



Brian Mailey, M.D.,^{1,2} Ashley Ignatiuk, M.D.,^{1,3} Jennifer Kargel, M.D.,¹ Dennis Kao, M.D.,¹ Douglas Sammer, M.D.,¹ Jonathan Cheng, M.D.¹



Division of Hand Surgery, Department of Plastic Surgery, University of Texas Southwestern, Dallas, TX USA,¹ Southern Illinois University, Institute for Plastic Surgery, Department of Surgery, Springfield, IL.² Division of Plastic Surgery, Anschutz Medical Center, University of Colorado, Denver,³

Background

Recent evidence suggests variation in the diagnostic utility of different provocative maneuvers for thumb base arthritis.^{1,2}

Purpose

We sought to **compare** the accuracy of the **three** most common provocative **tests**

- 1.) **Grind** test
- 2.) **Shift** test
- 3.) **Reduction** maneuver

when examining patients for **thumb** basal joint **arthritis**.

Material and Methods

Subjects:

Patients evaluated by a single provider for symptomatic **thumb** basal joint **arthritis** from **2011-2015** were identified from an institutional database. **Charts** were **reviewed** for results of **provocative tests** (**grind**, **shift**, **reduction**) and classified as **positive if they elicited pain**. Five surgeons blindly scored radiographs, and the median **Eaton stage** for each hand was used for comparison. Tests were also performed on asymptomatic control subjects.

Statistical Analysis:

McNemar's test was calculated for each provocative test; Cohen's kappa was used to define the agreement between each test and the diagnosis of thumb basal joint arthritis.

Results

Thirty-seven patients (48 thumbs) were identified in the experimental group. The median Eaton stage was 3. **Grind**, **shift**, and **reduction** were positive in **29%**, **27%** and **81%** of subjects ($p < 0.001$). Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value were higher for **reduction** compared to **grind** and **shift**. Each test was separately evaluated for accuracy in diagnosing thumb basal joint arthritis (**Table 1**). **Grind**, **shift**, and **reduction** were positive more often in patients with arthritis than in control subjects (McNemar's $p < 0.001$, $p < 0.001$, and $p = 0.004$, respectively). However, there was a poor level of agreement for having arthritis and a positive **grind** or **shift** ($k = 0.103$, $p = 0.13$ and $k = 0.095$, $p = 0.16$, respectively), but a substantial level of agreement for **reduction** ($k = 0.634$, $p < 0.001$). There was a 100% correlation between obtaining a positive **shift** or **grind** and a positive **reduction** ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively), indicating that if the **grind** or **shift** is positive the **reduction** will also be **positive**.

REFERENCES

1. Gelberman RH. Trapeziometacarpal Arthritis: A Prospective Clinical Evaluation of the Thumb Adduction and Extension Provocative Tests. J Hand Surg Am. 2015 Jul.
2. Choa RM. A Prospective case-control study to compare the sensitivity and specificity of the grind and traction-shift tests in osteoarthritis of the thumb carpometacarpal joint. J Hand Surg Eur Vol. 2014 Mar.

Provocative Tests

Figure 2. Grind test. The examiner applies axial loading to the subjects thumb and then flexes, extends and **circumducts** the thumb.



Figure 3. Shift test. The examiner applies pressure to the radial aspect of the thumb to shift the base of the metacarpal in an **ulnar** direction compared to the trapezium.



Figure 4. Reduction maneuver. The examiner applies a **volarly** directed pressure on the base of the metacarpal to reduce the metacarpal from its dorsally subluxed position.



Conclusions

- The **reduction** maneuver is a more accurate test for diagnosing thumb basal joint arthritis than the **grind** or **shift** test.
- **Grind** or **shift** tests are more likely to be positive in higher stages of arthritis, but do not reliably make the correct diagnosis. **Reduction** was highly accurate regardless of stage.
- **Reduction** maneuver was appropriately positive in **every case** in which **grind** or **shift** tests also elicited pain.

Table 1. Characteristics of Patient Population

Characteristic	Study Population, N (%)	Control Population
Study cohort		
Total thumbs	48	12
Unique patients	37 (77%)	6 (50%)
Bilaterals	11 (23%)	12 (100%)
Gender		
Male	12 (25%)	1 (8%)
Female	36 (75%)	5 (92%)
Age		
Mean ± SD (range)	65.6 ± 9.7 (35 – 101)	50.2 ± 9.0 (33 – 59)
<40	1 (2%)	2 (17%)
41 – 65	25 (52%)	10 (83%)
>65	22 (46%)	0 (0%)
Handedness		
Right	40 (83%)	10 (83%)
Left	5 (10%)	2 (17%)
Missing	3 (7%)	
Pain Laterality		
Right	23 (48%)	NA
Left	25 (52%)	
Grind test		
Negative	34 (71%)	11 (92%)
Positive	14 (29%)	1 (8%)
Shift test		
Negative	34 (71%)	11 (92%)
Positive	13 (27%)	1 (8%)
Missing	1 (2%)	
Reduction maneuver		
Negative	9 (19%)	12 (100%)
Positive	39 (81%)	0 (0%)
Eaton stage (averaged)		
Mean ± SD (range)	2.9 ± 0.7 (1.6 – 4)	NA
1-2	6 (13%)	
2-3	18 (38%)	
3-4	15 (31%)	
missing x-ray	9 (19%)	

Table 2. Sensitivity, Specificity and predictive values of the grind, shift and reduction tests

	Se	Sp	PPV	NPV
Grind Test				
Symptoms				
positive				
negative				
total				
Positive	13 (TP)	26 (FN)	39	
Negative	1 (FP)	11 (TN)	12	
total	14	37		
Shift Test				
Positive	11 (TP)	27 (FN)	38	
Negative	1 (FP)	11 (TN)	12	
total	12	38		
Reduction Maneuver				
Positive	32 (TP)	7 (FN)	39	
Negative	0 (FP)	12 (TN)	12	
total	32	19		
	33	92	93	30
	29	92	92	29
	82	100	100	63

Table 3. Comparison of positive tests by stage

	Percentage of Positive Exam by Arthritis Stage			
	I	II	III	IV
Grind Test	0%	20%	33%	50%
Shift Test	0%	33%	20%	41%
Reduction Maneuver	100%	70%	86%	92%

Figure 1. (a.) **Eaton stage I** (b.) **Eaton stage II** (c.) **Eaton stage III** and (d.) **Eaton stage IV** osteoarthritis of the 1st CMC joint.

