

1

2

3

4 **An Endpoint Adjudication Committee for the Assessment of Computed Tomography Scans in**  
5 **Fracture Healing**

6

7 Chloe Elliott<sup>1</sup>, Ethan Patterson<sup>1</sup>, Brenna Mattiello<sup>1</sup>, Adina Tarcea<sup>1</sup>, Bevan Frizzell<sup>2</sup>, Richard E.  
8 Walker<sup>2</sup>, Kevin A. Hildebrand<sup>1</sup>, Neil J. White<sup>1</sup>

9

10

11

12

13 <sup>1</sup>Section of Orthopaedics, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB,  
14 Canada.

15 <sup>2</sup>Department of Radiology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada.

16 \*Corresponding Author:

17 [adinatarcea17@gmail.com](mailto:adinatarcea17@gmail.com) (AT)

18 **Abstract**

19 The use of endpoint adjudication committees (EACs) has the potential to reduce subjectivity  
20 and potential bias in clinical research trials and contribute to a higher quality of research. In a  
21 recent randomized control trial (RCT), we used serial computed tomography (CT) imaging to  
22 visualize fracture healing of the scaphoid as a primary outcome. The scaphoid bone poses a  
23 challenge in the diagnosing of fractures and non-unions due to its complicated shape. An EAC  
24 was created to increase the quality of the data and the validity of our findings. While an  
25 adjudication process has long been proposed and described for X-rays, this study outlines a  
26 rational approach to CT scan adjudication for bone fracture healing. A total of 364 scans were  
27 acquired in the RCT and of these, 101 were adjudicated for a binary endpoint of union vs. non-  
28 union. The application of EACs such as described in this paper is a useful tool in orthopaedic  
29 research requiring the adjudication of fracture healing as a study outcome.

30

31 **Introduction**

32 A randomized controlled trial is only as good as its primary outcome. In studies regarding bone  
33 healing, fracture union is often a desired trial outcome, albeit a historically unreliable one.  
34 Fracture healing determined by radiographs or CT scans lends itself to a large degree of  
35 subjectivity. Standard definitions of union, delayed union, non-union and partial union remain  
36 elusive. Dozens of studies have highlighted the poor intra- and inter-observer reliability of  
37 assessing radiographs for fracture union [1-8]. Vannabouathong et al. [1] observed this  
38 knowledge gap in the assessment of long bone fractures. They described and advocated for an  
39 endpoint adjudication committee (EAC) to be used when determining fracture union as a

40 primary outcome in research. The interpretation of fracture union is subject to the individual  
41 opinions of professionals and must be cooperatively decided upon by a committee. Bhandari et  
42 al. [2] found that in the case of tibial shaft fractures, surgeons' definitions of delayed union  
43 ranged from one to eight months. This disparity is crucial in determining the primary outcomes  
44 of clinical trials. An adjudication committee is highly recommended to determine subjective  
45 assessments, such as bone healing [3].

46 Adjudication is the process by which a debatable topic is deliberated by a panel of experts. The  
47 main goal of an EAC is to ultimately derive the best possible answer and remove uncertainty,  
48 therefore, significantly increasing primary outcome reliability. The current literature displays  
49 the significance of EACs and their value in studies involving cardiovascular, neurological, and  
50 fracture assessment [9], and in orthopaedics has been predominantly proposed for the  
51 assessment of long bone fracture healing [1]. EACs are recommended by the Food and Drug  
52 Administration (FDA) to be implemented in any form of clinical research that is at risk for  
53 subjectivity that may vary primary outcomes [5]. Dechartres et al. [3] investigated the use of  
54 adjudication committees in bone healing and asserted that they have a direct impact on the  
55 study result with up to a 20-30% change in union status after completing the adjudication  
56 process. An EAC tasked with determining union status of a series of fractures should be  
57 comprised of specialized surgeons and subspecialty trained musculoskeletal (MSK) radiologists.  
58 The use of adjudication in cases where primary outcome measures are subjective, as the FDA  
59 suggests, would benefit in terms of accuracy and ability for reproducible results by other  
60 parties.

