



International Journal of Information Research and Review Vol. 08, Issue, 11, pp.7367-7370, November, 2021



NON-VASCULARISED CORTICO-CANCELLOUS GRAFTS FOR CARPAL SCAPHOID PSEUDARTHROSIS ARE THEY STILL RELEVANT?

*Yassine Rachdi, Adnane Lachkar, Abdeljaouad Najib and Hicham Yacoubi

Morrocco

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article History: Received 16th August, 2021 Received in revised form 29th September, 2021 Accepted 20th October, 2021 Published online 30th November, 2021

Keywords: Scaphoid, Pseudarthrosis, Graft, Cortico-Cancellous.

The aim of this retrospective study was to analyse the results obtained in 12 carpal scaphoid pseudarthroses that had benefited from a non-vascularised cortico-cancellous graft, in order to specify the factors influencing the results and to determine the ideal indications and limitations. Between 2015 and 2021, 12 patients received a non-vascularized cortico-cancellous graft. The average followup was 36 months. The average age was 31 years. For 5 patients, the fracture was not initially diagnosed and the average delay of diagnosis was 2 months. In the Schernberg classification, the fracture was located: 3 times in zone II, 7 times in zone III and 2 times in zone IV. According to Alnot's classification, the stages of pseudarthrosis were divided into: stage I (3), stage IIA (4), stage IIB (4), stage IIIA (1) and stage IIIB (0). The average postoperative immobilisation was 2.7 months. Consolidation was obtained in 10 cases, on average, after 3 months. 7 patients were very satisfied, 3 satisfied and 2 not satisfied. Five patients had significant pain at the time of grafting, but this disappeared within a few months, and all patients had no sequelae in retrospect. Compared to the healthy wrist, the range of motion was reduced in flexion (average 7.2q), extension (average 13.5q) and radial tilt (average 11.5q). The other areas of wrist mobility were respected (in particular supination and pronation). The carpal height index averaged 0.52, and 3 wrists had decreased height. The mean radiolunate angle was 4.2q . 4 wrists had a DISI deformity. 7 patients had little or no osteoarthritis. 2 pseudoarthroses could not be consolidated. All patients were improved for pain. The occurrence of osteoarthritis was favoured by the persistence of a DISI deformity. Although this technique allows 81% consolidation, it is outdated for advanced stages of arthrosis. The correction of an intra-carpal deformity in DISI appears to be essential to prevent the onset of arthrosis. This technique should not be used in cases of necrosis of the proximal pole, and a vascularised graft should probably be preferred.

Copyright © 2021, Yassine Rachdi et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Scaphoid fracture is the most common carpal bone fracture [Leslie and Dickson (1)]. And 5 to 10% progress to pseudoarthrosis [Alnot (2)]. Pseudoarthrosis inevitably progresses to osteoarthritis, in the more or less long term, when it is not treated surgically. Classically, the treatment of pseudoarthrosis uses cancellous or cortico-cancellous grafts most often taken from the iliac crest. In recent years, thanks to the development of microsurgery, vascularised grafts have been proposed [Doi *et al* (3), Gabl *et al* (4), Guimberteau and Panconi (5), Mathoulin and Haerle (6)]. It is therefore questionable whether the classical non-vascularised graft techniques are still relevant. The aim of our retrospective radio-clinical study was to determine: 1) the limitations of this method of grafting carpal scaphoid pseudarthroses, factors influencing the results, 3) the ideal indication.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patients: Between 2015 and 2021, 12 patients with scaphoid pseudarthrosis were treated with a non-vascularised graft. During the study period, no other treatment was offered for the treatment of scaphoid pseudarthrosis. There were 11 men and one woman. There were 7 right, 5 left lesions. 8 patients were affected on the dominant side. The average follow-up time was 36 months. The average age of the patients at the time of the operation was 31 years. In 5 patients, the fracture was not initially diagnosed; 7 fractures were initially diagnosed. 4 fractures had no initial treatment, 2 had a cast for 9 weeks, and 1 had a pinning. The average time from fracture to surgical management was 2 months. According to the classification of Schernberg et al (7) (fig. 1) the The fracture was located 3 times in zone II, 7 times in zone III and 2 times in zone IV. According to Alnot (2), the stages of pseudoarthrosis and arthrosis were divided into 3 stages I, 4 stages IIA, 4 stages IIB, only one stage IIIA and no stage IIIB cases (Table I).

