CrossMark

Functional Measures Developed for Clinical Populations Identified Impairment Among Active Workers with Upper Extremity Disorders

Bethany T. Gardner[1] · Ann Marie Dale[1] · Skye Buckner-Petty[1] · Robert Rachford[1] · Jaime Strickland[1] · Vicki Kaskutas[1,2] · Bradley Evanoff[1]

Abstract *Purpose* Few studies have explored measures of function across a range of health outcomes in a general working population. Using four upper extremity (UE) case definitions from the scientific literature, we described the performance of functional measures of work, activities of daily living, and overall health. *Methods* A sample of 573 workers completed several functional measures: modified recall versions of the QuickDASH, Levine Functional Status Scale (FSS), DASH Work module (DASH-W), and standard SF-8 physical component score. We determined case status based on four UE case definitions: (1) *UE symptoms*, (2) *UE musculoskeletal disorders* (MSD), (3) *carpal tunnel syndrome* (CTS), and (4) *work limitations due to UE symptoms*. We calculated effect sizes for each case definition to show the magnitude of the differences that were detected between cases and non-cases for each case definition on each functional measure. Sensitivity and specificity analyses showed how well each measure identified functional impairments across the UE case definitions. *Results* All measures discriminated between cases and non-cases for each case definition with the largest effect sizes for *CTS* and *work limitations*, particularly for the modified FSS and DASH-W measures. Specificity was high and sensitivity was low for outcomes of UE symptoms and UE MSD in all measures. Sensitivity was high for CTS

and *work limitations*. *Conclusions* Functional measures developed specifically for use in clinical, treatment-seeking populations may identify mild levels of impairment in relatively healthy, active working populations, but measures performed better among workers with CTS or those reporting limitations at work.

Keywords Case definitions · Health outcomes · Functional measures · Occupational injuries · Work

Introduction

Assessment of functional outcomes related to health is necessary for both researchers and clinicians as diagnosis alone is a poor predictor of clinical and functional outcomes [1]. Measurement of functional outcomes is becoming increasingly important for assessing improvement in health-related quality of life of patients or populations, justifying and obtaining reimbursement for healthcare services, providing an economic interpretation of the burden of chronic diseases, and demonstrating efficacy of interventions in clinical trials [2–5]. Many measures of the impact of musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) and chronic health conditions on the performance of functional activities have been developed over the last two decades [6–8]. Although some measures have undergone extensive psychometric testing to determine their reliability and validity, few studies are available to guide researchers and clinicians about which measure(s) are best suited for use in a given setting, population, or stage of disease severity [3, 9, 10].

Some measures of upper extremity function that have been used in recent musculoskeletal research studies, such as the Quick Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand

✉ Ann Marie Dale
adale@dom.wustl.edu

1 Division of General Medical Sciences, Washington University School of Medicine, Campus Box 8005, 660 S. Euclid Avenue, Saint Louis, MO 63110, USA

2 Program in Occupational Therapy, Washington University School of Medicine, Campus Box 8505, 4444 Forest Park Avenue, Saint Louis, MO 63108, USA

(QuickDASH) [11], the Work module of the DASH (DASH-W), and the Functional Status Scale (FSS) from the Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire [12], were designed and validated for use in clinical populations. The QuickDASH is a region-specific measure that was designed to assess functional outcomes relevant to a range of conditions affecting the upper extremity (UE) [13]. The Work module of the DASH (DASH-W) is designed to assess difficulties with work performance due to UE disorders. The QuickDASH and DASH-W have been tested and widely used in orthopedic and rehabilitation settings among patients for many different UE musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) [3, 14–18]. However, both workplace-based studies and comparative studies against other functional measures have been more limited, especially for the DASH-W [19–24]. The FSS was designed for use in clinical patients seeking treatment for symptoms of carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS), and has primarily been tested in patients undergoing surgical interventions for CTS [12, 25]. The Short-form 8 health survey (SF-8) is a generic health status measure that assesses multiple domains of health and well-being, and was developed for assessment of health-related quality of life in national health surveys [26]. The SF-8 has been tested in both general population samples and specific patient samples [26, 27].

Clinical populations are comprised of people who are treatment-seeking and likely represent a more symptomatic and severe range of disease than found in general or working populations. It is unclear how well measures designed for clinical populations perform in relatively healthy active working populations [19, 20] and whether the response scales are able to capture functional limitations corresponding to early stage disease [28]. Using functional measures in working populations may identify early stages of disease, allowing for interventions to improve work ability, prevent disability, and promote return to work following injury [19–21, 29]. Epidemiological studies have used a range of case definitions associated with MSD outcomes including symptoms alone, symptoms plus physical signs, or various functional outcomes [30–32]. Simultaneous comparison of the performance of multiple health measures against various UE MSD outcomes would inform research and clinical practice regarding which measure(s) may be used to identify mild levels of impairment in relatively healthy, active working populations.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the performance of several standardized measures of functional work performance, activities of daily living, and overall health in relation to four upper extremity (UE) case definitions: (1) *UE symptoms*, (2) *UE musculoskeletal disorders* (MSD), (3) *carpal tunnel syndrome* (CTS), and (4) *work limitations due to UE symptoms*.