61 The scaphoid is the most commonly fractured carpal bone and has a high rate of non-union  
62 [10]. Scaphoid fractures account for 60% of all carpal fractures and 2-3% of all fractures [11].  
63 Due to the complex geometric shape of the scaphoid, judging union based on radiographic  
64 imaging is challenging and involves a high rate of subjectivity [12]. The diagnosis of scaphoid  
65 non-union (SNU) is usually given months or years after the initial injury and is commonly  
66 identified through standard radiographic assessment including wrist and scaphoid views [12]. X-  
67 ray examination, however, allows for accurate diagnosis of scaphoid fractures in only 70-80% of  
68 cases [11]. CT imaging is used to help diagnose scaphoid fractures when presented with positive  
69 clinical symptoms and negative x-rays. Considering this, Singh et al. [7] conducted a study that  
70 suggests a prominent level of difficulty in deciphering partial union of scaphoid fractures  
71 without the use of CT scans. They further highlighted that the difficulty in the assessment of  
72 union may lead to poor injury management. Matzon et al. [13] complemented this finding by  
73 describing the increased difficulty in CT evaluation after internal fixation. The challenge to  
74 adequately diagnose scaphoid union and non-union can cause long-term disability and inhibit  
75 the daily activities of patients. A more accurate diagnostic approach to scaphoid fractures  
76 would allow for these complications to be identified sooner, improve patient outcomes, and  
77 add credibility within research.

78 The senior author of this manuscript (NJW) conducted a Level I double-blinded randomized  
79 controlled trial assessing surgical SNUs and the effects of LIPUS as an adjunct to surgery (the  
80 SNAPU Trial). The primary outcome of the study was time to union of the scaphoid following  
81 surgery for an established non-union and the post-operative application of a LIPUS unit.  
82 Patients were randomized to either 'active' or 'sham' units. Union status was determined with

83 the use of serial CT scans. The initial trial design prescribed a fellowship-trained hand surgeon  
84 and MSK radiologist to independently read each CT scan and assess union using quartiles of  
85 percent union and a cutoff of 50% bridging for the definition of union (see S1 Appendix for  
86 study overview). It was soon realized the degree of variability between surgeons' and  
87 radiologists' interpretations necessitated a more standardized protocol to maintain the quality  
88 of the trial and ensure the best possible primary outcome. After conducting a literature review  
89 to find a pre-existing standardized tool for assessing union status on CT scan, the investigators  
90 identified a gap in the literature and formed their own standardized adjudication process. The  
91 purpose of this paper is to describe this adjudication process for reference, critique, and use by  
92 other researchers.

93

## 94 **Methods**

95 The SNAPU trial was registered at [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT02383160) and local and subsite ethics  
96 were obtained (REB13-0849). Recruitment for this trial took place from 2014 Jul to 2020 Feb  
97 and the last date of follow-up was 2022 May 19. The primary outcome of the SNAPU trial was  
98 time to union of the scaphoid after surgical fixation for established non-unions. We  
99 hypothesized that subjects randomized to a functional LIPUS device have a shorter time to  
100 union than subjects randomized to a placebo LIPUS device. The patients were instructed to use  
101 the LIPUS device once daily for 20 minutes until either union or non-union was declared. Serial  
102 CT scans were collected at 8 +/- 2 weeks, 12 +/- 2 weeks, and then every 4-6 weeks thereafter  
103 until either union was reached or a recurrent non-union was declared. All subjects were asked  
104 to continue to attend follow-up appointments until two years after the index procedure.

105 Over the course of the trial, 364 CT scans from 142 participants were accumulated (average  
106 2.56/patient). These scans consisted of coronal and lateral two-dimensional serial views. Exact  
107 CT scan acquisition and reconstruction parameters used can be found in S2 Appendix. For each  
108 CT scan, both the treating fellowship-trained hand surgeon and MSK radiologist reported union  
109 status based on the following six classifications: 0%, 1-24%, 25-49%, 50-74%, 75-99% and 100%.  
110 The scaphoid was considered united once a threshold of 50% union was met as outlined by  
111 Singh et al. [7]. This double assessment process was designed to ensure an accurate assessment  
112 of union. However, there were three outcomes that came from this dual interpretation:

