

1 **Title {1}**

2 Evaluation of ultrasound as diagnostic tool in patients with clinical features suggestive of carpal tunnel  
3 syndrome in comparison to nerve conduction studies: study protocol for a diagnostic testing study  
4

5 **Names protocol contributors**

6 María de la Paz Murciano Casas<sup>1\*</sup>, Manuel Rodríguez-Piñero<sup>2</sup>, Aguas-Santas Jiménez Sarmiento<sup>3</sup>, Mercedes  
7 Álvarez López<sup>2</sup>, Gema Jiménez Jurado<sup>2</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup> Hospital Virgen Macarena. Sevilla. Spain.

9 <sup>2</sup> Hospital Virgen Macarena. Sevilla. Spain

10 <sup>3</sup> Hospital Virgen de Valme. Sevilla. Spain

11

12 \* Corresponding author: [maripazmurciano@gmail.com](mailto:maripazmurciano@gmail.com)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 26 Abstract

- 27 • **Background:** Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (CTS) is the most common compressive neuropathy, accounting  
28 for 90% of all neuropathies. Its prevalence ranges from 3.8% - 7.8% in the population. The gold standard  
29 for its diagnosis is the neurophysiological study (85% sensitivity and 95% specificity), with the  
30 disadvantage of being invasive, complex and expensive, which means an increase in cost and time for the  
31 diagnosis of the disease. The main objective of this diagnostic test evaluation study is to investigate the  
32 value of ultrasound in the diagnosis of CTS, and among the secondary objectives, to establish the  
33 ultrasound parameters that are predictors of CTS in comparison with neurophysiological studies,  
34 attempting to standardize a protocol and reference values that determine the presence or absence of CTS.
- 35 • **Methods:** Prospective, cross-sectional study. The reference test with which we compared the ultrasound  
36 is the neurophysiological test (NPT). Patients will come consecutively from the Neurophysiology  
37 Department of the Virgen Macarena Hospital, with clinical suspicion of CTS and fulfilling the  
38 inclusion/exclusion criteria. To calculate the sample size (EPIDAT program) we proposed a sensitivity of  
39 78% and specificity of 87% with a confidence level of 95%, requiring 438 patients (264 NPT positive, 174  
40 NPT negative). We followed an ultrasound study protocol that included the ultrasound variables: cross-  
41 sectional area at the entrance and exit of the tunnel, range of nerve thinning, wrist-forearm index, flexor  
42 retinaculum bulging, power Doppler uptake and the existence of adjacent wrists or masses. We propose  
43 a timeline for the study to be performed between 2020 and 2023. Finally, we propose a cost-effectiveness  
44 analysis.
- 45 • **Discussion:** Ultrasound not only allows to objectify the alterations of the median nerve but also the  
46 underlying pathological mechanisms in CTS. A multitude of ultrasound parameters have been described  
47 that should be regarded in syndrome's study, among which we included the cross-sectional area, the  
48 range of nerve thinning, the wrist-forearm index, flexor retinaculum bulging, power Doppler uptake and  
49 assessment of anatomical alterations. The use of ultrasound as a diagnostic tool in CTS has many  
50 advantages for both doctors and the patients, as it is a non-invasive, convenient, and fast tool increasingly  
51 accessible to professionals.

52

## 53 Keywords

54 Carpal Tunnel Syndrome; ultrasound; nerve conduction study; diagnostic; screening

55 **Administrative information**

<b>Title {1}</b>	Evaluation of ultrasound as diagnostic tool in patients with clinical features suggestive of carpal tunnel syndrome in comparison to nerve conduction studies: study protocol for a diagnostic testing study.
<b>Trial registration {2a and 2b}.</b>	NCT05556278. Evaluation of Ecography as a Diagnostic Tool in the Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Compared to the Studies of Electroconduction. Registered 27 September 2022 – Retrospectively registered, <a href="https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05556278?term=Evaluation+of+Ecography+as+a+Diagnostic+Tool+in+the+Carpal+Tunnel+Syndrome+Compared+to+the+Studies+of+Electroconduction&amp;draw=2&amp;rank=1">https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05556278?term=Evaluation+of+Ecography+as+a+Diagnostic+Tool+in+the+Carpal+Tunnel+Syndrome+Compared+to+the+Studies+of+Electroconduction&amp;draw=2&amp;rank=1</a>
<b>Protocol version {3}</b>	Protocol version 4. Date: 04/10/2021.
<b>Funding {4}</b>	The authors declare that they did not receive any funding to carry out the study.
<b>Author details {5a}</b>	Murciano Casas, MP: Hospital Virgen Macarena. Sevilla. Spain Rodríguez-Piñero, M: Hospital Virgen Macarena. Sevilla. Spain Jiménez Sarmiento, AS: Hospital Virgen de Valme. Sevilla. Spain Álvarez López, M: Hospital Virgen Macarena. Sevilla. Spain Jiménez Jurado, G: Hospital Virgen Macarena. Sevilla. Spain
<b>Name and contact information for the trial sponsor {5b}</b>	The authors declare that they did not receive any funding to carry out the study.

<p><b>Role of sponsor {5c}</b></p>	<p>The authors declare that they did not receive any funding to carry out the study.</p>
<p><b>Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable {5d}</b></p>	<p>The trial coordinating center and steering committee is made up of two principal investigators running the trial day-to-day, and supported by 3 secondary investigators providing organizational support. This committee is made up of doctors specialists in rehabilitation.</p>

56

57 **Introduction**

58 **Background and rationale {6a}**

59 The carpal tunnel is an anatomical space located at the base of the palm of the hand, delimited by a rigid floor  
60 and walls, the carpal bones, and a roof with a certain capacity for distension, the transverse carpal ligament  
61 or flexor retinaculum. The entrance of the tunnel is located between the scaphoid and pyramidal bones, and  
62 its exit between the trapezium and hamate bones. A number of anatomical structures pass through this  
63 relatively narrow space as it transitions from the forearm to the hand: the tendons of the superficial and deep  
64 flexor muscles of the fingers, the tendon of the long flexor muscle of the first finger, and the median nerve (1).  
65 Thus, an increase in volume within this space, however small, can lead to compression of the nerve (2).  
66 The dimensions of the carpal tunnel are 20 mm at the level of the hook of the hamate, narrow compared to  
67 the proximal (24 mm) or distal (25 mm) dimensions (4). In healthy individuals the intratunnel pressure ranges  
68 between 3-5 mmHg in neutral position (5); vascular compromise of the nerve begins when the pressure  
69 exceeds 20-30 mmHg (6), which could be favored by certain postures or gestures as common as using a  
70 computer mouse (7). Adjacent musculature may also play a role in the etiology; in a cadaver study, the muscle  
71 belly of the flexor digitorum superficialis was observed to access the proximal tunnel during wrist extension,  
72 similar to the lumbrical muscles observed in contact with the distal tunnel during metacarpophalangeal flexion

73 (8).

74 The median nerve is responsible for the sensory innervation of the first three fingers and the radial border of  
75 the fourth, which is why patients who suffer compression of the median nerve inside the tunnel report pain and  
76 hypoesthesia in these fingers. The palm of the hand, however, usually remains unaltered, as it is innervated  
77 by a sensory cutaneous branch that emerges 6 cm proximal to the entrance of the nerve into the tunnel (5).

78 Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (CTS) is the most common compressive neuropathy, accounting for 90% of all  
79 neuropathies (1,9). It is estimated that 1 in 5 patients with symptoms of pain, paresthesia and numbness of  
80 the hand will be diagnosed with CTS based on examination and an electrodiagnostic test (9).

81 Its prevalence ranges from 3.8% to 7.8% of the general population, being more prevalent in females than in  
82 males (10% vs. 5.8%), with an incidence of 9.3 new cases per 100 persons per year (10,11). It leads to  
83 increased absenteeism, morbidity and, depending on the country, a cost of up to 2 billion dollars per year (11).