Surgical method: The approach was anterior in all our cases. The graft was harvested 8 times from the anterior iliac crest and 4 times from the distal radial epiphysis. The graft was cortico-cancellous 8 times and pure cancellous 4 times.

The grafting was performed with a curette. In 7 cases, a bone graft was embedded and in 5 cases an intercalary graft. For the osteosynthesis material, the patients benefited from screw fixation in 9 cases and pinning in 3 cases. The average immobilisation period was 2.7 months (1.5 to 4 months).

Evaluation method: In addition to the level of patient satisfaction, wrist pain was assessed in 4 stages (severe, moderate, We compared the range of motion of the affected wrist with that of the healthy side. We compared the range of motion of the affected wrist with that of the healthy side. The height of the carpus was assessed by the Mac Murtry index [Sintzoff and Fumiere (9)]. The radiolunate angle was measured on a profile X-ray of the wrist using a planchette (*Fig. 2*). A value greater than or equal to 10q was considered to be DISI (dorsal lunate tilt). A value less than or equal to -25q was considered VISI (ventral lunate tilt).



Fig. 1. Distribution of locations according to Schernberg zones

Proximal pole necrosis was only looked for on plain radiographs and on the following signs: densified appearance, bone resorption, multiple geodes. The function was assessed by the Shah and Jones score (10) *(Table II), which* we felt was the most appropriate for this condition and which includes an objective and subjective evaluation. A score of 90 or more is considered excellent, between 80 and 89 good, between 70 and 79 average and below 70 poor. Following the same divisions as Shah's score, we have introduced a personal score *(table III)* which takes into account the mobility in radio-ulnar tilt and for which the subjective side no longer counts for half but for 1/5th of the score.



Figure 2. Measurement of the radiolunar angle, to assess the lunate tilt (if > 10q = DISI; if < -25q = VISI)

RESULTS

Complications: No infections were observed at any of the 12 wrists or iliac harvest sites. Of the 8 patients who received an iliac graft, 5 experienced significant immediate postoperative pain. However, none of them had any pain at the graft site in retrospect. 2 pseudarthroses did not consolidate. 7 patients were very satisfied, 3 satisfied and 2 not satisfied.

Table II. - Shah and Jones score (10).