- 113 1. The treating surgeon and MSK radiologist agreed on the union percentage and no  
114 further action was required.
- 115 2. The treating surgeon and MSK radiologist disagreed on the percent quartile but differed  
116 by only one quartile (i.e., 0-24% and 25-49%) and it did not cross the critical threshold of  
117 50% union. In this case, the CT scan was not adjudicated. The authors termed this a  
118 “minor discrepancy.”
- 119 3. The treating surgeon and MSK radiologist disagreed on the union status. This was  
120 declared as a “major discrepancy” and the CT scans in question were subsequently  
121 flagged for adjudication. A major discrepancy was defined as any time the surgeon and  
122 radiologist disagreed by more than one quartile (i.e., 25-49% vs. 75-99%) or more than  
123 one quartile away from the extremes 0% and 100% (i.e., 0% vs. 25-49%) or a single  
124 quartile that crossed the critical threshold of 50% union. Note that in the SNAPU trial,

125 the classifications also included 0% and 100% which was not used in the adjudication  
126 process.

### 127 **Adjudication Committee Members and Charter**

128 To address these discrepancies between professionals, the investigators implemented an EAC,  
129 using previously established guidelines regarding adjudication of radiographic imaging [2, 3].

130 The investigators designed an efficient adjudication protocol that could be effectively adapted  
131 to CT images in the SNAPU trial.

#### 132 **Step 1: Identifying committee members and roles:**

- 133 - The EAC consisted of fellowship-trained hand surgeons and MSK radiologists
- 134 - There were three elected members of the adjudication committee to allow for a  
135 consensus to be reached on each CT scan
- 136 - Eligible individuals had to meet the following criteria: a minimum of 10 years of clinical  
137 experience and fellowship-trained in either hand and wrist surgery or musculoskeletal  
138 radiology
- 139 - The panel consisted of both MSK radiologists and surgeons, indifferent and unbiased  
140 toward study outcomes, with the single goal of assessing CT scans with major  
141 discrepancies to come to an agreement on the union status of the scaphoid at a given  
142 time point
- 143 - An experienced MSK radiologist was selected to be the chair of this EAC

144 The project manager identified all discrepant CT scans and created a de-identified worksheet  
145 (IMPAX for local images, Aycan/ResMD for sub-sites). The project manager also created  
146 spreadsheets that recorded outcomes and had available spaces for notes. The primary  
147 investigator (NJW) observed, organized, and facilitated the adjudication meetings, but had no  
148 role in CT image reading or decision-making during the adjudication process. The project  
149 manager (BM) and the principal investigator of the SNAPU trial (NJW) had access to identifying  
150 patient information during the adjudication process, but panel members did not. Other  
151 research team members involved in the SNAPU trial (CE, EP, AT) also had access to information  
152 that could identify individual participants.

153 **Step 2: Charter of Adjudication (See S3 Appendix for more details)**

154 The EAC was created by the selected chair. The charter created for the SNAPU trial EAC outlines  
155 the process, and rules, of the adjudication process. The rules for the committee included the  
156 following:

- 157 - Reviewers had access to both X-ray and CT images from each time point on every  
158 subject;
- 159 - All serial imaging leading up to the point in question may be reviewed
- 160 - If a single participant had more than one CT scan requiring adjudication they were  
161 evaluated separately. The first time was adjudicated with earlier imaging available only  
162 and later (not sequentially) the second time point was adjudicated as a discreet event.
- 163 - Time from surgery to adjudicated CT scan was known to the committee



- 164 - The committee was blinded to the original reading on the CT scan as well as functional
- 165 vs. sham device status
- 166 - Reviewers did not read the original radiology report for any interval image
- 167 - The hardware (screw or k-wires) is NOT included in the calculation of cross-sectional
- 168 area
- 169 - The goal of the committee was agreement on a specific quartile between all three
- 170 reviewers

### 171 **Step 3: Adjudication Meetings**

172 Before the start of the adjudication panel, the process was outlined by the committee chair to  
173 ensure understanding of the following:

- 174 - Confirmation that all members accept methodology and the grading for determining
- 175 percentage union by CT scan (Table 1).
- 176 - Project manager would provide spreadsheets with discrepant cases to review
- 177 - The reviewer would access cases through IMPAX and AYCAN using existing credentials.
- 178 - The panel members were sent the charter for review, feedback and approval, and the
- 179 panel members would confirm no conflicts of interest to the study coordinator.