84 It is characterized by a combination of motor and sensory symptomatology leading to functional impairment,  
85 manifested by weakness of the intrinsic hand musculature with decreased grip strength, pain and paresthesia  
86 (5). The etiology of this entity remains uncertain, and most cases are labelled idiopathic; recently, magnetic  
87 resonance imaging, biomechanical and histological studies have proposed a close relationship between  
88 neuronal vascular dysfunction, synovial tissue, flexor tendons and their sheaths, with the onset of the  
89 syndrome (3).

90 Diagnosis has traditionally been established by anamnesis and physical examination; electrodiagnostic testing  
91 is frequently used as a method of confirmation and assessment of severity. Although these studies offer 85%  
92 sensitivity and 95% specificity (12), they have the disadvantage of being invasive and unpleasant for patients.

93 Recent advances in ultrasonography techniques have considerably improved the quality of ultrasound imaging  
94 of the nerve while providing more compact and economical equipment that makes it more accessible to the  
95 clinician, making ultrasonography a potential tool for the evaluation of entrapment neuropathies.

96 The high prevalence of CTS in the general population causes a high demand for neurophysiological studies,  
97 which to date is considered the gold standard in its diagnosis; this leads to long waiting times for the test to be  
98 carried out as well as an increase in direct and indirect costs derived from the disease. The availability of an  
99 additional technique that allows CTS to be diagnosed quickly, non-invasively and inexpensively would  
100 represent a clear advance in healthcare and an improvement in the efficiency of the healthcare system. In this  
101 sense, the present study aims to investigate the diagnostic value of ultrasound in the diagnosis of CTS, the  
102 specific ultrasound parameters that predict the existence of the syndrome in comparison with

103 neurophysiological studies, and thus try to standardize a study protocol and reference values that determine  
104 the presence or absence of the syndrome.

105

## 106 **Explanation for the choice of comparators {6b}**

107 We compared the NPT based on the recommendations of the American Association of Electrodiagnostic  
108 Medicine (AAEM) protocol with the ultrasound study protocol described in Chen et al. (11) for assessing its  
109 effectiveness. The study protocol included different variables: cross-sectional area at the entrance and exit of  
110 the tunnel, range of nerve thinning, wrist-forearm index, flexor retinaculum bulging, power Doppler uptake and  
111 the existence of adjacent wrists or masses.

112

## 113 **Objectives {7}**

114 **Primary:** To assess the efficacy of ultrasound in the diagnosis of CTS with respect to nerve conduction studies.

115 **Secondary:**

- 116 • To determine the set of ultrasound parameters (ultrasound standards and reference values) that best  
117 predict the existence of CTS.
- 118 • To correlate the intensity or degree of involvement between ultrasound findings and nerve conduction  
119 studies.
- 120 • To propose a standardised protocol for the study of CTS by ultrasound.
- 121 • To establish the interobserver and intraobserver variability of ultrasound in the diagnosis of CTS.
- 122 • To perform a cost-effectiveness analysis between ultrasound and neurophysiological studies in the  
123 diagnosis of CTS.
- 124 • To detect and describe anatomical alterations and pathological findings that could predispose to the  
125 presence of CTS.

126 **Hypothesis:** Ultrasound is more effective than neurophysiological studies in the diagnosis of CTS.

127

## 128 **Trial design {8}**

129 Prospective, cross-sectional study that compares two diagnostic tests: electroneurography and ultrasound in

130 the diagnosis of CTS. Also, a cost-effectiveness analysis will be proposed to evaluate the costs of the  
131 consumables established by the Andalusian Health Service used in both tests and the average time for each  
132 of the tests, in order to calculate the cost of the professional when performing each of them.

133

## 134 **Methods: Participants, interventions and outcomes**

### 135 **Study setting {9}**

136 Patients will come consecutively from the Neurophysiology Department of the Virgen Macarena Hospital in  
137 Seville (Spain), with clinical suspicion of CTS and fulfilling the inclusion/exclusion criteria. Electroneurography  
138 or ultrasound diagnosis techniques will be performed to compare their effectiveness.

139

### 140 **Eligibility criteria {10}**

141 We establish the following inclusion criteria in order to be able to take part in the study:

142 1) Presenting clinical symptoms suggestive of CTS, at least one of the following:

- 143 • Neuropathic profile pain in wrist-hand at the level of the median nerve territory (wrist, first-  
144 second-third, and radial half of the fourth finger by palmar and/or volar side), possibility of  
145 irradiation of the pain towards the forearm and/or arm.
- 146 • Nocturnal symptoms.
- 147 • Hypotrophy or atrophy of the thenar eminence.
- 148 • Self-described sensory alteration (sensation of cramping, numbness, tingling, hypoalgesia or  
149 analgesia).

150 2) Age: 18 to 75 years.

151 3) Consent to participate in the study.

152 Similarly, the exclusion criteria established are as follows:

- 153 1) Previous surgery on the wrist
- 154 2) Acquired or hereditary pathology causing peripheral neuropathies
- 155 3) Polyneuropathy of any etiology
- 156 4) Rheumatoid arthritis
- 157 5) Diabetes Mellitus

158

159 **Interventions**

160 **Intervention description {11a}**

161 We work side by side with the neurophysiology service of the Virgen Macarena hospital (Seville, Spain); they  
 162 will apply the neurophysiological evaluation protocol between 1 and 3 months previous to the echography  
 163 study.

164 - **Neurophysiological:**

165 The neurophysiological evaluation protocol is based on the recommendations of the AAEM (12), listed in table  
 166 1.

167 Table 1. Recommendations of the American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine (AAEM)

<b>PROTOCOL FOR NEUROPHYSIOLOGICAL STUDY ACCORDING TO AAEM <sup>(12)</sup></b>	
<b>Parameter 1</b>	Performing median motor conduction velocity with surface electrodes (recording on abductor pollicis brevis-APB- and reference along the distal tendon-extremus thumb). Bipolar electrode stimulation at wrist and elbow. Calculation of distal motor latency (DML), motor conduction velocity (MCV) wrist-elbow. Assessment of amplitude and duration of the potentials obtained.
<b>Parameter 2</b>	Ulnar motor conduction velocity with surface electrodes (recording in the hypothenar eminence and reference along the distal tendon-extremus-fifth finger). Bipolar electrode stimulation at wrist and elbow (inferior-superior). Calculation of distal motor latency, motor conduction velocity wrist-lower elbow and lower elbow-upper elbow. Assessment of amplitude and duration of the potentials obtained.
<b>Parameter 3</b>	Orthodromic median sensory conduction with stimulation on 2 and 4 fingers and palm and recording on wrist. Stimulation on 3 fingers and recording on palm. Assessment of sensory conduction velocity (SCV) in the 2 finger-wrist, 4 finger-wrist, palm-wrist and palm-wrist segments. Assessment of amplitude and duration of the potentials obtained.
<b>Parameter 4</b>	Ulnar orthodromic sensory conduction with stimulation on 4 and 5 fingers and recording at the wrist. Assessment of conduction velocity in the 4-wrist



	and 5-wrist segments and amplitude and duration of the potentials obtained.  Comparison of the IV middle finger-ulnar.
<b>Parameter 5</b>	Orthodromic radial sensory conduction with stimulation of the dorsum of the MCF joint of 1 finger and recording on the radial edge of the forearm.  Assessment of conduction velocity and amplitude and duration of the potentials obtained.
<b>Parameter 6</b>	Antidromic sensory conduction of median, ulnar and radial with surface electrode recording at the base of 2 and 4 fingers (median), at the base of 4 and 5 fingers (ulnar) and at the dorsum of 1 finger MCF (radial) with stimulation at the wrist for median and ulnar, and at the radial edge for radial.

168

169 - **Ultrasound:**

170 In our study we followed the ultrasound protocol described by Chen et al. (11) (table 2), discarding dynamic  
171 parameters and adding others based on the most recent literature.

