

1 **Inter-rater and intra-rater reliability of finger goniometry measured from screenshots taken**
2 **via video consultation**

3

4 **Authors**

5 Dane Johnson ^{1,2}

6 Rodrigo Barradas ¹

7 Lisa Newington ^{1,3}

8

9 **Affiliations**

- 10 1. Hand Therapy, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
11 2. Melbourne Hand and Upper Limb Clinic, Melbourne, Australia
12 3. MSk Lab, Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London, London, UK

13

ABSTRACT

14 The purpose of this study was to assess the intra- and inter-rater reliability of using
15 screenshots and handheld manual goniometers to assess range of finger movements during
16 video consultations. Twenty-seven hand therapists measured finger joint angles from four
17 different screenshots using two different goniometers. Results were compared within and
18 between participants using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). The ICC grading for
19 both intra- and inter-rater reliability was moderate to excellent for all joints and both
20 goniometers,. Clinicians can measure finger joint angles from a screenshot with good
21 reliability. The protocol used in this study can be used in remote video consultations as a no-
22 cost substitute for in-person goniometry.

23 **Level of evidence: II**

24

INTRODUCTION

25 Goniometry is an integral assessment tool used in the diagnostic process and to measure the
26 effects of hand surgery and hand therapy interventions (Burr et al., 2003; Gibson, 2015;
27 Groth and Ehretzman, 2001). The use of hand held, manual finger goniometers has been
28 shown to have high inter- and intra-rater reliability (Gibson, 2015; Kooij et al., 2017).

29 In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic led to a rapid shift in the delivery of hospital appointments,
30 with face-to-face appointments being replaced with video appointments. Some patient
31 presentations will always need to be seen face-to-face for at least part of their treatment
32 owing to their complexity, acuity or need for manual treatments, but many hand and upper
33 limb assessments may be well suited to video consultations. The entire hand and upper limb
34 can be easily visualized on screen with a webcam or phone-mounted camera and for many
35 presentations there is a preference for active self-management strategies rather than
36 “hands-on” passive techniques (Hutting et al., 2019). Furthermore, most of the United
37 Kingdom and European households have internet access and connected devices (European
38 Commission., 2021; Statista, 2020). However, for both patients and clinicians, there are
39 barriers to virtual consultations. These include access to, and ability to use, the technology;
40 space required to run a virtual consultation; desire for human contact; the perception that
41 face-to-face is required for adequate assessment of a complex presentation; and a level of
42 anxiety that patients report around seeing themselves on screen (Gilbert et al., 2021).
43 Additionally, many of the assessment tools that are relied upon in the clinic need adaptation
44 for the virtual setting (Nest et al., 2020).

45 Previous studies have found that finger, wrist and elbow joint angles can be measured from
46 photographs using computer software with good reliability (Chen et al., 2021; Meislin et al.,

47 2016; Wagner et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2020). These studies describe patients and carers
48 being trained to take photographs of their limbs and to send them to the health
49 professionals to be assessed. The health professionals then use software programs to
50 measure joint angles.

51 To meet the need for range of movement assessments for patients being reviewed using
52 video consultations, hand therapists at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, a large
53 tertiary referral hospital in the United Kingdom, started to use manual goniometers to
54 measure finger joint angles from screenshots taken during video consultations. This was
55 considered acceptable for both patients and clinicians. Unlike using photographs taken by
56 patients and carers, the screenshot measurements could be made contemporaneously and
57 did not require either patient or carer training or additional software. The use of screenshots
58 and manual goniometer measurements was adopted out of necessity and to the best of our
59 knowledge, there are no existing data reporting the reliability of this method of assessment.
60 The aim of this study was to assess the intra- and inter-rater reliability of using screenshots
61 and handheld manual goniometers to assess range of finger movement.

62

METHODS

63

64 Three volunteer 'patients' had all of the fingers of one hand immobilized in varying degrees
65 of mid-range flexion in a custom orthosis. Two authors (DJ and RB) simulated a video
66 consultation with each volunteer using the same process as with patients. The appointment
67 was hosted on the NHS Attend Anywhere platform and volunteers connected using their
68 own mobile devices and mobile network data. The lead author (DJ) connected to the
69 appointment on a desktop computer using the hospital internet and gave verbal prompts to
70 guide the volunteers to orientate their hand so that a lateral view of the target finger was
71 achieved, and the dorsum of the finger was clearly visible. Screenshot images were taken
72 using the operating system default screen capture tool (Figure 1). Four screenshot images
73 were taken in total (one image of volunteer 1, two images of volunteer 2 and one image of
74 volunteer 3) with each image focused on a single finger (index, middle, ring and little finger).
75 The volunteers were non-clinical members of the hand unit team.

