

James Chapman^{1,2}, Zain Choudhury², Shubhi Gupta², Grace Airey^{1,2}, Thomas Davies³, Paula Houghton¹, Katy Clay¹, Lyndon Mason^{1,2}

1. Liverpool Orthopaedic & Trauma Service, Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust 2. School of Medicine, University of Liverpool 3. Postgraduate Department, Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Introduction

Treatment pathways of 5th metatarsal fractures are commonly directed based on fracture classification, with Jones types for example, requiring closer observation and possibly more aggressive management. We sought to investigate the reliability of assessment of subtypes of 5th metatarsal fractures by different observers



British Orthopaedic Association





> 02/2016 to 07/2021

\checkmark **Inclusion Criteria**

Totals

Zone 1.1

Zone 1.3

Zone 2

Zone 3

Diaphyseal Shaft

Head

- Suspected or confirmed 5th metatarsal fracture
- Referred to our Virtual Fracture Clinic



- > Neither observer able to identify a fracture
- Images not available



- 2 independent observers
- > AP foot radiographs reviewed to classify
 - Image 1



Image 1 – Classification of fracture zones used in this study



- Inter-observer reliability
 - Cohen's Kappa Co-efficient
 - Landis & Koch description (Table 1)
- All data analysed with IBM SPSS v. 27.







Mean age 48.1 (SD = 19.1)

Kappa value range	Interpretation of Agreement
0-0.2	Slight
0.2-0.4	Fair
0.4-0.6	Moderate
0.6-0.8	Substantial
0.8-1.0	Almost Perfect

Table 1 – Landis & Koch Description of Interobserver variability

Maximum level of agreement

Moderate (Table 2)

Kappa value

0.538

0..511

0.515

0.57

0.545

0.558

P value

< 0.001

< 0.001

< 0.001

< 0.001

< 0.001

< 0.001

'Fair Agreement'

- Zone 1.2 (K = 0.308)
- Distal Metaphyseal (K = 0.381)

Adjacent Zonal Agreement

- > Fair
 - Diaphyseal shaft & distal metaphyseal
- > Slight
 - \succ Next most proximal 1.2, 1.3, Zone 3
 - Next most distal 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2, Zone 3, Distal Zone Metaphyseal

Table 2 – Kappa values for all fracture regions achieving the moderate level of agreement

Conclusion

The reliability of sub-categorising 5th metatarsal fractures using standardised instructions conveys moderate agreement in most

cases.

Implications

If the region of the fracture is going to be used in an algorithm to guide a management plan and clinical follow up during a virtual clinic review, defining fractures of zones 1-3 needs careful consideration

NHS

Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust



