

Intrarater and Interrater Reliability of the Soong Classification for Distal Radius Volar Locking Plate Placement

HAND
2020, Vol. 15(3) 414–417
© The Author(s) 2018
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/1558944718797347
hand.sagepub.com

James J. Creighton III¹, Courtney D. Jensen², and F. Thomas D. Kaplan³ 

Abstract

Background: The purpose of this study was to analyze the intrarater and interrater reliability of the Soong classification for volar locking plate placement on a randomly selected, consecutive series of radiographs. Our hypothesis was that the classification would be reliable. **Methods:** Six physicians of differing levels of training (orthopedic surgery intern to fellowship-trained upper extremity staff) were asked to review 40 radiographs in a random order on 2 separate occasions, 4 weeks apart. All observers graded each image (0, 1, or 2) based on the corresponding Soong grade. A weighted κ was used to determine the intrarater agreement. The interrater agreement was determined using an intraclass coefficient. **Results:** The intrarater reliability using a weighted κ ranged from 0.229 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.048-0.411) to 0.946 (95% CI: 0.840-1.051). The interrater intraclass coefficient for Randomization 1 was 0.944 (95% 0.912-0.967) and Randomization 2 was 0.877 (95% CI: 0.797-0.930). **Conclusion:** The Soong classification is a reliable tool, both interrater and intrarater, for assessing distal radius volar locking plate placement. The classification system remained reliable despite a randomly selected, consecutive series of images and physician observers of varying levels of training.

Keywords: volar plate position, Soong classification, distal radius fracture, intrarater reliability, interrater reliability

Introduction

Volar locking plate fixation has become a popular method of treatment for displaced and unstable distal radius fractures. Several randomized studies support this technique¹⁻⁴; however, there are many complications associated with its use.⁵⁻⁷ One complication worth considering is flexor tendon rupture, and plate prominence has emerged as a contributory factor.^{5,6} In 2011, Soong and colleagues proposed a grading scale for volar locking plate placement based on the plate's location to the watershed line of the volar distal radius, correlating plate placement with risk of tendon rupture.⁸ The grade was based on a critical line drawn tangential from the most volar prominence of the distal radius and parallel to the volar cortex (Figure 1). Grade 0 was given to plates that did not extend volar to this line. Plates given a grade 1 were volar to the critical line but proximal to the volar rim of the distal radius. Plates that were directly on or distal to the volar rim were given a grade 2. Since the grading scale was published in 2011, it has been referenced in several studies,^{5,9-14}

The purpose of this study was to analyze the intrarater and interrater reliability of the Soong classification for volar locking plate placement on a consecutive series of radiographs by surgeons of varying levels of experience. Our hypothesis was that the classification would be reliable.

Methods

Approval from our hospital's institutional review board was obtained. Informed consent was not required by the overseeing institution. We selected 6 physicians with varying levels of education: 3 orthopedic surgery residents at postgraduate years 1, 3, and 4; an orthopedic upper extremity fellow; and 2 fellowship-trained orthopedic upper extremity surgeons. The physicians were provided the original article by Soong et al to familiarize themselves with the grading scale, and then they were asked to apply that scale to a series of radiographs.

Inclusionary criteria for image selection were: (1) patients who had a fracture of the distal radius and were treated with volar plating; (2) patients who underwent radiographs of the lateral wrist secondary to plating; and (3) patient age \geq 18 years. Criteria for exclusion were: (1)

¹Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, USA

²University of the Pacific, Stockton, CA, USA

³Indiana Hand to Shoulder Center, Indianapolis, USA

Corresponding Author:

James J. Creighton III, Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Indiana University School of Medicine, 720 Eskenazi Avenue, Fifth Third Bank Building, 2nd Floor, Indianapolis, IN 46202, USA.

Email: james.creighton.md@gmail.com




Figure 1. Soong classification. (a) Grade 0 (dorsal to critical line). (b) Grade 1 (volar to critical line but proximal to the volar rim). (c) Grade 2 (volar to critical line and on or distal to the volar rim).

presence of multiple plates in the distal forearm; (2) presence of additional hardware such as Kirschner wires; (3) images that were inadequate for precise appraisal; and (4) features present in the radiograph that would enable physicians to easily identify the patient at a later date.