Objective score Subjective score Consolidation Function No 10 Limitation of all activities 0 Fibrous union 15 Unable to find a job 10 Partial bone healing 20 Unable to return to previous 20 job 0 Complete bone healing 25 Able to return to previous 30 work 0 Osteoarthritis Normal activity 40 Complete (the whole carp) 5 Pain Advance 10 Needed a medication 0 Moderate 15 Daily pain 6 Beginner 20 Pain during heavy loads 10 No 25 Pain after 16 intensive work 10 Pain more 22 (flexion-extension arc to theonce a month opposite side) 25 Decrease limits performance 0 S1 - 75 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility performance Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 Force	Shah's score				
ConsolidationFunctionNo10Limitation of all activities0Fibrous union15Unable to find a job10Partial bone healing20Unable to return to previous 20 jobjobComplete bone healing25Able to return to previous 30 work0OsteoarthritisNormal activity40Complete (the whole carp)5PainAdvance10Needed a medication0Moderate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during heavy loads10No25Pain after intensive work16MobilityPain nore posite side)2225 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month opposite side)25Do %10Force forceThe reduction does not limit 10 performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance10Torce1010 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance10 %10Force11 - 75 % <td< td=""><td colspan="2">Objective score</td><td colspan="3">Subjective score</td></td<>	Objective score		Subjective score		
No10Limitation of all activities0Fibrous union15Unable to find a job10Partial bone healing20Unable to return to previous 20 jobjobComplete bone healing25Able to return to previous 30 workOsteoarthritisNormal activity40Complete (the whole carp)5PainAdvance10Needed a medication0 a medicationModerate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during heavy loads10No25Pain after intensive work16Mobility opposite side)Pain nore posite side)2225 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month opposite side)20Xormal25Decrease limits performance 0Force force forceThe reduction does not limit 10 performance1026 - 50 %10Force551 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance10Normal25Satisfaction026 - 50 %10Force551 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance27 - 50 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 0 <td colspan="2">Consolidation</td> <td colspan="3">Function</td>	Consolidation		Function		
Fibrous union 15 Unable to find a job 10 Partial bone healing 20 Unable to return to previous 20 job Complete bone healing 25 Able to return to previous 30 work Osteoarthritis Normal activity 40 Complete (the whole carp) 5 Pain Advance 10 Needed 0 a medication 0 a medication 0 Moderate 15 Daily pain 6 Beginner 20 Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads 10 No 25 Pain after intensive work 16 Mobility Pain more 22 22 (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side) 20 Mobility 25 - 50 % 10 Pain less than once a month 26 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility 10 performance 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 performance 0 26 - 50 % 10 Force 5 1-75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20	No	10	Limitation of all activities	0	
Partial bone healing20Unable to return to previous 20 jobComplete bone healing25Able to return to previous 30 workOsteoarthritisNormal activity40Complete (the whole carp)5PainAdvance10Needed a medication0Moderate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads10No25Pain after intensive work16Mobility (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side)Pain less than once a month 2625 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month 2651 - 75 %15No3076 - 100 %20MobilityNormal25Decrease limits performance 0Force (in relation to the opposite side)The reduction does not limit 10 performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit 10 performanceNormal25SatisfactionNormal25Satisfaction10performance111012Dati improved131001410015Decrease limits performance	Fibrous union	15	Unable to find a job	10	
jobComplete bone healing25Able to return to previous 30 workOsteoarthritisNormal activity40Complete (the whole carp)5PainAdvance10Needed a medication0Moderate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads10No25Pain after intensive work16Mobility (flexion-extension arc to the opposite side)Pain less than once a month 302625 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month 303076 - 100 %20Mobility10Normal25Decrease limits performance performance0651 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance performance076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance1026 - 50 %10Force performance076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance076 - 100 %20The reduction do	Partial bone healing 20 Unable to return		Unable to return to previous	20	
Complete bone healing 25 Able to return to previous 30 Osteoarthritis Normal activity 40 Complete (the whole carp) 5 Pain Advance 10 Needed 0 a medication 0 a medication 0 Moderate 15 Daily pain 6 Beginner 20 Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads 10 No 25 Pain after intensive work 16 Mobility Pain more 22 (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side) 20 Mobility 25 - 50 % 10 Pain less than once a month 26 51 - 75 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility Mobility Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 0 Force 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance 0 26 - 50 % 10 Force 5 1-75 % 0 0 76 - 100 %			job		