172

173 Table 2. Ultrasound protocol

VARIABLES	DESCRIPTION
General Position	The patient is seated facing the examiner with the forearm resting supinated on a stable surface (for other patients it may be more comfortable to lie face down with the forearm in full pronation).  A rolled towel is placed under the wrist to allow 30°-45° extension of the wrist, minimizing the thenar eminence for better transducer glide. The use of a generous amount of gel is helpful. (*)
Nerve cross-sectional area (CSA) in distal forearm	In the transverse axis, in the distal and volar third of the forearm, the pronator quadratus is located between the radius and ulna.  The CSA for the calculation of the wrist-forearm index is measured at this level. (**)
CSA at tunnel entrance	At the level of the pisiform the cross-sectional area of the nerve is measured.

CSA at the tunnel exit and mass search	The cross-sectional area of the nerve is measured at the level of the hook of the hamate.  At the same time, an anatomical analysis is carried out to look for any space-occupying lesions (accessory lumbricals, tenosynovitis or hidden cysts, etc.).
Longitudinal axis of the nerve at the exit of the tunnel	Rotate the transducer in line with the 3rd metacarpal; nerve compression may show as a notch or change in caliber. The carpal tunnel is also examined for space-occupying masses by short-axis sliding along the full width of the tunnel.
Dynamic test 1: Thenar digital flexion stress test	Compressing a soft object (towel) between the 1st and 2nd finger is visualized transversely and longitudinally; positive result due to flattening of the nerve due to compression of the flexor tendon.  No CSA measurement.
Dynamic test 2: Superficial digital flexor digitorum intrusion test	The superficial and deep flexor belly should enter the tunnel with the wrist in hyperextension contributing to nerve compression. No CSA measurement.
Dynamic test 3: Intrusion test lumbrical muscles	To be positive, flexion of the fingers with full grip must enter the tunnel at the muscle belly of the lumbricals compressing the nerve. No CSA measurement.

174 (\*) in our case, the cylindrical gel canister is the one we have positioned under the patient's wrist to achieve  
175 its hyperextension.

176 (\*\*) it should be noted that for the measurement of the wrist-forearm index we have carried out, based on other  
177 publications, the HAG at the entrance of the tunnel between the HAG and 12 cm from the distal crease of the  
178 wrist.

179

180 **Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions {11b}**

181 Not applicable since the intervention comprises a one-time diagnostic procedure.

182

183 **Strategies to improve adherence to interventions {11c}**

184 Not applicable since the intervention comprises diagnostic procedure.

185

## 186 **Relevant concomitant care permitted or prohibited during the trial {11d}**

187 No concomitant care was prohibited during the study.

188

## 189 **Outcomes {12}**

190 1. **Demographic variables:** sex, age, time of evolution of the clinic, manual dominance, hand affected,  
191 body mass index, employment status, type of work (pink, white or blue collar), time worked, triggers  
192 of symptoms, what symptoms are relieved with, as well as toxic habits, whether they are smokers (to  
193 be answered affirmative or negative) or alcohol consumers (to be answered affirmative or negative).

194

195 2. **Electrodiagnostic variables:** motor conduction velocity of the median nerve (calculating distal motor  
196 latency and wrist-elbow motor conduction velocity), motor conduction velocity of the ulnar nerve  
197 (calculating distal motor latency, lower and upper wrist-elbow motor conduction velocity), orthodromic  
198 sensory conduction of the median, ulnar and radial nerve, as well as antidromic sensory conduction  
199 of the median, ulnar and radial nerve.

200

201 3. **Ultrasound variables:**

202 • The cross-sectional area (CSA), to be performed with linear tracing, measured over the inner  
203 border of the epineurium of the median nerve at the level of the entrance and exit of the carpal  
204 tunnel. We take the average of 3 consecutive measurements.

205 • The range of median nerve thinning understood as the ratio of the transverse and anteroposterior  
206 diameters of the nerve in the proximal-medial intracarpal region, at the level of the pisiform.

207 • The wrist-forearm index, understood as the ratio of the CSA at the tunnel entrance to the CSA at  
208 12 cm from the distal wrist crease.

209 • The flexor retinaculum bulge, which translates an increase in intracarpal pressure. We measure  
210 this by tracing a horizontal from the superior pole of the scaphoid to the superior pole of the  
211 pisiform, and a vertical from the superior end of the flexor retinaculum to the horizontal.

212 • Power Doppler uptake, which determines the hypervascularization of the nerve, especially in the

213 periphery, at the expense of low-flow intraneural vessels. The uptake is at mid-tunnel level,  
214 between the pisiform and hamate nerves.

215 • The existence of notches in the nerve in the longitudinal ultrasound view, including the entrance,  
216 interior and exit of the tunnel.

217

218 4. **Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire** (BCTQ), to assess both the symptoms and the subjective  
219 functional impact of patients.

220

221 5. **Cost evaluation:** To carry out a cost-effectiveness analysis, we will evaluate the costs of the  
222 consumables established by the Andalusian Health Service used in both tests and the average time  
223 for each of the tests, in order to calculate the cost of the professional when performing each of them.

224

## 225 **Participant timeline {13}**

226 As shown in table 3, we have established a first period for the study, from July 2020 to December 2020, where  
227 the initial literature search is carried out, the study protocol is drawn up and submitted to the ethics committee  
228 for approval. During this time, a training period is also planned for the researcher in the performance of the  
229 ultrasound protocol, a study carried out in the Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Services of the Virgen  
230 Macarena, Virgen del Rocío and Valme University Hospitals, where ultrasound studies are performed on  
231 patients with CTS.

232 During the second period of the study, from January 2021 to December 2021, we planned to have performed  
233 ultrasound studies on patients. However, due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation, we were forced to prolong  
234 this period until September 2022.

235 We propose a third and final period from September 2022 to May 2023 for data collection, statistical analysis  
236 and writing of the study, as well as the relevant corrections.

237

238 Table 3. Participant timeline

Staff responsible	Task	First period	Second period	Third period

		From July 2020 to December 2020	From January 2021 to September 2022	From September 2022 to May 2023
Principal investigator and sponsors	Bibliographic search	X		
Principal investigator and sponsors	Protocol development	X		
Principal investigator and sponsors	Ethics Committee	X		
Principal investigator and sponsors	Training period	X		
Principal investigator	Ultrasound study performed on the sample		X	
Principal investigator	Data collection			X
	Statistical analysis			X
Principal investigator	Writing			X
Sponsors	Corrections			X

239

240 **Sample size {14}**

241 To calculate the sample size (EPIDAT program) we proposed:

- 242
- Expected sensibility: 78%

- 243 • Expected specificity: 87%
- 244 • Level of confidence: 95%

245 Table 1. Sample size

Precision (%)	Sample Size		
	Positive test	Negative test	Total
5,000	264	174	<b>438</b>

252 In order to evaluate ultrasound as a diagnostic test versus neurophysiological study in patients with a high  
253 clinical suspicion of suffering from CTS, expected values of sensitivity and specificity of the ultrasound test of  
254 78% and 87% respectively, a maximum imprecision of 5% and a confidence level of 95% are considered,  
255 resulting in the need to evaluate a minimum of 264 patients with a positive result in the nerve conduction study  
256 as well as a minimum of 174 patients with a negative result, which means a total sample of 438 patients.

257 The calculation was performed using the EPIDAT program.

258

## 259 **Recruitment {15}**

260 The patients included in the study will be obtained consecutively through the consultations of the  
261 Neurophysiology Department of the Virgen Macarena Hospital (Seville, Spain), provided that they have clinical  
262 suspicion of CTS.

263

## 264 **Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)**

### 265 **Sequence generation {16a}**

266 Not applicable, since there are no intervention groups. All patients we recruited from the neurophysiology  
267 department of the Vigen Macarena Hospital (Seville, Spain), who underwent an ultrasonography following a  
268 specific protocol.

269 **Concealment mechanism {16b}**

270 Not applicable, since there are no intervention groups.

271

272 **Implementation {16c}**

273 Not applicable, since there are no intervention groups.

274

275 **Assignment of interventions: Blinding**

276 **Who will be blinded {17a}**

277 Not applicable. This protocol is for an evaluation study of diagnostic tests comparing electroneurography and  
278 ultrasound. Nevertheless, the result of the neurophysiological study will be blinded so the researcher does not  
279 know the expected outcome of the ultrasound.

