

Supplementary data

Table 3. Patients with multiple revision procedures

#	Primary procedure	Revision 1	Revision 2	Revision 3	Revision 4	Revision 5
1	LRTI with APL + bone tunnel	Adductor release	MCP fusion			
2	LRTI with APL	Tenotomy of APL sling	Soft tissue interposition (fascia lata)	Soft tissue interposition (fascia lata) revision	MC1–Scaphoid fusion	MC1–Scaphoid fusion (revision)
3	LRTI with APL + bone tunnel	Suspension MC1–MC2	Soft tissue interposition (fascia lata)			
4	LRTI with APL	Soft tissue interposition (fascia lata)	Removal of residual bone fragments			
5	Simple trapeziectomy	LRTI with APL + bone tunnel	Suspension + MCP fusion			
6	LRTI with APL + bone tunnel	Radiolunate fusion (both sides)	Total wrist fusion (left side)	MC1–MC2 fusion (left side)		
7	LRTI with APL	Removal of residual bone fragments	FCR tenotomy			
8	LRTI with APL + bone tunnel	Soft tissue interposition (fascia lata)	MCP fusion			
9	LRTI with APL + bone tunnel	Implant (RegJoint)	Soft tissue interposition (fascia lata)			

Table 4. Revision procedures

All revision procedures (primary and repeat procedures)	n
Soft tissue interposition with fascia lata	19
Soft tissue interposition with palmaris longus	4
Soft tissue interposition with joint capsule	1
LRTI with APL	1
LRTI with APL + bone tunnel	2
Suspension arthroplasty between MC1 and MC2 using autologous tendon	7
Suspension arthroplasty between MC1 and MC2 using TightRope	1
Debridement of resection cavity of residual bone fragments	8
Tenolysis (FCR, APL, adductor release)	6
Neurolysis of superficial branch of radial nerve	4
Thumb MCP joint fusion	3
Partial or total wrist fusion	4
MC1–Scaphoid fusion	2
Implant arthroplasty (RegJoint)	3
Total	65

Table 6. Factors affecting final outcome of revision surgery

Spearman's rho		Correlation coefficient	
Age (not categorized)	p-value		
DASH	0.5	rho -0.12	
PEM	0.5	rho -0.12	
pain VAS	0.6	rho -0.10	
Key pinch	0.5	rho -0.11	
T-test, mean, (SD) and [range]			Difference between means (95% CI)
Sex	Male	Female	
DASH	40 (18) [21–55]	37 (20) [2–73]	3 (-22 to 27)
PEM	36 (25) [13–63]	44 (24) [3–94]	8 (-38 to 21)
pain VAS	47 (38) [20–90]	42 (29) [0–100]	5 (-31 to 41)
Key pinch	8 (1) [7–9]	5 (3) [2–11]	3 (-1 to 7)
Failed primary revision			
	Yes	No	
DASH	39 (13) [20–61]	37 (21) [2–73]	2 (-20 to 16)
PEM	40 (21) [16–66]	44 (25) [3–94]	4 (-18 to 26)
pain VAS	40 (28) [0–70]	43 (30) [0–100]	3 (-24 to 29)
Key pinch	5 (2) [2–8]	5 (3) [2–11]	0 (-2 to 3)
Scaphometacarpal space in radiograph			
	0–1 mm	> 1 mm	
DASH	45 (18) [5–66]	37 (20) [2–73]	8 (-8 to 24)
PEM	47 (16) [25–66]	43 (27) [3–94]	4 (-16 to 24)
pain VAS	47 (26) [20–90]	37 (34) [0–100]	10 (-16 to 35)
Key pinch	7 (3) [3–10]	5 (3) [2–11]	2 (0 to 5) ^a
MCP-joint hyperextension in radiograph			
	Yes	No	
DASH	44 (25) [11–73]	38 (17) [2–71]	6 (-21 to 10)
PEM	47 (30) [3–94]	43 (21) [3–87]	4 (-23 to 16)
pain VAS	39 (32) [0–90]	41 (32) [0–100]	2 (-25 to 28)
Key pinch	5 (2) [2–8]	6 (3) [2–11]	1 (-1 to 3)

^a p-value = 0.04

Table 7. Results of revision surgery. Number of patients with data = 38

DASH ^a	37 (23–45)	[2 to 73]
PEM ^a	40 (27–63)	[3 to 94]
Pain VAS (mm) ^a	40 (20–70)	[0 to 100]
Key pinch (kg) ^a	5 (3–8)	[2 to 11]
Tip pinch (kg) ^a	3 (2–6)	[0 to 12]
Grip strength (kg) ^b	23 (9)	[5 to 48]
Kapandji score ^b	9 (2)	[3 to 10]
Ability to flatten hand (cm)	2 (1–4)	[0 to 6]
Palmar abduction (°) ^b	67 (15)	[30 to 95]
Radial abduction (°) ^b	81 (18)	[20 to 110]
MCP extension (°) ^a	30 (15–40)	[-30 to 60]
MCP flexion (°) ^b	39 (19)	[0 to 90]
IP extension (°) ^a	15 (0–20)	[-20 to 45]
IP flexion (°) ^b	69 (16)	[40 to 95]
Connolly Rath score (good/fair/poor)	4/27/5	
Benefit of surgery (yes/no)	31/3	
Scaphometacarpal space (mm) ^a	3 (2–4)	[0 to 7]
Adduction/MCP-joint hyperextension (yes/no)	12/27	
Bone fragments in operative area (yes/no)	5/31	

^a Median (interquartile range) [range]

^b Median (standard deviation) [range]