workworkOsteoarthritisNormal activity40Complete (the whole carp)5PainAdvance10Needed a medication0Moderate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads10No25Pain after intensive work16MobilityPain after intensive work16MobilityPain more (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side)2225 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month 3025 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month performance26 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month in relation to the opposite side)26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance performance25SatisfactionQuality of life has not improved0Quality of life has improved010Total100	Complete bone healing	25	Able to return to previous		
Osteoarthritis Normal activity 40 Complete (the whole carp) 5 Pain Advance 10 Needed 0 a medication 10 Needed 0 Moderate 15 Daily pain 6 Beginner 20 Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads 10 No 25 Pain after intensive work 16 Mobility Pain more 22 (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side) Pain less than once a month 26 25 - 50 % 10 Pain less than once a month 26 51 - 75 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) Performance 0 26 - 50 % 10 Force 0 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 0 performance 20 The reduction does not li			work		
Complete (the whole carp) 5 Pain Advance 10 Needed 0 a medication 10 a medication 0 Moderate 15 Daily pain 6 Beginner 20 Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads 10 No 25 Pain after intensive work 16 Mobility Pain more 22 (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side) Pain less than once a month 25 50 % 10 Pain less than once a month 25 50 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility Normal 25 26 - 50 % 10 Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) 10 Force 0 11 26 - 50 % 10 Force 0 10 The reduction does not limit 10 26 - 50 % 10 Force 0 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance	Osteoarthritis		Normal activity	40	
Advance10Needed a medication0Moderate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads10No25Pain after intensive work16Mobility (flexion-extension arc to the opposite side)Pain more ence a month2225 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month 302651 - 75 %15No3076 - 100 %20Mobility Performance10(in relation to the opposite side)25Decrease limits performance 0Force (in relation to the opposite side)The reduction does not limit performance1026 - 50 %10Force Force (in relation to the opposite side)1026 - 50 %10Force (in relation to the opposite side)026 - 50 %10Force (in relation does not limit performance076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance0Normal25Satisfaction0Normal25Satisfaction0Normal25Satisfaction0Normal25Satisfaction0Normal100Total100	Complete (the whole carp)	5	Pain	-	
a medicationModerate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads10No25Pain after intensive work16MobilityPain more once a month22(flexion-extension opposite side)10Pain less than once a month 3025 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month 3025 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month 3026 - 100 %20Mobility PerformanceVormal25Decrease limits performance 0Force (in relation to the opposite side)The reduction does not limit performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance20The reduction does not limit performance1025SatisfactionNormal25SatisfactionQuality of life has not improved0Quality of life has improved10Total100Total	Advance	10	Needed	0	
Moderate15Daily pain6Beginner20Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads10No25Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads16No25Pain after intensive work16Mobility (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side)Pain more once a month2225 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month 302651 - 75 %15No3076 - 100 %20MobilityNormal25Decrease limits performance 0Force (in relation to the opposite side)The reduction does not limit performance26 - 50 %10Force 051 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance2020Satisfaction21 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performance2020Force performance21 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limit performanceNormal25SatisfactionQuality of life has not improved0Quality of life has not improved10Total100Total			a medication		
Beginner 20 Pain during of the grip, when carrying heavy loads 10 No 25 Pain after intensive work 16 Mobility Pain nere 22 (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side) Pain less than once a month 26 25 - 50 % 10 Pain less than once a month 26 51 - 75 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility 0 Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) performance 0 26 - 50 % 10 Force 5 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance 0 20 The reduction does not limit 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 0 Not im	Moderate	15	Daily pain	6	
of the grip, when carrying heavy loadsNo25Pain after16MobilityPain nore22(flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side)Pain less than once a month2625 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month2651 - 75 %15No3076 - 100 %20MobilityNormal25Decrease limits performance 0ForceThe reduction does not limit(in relation to the opposite side)performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance 076 - 100 %20The reduction does not limitNormal25SatisfactionNormal25SatisfactionNormal25SatisfactionQuality of life has not improved0Total100Total	Beginner	20	Pain during	10	