We searched the database at our institution using *Current Procedural Terminology (CPT)* codes 25607, 25608, and 25609 between January 1, 2013, and September 30, 2015. We identified 479 patients who met inclusionary criteria. A random number generator was used to select a starting point, after which 65 consecutive patients were exported. Enforcing our exclusionary criteria resulted in the elimination of 25 patients; the remaining 40 patients constituted the study sample. The radiographs for this sample were reviewed, de-identified, saved, and assigned a number (1 through 40). The order of these images was randomized (Randomization 1) and they were shown to the 6 physicians. Each physician graded them as 0, 1, or 2 using the Soong classification system. After 4 weeks, the order of radiographs 1 through 40 was rerandomized (Randomization 2), and the physicians were asked to grade them a second time. All physicians completed this task within a week of the assignment date. Both evaluation sessions began with examples from the original article to act as a reference.

Descriptive statistics characterized the percentages of Soong classifications (0, 1, and 2) present in the sample during both grading sessions. Intrarater reliability was performed using weighted κ values. The strength of agreement was determined to be poor (<0.20), fair (0.21-0.40), moderate (0.41-0.60), good (0.61-0.80), or very good (0.81-1.00) based on criteria presented by Altman.¹⁵ Interrater reliability was determined using the intraclass coefficient

(ICC) on both Randomization 1 and Randomization 2.¹⁶ All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Statistics version 24 (IBM Corporation, Chicago, Illinois).

Results

Among the 6 physicians, a total of 240 images were reviewed in each randomization. In Randomization 1, there were 19 images (7.9%) scored as Grade 0, 137 images (57.1%) scored as Grade 1, and 84 images (35.0%) scored as Grade 2. In Randomization 2, there were 12 images (5.0%) scored as Grade 0, 113 images (47.1%) scored as Grade 1, and 115 images (47.9%) scored as Grade 2. The weighted κ values for intrarater reliability can be found in Table 1. These ranged from 0.229 to 0.946. The interrater reliability for Randomization 1 had an ICC of 0.944 (95% CI: 0.912-0.967); for Randomization 2, the ICC was 0.877 (95% CI: 0.797-0.930).

Discussion

The present study found the intrarater reliability of the Soong grading system to have strong agreement. Among the 6 physicians who reviewed the radiographs, 5 had weighted κ values that were classified as “good” or “very good” based on the criteria by Altman. The interrater reliability was also found to be very good for both Randomization 1 and Randomization 2. Interestingly, there was a broad range of weighted κ values when looking at the intrarater reliability: the lowest was 0.229 (95% CI: 0.048-0.411) and the highest was 0.946 (95% CI: 0.840-1.051). These values did not appear to correspond to experience as the lowest value was recorded by the most experienced surgeon. When looking at Observer 1 who had the

Table 1. Intrarater Weighted Kappa Results.

Observer	Weighted κ	P value	95% Confidence interval	Agreement
1	0.229	.006	0.048-0.411	Fair
2	0.756	.000	0.568-0.943	Good
3	0.700	.000	0.486-0.913	Good
4	0.628	.000	0.437-0.819	Good
5	0.946	.000	0.840-1.051	Very Good
6	0.818	.000	0.640-0.995	Very Good

lowest κ value, there were 2 separate occasions a grade 0 in Randomization 1 was changed to a grade 2 in Randomization 2. Using the weighted κ values places a larger emphasis on a disagreement of 2 compared with 1. This, along with 16 images that were changed from a 1 to a 2, could account for the fair rating for Observer 1. Overall, our results were found to be comparable to previously published data on the classification system. This may be attributable to differences in study design.

Lutsky et al performed a reliability study of the Soong classification in 2016 and found it to have an intrarater κ value between 0.94 and 0.80.¹⁰ They also found an interrater ICC of 0.78. In their study, all reviewers were fellowship-trained upper extremity surgeons and the images were selected to ensure an adequate number of Soong grades 0, 1, and 2. By comparison, our study used a series of consecutive radiographs; thus, the distribution of grades was not balanced. While this might account for some of the increased variability, it is a more approximate representation of data observed in the clinical setting. Our attempt to limit bias by avoiding deliberate selection of the best examples of each Soong grade resulted in the inclusion of images that could be considered borderline or between grades. This presented challenges in our effort to classify them consistently. Furthermore, the radiographs evaluated in the present study were taken at different times and by different technicians. As a result, there was variation in the amount of rotation in the lateral images, which made it more difficult to assess the true location of the volar rim required to draw the tangential line. Our interrater agreement may have also been affected by the wide variety of experience among our graders, ranging from a first postgraduate year orthopedic surgery resident to a fellowship-trained upper extremity surgeon with more than 30 years of experience.