280

281 **Procedure for unblinding if needed {17b}**

282 Not applicable. No unblinded procedure will be carried out due to the diagnostic nature of the study.

283

284 **Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis**

285 **Data collection methods**

286 **Plans for assessment and collection of outcomes {18a}**

287 The means necessary to carry out our study will be a Sonosite ultrasound scanner model X-porte, ultrasound  
288 gel and a computer for data collection in Excel table. We do not need external funding to carry out the study.

289 In order to promote data quality, a training period was included for the researcher in charge of performing the  
290 ultrasounds, it was carried out during the first period of the timeline.

291 On the other hand, when the ultrasound was performed, 3 measurements were made of each parameter,  
292 taking the average of the three of them.

293 Of the instruments included in the study, the following should be highlighted:

294 • Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire – (BCTQ):

295 The Boston scale is a validated and self-administered instrument that assesses the impact of CTS on both  
296 symptoms and patient function (13), having demonstrated a statistically significant relationship between AST,  
297 NF, clinical symptoms and hand functionality (14,15). Contrary to the above, Mondelli et al. in 2008 (16)  
298 obtained results when comparing the combination of ultrasound and NF versus BCTQ, finding no relationship  
299 between the questionnaire and the other two tools.

300 However, more publications support the usefulness of BCTQ, being a tool translated into several languages  
301 such as Arabic, Turkish or Japanese (17).

302 Of the tests used in the physical examination the following should be highlight:

303 - Tinel sign: The sensitivity is between 26 and 79% and the specificity is between 40 and 100% (18).

304 - Phalen sign: the sensitivity is between 67 and 83% and the specificity is between 47 and 100% (18,19).

305

### 306 **Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up {18b}**

307 Not applicable. The data collection is a one-time ultrasound and there are no further revisions or assessments  
308 scheduled after.

309

### 310 **Data management {19}**

311 The data will be entered by one of the two principal investigators, in batches of 50 patients, performing a  
312 subsequent review of the data to ensure that there are no errors when entering them.

313 We will not use the patient's personal data but the personal health code (NUSHA).

314 The storage will be done in Excel format on a computer and on an external storage system (USB).

315

### 316 **Statistical methods**

#### 317 **Statistical methods for primary and secondary outcomes {20a}**

318 After an initial exploration of the data, quantitative variables are expressed as means and standard deviations



319 or medians and quartiles in case of asymmetric distributions, and qualitative variables as percentages.  
320 The calculation of the measures of validity and safety of the ultrasound test as a diagnostic test for CTS:  
321 sensitivity, specificity, predictive values and likelihood ratios, are carried out considering the neurophysiological  
322 study as the reference test (gold standard).  
323 Likewise, the reliability of the ultrasound is analyzed by calculating the degree of agreement between the  
324 diagnoses of the two tests using Cohen's Kappa coefficient. The concordance of both tests with the established  
325 clinical severity is also studied.  
326 The analysis of the ultrasound parameters predictive of CTS is approached univariate with the Student t-test  
327 for two independent samples or Mann-Whitney U test for quantitative variables and with the chi-square test or  
328 non-asymptotic methods for qualitative variables.  
329 Shortly afterwards, a multivariate logistic regression model will be created to try to determine the best subset  
330 of them that predict CTS.  
331 Finally, ROC curves will be performed to evaluate cut-off points for certain quantitative ultrasound parameters  
332 that discriminate well against CTS.  
333 Data analysis is performed with SPSS 25.0 statistical software.

334

### 335 **Methods for additional analyses (e.g. subgroup analyses) {20b}**

336 Not applicable, no additional analysis will be performed.

337

### 338 **Methods in analysis to handle protocol non-adherence and any statistical methods to** 339 **handle missing data {20c}**

340 The main analysis will be the concordance between the results of electroneurography and ultrasound in the  
341 diagnosis of CTS. Different parameters will be considered and in case of missing values these will be imputed  
342 by multiple imputation, selecting some of the methods that best suits the data set, these being the Monte Carlo  
343 method and Markov chains (MCMC), the maximum interaction method, monotonic method, linear regression,  
344 predictive mean matching (PMC) among others.

345

### 346 **Methods: Monitoring**

347 **Data monitoring**

348 **Composition of the data monitoring committee, its role and reporting structure {21a}**

349 We did not need a data monitoring committee as a single measurement of the variables will be included in the  
350 study, and the serial collection of the variables was not necessary. Each patient was explored, the  
351 questionnaire was passed to them, and neurophysiology and ultrasound were performed on a single occasion.

352

353 **Interim analyses {21b}**

354 No interim analysis will be performed.

355

356 **Harms {22}**

357 Although the diagnostic tests evaluated in this study are harmless for humans, we have to consider the  
358 possibility or adverse effects, and how we will collect them when applying the test throughout the study.

359 On the one hand, at the end of the ultrasound, we will collect the appearance of any adverse effect by  
360 answering a Yes / No question, and if so, a brief description of it. If the adverse effect come up hours after the  
361 test was carried out, all patients have, in their informed consent copy, an email address of the principal  
362 investigator that they can attend.

363 Regarding the possible side effects derived from the neurophysiological test, being a different department from  
364 Rehabilitation, Regarding the possible side effects derived from the neurophysiological test, being a different  
365 department from Rehabilitation, it is they who manage the appearance of these adverse effects as part of their  
366 daily clinical activity.

367

368 **Auditing {23}**

369 Of the two main researchers, one of them will carry out the ultrasounds and data collection, while the other  
370 one will carry out the quality control of the study, a well-done data collection, the proper functioning of the  
371 ultrasound system, the appointment of patients, etc.

372

## 373 Discussion

374 Ultrasonography allows not only to objectify median nerve alterations but also the underlying pathological  
375 mechanisms in CTS. The median nerve undergoes physiological changes including swelling and edema as it  
376 is compressed within the tunnel, resulting in increased CSA and hypoechogenicity. As the nerve becomes  
377 inflamed, it moves against the flexor retinaculum which becomes bowed, further compressing the nerve. In  
378 advanced CTS, inflammation of the nerve leads to hypervascularisation, which can be detected by Doppler.  
379 In turn, ultrasound can also be useful to assess underlying structural causes of CTS, such as cysts, ganglions  
380 or the presence of other masses invading the tunnel (20). These structural changes that the nerve undergoes  
381 are translated into ultrasound parameters that we can measure, and which position ultrasound as a useful tool  
382 in the study of the syndrome. It is important to note that in early stages, morphology may not be affected, so  
383 in the presence of normal ultrasound findings in patients with suggestive symptoms, we should not exclude  
384 the diagnosis of CTS (21).

385 Regarding the sensitivity and specificity of ultrasound, in 2009 Beekman and Viser observed a sensitivity of  
386 70-88% and a specificity of 57-100%. In turn, in the meta-analysis carried out by Fowler et al. (22), although  
387 with a debatable methodology, they found similar results, with a combined sensitivity of 80.2% and a specificity  
388 of 78.7% (using neurophysiological testing as a reference). Others give sensitivity figures of 78% and  
389 specificity of 87% (23), with values of up to 94% sensitivity and 98% specificity having been described (24).

390 It should be emphasized that ultrasound is operator dependent (26), therefore good training is very important  
391 to ensure reliability and reproducibility.

392 If we analyze the ultrasound assessment protocols described to date, there has been much disparity between  
393 scientific publications; like Roll et al. (25), we consider this to be the main reason why there is no standardized  
394 protocol for ultrasound study as a diagnostic test.

395 The authors Chen et al. (11) proposed an ultrasound assessment protocol that included:

- 396 • Patient position.
- 397 • Ultrasound parameters: CSA at the entrance and exit of the tunnel, CSA in the distal third of the  
398 forearm, longitudinal view of the nerve, and dynamic tests (when flexing the first finger and when  
399 flexing the rest of the fingers) both to observe changes in the diameter of the nerve without  
400 measurement, and lumbrical tests (to determine whether they invade the tunnel when making a full

401 grip).

402 In our study, we have based ourselves on the general lines described in this protocol, adding other parameters  
403 based on the literature review.