Materials and Methods

Participants

Study participants were subjects in the prospective Predictors of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (PrediCTS) study. Subjects were enrolled in the PrediCTS study (2004–2006) as full-time, newly hired workers in construction, service, and clerical jobs. Detailed descriptions of subject recruitment for the PrediCTS study may be found in several prior publications [32–35]. The present analysis included subjects who completed a follow-up visit between March 2012 and August 2013, consisting of a self-reported questionnaire, physical examination of the upper extremity, and nerve conduction studies of the hands. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Washington University in St. Louis School of Medicine. All subjects provided written informed consent and were compensated.

Data Collection

Subjects completed self-reported questionnaires collecting information about demographics, employment history, physical and psychosocial job exposures, UE symptoms, and functional and work limitations related to UE symptoms. Trained research technicians performed a standardized physical examination for clinical signs of UE MSDs, including tenderness to palpation and standard provocative maneuvers. Research technicians also performed standardized bilateral nerve conduction testing of the median and ulnar nerves at the wrist to determine the presence of abnormal median neuropathy consistent with carpal tunnel syndrome. Specific methods are described in previous publications [36–38].

Functional Measures

As described below, standardized measures assessed three general domains of health and functioning: activities of daily living (ADL), work performance, and overall health. Assessments were administered to all participants, although the 1-year recall modified QuickDASH was only administered to subjects with UE symptoms.

One-Year Recall Modified QuickDASH

The QuickDASH is an 11-item, shortened version of the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand (DASH) outcome measure. The QuickDASH is designed to measure physical functioning in people with UE disorders. Respondents are asked to rate their ability to perform

various activities of daily living and the severity of their symptoms, on a scale from "1" to "5." A minimum of 10 of the 11 QuickDASH items must be completed in order for a score to be calculated. Completed responses are summed and averaged. The average value is transformed to a 0–100 scale by subtracting one and multiplying by 25. Higher scores indicate greater disability [15]. The Quick-DASH has been shown to be reliable and valid in various clinical populations [15, 39, 40]. The recall period for the QuickDASH was modified from the original timeframe of "during the past week" to "when your symptoms were the worst in the past year" to parallel the reference time frame used for other measures in the PrediCTS study. Due to the modified recall period, we refer to the QuickDASH in this study as the 1-year recall modified QuickDASH.

Modified Functional Status Scale

The Functional Status Scale (FSS) from the Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire is an 8-item questionnaire originally developed by Levine et al. [12] to assess functional abilities in patients with CTS. The FSS has shown good reproducibility, internal consistency and responsiveness to change in surgical patients [12]. Each item of the FSS is rated on a scale from "1" "no difficulty" to "5" "unable." The overall score for the FSS is calculated as the mean of the completed items, and ranges from 1 to 5 [12]. Higher scores indicate greater disability. Similar to the Quick-DASH, the recall period for the FSS was modified from the original two-week recall period to 1 year, and is described as the modified FSS in this study.

One-Year Recall Modified DASH Work Module

The DASH Work module (DASH-W) is a 4-item scale assessing the impact of UE conditions on physical work ability. Workers are asked to rate their difficulty in performing work activities on a scale from "1" "no difficulty" to "5" "unable." All 4 items must be completed in order to calculate a score. The DASH-W is scored by summing all four responses and dividing by 4 to get an average. Then, 1 is subtracted and the value is multiplied by 25 to get a final score ranging from 0 to 100. Higher scores indicate greater disability [41, 42]. We also used a 1-year recall period for the DASH-W, in order to be consistent with the other outcome measures, which is referred to as the 1-year recall modified DASH-W.

Short Form-8 (SF-8) Health Survey: Physical Component Score

The SF-8 Health Survey is an 8-item scale designed to assess self-perception of overall health and ability to perform daily activities. The SF-8 has shown acceptable reliability compared with the longer, more widely tested SF-36 health survey [26]. Items are scored on "1" to "5" scales with various verbal anchors. The SF-8 was scored to yield the physical component score (PCS-8) according to the developers' recommendations [26]. If any items were missing, a score was not calculated. Higher scores on the PCS-8 indicate better health. In contrast to the other measures in this study, the PCS-8 used a 4-week recall period.

Case Definitions

Subjects were determined to meet or not meet each of the four UE case definitions described below for (1) *UE symptoms*, (2) *UE MSD*, (3) *CTS*, and (4) *work limitations due to UE symptoms*.

Upper Extremity (UE) Symptoms

Subjects reported symptoms in three regions of the UE that would commonly be used in epidemiological case definitions for UE MSDs. "In the past YEAR, have you had any RECURRING (repeated) symptoms in your (Shoulders/ upper arms, Elbow/forearms, or Hands/Wrists/fingers) more than 3 times or lasting more than one week?" [43].

Upper Extremity Musculoskeletal Disorders (UE MSD)

Among subjects reporting UE symptoms (#1 above), those who also had corresponding positive physical sign for a MSD of the shoulder, elbow, or wrist, met our epidemiological case definition of an UE MSD [31]. The case definitions considered for this study were rotator cuff tendonitis, biceps tendonitis, lateral or medial epicondylitis, radial tunnel syndrome, cubital tunnel syndrome, deQuervain's tenosynovitis, wrist flexor or extensor tendonitis, or carpal tunnel syndrome (defined in the following paragraph) [31].

Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (CTS)

CTS cases were contained within the UE MSD category, but we also evaluated CTS cases separately because the FSS (from the Boston CTS Questionnaire) was designed to specifically evaluate function of patients with CTS, CTS is one of the most expensive work-related diagnoses, and we had a small but reasonable number of cases to allow this study. Subjects with typical median nerve symptoms and abnormal median neuropathy of the same hand met our case definition for CTS [44]. Median nerve symptoms included numbness, tingling, burning, or pain in at least one of the thumb, index, or middle fingers, reported on a

hand diagram [45, 46]. Criteria for abnormal median neuropathy was defined as median distal motor latency >4.5 ms (ms), median distal sensory latency >3.5 ms, or median-ulnar sensory latency difference >0.5 ms [47].

