

ULTRASOUND-GUIDED PERCUTANEOUS RELEASE WITH SIMULTANEOUS CORTISONE INJECTION VS OPEN-RELEASE FOR TRIGGER FINGER: A COMPARATIVE STUDY AT SIX MONTHS

S.Shan Srivenkdes¹, Nur Basirah Taha¹, Lim Zhuang Li¹, Khairullina Khalid¹, Jacob Abraham¹

¹Department of Orthopaedics, Hospital Tengku Ampuan Afzan, Kuantan, Malaysia.

INTRODUCTION: Open release of the A1 pulley is traditionally the most effective treatment for trigger finger. Nevertheless, ultrasound-guided percutaneous release of the A1 pulley with simultaneous cortisone injection is a quick, safe and minimally invasive alternative procedure. We investigated the efficacy of open release (OR) compared to ultrasound-guided percutaneous release with cortisone injection (PRwC).

METHODS: This was a single-centre retrospective study of cases intervened from July 2020 to September 2021. A total of 13 patients (20 fingers) received either PRwC (N = 20) or OR of A1 pulley (16 patients, 20 fingers). Follow-up was conducted at 2-weeks, 3-months and 6-months post-procedure. VAS score for pain, modified Quinnell grading, patient satisfaction and days to return-to-work / ADL were assessed.

RESULTS:

Both groups were similar at baseline except for underlying diabetes (PRwC= 11/16 vs OR=2/13) and duration of triggering (PRwC: 4.26±2.96 months vs OR: 12.2±7.11 months). At 6-months, 95% of PRwC group were successfully treated compared to 50% within the OR group. High satisfaction rates were achieved within the PRwC group.

6 months	0	1.1
Return to work/ADL (days)	4.65±2.25	19.2 ±19.89
Patient satisfaction (<i>Likert scale: 1-5</i>)	4.22±0.60	4.1±1.07
Post-injection pain lasting ≥6 months	0/20	4/20
Recurrent triggering	1/20	-
Post-steroid flare	1/20	-
Stiffness	0/20	5/20
Tendon bowstring	0/20	1/20

DISCUSSIONS:

As this was retrospective, selection bias may be present within the PRwC group in determining pre-procedural suitability. A randomized-controlled trial is needed to ascertain the true differences in outcomes.

CONCLUSION:

Amidst the Covid-19 pandemic where access to elective operative-time was restricted, PRwC is an excellent alternative with good clinical outcomes and patient-satisfaction.

REFERENCES:

- Huang, HK et. al. J Hand Surg 2015; 40(7),735-739.
- Hansen RL et. al. J Hand Surg 2017; 42(5),359-366.

Table 1: Outcomes of PRwC vs OR for finger stenosing tenosynovitis

Outcomes	PRwC (N=20)	OR (N=20)
Baseline Quinnell	2.7	2.8
VAS pain score at:		
2 weeks	2	2.9
3 months	0.4	1.3