

# Scores VI

Ernesto Bersusky,<sup>†</sup> Ignacio Arzac Ulla,<sup>\*\*</sup> Lidia G. Loterzo,<sup>#</sup> Guillermo Ricciardi,<sup>\*\*</sup> Gerardo Zanotti<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>*Pediatric Hospital "Prof. Dr. Juan P. Garrahan", Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, Argentina*

<sup>\*\*</sup>*BR Traumatología, Azul, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

<sup>#</sup>*Hospital Central de San Isidro "Dr. Melchor Á. Posse", Buenos Aires, Argentina*

<sup>\*\*</sup>*Hospital General de Agudos "Dr. Teodoro Álvarez", Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, Argentina*

<sup>†</sup>*Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, Argentina*

## ABSTRACT

The Editorial Committee wants to provide its readers with an update on the commonly used scales. The use of tables and scales is a widespread practice in Orthopedics and Traumatology. The measurement and quantification of clinical, functional, and radiographic aspects has become an essential tool for decision-making in different aspects of healthcare activity. We carry out a review of the most used scales, defining their use and including original and updated literature.

**Keywords:** Scales; scores; tables; update

**Level of Evidence:** V

## Puntajes VI

## RESUMEN

El Comité Editorial quiere brindar a sus lectores una actualización de las escalas de uso corriente. El empleo de tablas y escalas es una práctica muy extendida en la Ortopedia y Traumatología. La medición y la cuantificación de los aspectos clínicos, funcionales y radiográficos se convirtieron en una herramienta imprescindible para la toma de decisiones en diferentes aspectos de la actividad asistencial. Llevamos a cabo una revisión de las escalas más utilizadas, definiendo su uso e incluyendo bibliografía original y actualizada.

**Palabras clave:** Escalas; puntajes; tablas; actualización

**Nivel de Evidencia:** V

## INTRODUCTION

The Editorial Committee wants to provide its readers with an update on the most commonly used scales. The use of tables and scales is a widespread practice in Orthopedics and Traumatology. The measurement and quantification of clinical, functional, and radiographic aspects have become essential tools for decision-making in different aspects of healthcare activity.

We carried out a review of the most used scales, defining their use and including original and updated literature. In this opportunity, we dealt with the section of ankle and foot scores.

## AOFAS Foot and Ankle Score

It was developed by Kitaoka in 1994 and covers four different regions: ankle and hindfoot, midfoot, metatarsophalangeal and interphalangeal joints of the hallux, metatarsophalangeal and interphalangeal joints of the other toes. These four anatomical regions have their own version in the American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society (AOFAS) study. Each is designed to be used independently. However, each measure is composed of nine questions and covers three categories: pain (40 points), function (50 points) and alignment (10 points). These categories are added to form a total of 100 points.

Dr. IGNACIO ARZAC ULLA • ignacioarzac@hotmail.com  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5038-7720>

**How to cite this article:** Bersusky E, Arzac Ulla I, Loterzo LG, Ricciardi G, Zanotti G, Patiño JM. Scores VI. *Rev Asoc Argent Ortop Traumatol* 2023;88(1):123-127. <https://doi.org/10.15417/issn.1852-7434.2023.88.1.1706>

*AOFAS Ankle-Hindfoot Scale***Pain (40 points)**

- None (40)
- Mild, occasional (30)
- Moderate, daily (20)
- Severe, almost always present (0)

**Function (50 points)****Activity limitations, support requirements**

- No limitations, no support (10)
- No limitation of daily activities, limitations of recreational activities, no support (7)
- Limited daily and recreational activities, cane (4)
- Severe limitation of daily and recreational activities, walker, crutches, wheelchair, brace (0)

**Maximum walking distance, blocks (approximately 100 m).**

- Greater than 6 (5)
- Between 4 and 6 (4)
- Between 1 and 3 (2)
- Less than 1 (0)

**Walking surfaces**

- No difficulty on any surface (5)
- Some difficulty on uneven terrain, stairs, inclines, ladders (3)
- Great difficulty on uneven terrain, stairs, inclines, ladders (0)

**Gait abnormality (limp)**

- None, slight (8)
- Obvious (4)
- Marked (0)

**Sagittal motion (flexion plus extension)**

- Normal or mild restriction ( $>30^\circ$ ) (8)
- Moderate restriction ( $15-29^\circ$ ) (4)
- Severe restriction ( $<15^\circ$ ) (0)

**Hindfoot motion (inversion plus eversion)**

- Normal or mild restriction (75-100% normal) (6)
- Moderate restriction (25-74% normal) (3)
- Severe restriction ( $<25\%$  of normal) (0)

