

Hand Surgery, Vol. 19, No. 3 (2014) 1–4

© World Scientific Publishing Company

DOI: 10.1142/S0218810414500324



1		46
2		47
3		48
4		49

WHAT IS THE BETTER TREATMENT FOR SINGLE DIGIT DUPUYTREN'S CONTRACTURE: SURGICAL RELEASE OR COLLAGENASE CLOSTRIDIUM HISTOLYTICUM (XIAPEX) INJECTION?

Bo Povlsen* and Sebastian D. Povlsen†

**London Hand Clinic, London Bridge Hospital, London, UK*

†St Catherine's College, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

Received ; Revised 19 April 2014; Accepted 21 April 2014

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare the initial and final outcome range of motion in the MCP-J and PIP-J of single digit Dupuytren's Contracture treated with either open surgical excision or manipulation after collagenase clostridium histolyticum (CCH; Xiapex) injection. Material: Ten patients in either group. The range of motion measurements were statistically compared using the student *t*-test with a *p*-value of 0.05. There was no statistical difference in the pre-treatment status of the total active range of movement (TAM) between the two groups. Results: Open surgical release achieved a statistically better initial outcome in combined total passive range of movement than the xiapex group ($p = 0.0047$), but at the final outcome the better TAM measurement at the MCP-J after surgery was not statistically significant. However, the total active range of movement was statistically better at the PIP-J level in the xiapex group ($p = 0.01$) and the MCP-J and PIP-J combined total active range of movement was statistically better in the xiapex group ($p = 0.0258$). Conclusion: Surgery achieved better initial outcome at both MCP-J and PIP-J levels, and at discharge, only extension in the MCP-J level was statistically better after open excision. However the final outcome was statistically better at the PIP-J level in extension ($p = 0.006$) and total active movement (TAM) ($p = 0.008$) after treatment with collagenase clostridium histolyticum. Further studies are required to assess the long-term differences between the two groups and to investigate the outcomes for patients with multi-digit involvement.

Keywords: .

INTRODUCTION

The gold standard for Dupuytren contracture treatment is surgical excision of the cord and the technique has remained the same for many decades.¹ However, though collagenase clostridium histolyticum (CCH) injection treatment was reported more than a decade ago² only recently has it been released for use in the United Kingdom under the name of Xiapex.³ Though

there are numerous studies that have reported on outcomes after surgical treatment, none have compared the final outcome of surgical excision with CCH injection treatment performed by the same surgeon. This study therefore aimed to compare the initial and final outcomes of single digit Dupuytren's contracture treated with either open surgical release or manipulation after CCH; Xiapex injection by the same surgeon.

Correspondence to: Bo Povlsen, Consultant Orthopaedic Surgeon, London Hand Clinic, London Bridge Hospital, London, SE1 9RT, UK. Tel: (+44)20-7357-8859, E-mail: Info@LondonHandClinic.co.uk

METHODS

Patients referred for treatment of Dupuytren's contracture were included in this study if they fulfilled the criteria similar to the JOINT I and II studies⁴ and only had one finger involvement, index to little finger. All patients were offered a choice between conventional open excisions or a single injection of 0.56 mg CCH administered in day surgery followed by outpatient manipulation of the cord under local anaesthetic three days later. Prospective data were collected from 10 consecutive patients with single digit Dupuytren's contracture who had undergone open fasciotomy and 10 patients with single digit Dupuytren's contracture who had undergone manipulation after CCH injection (0.56 mg *C. histolyticum* collagenase).⁵ Our local audit and ethics committee had approved an audit comparing

treatment with open surgery and CCH injection for Dupuytren's contracture.

Material: The pre-treatment active range of movement measurements of the included patients are found in Table 1. Pre-treatment status and digit side, number, and joint are also recorded.

All patients were treated by the same surgeon in a dedicated day surgery unit; open procedures were all performed under general anaesthetic. At surgery, a Brunner incision was used for the skin and the whole fibrous band was removed. The patients were placed in a cast in full extension until they were seen five days later in the out-patient department for dressing change and started hand therapist supervised rehabilitation, involving provision of a night splint custom-made by a hand therapist,

Table 1 Range of Movement After Xiapex or Open Treatment of Dupuytren's Contracture.