Work Limitations Due to UE Symptoms

Subjects who reported UE symptoms were asked to complete six additional items from the University of Michigan Upper Extremity Questionnaire (UEQ) [48, 49], to describe work limitations that resulted from having UE symptoms. We created a composite work limitations outcome from these questionnaire items which included self-reported limitations in work ability or productivity, or missing days from work, having job restrictions, or changing jobs or companies due to one's symptoms. We have used a similar case definition for work limitations in our prior studies [32, 50].

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the study population and the frequencies of each case definition. We ran correlations between the functional measures using Spearman rank correlations. We considered correlation coefficients of 0.7–0.9 to be strong, 0.4–0.7 moderate, and <0.4 weak [51]. We expected moderate correlations at best between the measures based on differences in the constructs each measure was designed to assess, as well as the strength of associations that have been shown in prior studies [3, 19, 23]. Because lower scores on the SF-8 indicate worse health, whereas higher scores on all of the other measures indicate greater disability, negative correlations were expected between the SF-8 (PCS-8) and the other measures.

We determined if there were statistically significant differences in mean scores between cases and non-cases for each cases definition on each of the measures using Student's t tests. We also reported the effect sizes (Cohen's D) to show the magnitude of the differences that were detected between cases and non-cases for each case definition on each functional measure.

Finally, we compared the sensitivity and specificity of each measure across each of the case definitions for *UE symptoms*, *UE MSD*, *CTS*, and *work limitations*, to evaluate how well each measure identified functional impairments across a range of UE case definitions. We selected a cut-point for each measure using normative population scores from the scientific literature. We selected a cut-point of 8.81 points for the 1-year recall modified DASH-W from the U.S. normative population mean value for the standard 1-week recall version of the measure [52]. We selected the U.S. population mean value of 50 as the cut-point for the

SF-8 physical component score [26]. As the FSS was designed for a clinical population, there has been no population mean score determined. Therefore, subjects whose score was more than 0.5 standard deviations (SD) above the mean were considered as having functional limitations. Our PrediCTS cohort at 6 months had an average FSS score of 1.14 (SD 0.38) [32]. We used a score difference of [0.5(SD) + Mean], or 1.3 points as a cut-point for the FSS. This value shows slightly less impairment than the post-surgical average score for CTS patients as previously reported by Levine and colleagues (FSS score = 1.9) [12]. Sensitivity and specificity could not be calculated for the QuickDASH since it was only completed by symptomatic workers. Analyses were conducted using R version 3.1 and SAS Version 9.3 (Statistical Analysis System Institute, Cary, NC).

Results

From the original PrediCTS cohort, 573 subjects were included in the present analyses. The majority of subjects were male (62 %), with a mean age of 38.4 years (SD 10.8), and the largest proportion was employed in construction trades (31 %) (see Table 1). Among the full cohort, 40 % of subjects had *UE symptoms* and 25 % of the

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the study population and frequencies of the outcomes (n = 573)

Characteristic	Mean (SD)
Age	38.4 (10.8)
Body mass index (kg/m^2)	29.9 (7.0)

	n (%)
Gender	
Male	353 (62)
Female	220 (38)
Job Category	
Construction	180 (31)
Service	160 (28)
Office/Clerical	94 (17)
Technical	54 (9)
Unemployed	85 (15)
Sought treatment for upper extremity symptoms from a medical professional, in the past year	70 (12)
Outcomes	
Upper extremity symptoms	228 (40)
Upper extremity musculoskeletal disorder	50 (9)
Carpal tunnel syndrome	145 (25)
General work limitations due to upper extremity symptoms	24 (4)

SD standard deviation

cohort had symptoms and signs, meeting an *UE MSD* case definition. The prevalence of *work limitations due to UE symptoms* and *CTS* were substantially lower, 9 and 4 %, respectively. Compared with a clinical population in which 100 % of subjects would be symptomatic and would be seeking treatment, there was a relatively low prevalence of disease in this actively working population, with only 12 % of the overall cohort reporting having sought treatment from a medical professional in the past year.

Distributions of Functional Outcome Scores

Descriptive statistics including distributions of scores, means, and median scores for each measure are shown in Table 2. Subject responses represented the full range of possible scores on each measure; however, the relatively low median scores across all measures suggested a relatively moderate MSD disease spectrum in this cohort.

Correlations Between Measures

Correlations among the measures ranged from poor to strong (−0.34 to 0.85) (Table 3). The 1-year recall modified QuickDASH was strongly correlated to the modified FSS (r = 0.85) and the 1-year recall modified DASH-W (r = 0.76). Correlations of the SF-8 PCS-8 with other measures were weak to moderate (−0.34 to −0.43).

Performance of the Measures Against 4 UE Case Definitions

Results of *t* tests showed statistically significant differences on all functional measures between cases and non-cases for *UE symptoms*, *UE MSD*, *CTS*, and *work limitations* (Table 4). Cases reported higher levels of ADL limitations, work disability, and worse overall health than non-cases for each outcome. Effect sizes showed larger differences for all measures between cases and non-cases of *CTS* and *work*

limitations. For *CTS*, the largest differences between cases and non-cases were shown with the modified FSS; for *work limitations* the largest differences between cases and non-cases were seen on the 1-year recall modified DASH-W.