heavy loadsNo25Pain after intensive work16MobilityPain more (flexion-extension arc to the once a month opposite side)2225 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month25 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month26 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month76 - 100 %20MobilityNormal25Decrease limits performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance26 - 50 %10Force51 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance076 - 100 %20Normal25SatisfactionNormal25SatisfactionQuality of life has not improved0Quality of life has improved10Total100Total			of the grip, when carrying		
No 25 Pain after intensive work 16 Mobility Pain more 22 (flexion-extension arc to theonce a month opposite side) Pain less than once a month 26 25 - 50 % 10 Pain less than once a month 26 51 - 75 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility Normal Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 performance 26 - 50 % 10 Force 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 0 Performance 0 76 - 100 % 0 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 Normal 10 Total 100			heavy loads		
intensive workMobilityPain more(flexion-extension arc to the once a monthopposite side)25 - 50 %1025 - 50 %1026 - 50 %15Normal2525 - 50 %20MobilityNormal2526 - 50 %10ForceThe reduction does not limit 10(in relation to the opposite side)performance26 - 50 %1076 - 100 %2026 - 50 %1051 - 75 %15Decrease limits performance76 - 100 %2020The reduction does not limit 10performance076 - 100 %2025SatisfactionNormal2525SatisfactionQuality of life0has not improved0Total100Total100	No	25	Pain after	16	
Mobility Pain more 22 (flexion-extension arc to the once a month 25 25 - 50 % 10 Pain less than once a month 26 51 - 75 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility Normal 25 Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) performance 0 76 - 100 % 10 Force 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 Performance 0 76 - 100 % 0 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 Mas not improved 0 partore does not improved 0 Total 100 Total 100 100			intensive work		
(flexion-extensionarctothe once a monthopposite side)25 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month26 $25 - 50 %$ 15No30 $76 - 100 %$ 20MobilityNormal25Decrease limits performance0ForceThe reduction does not limit 10(in relation to the opposite side)performance $26 - 50 %$ 10Force $51 - 75 %$ 15Decrease limits performance $76 - 100 %$ 20The reduction does not limit 10performance0Normal25SatisfactionNormal25SatisfactionQuality of life has not improved0Total100Total	Mobility		Pain more	22	
opposite side) $25 - 50 \%$ 10Pain less than once a month26 $51 - 75 \%$ 15No30 $76 - 100 \%$ 20MobilityNormal25Decrease limits performance0ForceThe reduction does not limit10(in relation to the opposite side)performance10 $26 - 50 \%$ 10Force51 $51 - 75 \%$ 15Decrease limits performance0 $76 - 100 \%$ 20The reduction does not limit10Normal25Satisfaction0Normal25Satisfaction0Total100Total100	(flexion-extension arc to	o the	once a month		
25 - 50 %10Pain less than once a month26 $51 - 75 %$ 15No30 $76 - 100 %$ 20MobilityNormal25Decrease limits performance0Force (in relation to the opposite side)The reduction does not limit10 $26 - 50 %$ 10Force5 $51 - 75 %$ 15Decrease limits performance0 $76 - 100 %$ 20The reduction does not limit10Normal25Satisfaction0Normal25Satisfaction0Interpret of the simproved010Interpret of the simproved10100Interpret of the simproved10100	opposite side)	r			
51 - 75 % 15 No 30 76 - 100 % 20 Mobility 0 Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) performance 0 26 - 50 % 10 Force 0 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction 0 Total 100 Total 100	25 - 50 %	10	Pain less than once a month	26	
76 - 100 % 20 Mobility Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) performance 26 - 50 % 10 Force 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 10 Total 100 Total	51 - 75 %	15	No		
Normal 25 Decrease limits performance 0 Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) performance 26 - 50 % 10 Force 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 Normal 25 Satisfaction Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 10 Total 100 Total	76 - 100 %	20	Mobility		
Force The reduction does not limit 10 (in relation to the opposite side) performance 26 - 50 % 10 Force 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 0 Total 100 Total	Normal	25	Decrease limits performance (
(in relation to the opposite side) performance 26 - 50 % 10 Force 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance 0 Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 0 Total 100 Total	Force		The reduction does not limit10		
26 - 50 % 10 Force 51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance 25 Satisfaction Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 10 Total 100 Total	(in relation to the opposite side)		performance		
51 - 75 % 15 Decrease limits performance 0 76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 performance performance Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 10 Total 100 Total	26 - 50 %	10	Force		
76 - 100 % 20 The reduction does not limit 10 Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 0 Quality of life has improved 10 Total 100 Total	51 - 75 %	15	Decrease limits performance	0	
performance Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 0 Quality of life has improved 10 Total 100 Total 100	76 - 100 %	20	The reduction does not limit	10	
Normal 25 Satisfaction Quality of life 0 has not improved 0 Quality of life has improved 10 Total 100 Total			performance		
Quality of life 0 has not improved 0 Quality of life has improved 10 Total 100 Total	Normal	25	Satisfaction		
has not improved Quality of life has improved 10 Total 100			Quality of life	0	
Quality of life has improved 10 Total 100 Total 100			has not improved		
Total 100 Total 100			Quality of life has improved	10	
	Total	100	Total	100	