180 **Table 1.** Quartiles of Union Status Identification

Percent Union (%)	0-24	25-49	50-74	75-100
Classification	Non-Union	Non-Union	Union	Union

181

182 The group held two separate formal adjudication meetings (2020 Oct 26 and 2021 Jun 10),  
183 totaling 4 - 5 hours for each meeting. A unique aspect of this process is that it was performed  
184 during the pandemic and it incorporated the use of remote access to imaging systems in  
185 combination with digital video communication platforms. The first step of the process was to  
186 identify the flagged CT scan as a major discrepancy and identify the number of weeks from  
187 surgery. The EAC members were encouraged to take notes while reviewing the images. Each  
188 scan was viewed independently by the EAC members for 2-3 minutes. The group then was  
189 brought together to discuss the images for another 5-7 minutes. The group could refer to  
190 imaging at any other time point before the flagged images on request. The committee was  
191 limited to a total of 10 minutes per CT scan and took an average of 7 minutes to arrive at an  
192 agreement. Committee members confirmed to the project manager once a final decision was  
193 agreed upon, and both the principal investigator and the project manager recorded the final  
194 decision. Where there was unanimous agreement, these data points were entered as final, but  
195 annotated as adjudicated. For the cases where a major discrepancy remained, the committee  
196 was set to meet further and review to reach a consensus. The SNAPU trial used the final  
197 decision by the board of adjudicators for all statistical analysis.

198

199 **Results:**

200 In total, 364 CT images were assessed by the treating surgeon and an MSK radiologist. Before  
201 adjudication, the surgeon and radiologist agreed on the exact quartiles (Table 1) on 153 of the  
202 CT images and found minor discrepancies in 114 scans. The EAC assessed 101 CT scans which  
203 were collected across 5 different study sites. Seventy-five (74.3%) of these CT scans were

204 defined as major discrepancies (Table 2) and the remaining 26 CT scans were adjudicated due  
205 to missing data or as a random selection to validate the other groups (S4 Appendix). Of these  
206 75 major discrepant cases, the final reading of the CT images by the EAC matched the initial  
207 reading of the MSK radiologist in 42 cases (56.0%) and the treating hand surgeon in 25 cases  
208 (33.3%). The remaining 8 CT images that were adjudicated to agree with both (6) or neither (2)  
209 the surgeon and/or MSK radiologist (10.7%). The EAC resulted in a final diagnosis of union in 41  
210 (40.6%) cases and in non-union in 60 cases (59.4%) (Fig 1).

211 **Table 2.** CT Scans with Minor, Major and No Discrepancies.

Discrepancy Grade	Minor	Major	None	Incomplete data	Total
Number of CT scans	114	75	153	22	364
Number of CT scans Adjudicated	0	75	4	22	101

212

213 **Fig 1.** SNAPU imaging CONSORT Diagram

214

215 **Discussion:**

216 **Success of the EAC**

217 CT scans are considered the gold standard for measuring union in scaphoid fractures for both  
218 research and clinical settings [1]. However, as highlighted by the SNAPU trial and other  
219 research, even with CT imaging, trained and experienced clinicians do not always agree on a  
220 diagnosis [13].

221 The primary outcome of the SNAPU trial was time to union as defined by 50% osseous bridging.  
222 The EAC changed the final union classification of 83 CT scans. The use of an adjudication  
223 committee for nearly one third of the total CT scans reviewed in the SNAPU trial underscored  
224 the vital role that the EAC played in determining the trial's results. The addition of an EAC in the  
225 SNAPU trial allowed for more accurate union assessment, and therefore provided a more  
226 reliable and consistent evaluation of scaphoid union. This can lead to fewer errors and more  
227 precise diagnoses and improving credibility of research. The process of adjudication in the  
228 radiological assessment of CT images can be implemented in clinical studies and have a positive  
229 impact on data analysis of primary outcomes.