Applying one cut-point for each measure across all case definitions allowed us to compare the sensitivity and specificity of each measure for the four UE case definitions (Table 5). In general, sensitivity of all measures was low and specificity was high in relation to *UE symptoms* and *UE MSD*. Sensitivity was higher for classifying workers with *CTS* and *work limitations* for all measures. The 1-year recall modified DASH-W showed the highest sensitivity in relation to the *work limitations* case definition.

Discussion

This study examined the utility of several measures of work ability, functional limitations, and overall health for a range of UE health outcomes in a working population. This study helps to fill important gaps in the literature as few previous studies have directly compared these functional measures for various musculoskeletal case definitions or in an actively working population. Workers with *UE symptoms*, *UE MSD*, *CTS*, and *work limitations due to UE symptoms* reported worse ADL function, more limited work performance, and worse overall health than non-cases. Measures generally showed higher sensitivity and lower specificity with increasing levels of impairment, suggesting that measures performed better with more defined states of disease in this generally healthy population.

Measures designed to assess similar constructs of health and function were moderately to strongly correlated with one another, such as the modified versions of the Quick-DASH and FSS which both address functional performance of daily activities. The strong correlation observed between the 1-year recall modified QuickDASH and DASH-W

Table 2 Distributions of scores of each functional measure in the study population (n = 573)

Measures	Number of useable observations	Mean (SD)	Median (IQR)	Range of subject scores
QuickDASH (1-year recall modified)[a,b]	226	27.3 (21.5)	21.6 (27.3)	0–95.5
Functional Status Scale (modified recall)[b]	573	1.3 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	1–5
DASH-W (1-year recall modified)[b]	553	9.1 (19.6)	0 (6.3)	0–100
SF-8 physical component score[c]	573	52.3 (7.4)	54.2 (7.3)	13.6–66.0

IQR interquartile range, *SD* standard deviation, *DASH* Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand, *DASH-W* DASH Work module, *SF* short form

[a] The 1-year recall modified QuickDASH was completed only by subjects who reported upper extremity symptoms

[b] Higher scores indicate greater disability

[c] Lower scores indicate worse health

Table 3 Spearman correlation coefficients between the functional measures (n = 573)

	QuickDASH[a,b] (n = 226)	FSS[c,d] (n = 573)	DASH-W[a,b] (n = 553)	SF-8 PCS[d] (n = 573)
QuickDASH	1			
p				
Combined n				
FSS	0.85	1		
p	<.0001			
Combined n	226			
DASH-W	0.76	0.63	1	
p	<.0001	<.0001		
Combined n	215	553		
SF-8 PCS	−0.43	−0.35	−0.34	1
p	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	
Combined n	226	573	553	

DASH Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand, *DASH-W* DASH Work module, *FSS* Functional Status Scale, *SF* short form, *PCS* physical component score

[a] Higher scores indicate greater disability

[b] 1-year recall modified

[c] Modified recall

[d] Lower scores indicate worse health

(r = 0.76) is consistent with the findings of Fan et al., comparing the standard QuickDASH and DASH Work module (r = 0.63) in active workers with UE symptoms and clinical cases for UE MSD [19] and those of House et al. [22] comparing the full DASH and DASH-W in workers with hand–arm vibration syndrome (r = 0.64). In another study that compared the full Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire (BCTQ), from which the FSS is taken, stronger correlations were observed between the BCTQ and the full DASH, than with measures of overall health such as the SF-36, from which the SF-8 was developed [25]. Our findings are consistent with those of Leite et al. [25], with strong correlations observed between the modified FSS and 1-year recall modified QuickDASH, but weaker correlations with the SF-8 physical component score.

Many previous studies have shown that clinical patients with UE MSD report problems with functional performance [11, 14, 53, 54]. Studies in non-clinical populations are limited, but the growing body of literature suggests that active workers with UE symptoms also experience difficulties in ADL and work performance [19–21, 23, 55]. Even in this relatively young, healthy working population in which few workers sought medical treatment (12 %), cases for all outcomes reported more difficulty performing ADL and work activities. In addition, workers with UE conditions also perceived themselves to have lower overall health, as measured by the SF-8. These findings provide support for the ability of all of the measures to discriminate statistically significant differences between cases and non-cases along a range of severity for UE conditions in workers.

The sensitivity and specificity of measures can vary among patients in different settings or different stages of disease severity. Our findings showed higher sensitivity of measures with case definitions that suggest greater levels of impairment, whereas the specificity was lower. These findings suggest that functional measures showed weaker ability to discriminate between workers at lower levels of disease severity. Measures that are more closely related to the outcome are more likely to be sensitive to discriminating cases from non-cases [9]. The DASH-W is an UE region-specific measure which was developed for clinical populations, and has performed well in relation to a variety of UE disorders [56]. In our study, the 1-year recall modified DASH-W showed the highest sensitivity in relation to our *work limitations* outcome. The FSS is a condition-specific measure designed for use with patients seeking treatment for CTS, and showed its highest sensitivity for *CTS* versus the other UE case definitions. Even a measure of overall physical health, the SF-8 physical scale, showed differences between cases/non-cases for each UE outcome in this study. Selection of appropriate measures should be guided by the outcome of interest and which measures relate best to the outcome.

