of CT Scans. The observers were given adequate time for assessment without any time restrictions. The observers were not allowed to discuss their findings with others & were provided with detailed description of both classification systems. Statistical analysis was performed by calculating the Cohen kappa value using SPSS 17.0 statistical software for interobserver reliability. We interpreted the kappa value coefficient according to the guidelines proposed by Landis and Koch: less than 0.00 poor reliability, 0.00–0.20 slight reliability, 0.21–0.40 fair reliability, 0.41–0.60 moderate reliability, 0.61–0.80 substantial agreement and 0.81–1.00 almost perfect agreement [9].

RESULTS

The mean age of the 31 subjects was 59 years (32-98 years). Fifteen patients were male and 16 female. Table 1 shows the entire kappa values calculated after observers classified the fractures using radiographs alone.

Table 1: Inter-observer agreements using plain radiographs only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boyd-Griffin classification</th>
<th>Kappa value</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist1 - Radiologist2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedist1 - Orthopaedist2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO/ASIF (without sub-groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist 1- Radiologist 2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedist1-Orthopaedist2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO/ASIF (with sub-group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist 1- Radiologist 2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedist1-Orthopaedist2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Inter-observer agreement when combined with CT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boyd-Griffin classification</th>
<th>Kappa value</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist 1- Radiologist 2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedist1-Orthopaedist2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO/ASIF (without sub-groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist 1- Radiologist 2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedist1-Orthopaedist2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO/ASIF (with sub-group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist 1- Radiologist 2</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedist1-Orthopaedist2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the entire kappa values calculated after observers classified the fractures using radiographs combined with computed tomography.

- The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using Boyd-Griffin system was 0.00 and 0.27.
- The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using AO/ASIF without sub-groups system was 0.15 and 0.65
- The mean kappa value for radiologists & orthopaedists using AO/ASIF with sub-groups was – 0.12 and 0.29.

In this study the reliability of two commonly used classifications for trochanteric femur fractures, the AO/ASIF classification and the Boyd-Griffin classification, was compared. We found a 'slight' reliability for the Boyd-Griffin classification and only a ‘fair’ reliability for the AO/ASIF classification. Furthermore, our study showed that the reliability of the AO/ASIF classification improved when subgroups of the classification were not provided.
DISCUSSION

Any fracture classification system should be reliable among different observers as well as by the same observer on separate occasions. In addition, the classification should suggest treatment and/or outcome. The kappa statistic provides a method of determining the diagnostic accuracy of a classification system with the calculation adjusting for random matches.

Previous studies have assessed the reliability of either the AO or other commonly used classification systems. Chapman et al. [10] to evaluated the reliability of AO/ASIF and Jensen’s classification system. They found that the interobserver reliability does not change dramatically when CT is added to plain radiographs. They also found that inter-observer kappa coefficients were also higher for radiologists than orthopaedic surgeons i.e. 0.67 & 0.57 respectively. And concluded that these classification schemes may not be comprehensive in describing fracture pattern and displacement. Finally, both systems failed to provide any prognostic value.

H. Pervez et al. [11] took five observers using the Jensen modification of the Evan’s classification and the AO classification (with and without subgroups) classified the radiographs of 88 trochanteric hip fractures. For the Jensen classification, the mean kappa value was 0.34. For the AO system with subgroups, the mean kappa value was 0.33. For the AO classification system without subgroups, the mean kappa value was 0.62. Our study also observed similar results.

Van Embden et al. [8] in their prospective study compared the reproducibility of two classifications for trochanteric femur fractures: the Jensen classification and the AO/ASIF classification. The inter-observer agreement of the AO/ASIF classification and the Jensen classification was kappa 0.40 and kappa0.48 respectively. The inter-observer agreement of the AO/ASIF classification without the sub-groups was 0.68 and concluded that both the classifications systems showed poor reliability.

Schipper et al. [12] did a prospective study on the reliability of AO/ASIF classification. 20 radiographs were reviewed twice by 15 observers. A substantial improvement in agreement was found when fractures were classified only according to main groups rather including subgroups. The mean kappa value for interobserver reliability was 0.33 and 0.67 without subgroups. They concluded that the AO/ASIF classification for pertrochanteric fractures is reliable for fracture groups 31A1, A2 or A3. The group classification should be used to compare scientific data and determine the best treatment. Further classification of fracture subgroups leads to poor reproducibility of results.

Wen-Jie Jin et al. [13] also studied the reliability of classification systems for intertrochanteric fractures of the proximal femur among experienced orthopaedic surgeons. Five experienced observers using AO, Evans, Kyle and Boyd-Griffins classification systems classified forty trochanteric fractures independently and interobserver variation was assessed. They found that the AO classification system with groups could be used more reliably to measure intertrochanteric fractures of the proximal femur than the other classification systems. However, the reliability of the AO classification with subgroups is not satisfactory. Their kappa values were 0.29 for Boyd-Griffin system and 0.80 for AO system without sub-groups and 0.38 including sub-groups.

We found that AO/ASIF classification system is a better system than Boyd-Griffin system in classifying trochanteric fractures. We also found that the simpler classification of trochanteric fracture into three AO groups (31A1, 31A2, 31A3) is more acceptable. The reliability of both the classification system is affected by the training, knowledge and experience of the observers. We have included CT in addition to plain radiographs which only one study had included [10]. In our study addition of computed tomography to the plain radiographs has improved observer reliability from ‘moderate’ to ‘substantial’ levels in comparison to radiographs alone. So CT can be an excellent mode for the diagnosis and classification of trochanteric fractures.
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