

comments

Comment on: Comparison of the results of ultrasonographic evaluation and arthroscopy in patients scheduled for surgery of the supraspinatus tendon rupture

With respect to the following article published in 2014 in *Annals of Saudi Medicine*:

Görmeli C, and others, "Comparison of the Results of Ultrasonographic Evaluation and Arthroscopy in Patients Scheduled for Surgery of the Supraspinatus Tendon Rupture" *Ann Saudi Medicine*, 34.6 (2014), 522-6 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5144/0256-4947.2014.522>>.

By recalculating the data of the ultrasonographic results compared to the arthroscopic diagnosis (the usual means of diagnosis, i.e., the gold standard), represented in **Table 1** in the original article, a statistical failure was found. The sensitivity and specificity of the tendinosis, full, and partial thickness tears were mixed up, as seen in the 2x2 tables and calculations at the right. The calculation of the humeral degeneration in **Table 2** in the original article was correctly calculated.

The corrected calculation of the sensitivity and specificity of tendinosis, full, and partial thickness tears are shown in the tables at the right. The corrections do not affect the conclusions and the high validity of the ultrasonographic findings for supraspinatus pathology can be confirmed. The specificity, however, is higher than the sensitivity for these findings. These findings correlate with other studies, which compared ultrasonography findings with a gold standard in supraspinatus disorders.^{1,2}

Görmeli and colleagues declined to respond.

| Ultrasonography | Arthroscopy | | Total |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|-------|
| | Tendinosis | No tendinosis | |
| Tendinosis | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| No tendinosis | 2 | 42 | 44 |
| Total | 7 | 43 | 50 |

Sensitivity: 5/7=71%; Specificity: 42/43=98%.

| Ultrasonography | Arthroscopy | | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------|
| | Partial thickness tear | No partial thickness tear | |
| Partial thickness tear | 18 | 4 | 22 |
| No partial thickness tear | 4 | 24 | 28 |
| Total | 22 | 28 | 50 |

Sensitivity: 18/22=82%; Specificity: 24/28=86%

| Ultrasonography | Arthroscopy | | Total |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------|
| | Full thickness tear | No full thickness tear | |
| Full thickness tear | 15 | 3 | 18 |
| No full thickness tear | 2 | 30 | 32 |
| Total | 17 | 33 | 50 |

Sensitivity: 15/17=88%; Specificity: 30/33=91%

Michel Kandel

From the Department of Physiotherapy, Physiotherapy Michel Kandel, Oberriet, SG, Switzerland

Correspondence:

Dr. Michel Kandel, Physiotherapie Michel Kandel, Physiotherapie, Staatsstrasse 46, 9463 Oberriet, SG, Switzerland
T: +41787073533
kandel.physio@bluewin.ch

Ann Saudi Med 2017; 37(2): 170

DOI: 10.5144/0256-4947.2017.170

REFERENCES

1. Lenza M, Buchbinder R, Takwoingi Y, Johnston R V, Hanchard NC, Faloppa F. Magnetic resonance imaging, magnetic resonance arthrography and ultrasonography for assessing rotator cuff tears in people with shoulder pain for whom surgery is being considered. *Cochrane database Syst Rev*. 2013;9(9):CD009020. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009020.pub2.
2. Vlychou M, Dailiana Z, Fotiadou A, Papanagiotou M, Fezoulidis I V, Malizos KN. Symptomatic partial rotator cuff tears: diagnostic performance of ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging with surgical correlation. *Acta radiol*. 2009;50(1):101-105. doi:10.1080/02841850802600764.