404 Among the ultrasound parameters analyzed, Duncan et al. were the first to demonstrate the superiority of the  
405 CSA over the other ultrasound parameters (26), although there are authors (27) who have suggested the  
406 superiority of the nerve inflammation ratio over the rest. In turn, Swen et al. established that the optimal atomic  
407 reference for measuring CSA is the entrance of the tunnel at the level of the pisiform (28).

408 As Hobson-Webb et al. (29) have already stated, a single measurement can result in a false positive, so in our  
409 protocol we have decided to take the mean of 3 consecutive CSA measurements of the median nerve, but not  
410 for the indices or retinaculum ballooning.

411 Regarding the cut-off point for CSA, a lot of variability is reported in the literature. CSA values have been  
412 reported from as low as 6.5 mm<sup>2</sup> (30) to as high as 13 mm<sup>2</sup> (31), with sensitivity ranging from 60% (32) to  
413 100% (33) and specificity ranging from 22% to 100%, as well as overall accuracy ranging from 68% (28) to  
414 97.2% (34).

415 Considered normal limits of nerve CSA range from 7 to 9.4 mm<sup>2</sup> (30), and diagnostic values vary from 9 to 15  
416 mm<sup>2</sup> (36). This variability is mainly due to the different measurement techniques used between studies. It does  
417 seem clear that the area of the median nerve increases as the syndrome progresses over time (37).

418 Descatha et al. (38) conducted a meta-analysis of 13 articles in 2012 and observed that for a cut-off point  
419 between 7-8.5 mm<sup>2</sup> the sensitivity amounted to 94% (0.94 [0.87-1.00]) with a likelihood ratio for the negative  
420 test of 0.15 [0.08-0.30]; similarly, for a cut-off point between 11.5-13.00 mm<sup>2</sup> the specificity amounted to 97%  
421 (0.97 [0.91-1.00]), with a likelihood ratio for the positive test of 8.5 [2.83-25.57]. On this basis, they state that  
422 ultrasonography cannot be considered as an alternative to the neurophysiological study, but it can be used as  
423 a screening tool.

424 Similarly, and in relation to the diagnostic accuracy of the CSA parameter, the most extensive review carried  
425 out in this regard dates from 2012 by Cartwright et al. (39), who reviewed 121 articles and concluded that  
426 ultrasound "probably adds value to nerve conduction studies in the diagnosis of CTS for detecting associated  
427 anatomical alterations" and recommended "using ultrasound as a screening tool to assess structural  
428 alterations in patients with suspected CTS".

429 In our study, we included both patients with CTS (confirmed by neurophysiological testing) and patients  
430 considered "healthy" (with negative neurophysiological testing), in order to analyze the ultrasound differences  
431 between the two groups.

432 Hobson-Webb et al. (29) observed that the CSA in healthy patients was lower than in patients with CTS, with  
433 values of 10 mm<sup>2</sup>, higher than that reported by authors such as Hammer et al. (35) or Yesildag (40), but similar  
434 to that reported by others such as Nakamichi and Tachibana (41). Similarly, Hobson-Webb et al. also observed  
435 that AST in the forearm differed between healthy ( $9.8 \pm 2.4$  mm<sup>2</sup>) and diseased ( $6.9 \pm 1.6$ mm<sup>2</sup>).

436 In relation to the wrist-forearm index, the first to consider this parameter were Hobson-Webb and his team,  
437 who observed that in normal subjects the CSA in the wrist has been described as having the same value as  
438 that of the forearm and hypothesized that the ratio between the two could be a diagnostic alternative (29), on  
439 this basis, the wrist-forearm index should be 1:1.

440 Both Hobson-Webb et al. (29) and Mhoon et al. (42) observed that values of 1.4 or higher have a high  
441 sensitivity (97-100%) to diagnose CTS and values below 1.4 a high sensitivity (99%) to rule it out, the low  
442 specificity (28%) limiting its use to screening only.

443 In our study, based on the approach of Hobson-Web et al. (29), we measured CSA at the tunnel entrance and  
444 12 cm from the distal wrist crease.

445 There are authors who have performed this index using different measurement references (43), so we will not,  
446 at the time, establish a comparison between their findings and those of our study. We took 1.4 as the cut-off  
447 point, as it is the most frequently considered cut-off point.

448 A case-control study conducted by Fu et al. in 2015 (44) performed the entrance-exit index (tunnel entrance  
449 CSA /exit CSA) in patients with clinically suggestive and positive electroneurogram, observing that for index  
450 values greater than or equal to 1.3, a sensitivity of 93% and specificity of 91% is obtained to diagnose CTS.  
451 Like us, they consider that the index can compensate for interexplorer variability when measuring CSA; they  
452 also observed that the index is not related to demographic variables and can be used without a population  
453 condition. In our study we considered a cut-off point of 1.3.

454 Echogenicity is another ultrasound parameter that has been studied in possible relation to the development of  
455 CTS, with a decrease in echogenicity observed as the syndrome progresses (45). Under normal conditions, a  
456 healthy median nerve is observed in transverse plane with high echogenicity, with its fascicles translating into  
457 the so-called "honeycomb" pattern, which is altered especially at the level of compression (46). However, this

458 parameter is very subjective even in experienced examiners, and may vary depending on the ultrasound  
459 scanner used, so we have dispensed with this parameter in our study.

460 In relation to the Doppler tool, its usefulness lies in the fact that in healthy subjects intraneural blood flow has  
461 never been demonstrated, which seems to reflect a pathological condition. It has been observed that Doppler  
462 can detect increased intraneural or epineural vascular flow in patients with CTS, which seems to reinforce the  
463 diagnosis (47), and a correlation has been observed between intraneural flow and CTS severity (48).

464 There are 3 Doppler techniques capable of detecting blood flow: color, power and spectral Doppler. Of these,  
465 power doppler is not affected by compression or alising when detecting blood flow, since blood volume (rather  
466 than velocity) is what is measured. In addition, power doppler is more sensitive when flow is slow (49).

467 When applying the doppler, the position of the wrist is very important, which could also influence blood flow;  
468 the authors Vanderschueren et al. recommend keeping the wrist in a neutral position, avoiding mobilization of  
469 the fingers or provocation tests (50).

470 Mohammadi et al. reported that the presence of color Doppler uptake in the median nerve correlates strongly  
471 with the severity observed in neurophysiological findings (48).

472 Roll et al. (25) developed a model with severity stages based on doppler uptake in patients with CTS; an 8-  
473 point system (from 0 to 7) taking the neurophysiological outcome as the gold standard. They mention that the  
474 assessment is more accurate in moderate stages.

475 Superb microvascular imaging (51), which is a pioneering technology in ultrasound that allows real-time blood  
476 flow assessment, developed by Toshiba, has also been described as far superior to the Doppler tool. However,  
477 it is not currently accessible to physicians, and therefore cannot be taken into consideration.

478 Another parameter studied over time has been the thickening of the flexor retinaculum in the proximal region  
479 of the carpal tunnel, the interest being based on the fact that continued inflammation and the consequent  
480 extraneural reactive fibrosis cause a greater thickness of this structure, considered in the pathological range  
481 above 1 mm (52). In any case, in our opinion, like Pardal-Fernández (53), we consider it to be a parameter of  
482 low sensitivity, due to the small size of its dimensions and the consequent variability in measurements.

483 The flattening ratio is a ratio between the transverse and anteroposterior diameters in the intracarpal region,  
484 described within the tunnel. It is a well-regarded parameter (54) and ratios above 3.5-4 are considered  
485 pathological. At the mid-distal level, in the ulnar nerve, some authors have shown that the trapped nerve

486 presents a morphological deformation of its floor, in such a way that it outlines the contour or ridge of the  
487 tendons it contacts, showing a deformity similar to a "triangular" (55), which is produced by the lower physical  
488 resistance of the nerve to the impaction of the tendons, which are more rigid and consistent. In turn, the authors  
489 Lee et al. carried out a prospective case-control study analyzing different ultrasound variables among which  
490 they included the flattening index, but at different levels of the tunnel: at the pisiform, hamate and lunate; they  
491 only obtained a statistically significant difference between both groups in the measurement made at the level  
492 of the hamate (cut-off point  $3.2 \pm 0.4$   $P < 0.05$ ) (56); these same results were found by Tai et al. in a meta-  
493 analysis carried out in 2012 (57). In any case, some authors did not find cost-effectiveness in this parameter  
494 (58). We have included it in our parameters and hope to clarify its usefulness.