As described in a review of functional measures for workers with UE MSDs, few measures have been

Table 4 Differences between cases and non-cases of *upper extremity symptoms, upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders, carpal tunnel syndrome,* and *work limitations due to upper extremity symptoms,* on the functional measures (n = 573)

Measures	Upper extremity symptoms				Upper extremity musculoskeletal disorder				Carpal tunnel syndrome[a]				Work limitations due to upper extremity symptoms			
	Case n = 228	Non-case n = 345	Student's T test		Case n = 145	Non-case n = 428	Student's t test		Case n = 24	Non-case n = 548	Student's t test		Case n = 50	Non-case n = 523	Student's t test	
			Effect size[b]	p-value			Effect size[b]	p-value			Effect size[b]	p-value			Effect size[b]	p-value
QuickDASH[c,d] (n = 226)																
n	226	0			143	83			24	201			48	178		
Mean (SD)	27.3 (21.5)	n/a (n/a)	n/a		30.0 (21.8)	22.6 (20.4)	0.344	0.01	48.0 (25.1)	24.9 (19.8)	1.075	<0.01	49.8 (24.2)	21.2 (16.1)	1.329	<0.01
FSS[e] (n = 573)																
n	228	345			145	428			24	548			50	523		
Mean (SD)	1.8 (0.9)	1.1 (0.2)	1.045	<0.01	1.8 (0.9)	1.2 (0.5)	0.956	<0.01	2.6 (1.1)	1.3 (0.6)	1.913	<0.01	2.4 (1.2)	1.3 (0.5)	1.729	<0.01
DASH-W[c] (n = 553)																
n	217	336			136	417			22	530			48	505		
Mean (SD)	21.2 (26.2)	1.3 (6.0)	1.014	<0.01	23.3 (26.7)	4.5 (13.8)	0.959	<0.01	37.2 (27.2)	8.0 (18.4)	1.492	<0.01	52.1 (31.0)	5.0 (11.8)	2.399	<0.01
SF-8 PCS[f] (n = 573)																
n	228	345			145	428			24	548			50	523		
Mean (SD)	49.5 (8.3)	54.2 (6.0)	−0.639	<0.01	47.8 (9.0)	53.9 (6.0)	−0.819	<0.01	43.9 (10.1)	52.7 (7.0)	−1.187	<0.01	46.6 (11.2)	52.9 (6.7)	−0.85	<0.01

DASH Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand, *DASH-W* DASH Work module, *FSS* Functional Status Scale, *SF* short form, *SD* standard deviation, *PCS* physical component score

[a] Case status could not be determined for 1 subject due to missing nerve conduction values

[b] Cohen's D

[c] 1-year recall modified

[d] For 1-year recall modified QuickDASH Score, a t test could not be performed for the upper extremity symptoms case definition because subjects who had no symptoms did not complete the modified QuickDASH

[e] Modified recall

[f] Higher scores on the SF-8 indicate better health

Table 5 Sensitivity and specificity of each functional measure for four upper extremity case definitions based on a common cut-point for each measure (n = 573)

Measures	Common cut-point[a]	Upper extremity symptoms (n = 228)		Upper extremity musculoskeletal disorder (n = 145)		Carpal tunnel syndrome (n = 24)		Work limitations due to upper extremity symptoms (n = 50)	
		Sens.	Spec.	Sens.	Spec.	Sens.	Spec.	Sens.	Spec.
FSS (modified recall)	1.3	56.1	93.0	60.0	84.8	79.2	75.9	76.0	78.2
DASH-W (1-year recall modified)	8.81	53.0	95.2	55.1	86.6	81.8	78.7	89.6	82.6
SF-8 PCS	50	39.9	85.2	49.7	83.6	66.7	77.0	52.0	77.8

Sens sensitivity, *Spec* specificity, *FSS* Functional Status Scale, *DASH-W* Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand Work module, *SF* short form, *PCS* physical component score

[a] Common cut-points were applied to each measure across all of the case definitions, in order to compare sensitivity and specificity of each measure for each case definition. Common cut-point for the modified Functional Status Scale was derived using data from the same cohort at a different study time-point using the formula: [0.5(SD) + Mean]. Common cut-points for the 1-year recall modified DASH-W and SF-8 were selected from the medical literature

developed specifically for identifying mild levels of impairment in relatively healthy working populations [28]. Salerno et al. [28] recommended three measures that were developed for research application as the most relevant measures for mild UE conditions: the Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire (NMQ), the Neck and Upper Limb Instrument (NULI), and the UEQ which included items from which our *work limitations* outcome was derived. Although several measures including the DASH and FSS have been used in previous studies of workers, few studies have tested their performance among workers with mild to moderate UE conditions [19–21, 28]. Our findings provide new evidence supporting the use of these measures in a mildly impaired population, even though they were primarily designed for clinical application.

One limitation of our study was in the design of our questionnaire. The 1-year recall modified QuickDASH was only completed by subjects with symptoms, thus we could not calculate *t* tests between scores for cases and non-cases or sensitivity and specificity. All measures used a 1-year recall period except for the SF-8 which used the standard 4-week recall period. This difference in recall periods may have contributed to the weak correlations found between the SF-8 PCS-8 and other measures. Modifying the recall periods from those suggested by developers of the Quick-DASH, DASH-W, and FSS may limit comparisons of our data with previous studies or with normative data. According to a recent study by Norquist et al. [57], recall periods for patient-reported outcome measures should depend upon the attributes of the disease or phenomenon of interest. Our study was longitudinal with the frequency of follow-up of approximately 1 year. Workers reported on symptoms that ranged from mild to severe and were episodic in nature. The recall periods chosen for the measures included in our questionnaires were selected to correspond with the one-year recall period for the Nordic-style

symptom questions. Some authors also caution that lengthening the recall period of measures may cause subjects to underreport functional limitations due to symptoms that occurred as much as 1 year prior [58, 59]. Stepan et al. [54], however, showed that patients with orthopedic hand and elbow injuries were able to accurately recall their baseline functional status on the QuickDASH up to 2 years following an initial office visit.

