Change in Oxford Shoulder Score (OSS) is associated with patient satisfaction one-year following primary total shoulder arthroplasty

Authors: Perry Liu, Irrum Afzal, Nick Clement, Vipin Asopa, Vipul Patel

The Academic Surgical Unit (ASU) at the South West London Elective Orthopaedic Centre. Correspondence to: perry.liu@nhs.net

Background

Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) are commonly used in orthopaedic research to ascertain information from the patient's perspective. These have been shown to be reliable, valid and sensitive to clinical change¹. One such measure is the Oxford Shoulder Score (OSS), a 12-question PROM tool which focusses on shoulder pain and function². The OSS is popular given its simplicity, reliability and high internal consistency², but is sparsely reported in the literature for shoulder arthroplasty³.





Furthermore, it is not clear how the change in score relates to patient satisfaction or whether this can be used to define the Minimal Clinically Important Difference (MCID).

Aims

- To assess the relationship between the change in OSS and patient satisfaction with their outcome (using a visual analogue) scale-VAS) following primary total shoulder arthroplasty (TSA).
- To calculate the MCID using a distribution-based method. 2)

Methods

- A retrospective analysis of patients who had TSA at a high-volume elective centre between January 2016 and December 2020.
- 109 consecutive patients with information on their pre-operative OSS, post-operative OSS (at one-year) and outcome ulletsatisfaction score (at one-year using a VAS from 0-poorly satisfied to 100-extremely satisfied) were included.
- 27 patients who underwent resurfacing, hemiarthroplasty or revision surgery were excluded.
- Kendall's rank correlation coefficient was used to compare the variables for statistical significance.
- The MCID was derived from a distribution-based method as follows:

 $MCID = 0.5 \cdot \frac{\text{SD}(\text{baseline}) + \text{SD}(\text{followup}) + \text{SD}(\text{difference})}{2}$

Results

- 82 patients (mean age 74, 62 female) had a primary TSA (46 anatomic, 36 reverse-polarity) during the study period.
- The mean outcome satisfaction score was 87/100 (SD 23.9).
- There was a statistically significant correlation between the change in OSS and patient-reported outcome satisfaction (p<0.01, correlation coefficient=0.505).
- Satisfaction was not influenced by age and gender (p>0.05).
- The MCID for OSS was calculated as 5.

Kendall's rank correlation coefficient

75-	100 -	•		•••••• • •
		•••	· : .	•
	75 -			

Conclusion/ Findings

The change in OSS correlates closely with patient-reported outcome satisfaction. This can be used to help manage patient expectations for those with higher pre-operative scores.

Our estimate of MCID for the OSS (for TSA) is 5, which is higher than previously recognised⁴. This will have repercussions on powering of studies and defining a clinically meaningful improvement.

However, calculating MCIDs by distribution methodology holds no clinical relevance as it is a solely statistical phenomenon. Using anchor-based questioning is better for this purpose, as it compares the change in a scoring measure in patients who have perceived to have had postoperative clinical improvement, relative to those who have not⁵.



References

- 1) Fitzpatrick R, Fletcher A, Gore S, Jones D, Spiegelhalter D, Cox D. Quality of life measures in health care. I: Applications and issues in assessment. BMJ. 1992;305(6861):1074-1077. doi:10.1136/bmj.305.6861.1074
- 2) Dawson J, Fitzpatrick R, Carr A. Questionnaire on the perceptions of patients about shoulder surgery. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 1996;78(4):593-600.
- 3) Padua R, de Girolamo L, Grassi A, Cucchi D. Choosing patientreported outcome measures for shoulder pathology. EFORT Open Rev. 2021;6(9):779-787. doi:10.1302/2058-5241.6.200109
- 4) Nyring MRK, Olsen BS, Amundsen A, Rasmussen JV. Minimal Clinically Important Differences (MCID) for the Western Ontario Osteoarthritis of the Shoulder Index (WOOS) and the Oxford Shoulder Score (OSS). Patient Relat Outcome Meas. 2021;Volume 12:299-306. doi:10.2147/PROM.S316920
- 5) McGlothlin AE, Lewis RJ. Minimal Clinically Important Difference: Defining What Really Matters to Patients. JAMA. 2014;312(13):1342. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.13128