**Ankle-hindfoot stability (anteroposterior, varus-valgus)**

- Stable (8)
- Clearly unstable (0)

**Alignment (10 points)**

- Good, plantigrade foot, well-aligned midfoot (10)
- Fair, plantigrade foot, some degree of malalignment, no symptoms (5)
- Poor, nonplantigrade foot, severe malalignment, symptoms (0)

**TOTAL (100)**

*AOFAS midfoot scale***Pain (40 points)**

- None (40)
- Mild, occasional (30)
- Moderate, daily (20)
- Severe, almost always present (0)

**Function (45 points)****Activity limitations, support requirements**

- No limitations, no support (10)
- No limitation for daily activities, limitation of recreational activities, no support (7)
- Limited daily and recreational activities, cane (4)
- Severe limitation of daily and recreational activities, walker, crutches, wheelchair (0)

**Footwear requirements**

- Fashionable, conventional shoes, no insert required (5)
- Comfort footwear, shoe insert (3)
- Modified shoe or brace (0)

**Maximum walking distance, blocks (approximately 100 m)**

- Greater than 6 (10)
- Between 4 and 6 (7)
- Between 1 and 3 (4)
- Less than 1 (0)

**Walking surfaces**

- No difficulty on any surface (10)
- Some difficulty on uneven terrain, stairs, inclines, ladders (5)
- Great difficulty on uneven terrain, stairs, inclines, ladders (0)

**Gait abnormality (limp)**

- None, slight (10)
- Moderate, evident (5)
- Marked (0)

**Alignment (15 points)**

- Good, plantigrade foot, well-aligned midfoot (15)
- Fair, plantigrade foot, some degree of malalignment, no symptoms (8)
- Poor, nonplantigrade foot, severe malalignment, symptoms (0)

**TOTAL (100)**

*Metatarsophalangeal and interphalangeal AOFAS scale*

<b>Pain (40 points)</b>	
• None	(40)
• Mild, occasional	(30)
• Moderate, daily	(20)
• Severe, almost always present	(0)
<b>Function (45 points)</b>	
<b>Activity limitations, support requirements</b>	
• No limitations, no support	(10)
• No limitation for daily activities, limitation of recreational activities, no support	(7)
• Limited daily and recreational activities, cane	(4)
• Severe limitation of daily and recreational activities, walker, crutches, wheelchair	(0)
<b>Footwear requirements</b>	
• Fashionable, conventional, no insert required	(10)
• Comfort footwear with shoe insert	(5)
• Modified shoe or brace	(0)
<b>Metatarsophalangeal joint motion (dorsiflexion plus plantarflexion)</b>	
• Normal or mild restriction (>75°)	(10)
• Moderate restriction (30-75°)	(5)
• Severe restriction (<30°)	(0)
<b>Interphalangeal joint motion (plantarflexion)</b>	
• No restriction	(5)
• Severe restriction (<10°)	(0)
<b>Metatarsophalangeal-interphalangeal stability (all directions)</b>	
• Stable (5)	
• Unstable (0)	
<b>Calluses related to metatarsophalangeal-interphalangeal hallux</b>	
• No or asymptomatic callus or corn/clavus	(5)
• Symptomatic callus or corn/clavus	(0)
<b>Alignment (15 points)</b>	
• Good, plantigrade foot, well-aligned midfoot	(15)
• Fair, plantigrade foot, some degree of malalignment, no symptoms	(8)
• Poor, nonplantigrade foot, severe malalignment, symptoms	(0)
<b>TOTAL (100)</b>	

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

E. Bersusky ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3121-9326>  
L. G. Loterzo ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5465-1747>

G. Ricciardi ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6959-9301>  
G. Zanotti ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8090-4832>

## SUGGESTED REFERENCES

- Button G, Pinney S. A meta-analysis of outcome rating scales in foot and ankle surgery: is there a valid, reliable, and responsive system? *Foot Ankle Int* 2004;25(8):521-5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107110070402500802>
- Palmén LN, Kosse NM, van Hooff ML, Witteveen AGH. Evaluation and validation of the Dutch European Foot and Ankle Society (EFAS) Score. *J Foot Ankle Surg* 2022;61(3):464-70. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jfas.2021.09.019>
- Arbab D, Kuhlmann K, Schnurr C, Lüring C, König D, Bouillon B. Comparison of the Manchester-Oxford Foot Questionnaire (MOXFQ) and the Self-Reported Foot and Ankle Outcome Score (SEFAS) in patients with foot or ankle surgery. *Foot Ankle Surg* 2019;25(3):361-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fas.2018.01.003>