Table III. - Specific evaluation score for our series.

Pain		Force (in relation to the opposite	
		side)	
Severe	5	< 25 %	0
Moderate (during and after activity)	10	25 — 50 %	5
Average (with activity)	15	51 — 75 %	10
No	20	76 - 100 %	15
Flexion-extension m	obility	Normal	20
(relative to the opposite si	de)		
< 25 %	0	Osteoarthritis	
25 — 50 %	5	Stage IV	0
51 — 75 %	10	Stage III	5
76 — 100 %	15	Stage II	10
Normal	20	Stage I	15
Mobility in radio-cubit (relative to the opposite si	al tilt de)	Absent	20
< 25 %	0	Consolidation	
25 — 50 %	5	No	0
51 — 75 %	10	Yes	10
76 — 100 %	15		
Normal	20		
Total	l	100	l

Consolidation and clinical and radiological outcome: For 47 fractures, consolidation was achieved after an average of 3 months (1.5-6). 98% of the wrists were pain-free or only moderately painful; the course of the pain is detailed in *Table IV*. At follow-up, the mean global mobility (*Table V*) was normal only for pronation and ulnar tilt.

Table IV. - Pain assessment before and after surgery.

Pain	In hindsight
No	4
Average (with activity)	2
Moderate (during and after activity)	5
Severe	1

The average objective Shah score was 79.9 and the average subjective value was 92.7. In total the average Shah score was 172.6 (maximum total 200 points). From an objective point of view: 2 wrists had an excellent result, 5 a good result, 3 an average result and 2 a poor result. The carpal height index averaged 0.52 on the side with pseudarthrosis. Of the 58 wrists, 3 patients had decreased carpal height. The mean radiolunate angle was 4.2q. 4 wrists had a radiolunate angle greater than 10q, i.e. pathological dorsal tilt of the lunate (DISI). 7 wrists were free of or had minimal osteoarthritis

Table V. - Comparison of mean wrist mobility at recoil on the operated and healthy sides

	Flexion	Extension	Pronation
Operated wrist	56q (25 — 90)	56q (20 — 80)	83q(65 — 90)
Healthy wrist	64,7q (45 — 90)	68,8q(50 — 90)	83q(70 — 90)
Supination	Radial Inc.	Ulnar inc.	
83q(65 — 90)	11q(-5 - 30)	32,7q(20-50)	
83q(60 — 90)	20,5q(9-40)	35,6q(20 — 50)	

DISCUSSION

The data from our series correspond to those in the literature [Carpentier et al (12), Green (13), Hoang and Rombouts (14), Schneider and Aulicino (15)]: these are young patients (average age 26.7 years), mostly manual workers (55.2%), the sex ratio shows a majority of men (87.3% male) Forty-five patients (77.5%) were not immediately diagnosed with a scaphoid fracture, the main causes of pseudarthrosis being errors in diagnosis and initial treatment [Gandin (16)]. Most authors do not use a functional score, and are only interested in whether or not the pseudoarthrosis has consolidated [Merrell et al. (17)]. However, patients do not complain directly about their pseudoarthrosis, but about its consequences (pain, reduced mobility, reduced strength, etc.). It therefore seemed important to us to use a means of assessing function in the form of a numerical score. Although Shah's score seemed to be the most suitable, it has some imperfections which led us to weight it in the form of a personal score: 1) In their objective score, Shah and Jones (10) used nuances for consolidation (none, fibrous union, partial bony union, complete bony union) which seem to us to be difficult to assess. This is why our score is limited to a binary evaluation of consolidation (yes or no). 2) Shah's score studies only the flexion-extension arc, whereas the radio-ulnar inclinations, which are very often disturbed, must be evaluated. As with Stark et al (18), the majority of patients are satisfied regardless of the outcome. It seemed more appropriate to us to take into account the subjectivity of 20% in our score, as opposed to 50% in Shah's score.

Overall, non-vascularised cortico-cancellous grafts give excellent subjective results. In terms of pain, all patients were improved. Although the objective criteria are important (consolidation, necrosis, osteoarthritis), they are not recognised as such by the patient, who places the result on pain in the forefront [Stark et al. (19)]. The duration of immobilisation did not influence flexion-extension mobility, which is globally reduced in our population compared to the healthy side. However, in our series, immobilisation was always for at least one and a half months. Although stable osteosynthesis sometimes allows earlier mobilisation, it does not guarantee better mobility [Merrell et al (17)]. The hand strength was 89.2% compared to the healthy side. The most advanced stages of pseudoarthrosis and osteoarthritis were accompanied by a greater strength deficit. It therefore seems advisable to start the diagnosis and treatment of scaphoid fractures early. Hooning et al (20) suggest that there is no correlation between DISI and osteoarthritis, which we do not confirm in our series. While Nakamura et al (21) did not find any significant influence of the quality of the reduction on the results, our medium-term series underlines, like those of Tomaino et al (22) and Linscheid et al (23), that the correction of the deformity in DISI is necessary for a good result. Linsheid et al (23) have shown that instability invariably results in mobility limitation and pain. We do not find this direct correlation, but our series showed that persistent DISI deformity favoured the development of osteoarthritis, which in turn was a source of reduced mobility in extension. In our series, correcting the DISI deformity indirectly allowed for the maintenance of mobility in extension. This spatial correction with restoration of scaphoid height is only possible with an anterior cortico-cancellous graft and not only cancellous graft [Nakamura et al.(24)].