495 The flexor retinaculum may bulge as a result of increased intracarpal pressure. The buckling of the flexor  
496 retinaculum, in most CTSs, is usually not important considering the low elasticity of this structure, especially if  
497 it is also fibrosed. It is observed more in the distal third, at the level of the hamate bone, and is established by  
498 determining the distance from the crossing of the line that joins the upper edge of the trapezium bone with that  
499 of the hamate bone, with the line that goes from the floor, the large bone, to the highest point of the vault of  
500 the retinaculum or anteroposterior diameter. It is considered pathological if it is greater than 2 mm (52),  
501 although some consider it to be 3.7 mm (55). In any case and taking into account that the image at this point  
502 is not usually good, these findings are not very conclusive due to their low reproducibility. We have included  
503 this parameter in our measurements, finding it useful based on the literature analyzed and hoping to clarify the  
504 best cut-off point.

505 Another of the ultrasound parameters described in the literature is the overall dimension of the tunnel (43),  
506 understood as the ratio between the scaphoid-pisiform distance and the distance from the flexor retinaculum  
507 to the lunate; a more square morphology has been described in patients with CTS compared to healthy patients  
508 (43). This parameter, although included in the literature, has not been studied or taken into account as much  
509 as others, so we have not included it in our study in order to propose a protocol that is as useful and simple  
510 as possible for its application in clinical practice.

511 The mobility patterns of the nerve in patients with CTS have also been analyzed. The authors Kuo et al. (59)  
512 studied the transverse gliding patterns of the median nerve during finger movement, analyzing dynamic images  
513 to distinguish between healthy subjects and affected patients; they also proposed a formula to be integrated  
514 into the ultrasound software for assessment.

515 Chen et al. (11) also included in their protocol a "stress test" when flexing the first finger and when flexing the  
516 rest of the fingers (changes in the diameter of the nerve without measuring) as well as the lumbrical test (to  
517 determine whether they invade the tunnel when performing a full grip). We found the performance and  
518 assessment of these tests to be highly dependent on the experience of the examiner, which is why we have  
519 dispensed with dynamic tests in the development of our protocol.

520 The last two "items" that we analyzed in our study are, on the one hand, the search for anatomical alterations  
521 that may compress the median nerve as it passes through the tunnel (ganglions, tendonitis, etc.), since  
522 ultrasound allows easy detection of anatomical alterations of the nerve (41). In our study, as described above,  
523 we performed a scan of the image in both the transverse and longitudinal planes, covering all structures from  
524 lateral to medial.

525 On the other hand, we assessed the presence of nerve grimacing in the longitudinal plane, to identify whether  
526 there is a specific point of compression. In general, the nerve increases in size immediately after the  
527 compression zone.

528 Other variables included in our study are demographic variables; it is in our interest to analyze whether there  
529 is a predisposition to suffer from CTS in certain subjects according to their baseline characteristics. This has  
530 been studied previously (60, 61), and it has been observed that weight is directly related to the presence of  
531 the syndrome.

532 We have included the BCTQ scale, a validated, self-administered instrument that assesses the impact of CTS  
533 on both symptoms and patient function (62), and a statistically significant relationship has been demonstrated  
534 between CSA, NPT score, clinical symptoms and hand function (14, 15). Contrary to this, Mondelli et al. in  
535 2008 (16) found no relationship when comparing the combination of ultrasound and NPT score versus BCTQ.  
536 However, there are more publications that support the usefulness of the BCTQ, being a tool translated into  
537 several languages such as Arabic, Turkish or Japanese (17).

538 When comparing neurophysiological studies versus ultrasound, although the former offer 85% sensitivity and  
539 95% specificity in the diagnosis of CTS, they are invasive and unpleasant for the patient (12); recent literature  
540 has shown that patients themselves have a preference for ultrasound over nerve conduction studies (62).

541 Although the specificity of neurophysiological tests is high, there is significant variability in their sensitivity (56-  
542 85%) which can translate into false negative results between 10-20% of patients (39) and false positives  
543 between 16-34% (22). Other authors report an NPT sensitivity of 88% and specificity of 93% (54).



544 Seror in his 2008 review concluded that there is no "competition" between ultrasound and NPTs, but rather a  
545 complementarity between the two tests (63).

546 Although ultrasound may not replace neurophysiological testing as the gold standard for confirmation, authors  
547 Fowler and Gaughan suggest that it could be proposed as a first-line tool (22); they add that the best  
548 candidates for ultrasound are those with high prior probability based on examination and reported  
549 symptomatology.

550 Several authors (38,39) propose ultrasound as an initial screening test, leaving nerve conduction for definitive  
551 diagnosis.

552 The use of ultrasound as a diagnostic tool in CTS has many advantages for both the physician and the patient.  
553 It is a non-invasive, convenient, and fast tool, and ultrasound equipment is becoming increasingly cheaper,  
554 making it more accessible to the healthcare system (20).

555

## 556 **Ethics and dissemination**

### 557 **Research ethics approval {24}**

558 This study has been approved by the Andalusian Biomedical Research Ethics Committee (Comité de Ética de  
559 la Investigación Biomédica de Andalucía). Written informed consent will be obtained from all participants  
560 before entering in the study.

561

### 562 **Protocol amendments {25}**

563 We will communicate it by email with the relevant parts, as the secondary investigators or the statistician.

564

### 565 **Consent or assent {26a}**

566 The patients included in the study will be obtained consecutively through the consultations of the  
567 Neurophysiology Department of the Virgen Macarena Hospital (Seville), provided that they have clinical  
568 suspicion of CTS. These patients will be invited to participate in the study and will be asked to sign the informed  
569 consent form, which reflects the documentary commitment to confidentiality and safeguards in the treatment  
570 of their data by the researchers, as well as information on what their participation in the study will consist of.

571

572 **Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological**  
573 **specimens {26b}**

574 Not applicable, as these will not be collected.

575

576 **Confidentiality {27}**

577 In order to protect participants personal information, we did not use their names, but their personal health code  
578 called "NUSHA" (e.g.: AN0123456789).

579

580 **Declaration of interests {28}**

581 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

582

583 **Access to data {29}**

584 Only the two main investigators will have access to the final trial dataset as well as the statistician who will  
585 handles the database.

586

587 **Ancillary and post-trial care {30}**

588 Being the echography an innocuous test, we do not stand any provision for post-trial test. Not applicable.

589

590 **Dissemination policy**

591 **Dissemination plans {31a}**

592 The trial results will be communicated to the scientific community through journal as well as communications  
593 at scientific meetings or congresses. As for the patients participating in the trial, again within the informed  
594 consent they will have an email address to contact with in case they want to know the results; this way we do  
595 not bother those participants who do not want to know the results.

596

## 597 **Authors' contributions {31b}**

598 MPMC is the principal investigator, having developed the idea and protocol with the help of the research team.  
599 She will be responsible for collecting the sample. MRPD led the study proposal and developed the protocol,  
600 being the main methodologist. ASJS participated in the development of the protocol until the final version was  
601 reached. MAL facilitated the collection of the sample by performing the neurophysiological tests in the first  
602 stage, and by bringing the patients to the principal investigator. In turn, she provided the neurophysiological  
603 protocol used to be included in the manuscript. GJJ facilitated the collection of the sample by performing the  
604 neurophysiological tests at an early stage, getting the patients to the principal investigator.

605

## 606 **Plans to give access to the full protocol, participant level-data and statistical code** 607 **{31c}**

608 The full study protocol can be accessed by contacting the trial team at (e-mail). Anonymized participants level  
609 data and statistical codes used for the analysis are available on request and subject to data sharing  
610 agreements. Data sharing may only be possible after relevant embedded trials have been published.