230 The process of adjudication based on quartiles and both "minor" and "major" discriminators  
231 obviated the need to adjudicate all CT scans creating an efficient and logical process to arrive at  
232 the most accurate determination of union status. All CT scans in the SNAPU trial had a union  
233 status that was either agreed upon by an MSK radiologist and hand surgeon during the first  
234 pass or adjudicated and agreed upon by the panel on the second pass. To our knowledge, a  
235 process for adjudication of CT imaging has not been described in orthopaedic literature. While  
236 our process has limitations, it satisfies a balance between accuracy and feasibility.

237 Much of the orthopaedic literature is dependent on radiographic assessment and as we delve  
238 deeper into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, researchers are depending more on advanced imaging to make  
239 accurate assessments. Regardless of the imaging modality, results and diagnosis are reliant on  
240 interpretation from an expert. This opens the door to error, due to limitations in accuracy and  
241 removal of bias. We propose that EAC's serve as the gold-standard in high quality research  
242 when the primary outcome has any degree of subjectivity.

243 **Limitations**

244 We recognize as pioneers of adjudication committees for CT images, that the design presented  
245 here is not without faults. One limitation is that review of the CT scans was limited to a  
246 maximum of 10 minutes each to provide efficacy in this process. This could possibly influence  
247 the decisions made by the clinicians as the diagnosis may have been different if they had been  
248 given more time to read and analyze the images. Images were adjudicated for an average of 7  
249 minutes, but more time, such as a 15-minute limit, for example, would ensure that the reading  
250 would not be rushed. It was necessary to balance accuracy with feasibility and efficiency.  
251 Another weakness is that not every CT scan obtained from the trial was adjudicated. Only major  
252 discrepancies were reassessed (union vs. non-union or two or more grades difference) by  
253 adjudication. This was for reasons of efficiency as we deemed it was not practical to ask  
254 professionals to adjudicate every image. The multiple study sites in the SNAPU trial created a  
255 third limitation. There were multiple CT scanners and CT scanning protocols used allowing for  
256 varying imaging quality and reformatting methods. This limitation was present because not  
257 every site was able to use the exact same CT parameters for all imaging. However, this is  
258 reflective of practice in the real world and of the fact that surgeons and radiologists are  
259 required to interpret varying CT images in their day to day practice. To reduce discrepancies  
260 caused by this challenge, using the same CT scanner parameters as well as radiologist personnel  
261 would help with consistency in image acquisition.

262

263 **Conclusion**

264 The analysis in this paper confirms that the adjudication process had an impact on the  
265 assessment of scaphoid fracture union on CT scan during the SNAPU trial. The process allowed  
266 for imaging to be reviewed subjectively by a team of experts to define union in cases where  
267 discrepancies were present, allowing for a more valid analysis of the LIPUS device in scaphoid  
268 fracture healing. The adjudication process in the analysis of serial CT scans in fracture healing  
269 trials is a novel and pivotal step to the assessment, treatment, and outcome of fracture healing.  
270 EACs should be used routinely in orthopaedic trials where the endpoint is radiographic union.

271 **References**


- 272 1. Vannabouathong C, Sprague S, Bhandari M. Guidelines for fracture healing assessments  
273 in clinical trials. Part I: definitions and endpoint committees. *Injury*. 2011 Mar;42(3):314-  
274 6. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2010.11.048. Epub 2010 Dec 30. PMID: 21194691.
- 275 2. Bhandari M, Guyatt GH, Swiontkowski MF, Tornetta P 3rd, Sprague S, Schemitsch EH. A  
276 lack of consensus in the assessment of fracture healing among orthopaedic surgeons. *J*  
277 *Orthop Trauma*. 2002 Sep;16(8):562-6. doi: 10.1097/00005131-200209000-00004.  
278 PMID: 12352564.
- 279 3. Dechartres A, Boutron I, Roy C, Ravaud P. Inadequate planning and reporting of  
280 adjudication committees in clinical trials: recommendation proposal. *J Clin Epidemiol*.  
281 2009 Jul;62(7):695-702. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2008.09.011. Epub 2009 Jan 9. PMID:  
282 19135860.
- 283 4. Carlson EJ, Save AV, Slade JF 3rd, Dodds SD. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound treatment  
284 for scaphoid fracture nonunions in adolescents. *J Wrist Surg*. 2015 May;4(2):115-20. doi:  
285 10.1055/s-0035-1549276. PMID: 25945296.
- 286 5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Establishment and Operation of Clinical Trial Data  
287 Monitoring Committees. 2006 Mar. 38 p. Report No.: FDA-2001-D-0219.
- 288 6. Deszczyński J, Szczesny G. The bone union process: pathophysiology and clinical issues.  
289 The course of bone union and the physical factors conditioning its occurrence. *Ortop*  
290 *Traumatol Rehabil*. 2000;2(3):10-20.