76 The joints of each of the individual target fingers were also measured in-person by three
77 hand therapists while the volunteers were still wearing the custom orthoses. These
78 measures were taken using a JAMAR[®] Finger/Toe Goniometer (Performance Health
79 International Ltd, Warrenville, Illinois, United States of America) and were used to calculate
80 the 'true' position of each finger joint for comparison with the virtual measures.

81 To assess inter-rater reliability, hand therapists within the team were shown four screenshot
82 images (one of each finger) and asked to measure the metacarpophalangeal (MCP),
83 proximal interphalangeal (PIP) and distal interphalangeal (DIP) joint angles. Therapists
84 followed a written protocol that reflected how range of movement assessments are carried
85 out in practice. A manual goniometer was placed against the screen of their computer or

86 tablet and the goniometer arms were aligned with the dorsum of the finger. Figure 2 shows
87 images that were included in the written protocol to illustrate the assessment method. Two
88 different types of goniometer were tested: the JAMAR® Clear Goniometer (Performance
89 Health International Ltd, Warrenville, Illinois, United States of America) and the JAMAR®
90 Finger/Toe Goniometer (Figure 3).

91 To assess intra-rater reliability, each assessment was repeated for each type of goniometer,
92 with a 2-week period between measures to prevent recall of the previous measurements.
93 Measurements were submitted via an online portal (Google Forms) and therapists did not
94 have access to their previous measurements once submitted.

95

96 *Data analysis*

97 Both in-person and virtual joint measurements were summarized using descriptive statistics.
98 Data were normally distributed (consistency of mean and median) and were reported as the
99 mean and standard deviation (SD) for each joint. Reliability was calculated using the
100 intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Inter-rater
101 reliability was assessed using a two-way random effects model with consistency of
102 agreement, and intra-rater reliability was assessed using a two-way mixed effects model
103 with absolute agreement (Koo and Li, 2016). The ICC results were graded as poor (<0.5),
104 moderate (0.5-0.75), good (0.75-0.9) and excellent (>0.9) (Koo and Li, 2016).

105 In a sensitivity analysis, mean and SD measures for each joint, and the ICC and 95% CIs were
106 compared for in-person and virtual measurements.

107

108 *Approvals and governance*

109 The study was approved by the Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust Occupational
110 Therapy Clinical Audit Team (Project number 12308).

Accepted manuscript JHSE

111

RESULTS

112 *Participants*

113 Twenty-seven hand therapists took part in the study. Of these, 12 were occupational
114 therapists and 15 were physiotherapists. Three therapists had been working in hand therapy
115 for less than 1 year, nine for 1-5 years, another nine for 5-10 years, and six for more than 10
116 years. All therapists were included in the inter-rater reliability analysis. For the intra-rater
117 reliability assessment, 25 therapists completed repeated measures with the finger/toe
118 goniometer and 24 with the clear goniometer.

119 *Sensitivity analysis*

120 The mean and SD of the in-person and virtual measures for each joint are presented in Table
121 1. The SD for virtual measurement methods were similar to those of the in-person
122 measurement methods, indicating comparable variability between the virtual assessment
123 and the standard in-person method. Comparison of the mean in-person measurements and
124 virtual measurements shows no systematic over- or underestimation of joint angle.
125 However, individual measures of the DIP joint appear to be consistently underestimated via
126 in-person measurement, while MCP joint measures appear to be consistently
127 overestimated.

128

129 *Inter-rater reliability*

130 Inter-rater reliability ICC with 95% CIs are presented in Table 2. The ICC grading was
131 moderate to excellent for in-person and virtual measurement methods, for all joints and
132 both goniometers.

133

134 *Intra-rater reliability*

135 Intra-rater reliability ICC with 95% CIs are presented in Table 3. The ICC grading was
136 moderate to excellent for all joints and both goniometers.

137 Summary data for virtual and in-person measurements of each joint and goniometer are
138 available through the Open Science Framework (Johnson et al., 2022).

139

Accepted manuscript JHSE

140

DISCUSSION

141 The ICC for all joints combined indicated excellent inter- and intra-rater reliability, which
142 supports the use of this technique to measure finger joint angle during video consultations.

143 However, the finger/toe goniometer had only moderate reliability for MCP joint measures.

144 This could be due to a mismatch between the long metacarpal ray and short mobile arm.

145 The clear goniometer had only moderate reliability for DIP joint measures, potentially due
146 to the long mobile arm and short distal phalanx ray. These findings suggest that use of a
147 clear goniometer for the MCP joint and the finger/toe goniometer for the DIP joint may
148 result in more reliable measurements in practice.