An important strength of our study was the simultaneous comparison of multiple health measures across a range of UE disease severity. We assessed how well various measures were associated with common MSDs and functional work outcomes. Measures are often chosen without regard to how well they relate to the research question or outcome being studied. Previous studies of functional and disability measures have explored reliability and validity, but seldom provide guidance to researchers and clinicians as to which measure may be most applicable in a given setting or population. Our study population was an active working population rather than a clinical population. Most of the measures in this study were either tested in or designed primarily for use in clinical populations and few studies have examined their utility in working populations with a wider range of disease severity. Although all of the functional and work limitation measures were able to detect differences between the case and non-case groups of active workers across a range of UE health conditions, our results suggest that measures most closely related to the outcome of interest may perform better. The 1-year recall modified DASH-W showed the highest sensitivity and largest effect size for distinguishing workers with and without *work limitations*, and the FSS showed better performance for the *CTS* case definition versus the other UE case definitions. Additional longitudinal studies in active working populations are needed. Future work will look at the responsiveness of the measures to detect clinically meaningful change

over time and the ability of different measures to predict future disability among active workers. Assessment of functional outcomes is important in both research and clinical practice, however, the performance of measures in the population and setting of interest should be considered.

References

1. World Health Organization. The International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2001.

2. Stewart WF, Ricci JA, Chee E, Morganstein D, Lipton R. Lost productive time and cost due to common pain conditions in the US workforce. JAMA. 2003;290(18):2443–54. doi:10.1001/jama.290.18.2443.

3. Tang K, Pitts S, Solway S, Beaton D. Comparison of the psychometric properties of four at-work disability measures in workers with shoulder or elbow disorders. J Occup Rehabil. 2009;19(2):142–54. doi:10.1007/s10926-009-9171-6.

4. Amick BC, Lerner D, Rogers WH, Rooney T, Katz JN. A review of health-related work outcome measures and their uses, and recommended measures. Spine. 2000;25(24):3152–60.

5. Beaton DE, Kennedy CA. Beyond return to work: testing a measure of at-work disability in workers with musculoskeletal pain. Qual Life Res. 2005;14(8):1869–79. doi:10.1007/s11136-005-3865-9.

6. Lofland JH, Pizzi L, Frick KD. A review of health-related workplace productivity loss instruments. Pharmacoeconomics. 2004;22(3):165–84. doi:10.2165/00019053-200422030-00003.

7. Loeppke R, Hymel PA, Lofland JH, Pizzi LT, Konicki DL, Anstadt GW, et al. Health-related workplace productivity measurement: general and migraine-specific recommendations from the ACOEM expert panel. J Occup Environ Med. 2003;45(4):349–59.

8. Schultz IZ, Stowell AW, Feuerstein M, Gatchel RJ. Models of return to work for musculoskeletal disorders. J Occup Rehabil. 2007;17(3):327–52. doi:10.1007/s10926-007-9071-6.

9. Terwee CB, Bot SDM, de Boer MR, van der Windt DAWM, Knol DL, Dekker J, et al. Quality criteria were proposed for measurement properties of health status questionnaires. J Clin Epidemiol. 2007;60(1):34–42. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.03.012.

10. Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Knol DL, Stratford PW, Alonso J, Patrick DL, et al. Protocol of the COSMIN study: COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement INstruments. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2006;. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-6-2.

11. Beaton DE, Katz JN, Fossel AH, Wright JG, Tarasuk V, Bombardier C. Measuring the whole or the parts? Validity, reliability, and responsiveness of the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand outcome measure in different regions of the upper extremity. Hand Ther. 2001;14(2):128–46. doi:10.1016/S0894-1130(01)80043-0.

12. Levine DW, Simmons BP, Koris MJ, Daltroy LH, Hohl GG, Fossel AH, et al. A self-administered questionnaire for the assessment of severity of symptoms and functional status in carpal tunnel syndrome. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 1993;75(11):1585–92.

13. Stratford PW, Kennedy DM, Hanna SE. Condition-specific Western Ontario McMaster Osteoarthritis Index was not superior to region-specific Lower Extremity Functional Scale at detecting change. J Clin Epidemiol. 2004;57(10):1025–32. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.03.008.

14. Kennedy CA, Beaton DE, Smith P, Van Eerd D, Tang K, Inrig T, et al. Measurement properties of the QuickDASH (Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand) outcome measure and cross-cultural adaptations of the QuickDASH: a systematic review. Qual Life Res. 2013;22(9):2509–47. doi:10.1007/s11136-013-0362-4.

15. Beaton DE, Wright JG, Katz JN, Group UEC. Development of the QuickDASH: comparison of three item-reduction approaches. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2005;87(5):1038–46. doi:10.2106/JBJS.D.02060.

16. Mehta S, MacDermid JC, Carlesso LC, McPhee C. Concurrent validation of the DASH and the QuickDASH in comparison to neck-specific scales in patients with neck pain. Spine. 2010;35(24):2150–6. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181c85151.