611

## 612 **Trial status**

613 This protocol is version 4 after several corrections and modifications based on the most recently published  
614 literature. We will start recruitment in January 2021 and expect to complete it in 2023.

615

## 616 **Abbreviations**

- 617     ▪ CSA: Cross sectional area.
- 618     ▪ AAEM: American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine.
- 619     ▪ BCTQ : Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire
- 620     ▪ CTS: Carpal Tunnel Syndrome.
- 621     ▪ NPT: Neurophysiological test.

622

## 623 Acknowledgements

624 We thank Merz Pharma for assisting in the development of the translation of the manuscript and appendices.

625

## 626 References

- 627 1. Aroori S, Spence RA. Carpal tunnel syndrome. *Ulster Med J.* 2008; 77: 6-17.
- 628 2. Phalen GS. The carpal-tunnel syndrome. Seventeen years' experience in diagnosis and treatment  
629 of six hundred fiftyfourhands. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1966; 48: 211-228
- 630 3. Vanhees M, Morizaki Y, Thoreson AR, Larson D, Zhao C, An KN, et al. The effect of displacement  
631 on the mechanical properties of human cadaver subsynovial connectivetissue. *J Orthop Res.*  
632 2012;30:1732-1737
- 633 4. Rotman MB, Donovan JP. Practical anatomy of the carpal tunnel. *Hand Clin.* 2002;18:219-230
- 634 5. Chammas M, Boretto J, Marquardt L, Ramos R, Dos Santos FC, Braga J. Carpal tunnel syndrome  
635 – Part I (anatomy, physiology, etiology and diagnosis). *Rev bras ortop.* 2014;4 9(5):429–436.
- 636 6. Rydevik B, Lundborg G, Bagge U. Effects of graded compression on intraneural blood flow. An in  
637 vivo study on rabbit tibial nerve. *J Hand Surg Am.* 1981;6:3-12
- 638 7. Keir PJ, Bach JM, Rempel D. Effects of computer mouse design and task on carpal tunnel pressure.  
639 *Ergonomics.* 1999;42:1350-1360
- 640 8. Byl C, Puttlitz C, Byl N, Lotz J, Topp K. Strain in the median and ulnar nerves during upper-extremity  
641 positioning. *J HandSurg Am.* 2002;27:1032-1040.
- 642 9. Ibrahim I, Khan WS, Goddard N, Smitham P. Carpal tunnel syndrome: a review of the recent  
643 literature. *Open Orthop J.* 2012;6:69-76
- 644 10. Rempel D, Gerr F, Harris-Adamson C, Hegmann KT, Thiese MS, Kapellusch J, et al. Personal and  
645 workplace factors and median nerve function in a pooled study of 2396 US workers. *J Occup Environ*  
646 *Med.* 2015;57(1):98-104
- 647 11. Chen YT, Williams L, Zak MJ, Fredericson M. Review of Ultrasonography in the Diagnosis of Carpal  
648 Tunnel Syndrome and a Proposed Scanning Protocol. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2016;35(11):2311-2324.
- 649 12. American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine, American Academy of Neurology, and  
650 American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. Practice parameter for electrodiagnostic  
651 studies in carpal tunnel syndrome: summary statement. *Muscle Nerve.* 2002;25(6):918-22.

- 652 13. Levine DW, Simmons BP, Koris MJ, Daltroy LH, Hohl GG, Fossel AH, et al. A self- administered  
653 questionnaire for the assessment of severity of symptoms and functional status in carpal tunnel  
654 syndrome. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1993; 75:1585-1592
- 655 14. Lee CH, Kim TK, Yoon ES, Dhong ES. Correlation of high-resolution ultrasonographic findings with  
656 the clinical symptoms and electrodiagnostic data in carpal tunnel syndrome. *Ann Plast Surg.*  
657 2005;54:20
- 658 15. Padua L, Pazzaglia C, Caliandro P, Granata G, Foschini M, Briani C, et al. Carpal tunnel syndrome:  
659 ultrasound, neurophysiology, clinical and patient-oriented assessment. *Clin Neurophysiol.*  
660 2008;119:2064–2069.
- 661 16. Mondelli M, Filippou G, Gallo A, Frediani B. Diagnostic utility of ultrasonography versus nerve  
662 conduction studies in mild carpal tunnel syndrome. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2008;59:357–366
- 663 17. El Miedany YM, Aty SA, Ashour S. Ultrasonography versus nerve conduction study in patients with  
664 carpal tunnel syndrome: substantive or complementary tests? *Rheumatology (Oxford).* 2004;43:  
665 887–895
- 666 18. Palumbo CF, Szabo RM. Examination of patients for carpal tunnel syndrome sensibility, provocative,  
667 and motor testing. *Hand Clin.* 2002;18(2):269–77
- 668 19. Buch-Jaeger N, Foucher G. Correlation of clinical signs with nerve conduction tests in the diagnosis  
669 of carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Hand Surg Br.* 1994;19(6):720–4
- 670 20. Vahed LK, Arianpur A, Gharedaghi M, Rezaei H. Ultrasound as a diagnostic tool in the investigation  
671 of patients with carpal tunnel syndrome. *Eur J Transl Myol.* 2018;28(2):193-197.
- 672 21. Kara M, Ozcakar L, Muynck M, Tok F, Vanderstraeten G. Musculoskeletal ultrasound for  
673 peripheral nerve lesions. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* 2012;48:665-74.
- 674 22. Fowler JR, Gaughan JP, Ilyas AM. The sensitivity and specificity of ultrasound for the diagnosis of  
675 carpal tunnel syndrome: a meta-analysis. *Clin Orthop.* 2011;469:1089–1094.
- 676 23. Strickland JW, Gozani SN. Accuracy of in-office nerve conduction studies for median neuropathy: a  
677 meta-analysis. *J Hand Surg Am.* 2011;36(1):52–60.
- 678 24. Wong SM, Griffith JF, Hui AC, Lo SK, Fu M, Wong KS. Carpal tunnel syndrome: diagnostic  
679 usefulness of sonography. *Radiology.* 2004;232:93–99.
- 680 25. Roll SC, Evans KD, Li X, Freimer M, Sommerich CM. Screening for carpal tunnel syndrome using  
681 sonography. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2011;30:1657-1667.

- 682 26. Duncan I, Sullivan P, Lomas F. Sonography in the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome. *AJR Am J*  
683 *Roentgenol.* 1999;173:681-684.
- 684 27. Altinok T, Baysal O, Karakas HM, Sigirci A, Alkan A, Kayhan A, et al. Ultrasonographic assessment  
685 of mild and moderate idiopathic carpal tunnel syndrome. *Clin Radiol.* 2004;59:916-25.
- 686 28. Swen WA, Jacobs JW, Bussemaker FE, de Waard JW, Bijlsma JW. Carpal tunnel sonography by  
687 the rheumatologist versus nerve conduction study by the neurologist. *J Rheumatol.* 2001;28:62–69.
- 688 29. Hobson-Webb LD, Massey JM, Juel VC, Sanders DB. The ultrasonographic wrist-to-forearm median  
689 nerve area ratio in carpal tunnel syndrome. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2008;119:1353–135.
- 690 30. Pinilla I, Martín-Hervás C, Sordo G, Santiago S. The usefulness of ultrasonography in the diagnosis  
691 of carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Hand Surg Eur Vol.* 2008;33:435–439.
- 692 31. Bayrak IK, Bayrak AO, Tilki HE, Nural MS, Sunter T. Ultrasonography in carpal tunnel syndrome:  
693 comparison with electrophysiological stage and motor unit number estimate. *Muscle Nerve.*  
694 2007;35:344–348.
- 695 32. Moran L, Perez M, Esteban A, Bellon J, Arranz B, del Cerro M. Sonographic measurement of cross-  
696 sectional area of the median nerve in the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome: correlation with nerve  
697 conduction studies. *J Clin Ultrasound.* 2009;37:125–131.
- 698 33. Keberle M, Jenett M, Kenn W, Reiners K, Peter M, Haerten R, et al. Technical advances in ultrasound  
699 and MR imaging of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Eur Radiol.* 2000;10:1043-1050.
- 700 34. Klauser AS, Halpern EJ, Faschingbauer R, Guerra F, Martinoli C, Gabl MF, et al. Bifid median nerve  
701 in carpal tunnel syndrome: assessment with US cross-sectional area measurement. *Radiology.*  
702 2011;259:808–815.
- 703 35. Hammer HB, Hovden IAH, Haavardsholm EA, Kvien TK. Ultrasonography shows increased cross-  
704 sectional area of the median nerve in patients with arthritis and carpal tunnel syndrome.  
705 *Rheumatology.* 2006;45:584–8.
- 706 36. Beekman R, Visser LH. Sonography in the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome: a critical review of  
707 the literature. *Muscle Nerve.* 2003;27:26–33.
- 708 37. Roll SC, Evans KD, Volz KR, Sommerich CM. Longitudinal design for sonographic measurement of  
709 median nerve swelling with controlled exposure to physical work using an animal model. *Ultrasound*  
710 *Med Biol.* 2013;39(12):2492–2497.
- 711 38. Descatha A, Huard L, Aubert F, Barbato B, Gorand O, Chastang JF. Meta-Analysis on the