149 The authors feel that the two-dimensional (flat) design of the clear goniometer may make it
150 better suited for range of movement assessment using screenshot images.

151 A broad range of hand therapy experience was reflected in the large sample of assessors.

152 This reflects how goniometry applies in clinical practice, with patient care often being
153 shared in a multidisciplinary team of varying skill levels.

154 Although it was the COVID-19 pandemic that stimulated a rapid shift to provide hand
155 surgery and hand therapy appointments via online platforms, the NHS long term plan
156 stipulated that technological solutions including telehealth consultations would replace one
157 third of face-to-face outpatient appointments by 2023 (NHS, 2019). Video appointments
158 have the potential to offer cost-savings for patients and healthcare services and may
159 improve accessibility to specialist services by reducing the travel burden for patients. In
160 addition, there is an environmental benefit of reducing transport requirements.

161 Previous studies have analysed the reliability of taking goniometric measurements from
162 photographs of fingers and elbows (Chen et al., 2021; Meislin et al., 2016; Zhao et al., 2020).
163 These studies required a patient or caregiver to be trained to use a smartphone camera to
164 take the photographs, which were later measured by a health professional using software.
165 In practice, the transfer and storage of files creates extra steps for patients and healthcare
166 workers. They also raise issues of data security, and necessitate the creation of a new
167 procedure, which in many settings would require separate consent forms. Additionally,
168 using new software to take the measurements incurs costs and training. The method
169 described above bypasses these issues. If screenshots are taken using the *Snipping Tool*
170 program in Windows, or similar, and measurements are taken in-session then no images are
171 saved. Patients are guided into position with verbal and visual prompts for the therapist to
172 take the screenshot, there are no extra steps or training. The goniometers that were used
173 are commonly available in most hand units and the protocol is sufficiently similar to
174 standard in-person measurement that most will find it intuitive.

175

176 There are some limitations to this study. The method used depends on the conversion of a
177 three-dimensional finger into a two-dimensional picture and as such introduces the
178 possibility of parallax error. The parallax effect is the change in relative position of objects
179 when viewed from different angles. In photography, angles can appear larger or smaller
180 depending on the position of the lens in relation to the subject. Analysis of our data shows
181 that this may have occurred in our study. For example, the mean of the virtual finger/toe
182 and clear goniometer measurements of DIP joint of the index finger shows that the angle
183 appears overestimated compared to in-person measurements. Similarly, the MCP joint

184 angle of the little finger appears underestimated by the virtual goniometers. With only a
185 small sample of in-person measures, it is not possible explore this finding in greater depth.
186 However, this does highlight the importance of positioning the hand and target finger when
187 taking screenshots so that a 'true' lateral view of the joint is achieved. Future work should
188 involve collaboration with radiography colleagues to develop a standardized protocol to
189 minimize the potential effect of parallax error.

190 During video consultations, it can be difficult to direct the patient to align their hand with
191 their camera in order to achieve an acceptable lateral view of the finger. This can be
192 complicated by dressings, pain and swelling from trauma, uninvolved fingers obstructing the
193 camera, low lighting, poor internet connection and other patient factors including whether
194 or not patients are adept at using the required technology. Our study focused on an initial
195 assessment of intra- and inter-rater reliability and did not look at these factors.

196 Our study did not assess measurements of the thumb joint angles as the Kapandji score
197 (Kapandji, 1986) was deemed to be a reliable method to assess for thumb opposition and
198 flexion (Jha et al., 2016) and could easily be used in the telehealth setting. All participants
199 were hand therapists which may limit generalizability of results to other healthcare
200 professionals. The plan for the study was for participants take repeat measures 7-14 days
201 apart to minimize recall of the previous measurements. However, in practice, owing to
202 workplace factors, the median time between individual participants' measurements was 21
203 days (range 0-60 days). Six individuals completed the repeated measures with a gap of less
204 than 7 days, which has the potential to affect the intra-rater reliability findings, however
205 there was similar variation in repeated measures for these individuals and the rest of the
206 participants.

207

208 Clinicians can measure finger joint angles from a screenshot with good reliability using
209 either the standard finger/toe goniometer and the clear goniometer. The protocol used in
210 this study can be used in remote video consultations as a no-cost substitute for in-person
211 goniometry. Development of a standardized protocol to ensure optimal orthogonal views of
212 the joints being measured may improve the accuracy of this method.