Our study has several limitations. No power analysis was performed, and only 3 board eligible/board certified surgeons were involved in the study. The physicians were provided static images that could not be annotated or drawn on, making it more challenging to fully assess the lines required for the classification system. There was also a low number of grade 0 images included which could have affected our results. However, despite imperfect images and different levels of training and expertise, the Soong classification was still found to be reliable when looking at a randomly selected, consecutive series of radiographs. We will

continue to use the Soong grade as an effective tool for analyzing distal radius volar locking plate placement.

Acknowledgments

We thank James J. Creighton Jr, MD, Mark Garon, MD, Nathan Bowers, MD, and Jonathan Harris, MD, for their participation in the study.

Ethical Approval

This study was approved by our institutional review board.

Statement of Human and Animal Rights

All procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional and national) and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

Statement of Informed Consent

Informed consent was not required by the overseeing institution.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

FTD Kaplan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0348-507X>

References

1. Chaudhry H, Kleinlugtenbelt YV, Mundi R, et al. Are volar locking plates superior to percutaneous K-wires for distal radius fractures? a meta-analysis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2015;473(9):3017-3027.
2. Jose A, Suranigi SM, Deniese PN, et al. Unstable distal radius fractures treated by volar locking anatomical plates. *J Clin Diagn Res*. 2017;11(1):RC04-RC08.
3. Rozental TD, Blazar PE, Franko OI, et al. Functional outcomes for unstable distal radial fractures treated with open reduction and internal fixation or closed reduction and percutaneous fixation. A prospective randomized trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2009;91:1837-1846.

4. Wei DH, Raizman NM, Bottino CJ, et al. Unstable distal radial fractures treated with external fixation, a radial column plate, or a volar plate. A prospective randomized trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2009;91:1568-1577.
5. Asadollahi S, Keith PP. Flexor tendon injuries following plate fixation of distal radius fractures: a systematic review of the literature. *J Orthop Traumatol.* 2013;14:227-234.
6. Bell JS, Wollstein R, Citron ND. Rupture of flexor pollicis longus tendon: a complication of volar plating of the distal radius. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 1998;80:225-226.
7. Berglund LM, Messer TM. Complications of volar plate fixation for managing distal radius fractures. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.* 2009;17:369-377.
8. Soong M, Earp B, Bishop G, et al. Volar locking plate implant prominence and flexor tendon rupture. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2011;93:328-333.
9. Ahsan ZS, Yao J. The importance of pronator quadratus repair in the treatment of distal radius fractures with volar plating. *Hand.* 2012;7:276-280.
10. Lutsky KF, Jimenez M, Rivlin M, et al. Reliability of the Soong classification for volar plate position. *J Hand Surg.* 2016;41(7):e199-e202.
11. Mathews AL, Chung KC. Management of complications of distal radius fracture. *Hand Clin.* 2015;31:205-215.
12. McCann PA, Clarke D, Amirfeyz R, et al. The cadaveric anatomy of the distal radius: implications for the use of volar plates. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl.* 2012;94:116-120.
13. Selvan DR, Machin DG, Perry D, et al. The role of fracture reduction and plate position in the etiology of flexor pollicis longus tendon rupture after volar plate fixation of distal radius fractures. *Hand.* 2015;10:497-502.
14. Tahririan MA, Javdan M, Motififard M. Results of pronator quadratus repair in distal radius fractures to prevent tendon ruptures. *Indian J Orthop.* 2014;48:399-403.
15. Altman DG. *Practical Statistics for Medical Research.* London, England: Chapman & Hall; 1991.
16. Shrout PE, Fleiss JL. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychol Bull.* 1979;86:420-428.