XIAPEX	Side	Digit	Pre-Treatment Status									Initial Outcome						Final Outcome					
			MCP			PIP			COMB.	MCP			PIP			COMB.	MCP			PIP			COMB.
			Flex	Ext	TAM	Flex	Ext	TAM	TAM	Flex	Ext	TPM	Flex	Ext	TPM	TPM	Flex	Ext	TAM	Flex	Ext	TAM	TAM
1	L	4	90	-30	60	110	-30	80	140	90	-20	70	90	-18	72	142	90	-6	84	96	0	96	180
2	R	4	90	-35	55	110	0	110	165	90	-4	86	100	0	100	186	90	-4	86	110	0	110	196
3	L	4	90	0	90	110	-45	65	155	90	0	90	100	0	100	190	90	0	90	104	0	104	194
4	R	5	90	-25	65	110	0	110	175	90	0	90	110	0	110	200	90	0	90	90	-8	82	172
5	L	3	90	0	90	110	-30	80	170	90	0	90	95	0	95	185	90	0	90	104	4	108	198
6	R	4	90	-20	70	110	0	110	180	90	0	90	110	0	110	200	90	0	90	102	0	102	192
7	R	4	90	-30	60	110	0	110	170	90	0	90	108	0	108	198	90	0	90	108	0	108	198
8	L	5	90	0	90	110	-40	70	160	90	0	90	110	0	110	200	96	12	108	90	0	90	198
9	L	5	90	-30	60	110	0	110	170	90	0	90	106	0	106	196	90	0	90	114	0	114	204
10	L	5	90	-30	60	110	-35	75	135	90	-12	78	100	-18	82	160	90	0	90	104	-2	102	192
Mean			90	-20	70	110	-18	92	162	90	-4	86.4	103	-4	99.3	185.7	90.6	0.2	90.8	102	-1	102	192.4

OPEN	Side	Digit	Pre-Treatment Status									Initial Outcome						Final Outcome					
			MCP			PIP			COMB.	MCP			PIP			COMB.	MCP			PIP			COMB.
			Flex	Ext	TAM	Flex	Ext	TAM	TAM	Flex	Ext	TPM	Flex	Ext	TPM	TPM	Flex	Ext	TAM	Flex	Ext	TAM	TAM
1	R	5	100	-30	70	110	0	110	180	90	0	90	110	0	110	200	98	20	118	96	-18	78	196
2	L	5	90	0	90	110	-40	70	160	90	0	90	110	0	110	200	90	14	104	90	-30	60	164
3	L	2	90	-20	70	110	-30	80	150	90	0	90	110	0	110	200	94	0	94	96	-18	78	172
4	L	5	90	0	90	110	-40	70	160	90	0	90	110	0	110	200	90	0	90	95	0	95	185
5	R	5	90	-30	60	110	0	110	170	90	10	100	110	0	110	210	92	14	106	20	0	20	126
6	R	4	90	20	110	110	-45	65	175	90	20	110	110	0	110	220	90	10	100	98	-18	80	180
7	R	5	90	-30	60	110	-10	100	160	90	10	100	110	0	110	210	82	8	90	102	-6	96	186
8	L	5	90	-20	70	110	-45	65	135	90	10	100	110	0	110	210	90	0	90	100	-8	92	182
9	L	5	90	0	90	110	-30	80	170	90	20	110	110	0	110	220	78	26	104	100	-16	84	188
10	R	2	90	-20	70	110	0	110	180	90	20	110	110	0	110	220	84	0	84	84	4	88	172
Mean			91	-13	78	110	-24	86	164	90	9	99	110	0	110	209	88.8	9.2	98	88.1	-11	77.1	175.1

1 supervision of mobilisation, and wound management on a
2 needs basis.

3 The CCH treated patients were injected, without anaesthetic
4 cover, in our day case unit with injection placement along the
5 fibrous band and post-injection observation following the
6 manufacturer's recommendation.³ The CCH treated patients were
7 seen three days later in the outpatient department, where they
8 underwent a manipulation of the cord under local anaesthetic.
9 After the manipulation they followed a similar rehabilitation
10 programme as the surgically treated patients involving provision
11 of a night splint custom-made by a hand therapist, supervision
12 of mobilisation, and wound management on a needs basis.

13 All patients were rehabilitated up until discharge by a
14 dedicated hand therapist who measured the active range of
15 motion outcome. Statistical analysis of the results was evalu-
16 ated using the student *t*-test with a significance value of 0.05.

18 RESULTS

19 The first section shows the *pre-treatment status* of the con-
20 tractions in the MCP-J and PIP-J and the active range of
21 movement for all patients, and the total active range of
22 movement (TAM) was calculated (Table 1). There was no
23 statistical difference between the groups.

24 The second section of Table 1 shows the passive measure-
25 ments obtained initially after the two interventions — *Initial*
26 *outcome*. For the surgical group this was recorded by the
27 surgeon before application of the cast during surgery, and for
28 the CCH group this was recorded by the hand therapist initially
29 after manipulation under anaesthesia by the surgeon.

30 The last section of Table 1 shows the measurements at
31 discharge — *Final outcome*. When comparing the final
32 measurements between the two treatment groups, it was seen
33 that the best TAM at the MCP-J level was achieved in the
34 surgical group, with the extension statistically better ($p =$
35 0.017) than the injection group. For the best TAM at the PIP-J
36 level, the injection treatment was statistically better
37 ($p = 0.01$). The xiapex group also achieved the best combined
38 TAM ($p = 0.0258$).