- 291 7. Singh HP, Forward D, Davis TR, Dawson JS, Oni JA, Downing ND. Partial union of acute  
292 scaphoid fractures. *J Hand Surg Br.* 2005 Oct;30(5):440-5. doi:  
293 10.1016/j.jhsb.2005.05.007. PMID: 16006021.
- 294 8. Squyer ER, Dikos GD, Kaehr DM, Maar DC, Crichlow RJ. Early prediction of tibial and  
295 femoral fracture healing: Are we reliable? *Injury.* 2016 Dec;47(12):2805-8. doi:  
296 10.1016/j.injury.2016.10.036. Epub 2016 Oct 28. PMID: 27810153.
- 297 9. Vannabouathong C, Saccone M, Sprague S, Schemitsch EH, Bhandari M. Adjudicating  
298 outcomes: fundamentals. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2012 Jul 18;94 Suppl 1:70-4. doi:  
299 10.2106/JBJS.L.00190. PMID: 22810452.
- 300 10. Johnson NA, Fairhurst C, Brealey SD, Cook E, Stirling E, Costa M, Divall P, Hodgson S,  
301 Rangan A, Dias JJ. One-year outcome of surgery compared with immobilization in a cast  
302 for adults with an undisplaced or minimally displaced scaphoid fracture : a meta-analysis  
303 of randomized controlled trials. *Bone Joint J.* 2022 Aug;104-B(8):953-62. doi:  
304 10.1302/0301-620X.104B8.BJJ-2022-0085.R2. PMID: 35909381.
- 305 11. Kahl T, Razny FK, Benter JP, Mutig K, Hegenscheid K, Mutze S, Eisenschenk A. Diagnostik  
306 des Skaphoids : Fraktur, Pseudarthrose, Durchblutung, Perfusion [Diagnosis of the  
307 scaphoid bone : Fractures, nonunion, circulation, perfusion]. *Orthopade.* 2016  
308 Nov;45(11):938-44. German. doi: 10.1007/s00132-016-3333-y. PMID: 27637547.
- 309 12. Pao VS, Chang J. Scaphoid nonunion: diagnosis and treatment. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2003  
310 Nov;112(6):1666-76; quiz 1677; discussion 1678-9. doi:  
311 10.1097/01.PRS.0000086090.43085.66. PMID: 14578801.



- 312 13. Matzon JL, Lutsky KF, Tulipan JE, Beredjiklian PK. Reliability of Radiographs and  
313 Computed Tomography in Diagnosing Scaphoid Union After Internal Fixation. J Hand  
314 Surg Am. 2021 Jul;46(7):539-43. doi: 10.1016/j.jhsa.2021.03.004. Epub 2021 Apr 20.  
315 PMID: 33888378.
- 316 14. Ricardo M. The effect of ultrasound on the healing of muscle-pediculated bone graft in  
317 scaphoid non-union. Int Orthop. 2006 Feb;30(2):123-7. doi: 10.1007/s00264-005-0034-  
318 2. PMID: 16474939.

- 319 **S1 Appendix. Introduction to SNAPU Trial**
- 320 **S2 Appendix. CT Scan Protocol**
- 321 **S3 Appendix. The Endpoint Adjudication Committee (EAC) Charter**
- 322 **S4 Appendix. The “Other” Cases Adjudicated by EAC**



Figure