- 712 Performance of Sonography for the Diagnosis of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *Semin Arthritis Rheum.*  
713 2012;41:914-922.
- 714 39. Cawright MS, Hobson-Webb LD, Boon AJ, Alter KE, Hunt CH, Flores VH, et al. Evidence-based  
715 guideline: neuromuscular ultrasound for the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Muscle Nerve.*  
716 2012;46:287–293.
- 717 40. Yesildag A, Kutluhan S, Sengul N, Koyuncuoglu HR, Oyar O, Guler K, et al. The role of  
718 ultrasonographic measurement of the median nerve in the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome.  
719 *Clinical Radiology.* 2004;59:910–5.
- 720 41. Nakamichi K, Tachibana S. Ultrasonographic measurement of median nerve cross-sectional area in  
721 idiopathic carpal tunnel syndrome: diagnostic accuracy. *Muscle Nerve.* 2002;26:798-803.
- 722 42. Mhoon JT, Juel VC, Hobson-Webb LD. Median nerve ultrasound as a screening tool in carpal tunnel  
723 syndrome: correlation of cross-sectional area measures with electrodiagnostic abnormality. *Muscle*  
724 *Nerve.* 2012;46:871–878.
- 725 43. Vögelin E, Mészáros T, Schöni F, Constantinescu MA. Sonographic wrist measurements and  
726 detection of anatomical features in carpal tunnel syndrome. *ScientificWorldJournal.*  
727 2014;2014:657906.
- 728 44. Fu T, Cao M, Liu F, Zhu J, Ye D, Feng X, et al. Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Assessment with  
729 Ultrasonography: Value of Inlet-to-Outlet Median Nerve Area Ratio in Patients versus Healthy  
730 Volunteers. *PLoS ONE.* 2015;10(1):e0116777.
- 731 45. Cartwright MS, Walker FO, Blocker JN, Schulz MR, Arcury TA, Grzywacz JG, et al. Ultrasound for  
732 carpal tunnel syndrome screening in manual laborers. *Muscle Nerve.* 2013;48(1):127–131.
- 733 46. Martinoli C, Bianchi S, Gandolfo N, Valle M, Simonetti S, Derchi LE. US of nerve entrapments in  
734 osteofibrous tunnels of the upper and lower limbs. *RadioGraphics.* 2000;20:199-217.
- 735 47. Visser LH, Beekman R. Ultrasound of peripheral nerves. In: Walker FO, Cartwright MS, editors.  
736 *Neuromuscular ultrasound.* Philadelphia: Elsevier Saunders; 2011. p. 30–31.
- 737 48. Mohammadi A, Ghasemi-Rad M, Mladkova-Suchy N, Ansari S. Correlation between the severity of  
738 carpal tunnel syndrome and color Doppler sonography findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.*  
739 2012;198:W181–W184.
- 740 49. Evans DH. Colour flow and motion imaging. *Proc Inst Mech Eng H.* 2010;224:241–253.
- 741 50. Vanderschueren GA, Meys VE, Beekman R. Doppler sonography for the diagnosis of carpal tunnel

- 742 syndrome: a critical review. *Muscle Nerve*. 2014;50(2):159-63.
- 743 51. Chen J, Chen L, Wu L, Wang R, Liu JB, Hu B, et al. Value of superb microvascular imaging  
744 ultrasonography in the diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome: Compared with color Doppler and power  
745 Doppler. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2017;96(21):e6862.
- 746 52. Ajeena IM, Al-Saad RH, Al-Mudhafar A, Hadi NR, Al-Aridhy SH. Ultrasonic assessment of females  
747 with carpal tunnel syndrome proved by nerve conduction study. *Neural Plasticity*. 2013;2013:754564;  
748 doi: 10.1155/2013/754564.
- 749 53. Pardal-Fernández JM. Síndrome del túnel carpiano. Aportación de la ultrasonografía. *Rev Neurol*.  
750 2014;59:459-69.
- 751 54. Naranjo A, Ojeda S, Mendoza D, Francisco F, Quevedo JC, Erasquin C. What is the diagnostic  
752 value of ultrasonography compared to physical evaluation in patients with idiopathic carpal tunnel  
753 syndrome? *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2007;25:853-9.
- 754 55. Szopinski K, Mazurczak-Pluta T. Sonographic diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome diagnostic value  
755 of the triangular cross-section sign. *Neurol Neurochir Pol*. 2011;45:556-60.
- 756 56. Lee KM, Kim HJ. Relationship Between Electrodiagnosis and Various Ultrasonographic Findings for  
757 Diagnosis of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *Ann Rehabil Med*. 2016;40(6):1040-1047.
- 758 57. Tai TW, Wu CY, Su FC, Chern TC, Jou IM. Ultrasonography for diagnosing carpal tunnel syndrome:  
759 a meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy. *Ultrasound Med Biol*. 2012;38(7):1121-8.
- 760 58. Wang LY, Leong CP, Huang YC, Hung JW, Cheung SM, Pong YP. Best diagnostic criterion in high-  
761 resolution ultrasonography for carpal tunnel syndrome. *Chang Gung Med J*. 2008;31:469-76.
- 762 59. Kuo TT, Lee MR, Liao YY, Chen JP, Hsu YW, Yeh CK. Assessment of Median Nerve Mobility by  
763 Ultrasound Dynamic Imaging for Diagnosing Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *PLoS One*.  
764 2016;11(1):e0147051.
- 765 60. Cartwright MS, Shin HW, Passmore LV, Walker FO. Ultrasonographic findings of the normal ulnar  
766 nerve. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2007;88:3946.
- 767 61. Visser LH, Smidt MH, Lee ML. High-resolution sonography versus EMG in the diagnosis of carpal  
768 tunnel syndrome. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2008;79:63-67.
- 769 62. Visser LH, Smidt MH, Lee ML. High-resolution sonography versus EMG in the diagnosis of carpal  
770 tunnel syndrome. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2008;79:63-67.
- 771 63. Seror P. Sonography and electrodiagnosis in carpal tunnel syndrome diagnosis, an analysis of the



772 literature. Eur J Radiol. 2008;67:146-52.

773

774

Figure 1. Schedule of enrolment, interventions, and assessments

	STUDY PERIOD			
	Enrolment	Intervention	Post-intervention	Close-out
TIMEPOINT**	From July 2020 to December 2020	From January 2021 to September 2022	From September 2022 to May 2023	May 2023
<b>ENROLMENT:</b>	X			
Eligibility screen	X			
Informed consent	X			
Training period	X			
<b>INTERVENTIONS:</b>		X		
Ultrasound study performed on the sample		X		
<b>ASSESSMENTS:</b>				
Demographic variables		X		
Electrodiagnostic variables		X		
Ultrasound variables		X		
Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire		X		
Cost evaluation		X		
Data collection			X	
Statistical analysis			X	
Writing				X

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.19.23284770>; this version posted January 19, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).