41 DISCUSSION

42 Though a recent paper has shown good long-term outcome of
43 Xiapex injection for Dupuytren's contracture⁶ there are no
44 studies comparing this with patients treated with open surgical
45

46 release by the same surgeon and receiving a similar rehabil-
47 itation programme. Furthermore, there is no comparative data
48 on how the measurements of passive correction, obtained
49 immediately after open surgical release or post-collagenase
50 manipulation for patients with Dupuytren's contracture,
51 translate into active range of motion for these two groups of
52 patients at the time of discharge. The current study is therefore
53 a valuable contribution to the knowledge of treatments of
54 Dupuytren's contracture and the short- and longer-term
55 effects, though the author accepts that the presented material
56 is small and only contains patients with single digit con-
57 tractions. However, the strength of this study is that all
58 patients, both in the open release and the CCH treated group
59 were treated by the same surgeon and all patients in both
60 groups received the same rehabilitation programme in the
61 same department.

62 Table 1 shows that in the *pre-treatment status* the two
63 groups were not statistically different regarding the TAM.
64 However, the *Initial outcome* section in Table 1 shows that the
65 open surgery group achieved a more impressive *total passive*
66 *range of movement (TPM)* than what was achieved with a
67 single CCH injection, but that this head start was mostly lost by
68 the time that the patients were discharged as seen in section
69 *Final outcome* in Table 1.

70 The present cohort of CCH treated patients present a very
71 different progress compared with those surgically treated. The
72 initial improvement is less impressive in the CCH group com-
73 pared with the surgically treated patients both at the MCP-J and
74 the PIP-J level, however, this is reversed particularly at the PIP-
75 J level as the xiapex group's TAM is statistically larger ($p =$
76 0.01) at the *Final outcome* measure. Furthermore, the com-
77 bined MCP-J and PIP-J TAM, as seen in Table 1, is also better in
78 the Xiapex group at the final outcome compared with the open
79 group ($p = 0.0258$).

81 CONCLUSION

82 Whilst surgery achieved a better initial outcome at both MCP-J
83 and PIP-J levels, and at discharge only, achieved statistically
84 better measurements of extension in the MCP-J level, the "final
85 outcome" was statistically better at the PIP-J level in extension
86 ($p = 0.006$) and TAM ($p = 0.008$) after treatment with CCH
87 injection. Further studies are required to assess the long-term
88 differences between the two groups and to investigate the
89 outcome for patients with multi digit involvements.
90

4 B. Povlsen & S. D. Povlsen

1 References

- | | | | |
|----|--|--|----|
| 1 | | | 46 |
| 2 | 1. Crean SM, Gerber RA, Le Graverand MP, Boyd DM, Capelleri JC, The | | 47 |
| 3 | efficacy and safety of fasciotomy for Dupuytren's contracture in European | | 48 |
| 4 | patients, <i>J Hand Surgery Eur</i> 36 (5):396–407, 2011. | | 49 |
| 5 | 2. Badalamente MA, Hurst LC, Enzyme injection as nonsurgical treatment of | | 50 |
| 6 | Dupuytren's disease, <i>J Hand Surg Am</i> 25 :629–636, 2000. | | 51 |
| 7 | 3. Summary of product characteristics: Xiapex 0.9 mg powder and solvent | | 52 |
| 8 | solution for injection (prescribing information). Kent, UK Pfizer Limited: | | 53 |
| 9 | March 14, 2011. | | 54 |
| 10 | | | 55 |
| 11 | | | 56 |
| 12 | | | 57 |
| 13 | | | 58 |
| 14 | | | 59 |
| 15 | | | 60 |
| 16 | | | 61 |
| 17 | | | 62 |
| 18 | | | 63 |
| 19 | | | 64 |
| 20 | | | 65 |
| 21 | | | 66 |
| 22 | | | 67 |
| 23 | | | 68 |
| 24 | | | 69 |
| 25 | | | 70 |
| 26 | | | 71 |
| 27 | | | 72 |
| 28 | | | 73 |
| 29 | | | 74 |
| 30 | | | 75 |
| 31 | | | 76 |
| 32 | | | 77 |
| 33 | | | 78 |
| 34 | | | 79 |
| 35 | | | 80 |
| 36 | | | 81 |
| 37 | | | 82 |
| 38 | | | 83 |
| 39 | | | 84 |
| 40 | | | 85 |
| 41 | | | 86 |
| 42 | | | 87 |
| 43 | | | 88 |
| 44 | | | 89 |
| 45 | | | 90 |

4. Witthaut J, Jones G, Skrepnik N, Kushner H, Houston A, Lindau TR, Efficacy and safety of collagenase clostridium histolyticum injection for dupuytren contracture: short-term results from 2 open-label studies, *J Hand Surg Am* **38**:2–11, 2013.
5. Xiaflex (collagenase clostridium histolyticum) [package insert]. Malvern, PA: Auxilium Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; 2010.
6. Peimer CA, Blazar P, Coleman S, Kaplan FTD, Smith T, Tursi JP *et al.* Dupuytren contracture recurrence following treatment with collagenase clostridium histolyticum clostridium histolyticum (CORDLESS Study): 3-year data, *J Hand Surg Am* **38**:12–22, 2013.