Accepted manuscript JHSE

213

REFERENCES

- 214 Burr N, Pratt AL, Stott D. Inter-rater and Intra-rater Reliability when Measuring
215 Interphalangeal Joints: Comparison between three hand-held goniometers. *Physiotherapy*.
216 2003, 89: 641–52.
- 217 Chen J, Xian Zhang A, Jia Qian S, Jing Wang Y. Measurement of finger joint motion after
218 flexor tendon repair: smartphone photography compared with traditional goniometry. *J*
219 *Hand Surg Eur*. 2021, 46: 825–9.
- 220 European Commission. *Key figures on Europe: 2021 edition*. Luxembourg, Publications Office
221 of the European Union, 2021. What does LU stand for?
- 222 Gibson G. Chapter 6, Goniometry. In: MacDermid JC, Solomon G, Valdes K (Eds.) *Clinical*
223 *assessment recommendations, impairment-based conditions*, 3rd Edn. Mt Laurel, NJ,
224 American Society of Hand Therapists, 2015: 71–80.
- 225 Gilbert AW, Jones J, Stokes M, May CR. Factors that influence patient preferences for virtual
226 consultations in an orthopaedic rehabilitation setting: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*. 2021,
227 11: e041038. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-041038.
- 228 Groth GN, Ehretzman RL. Goniometry of the proximal and distal interphalangeal joints, part
229 I: A survey of instrumentation and placement preferences. *J Hand Ther*. 2001, 14: 18–22.
- 230 Hutting N, Johnston V, Staal JB, Heerkens YF. Promoting the use of self-management
231 strategies for people with persistent musculoskeletal disorders: the role of physical
232 therapists. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2019, 49: 212–5.

233 Jha B, Ross M, Reeves SW, Couzens GB, Peters SE. Measuring thumb range of motion in first
234 carpometacarpal joint arthritis: The inter-rater reliability of the Kapandji Index versus
235 goniometry. *Hand Ther.* 2016, 21: 45–53.

236 Johnson D, Newington L, Barradas R. Inter-rater and intra-rater reliability of finger
237 goniometry measured from screenshots taken via video consultation. *Open Science*
238 *Framework.* 2022. <https://osf.io/gmcwv/> (accessed May 23, 2022).

239 Kapandji A. Clinical opposition and reposition test of the thumb. *Ann Chir Main.* 1986, 5: 67–
240 73.

241 Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for
242 reliability research. *J Chiropr Med.* 2016, 15: 155–63.

243 Kooij YE van, Fink A, Sanden MWN der, Speksnijder CM. The reliability and measurement
244 error of protractor-based goniometry of the fingers: A systematic review. *J Hand Ther.* 2017,
245 30: 457–67.

246 Meislin MA, Wagner ER, Shin AY. A comparison of elbow range of motion measurements:
247 smartphone-based digital photography versus goniometric measurements. *J Hand Surg Am.*
248 2016, 41: 510-515.e1.

249 Nest DSV, Ilyas AM, Rivlin M. Telemedicine evaluation and techniques in hand surgery. *J*
250 *Hand Surg Glob Online.* 2020, 2: 240–5.

251 NHS (National Health Service). *The NHS Long Term Plan.* London UK, National Health
252 Service, 2019.

253 Statista. *Connected device penetration in the United Kingdom from 2000 to 2020*. London
254 UK, 2020. [https://www.statista.com/statistics/271851/smartphone-owners-in-the-united-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/271851/smartphone-owners-in-the-united-kingdom-uk-by-age/)
255 [kingdom-uk-by-age/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/271851/smartphone-owners-in-the-united-kingdom-uk-by-age/) (accessed November 9, 2021) Please provide web address

256 Wagner ER, Conti Mica M, Shin AY. Smartphone photography utilized to measure wrist
257 range of motion. *J Hand Surg Eur* . 2018, 43: 187–92.

258 Zhao JZ, Blazar PE, Mora AN, Earp BE. Range of Motion Measurements of the Fingers Via
259 Smartphone Photography. *Hand (N Y)*. 2020, 15: 679–85.

260

Accepted manuscript JHSE

261 **Figure Legends**

262 **Figure 1.** The screenshot of a volunteer's hand immobilized in the custom-made orthosis,
263 focusing on the middle finger for measurement

264 **Figure 2.** Examples from the measurement protocol illustrating the placement of the manual
265 goniometers against an image of a "patient's" hand

266 **Figure 3.:** A) JAMAR® Clear Goniometer; B) JAMAR® Finger/Toe Goniometer

Accepted manuscript JHSE