17. Mintken PE, Glynn P, Cleland JA. Psychometric properties of the shortened disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand Questionnaire (QuickDASH) and Numeric Pain Rating Scale in patients with shoulder pain. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2009;18(6):920–6. doi:10.1016/j.jse.2008.12.015.

18. Niekel MC, Lindenhovius AL, Watson JB, Vranceanu AM, Ring D. Correlation of DASH and QuickDASH with measures of psychological distress. J Hand Surg Am. 2009;34(8):1499–505. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2009.05.016.

19. Fan ZJ, Smith CK, Silverstein BA. Assessing validity of the QuickDASH and SF-12 as surveillance tools among workers with neck or upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders. Hand Ther. 2008;21(4):354–65. doi:10.1197/j.jht.2008.02.001.

20. Fan ZJ, Smith CK, Silverstein BA. Responsiveness of the QuickDASH and SF-12 in workers with neck or upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders one-year follow-up. J Occup Rehabil. 2011;21(2):234–43. doi:10.1007/s10926-010-9265-1.

21. Stover B, Silverstein B, Wickizer TM, Martin DP, Kaufman J. Accuracy of a disability instrument to identify workers likely to

develop upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders. J Occup Rehabil. 2007;17:227–45. doi:10.1007/s10926-007-9083-2.

22. House R, Wills M, Liss G, Switzer-McIntyre S, Lander L, Jiang D. DASH work module in workers with hand–arm vibration syndrome. Occup Med Oxford. 2012;62(6):448–50. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqs135.

23. Kitis A, Celik E, Aslan UB, Zencir M. DASH questionnaire for the analysis of musculoskeletal symptoms in industry workers: a validity and reliability study. Appl Ergon. 2009;40:251–5. doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2008.04.005.

24. Dale AM, Gardner B, Buckner-Petty S, Kaskutas V, Strickland J, Evanoff B. Responsiveness of a 1-year recall modified DASH Work module in active workers with upper extremity musculoskeletal symptoms. J Occup Rehabil. 2015;. doi:10.1007/s10926-015-9571-8.

25. de Carvalho Leite JC, Jerosch-Herold C, Song F. A systematic review of the psychometric properties of the Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2006;7:78. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-7-78.

26. Ware JE, Kosinski M, Dewey JE, Gandek B. How to score and interpret single-item health status measures: a manual for users of the SF-8 Health Survey. Lincoln: QualityMetric Incorporated; 2001.

27. Turner-Bowker DM, Bayliss MS, Ware JE, Kosinski M. Usefulness of the SF-8 Health Survey for comparing the impact of migraine and other conditions. Qual Life Res. 2003;12(8):1003–12. doi:10.1023/A:1026179517081.

28. Salerno DF, Copley-Merriman C, Taylor TN, Shinogle J, Schulz RM. A review of functional status measures for workers with upper extremity disorders. J Occup Environ Med. 2002;59(10):664–70. doi:10.1136/oem.59.10.664.

29. Evanoff BA, Dale AM, Descatha A. A conceptual model of musculoskeletal disorders for occupational health practitioners. Int J Occup Med Environ Health. 2014;27(1):145–8. doi:10.2478/s13382-014-0232-5.

30. Beaton D, Cole D, Manno M, Bombardier C, Hogg-Johnson S, Shannon H. Describing the burden of upper-extremity musculoskeletal disorders in newspaper workers: what difference do case definitions make? J Occup Rehabil. 2000;10(1):39–53. doi:10.1023/A:1009489712094.

31. Sluiter JK, Rest KM, Frings-Dresen MH. Criteria document for evaluating the work-relatedness of upper-extremity musculoskeletal disorders. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2001;27(Suppl 1):1–102. doi:10.5271/sjweh.637.

32. Gardner BT, Dale AM, Vandillen L, Franzblau A, Evanoff BA. Predictors of upper extremity symptoms and functional impairment among workers employed for 6 months in a new job. Am J Ind Med. 2008;51(12):932–40. doi:10.1002/ajim.20625.

33. Johnson AM, Dale AM, Strickland JR, Venditti P, Evanoff BA. Employers' concerns regarding research participation. Int J Occup Environ Health. 2008;14(1):11–7. doi:10.1179/oeh.2008.14.1.11.

34. Armstrong T, Dale A, Franzblau A, Evanoff B. Risk factors for carpal tunnel syndrome and median neuropathy in a working population. J Occup Environ Med. 2008;50(12):1355–64. doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e3181845fb1.

35. Dale AM, Descatha A, Coomes J, Franzblau A, Evanoff B. Physical examination has a low yield in screening for carpal tunnel syndrome. Am J Ind Med. 2011;54(1):1–9. doi:10.1002/ajim.20915.

36. Armstrong TN, Dale AM, Al-Lozi MT, Franzblau A, Evanoff BA. Median and ulnar nerve conduction studies at the wrist: criterion validity of the NC-stat automated device. J Occup Environ Med. 2008;50(7):758–64. doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e3181645425.

37. Evanoff B, Zeringue A, Franzblau A, Dale AM. Using job-title-based physical exposures from O*NET in an epidemiological study of carpal tunnel syndrome. Hum Factors. 2014;56(1):166–77. doi:10.1177/0018720813496567.