Stages IIIA and IIIB are stages where the osteoarthritis is already significant and where a palliative intervention would have been more appropriate than the placement of a graft: partial arthrodesis of the wrist, resection of the first row of the carpus, resection of the proximal pole [Trumble (25)]. Consolidation alone does not resolve overly advanced carpal lesions, as radiological assessment is unreliable [Green (13)]. an MRI should therefore be performed at the slightest doubt and for all proximal fractures. In the case of necrosis discovered preoperatively, 50 to 100% of non-vascularised grafts do not consolidate [Trumble et al. (25)]. Green (13) suggested that the vascularisation of the proximal pole should be checked intraoperatively. And, in case of necrosis, a vascularised graft should be used. In addition, fixation is also influenced by the stage of pseudoarthrosis. Other series show the influence of the time between the fracture and surgical management on consolidation [Nakamura et al. (21)]. Lindström and Nystrom (29) have shown that 100% of pseudoarthroses, even asymptomatic ones, progress to symptomatic osteoarthritis. All pseudoarthroses, even asymptomatic ones, should therefore be operated on as early as possible, in order to achieve better longterm results. Alnot (2) reached the same conclusion in the SOFCOT symposium. The advantages of non-vascularised grafts are the relative simplicity of the technique, its reliability (between 70 and 97% consolidation depending on the series), and the current hindsight of the technique which allows us to confirm its results. The disadvantages of these grafts are their poor results in the event of necrosis of the proximal pole, the consequences on the site where the graft is harvested (mostly iliac), which is responsible for postoperative pain and requires general anaesthesia, and an average consolidation time of 3 months. In recent years, thanks to progress in microsurgery, vascularised grafts (free or pedicled) have appeared. They should make it possible to push back the limits of conservative treatment in case of necrosis of the proximal pole of the scaphoid if this vascularised graft allows revascularisation.

REFERENCES

- LESLIE IJ, DICKSON RA: The fractured carpal scaphoid: natural history and factors influencing outcome. J Bone Joint Surg (Br), 1981, 63, 225-230.
- ALNOT JY : Fractures and pseudarthroses of the scaphoid carpus. Symposium of the SOFCOT. *Rev Chir Orthop*, 1988, 74, 683-752.
- DOI K, ODA T, SOO-HEONG T, NANDA V: Free vascularized bone graft for nonunion of the scaphoid. J Hand Surg (Am), 2000, 25, 507-519.
- GABL M, REINHART C, LUTZ M, BODNER G, RUDISCH A, HUSSL H, PECHLANER S: Vascularized bone graft from the iliac crest for the treatment of nonunion of the proximal part of the scaphoid with an avascular fragment. J Bone Joint Surg (Am), 1999, 81, 1414-1428.
- GUIMBERTEAU JC, PANCONI B : Recalcitrant non-union of the scaphoid treated with a vascularized bone graft based in the ulnar artery. *J Bone Joint Surg (Am)*, 1990, 72, 88-97.
- MATHOULIN C, HAERLE M: Vascularized bone graft from the palmar carpal artery for treatment of scaphoid nonunion. *J Hand Surg (Br)*, 1998, 23, 318-323.
- SCHERNBERG F, ELZEIN F, GÉRARD Y : Anatomical and radiological study of carpal scaphoid fractures. Problème des cals vicieux. *Rev Chir Orthop*, 1984, *70*, 55-63.
- KAPANDJI A: Clinical test of apposition and cunter-apposition of the thumb. *Ann Chir Main*, 1986, *5*, 67-73.
- SINTZOFF S, FUMIERE E: Examen radiologique simple du poignet. *In:* Imagerie du poignet. *Masson,* Paris, 1993, 35-44.
- SHAH J, JONES WA: Factors affecting the outcome in 50 cases of scaphoid non-union with Herbert screw fixation. J Hand Surg (Br), 1998, 23, 680-685.
- STARK A, BROSTROM LA, SVARTENGREN G: Surgical treat- ment of scaphoid nonunion: review of the literature and rec- ommendations for treatment. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*, 1989, 108, 203-209.
- CARPENTIER E, SARTORIUS C, ROTH H : Scaphoid nonunion : treatment by open reduction, bone graft, and staple fixation. *J Hand Surg (Am)*, 1995, *20*, 235-240.
- GREEN DP: The effect of avascular necrosis on Russe bone grafting for scaphoid nonunion. J Hand Surg (Am), 1985, 10, 597-605.
- HOANG P, ROMBOUTS JJ: The Matti-Russe operation in the treatment of carpal scaphoid pseudarthrosis. *Acta Orthop Belg*, 1984, *50*, 677-685.