38. Dale A, Agboola F, Yun A, Zeringue A, Al-Lozi M, Evanoff B. Comparison of automated versus traditional nerve conduction study methods for median nerve testing in a general worker population. PM R. 2015;7(3):276–82. doi:10.1016/j.pmrj.2014.10.003.

39. Gummesson C, Ward MM, Atroshi I. The shortened disabilities of the arm, shoulder, and hand questionnaire (QuickDASH): validity and reliability based on responses within the full-length DASH. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2006. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-7-44.

40. Beaton DE, Tang K, Gignac MAM, Lacaille D, Badley EM, Anis AH, et al. Reliability, validity, and responsiveness of five at-work productivity measures in Patients with rheumatoid arthritis or osteoarthritis. Arthritis Care Res. 2010;62(1):28–37. doi:10.1002/acr.20011.

41. Hudak PL, Amadio PC, Bombardier C. Development of an upper extremity outcome measure: the DASH (disabilities of the arm, shoulder and hand) [corrected]. The Upper Extremity Collaborative Group (UECG). Am J Ind Med. 1996;29(6):602–8. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0274(199606)29:6<602:AID-AJIM4>3.0.CO;2-L.

42. Institute for Work and Health. The QuickDASH outcome measure: information for users. Toronto: Institute for Work and Health; 2006.

43. Kuorinka I, Jonsson B, Kilbom A, Vinterberg H, Biering-Sørensen F, Andersson G, et al. Standardised Nordic questionnaires for the analysis of musculoskeletal symptoms. Appl Ergon. 1987;18(3):233–7. doi:10.1016/0003-6870(87)90010-X.

44. Rempel D, Evanoff B, Amadio PC, de Krom M, Franklin G, Franzblau A, et al. Consensus criteria for the classification of carpal tunnel syndrome in epidemiologic studies. Am J Public Health. 1998;88(10):1447–51. doi:10.2105/AJPH.88.10.1447.

45. Dale AM, Harris-Adamson C, Rempel D, Gerr F, Hegmann K, Silverstein B, et al. Prevalence and incidence of carpal tunnel syndrome in US working populations: pooled analysis of six prospective studies. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2013;39(5):495–505. doi:10.5271/sjweh.3351.

46. Calfee RP, Dale AM, Ryan D, Descatha A, Franzblau A, Evanoff B. Performance of simplified scoring systems for hand diagrams in carpal tunnel syndrome screening. J Hand Surg Am. 2012;37A(1):10–7. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2011.08.016.

47. Silverstein BA, Fan ZJ, Bonauto DK, Bao S, Smith CK, Howard N, et al. The natural course of carpal tunnel syndrome in a working population. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2010;36(5):384–93. doi:10.5271/sjweh.2912.

48. Franzblau A, Salerno DF, Armstrong TJ, Werner RA. Test–retest reliability of an upper-extremity discomfort questionnaire in an industrial population. Scand J Work Environ Health. 1997;23(4):299–307. doi:10.5271/sjweh.223.

49. Salerno DF, Franzblau A, Armstrong TJ, Werner RA, Becker MP. Test–retest reliability of the Upper Extremity Questionnaire among keyboard operators. Am J Ind Med. 2001;40(6):655–66. doi:10.1002/ajim.10024.

50. Gardner BT, Dale AM, Descatha A, Evanoff B. Natural history of upper extremity musculoskeletal symptoms and resulting work limitations over 3 years in a newly hired working population. J Occup Environ Med. 2014;56(6):588–94. doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000000179.

51. Taylor R. Interpretation of the correlation coefficient: a basic review. J Diagn Sonogr. 1990;6(1):35–9. doi:10.1177/875647939000600106.

52. Institute for Work and Health. The DASH and QuickDASH outcome measures e-bulletin. Toronto: Institute for Work and Health; 2012.

53. Franchignoni F, Vercelli S, Giordano A, Sartorio F, Bravini E, Ferriero G. Minimal clinically important difference of the disabilities of the arm, shoulder and hand outcome measure (DASH) and its shortened version (QuickDASH). Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2014;44(1):30–9. doi:10.2519/jospt.2014.4893.

54. Stepan JG, London DA, Boyer MI, Calfee RP. Accuracy of patient recall of hand and elbow disability on the QuickDASH questionnaire over a two-year period. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2013;95-A(22):e176(1–8). doi:10.2106/JBJS.L.01485.

55. Jester A, Harth A, Germann G. Measuring levels of upper-extremity disability in employed adults using the DASH Questionnaire. J Hand Surg Am. 2005;30(5):1074.e1–10. doi:10.1016/j.jhsa.2005.04.009.

56. Changulani M, Okonkwo U, Keswani T, Kalairajah Y. Outcome evaluation measures for wrist and hand-which one to choose? Int Orthop. 2008;32(1):1–6. doi:10.1007/s00264-007-0368-z.

57. Norquist JM, Girman C, Fehnel S, DeMuro-Mercon C, Santanello N. Choice of recall period for patient-reported outcome (PRO) measures: criteria for consideration. Qual Life Res. 2012;21: 1013–20. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-0003-8.

58. Keller SD, Bayliss MS, Ware JE, Hsu MA, Damiano AM, Goss TF. Comparison of responses to SF-36 Health Survey questions with one-week and four-week recall periods. Health Serv Res. 1997;32(3):367–84.

59. Stull DE, Leidy NK, Parasuraman B, Chassany O. Optimal recall periods for patient-reported outcomes: challenges and potential solutions. Curr Med Res Opin. 2009;25(4):929–42. doi:10.1185/03007990902774765.