- SCHNEIDER LH, AULICINO P: Nonunion of the carpal scaphoid: the Russe procedure. *J Trauma*, 1982, *22*, 315-319.
- GANDIN J : Critical study of the surgical treatment of pseudarthroses of the carpal scaphoid. *Rev Chir Orthop*, 1970, *56*, 231-252.
- MERRELL GA, WOLFE SW, SLADE JF: Treatment of scaphoid nonunions: quantitative meta-analysis of the litera- ture. *J Bone Joint Surg (Am)*, 2002, *27*, 685-691.
- STARK A, BROSTROM LA, SVARTENGREN G: Scaphoid nonunion treated with the Matti-Russe technique. *Clin Orthop*, 1987, 214, 175-180.
- STARK HH, RICKARD TA, ZEMEL NP, ASHWORTH CR: Treatment of ununited fractures of the scaphoid by iliac bone grafts and Kirschner-wire fixation. J Bone Joint Surg (Am), 1988, 70, 982-991.
- HOONING VAN DUYVENBODE JFF, KEIJSER LCM, HAUET EJ, OBERMANN WR, ROZING PM: Pseudarthrosis of the scaphoid treated by the Matti-Russe operation. *J Bone Joint Surg (Br)*, 1991, 73, 603-606.
- NAKAMURA R, HORII E, WATANABE K, TSUNODA K, MIURA T: Scaphoid non-union: factors affecting the functional outcome of open reduction and wedge grafting with Herbert screw fixation. *J Hand Surg (Br)*, 1993, *18*, 219-224.
- TOMAINO MM, KING J, PIZILLO M: Correction of lunate malalignment when bone grafting scaphoid nonunion with humpback deformity: rationale and results of a revisited technique. *J Hand Surg (Am)*, 2000, 25, 322-329.
- LINSCHEID RL, DOBYNS JH, BECKENBAUGH RD, COONEY WP, WOOD MB: Instability patterns of the wrist. J Hand Surg (Am), 1983, 8, 682-686.
- NAKAMURA R, IMAEDA T, TSUGE S, WATANABE K: Scaphoid non-union with D.I.S.I. deformity. *J Hand Surg* (*Br*), 1991, *16*, 156-161.
- TRUMBLE TE: Proximal pole scaphoid fractures and nonunion. J Am Society Surg Hand, 2001, 1, 155-171.
- MORGAN WJ, BREEN TF, COUMANS JM, SCHULZ LA: Role of magnetic resonance imaging in assessing factors affecting healing in scaphoid nonunions. *Clin Orthop*, 1997, 336, 240-246.
- HUENE DR, HUENE DS: Treatment of nonunions of the scaphoid with the Ender compression blade plate system. J Hand Surg (Am), 1991, 16, 913-922.
- KORKALA OL, KUOKKANEN HOM, EEROLA MS: Compres- sion-staple fixation for fractures, non-unions and delayed unions of the carpal scaphoid. *J Bone Joint Surg* (*Am*), 1992, 74, 423-426.
- LINDSTROM G, NYSTROM A: Natural history of scaphoid non-union, with special reference to "asymptomatic" cases. *J Hand Surg (Br)*, 1992, *17*, 697-700.
