



Long-Term Quality of Life after Free Flap Upper Extremity Reconstruction for Traumatic Injuries

Sara van Bekkum, MD¹  Tim de Jong, MD, PhD¹ Michiel Zuidam, MD, PhD¹
 Marc A. M. Mureau, MD, PhD¹ 

¹ Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Erasmus MC Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Address for correspondence Marc A. M. Mureau, MD, PhD, Department of Plastic, Reconstructive and Hand Surgery, Erasmus MC, University Medical Center Rotterdam, P.O. Box 2040, NL-3000 CA, Rotterdam, The Netherlands (e-mail: m.mureau@erasmusmc.nl).

J Reconstr Microsurg 2020;36:213–222.

Abstract

Background Microsurgical reconstruction of upper extremity injuries is often challenging, and the resulting impact on the quality of life (QoL) may be significant. However, there is a lack of knowledge on long-term patient-reported QoL.

Methods In a retrospective long-term follow-up study, all consecutive patients with an upper extremity injury who had undergone a free flap reconstruction were identified and categorized into three groups based on the type of injury. Patient-reported upper extremity function and QoL were assessed using three validated questionnaires: the 36-item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36), the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand (DASH) questionnaire, and the Michigan Hand Outcomes Questionnaire (MHQ).

Results A total of 61 patients were identified, of whom 10% had undergone a free flap reconstruction for soft tissue loss only, 62% for an injury accompanied by a fracture, and 28% for a (sub) total amputation. Twenty-one (44%) patients responded to the questionnaires, with a mean follow-up time of 9.7 ± 6.2 years. Patients, on average, reported poorer SF-36 “physical component score” and “role limitations due to physical health” scores compared with Dutch norms. Also, they reported poorer mean DASH scores compared with the general population, indicating worse upper extremity function. Mean MQH scores were lower for the injured side compared with the noninjured side. Pain correlated negatively with the total scores of DASH, MHQ, and SF-36.

Conclusion Free flap upper extremity reconstruction is challenging. At 10 years of follow-up, the injury and its treatment continued to have a significant impact on the upper extremity function and daily QoL, with chronic pain being an important factor negatively affecting these outcomes.

Keywords

- ▶ upper extremity
- ▶ free flap
- ▶ patient-reported outcomes

Reconstruction of upper extremity injuries is often challenging because of the high functional properties of the hand, wrist, and arm. These injuries occur in a broad range of severity, frequently affecting patients' basic daily functioning.^{1,2} Consequently, they may have a significant impact on work and social life and are therefore expensive from a personal and

socioeconomic perspective, negatively affecting the general quality of life (QoL).^{1–4}

Different treatment modalities are available for upper extremity injuries. However, complex forearm and hand injuries, specifically with soft tissue loss, often necessitate free flap reconstruction.^{5–7} Over the past decades, free flap

received
 July 22, 2019
 accepted after revision
 October 10, 2019
 published online
 November 22, 2019

Copyright © 2020 by Thieme Medical Publishers, Inc., 333 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10001, USA.
 Tel: +1(212) 760-0888.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-3400515>
 ISSN 0743-684X.

reconstruction of these complex upper extremity defects have become a reliable standard-of-care approach.^{8–10}

Most published studies on upper extremity reconstruction are retrospective with small study populations or mainly focused on surgical techniques and clinical outcomes without reporting the impact on QoL of these patients.^{11–13} Since upper extremity injuries may have a major effect on patients' functioning, patient-reported outcomes are crucial to evaluate treatment results.^{1,14} However, there is a lack of knowledge about the impact of severity of injury, treatment, and results, including postoperative complications, on long-term patient satisfaction and patient-reported outcomes after these microsurgical procedures.¹¹

Therefore, the first aim of the present study was to assess long-term patient-reported upper extremity function and QoL after free flap reconstruction of severe upper extremity injuries. The second objective was to investigate possible relationships between patient and treatment variables and patient-reported outcomes.

Methods

Study Design

The present study was a retrospective cross-sectional long-term follow-up study of all consecutive patients who had received a free flap for an upper extremity injury between January 1993 and December 2014 at the Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. The Medical Ethical Board of Erasmus MC approved the study (MEC-2016–345).

Patient Selection

Patients were included if they had undergone a free flap reconstruction following traumatic injury to the upper extremity and if surgical follow-up data of at least 30 days were available. Upper extremity free flap reconstructions for other indications were excluded.

All patients were treated following the local limb salvage protocol after traumatic upper extremity injury. Following this protocol, limb salvage is the treatment of choice. In case of traumatic amputation, feasibility for replantation is predominantly assessed based on neurovascular status. Hand and forearm amputations are always an indication for replantation. Replantation of digits occurs when two or more digits are amputated, with the exception of the thumb, which always qualifies replantation. Nerve grafts are used for nerve repair to bridge nerve gaps if necessary. Based on the length and thickness needed, the graft is harvested from the forearm (medial or lateral antebrachial cutaneous nerve) or lower leg (sural nerve). Depending on the level of bone injury, either primary fixation or arthrodesis is performed. Postoperative pain management is established on individual needs. No significant changes have been made to the protocol since its introduction.

Questionnaires were sent by mail if patients were 18 years or older, and at least 1-year follow-up was reached, or treatment had been finished. All questionnaires were sent at the same time in the spring of 2017, regardless of the time after trauma. Evaluation of patient-reported outcome measures

(PROMs) was performed at one moment in time, resulting in different follow-up times per patient. No further follow-up questionnaires were sent. When patients did not respond, a postal reminder was sent followed by a phone call. Written informed consent was obtained from all participating patients.

Medical Data

Patient-related variables were extracted from electronic medical records. Patient demographics, details of trauma, pre-, intra-, and postoperative treatment characteristics, and short- and long-term outcomes were collected. The following relevant comorbidities were scored: hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and vascular disease. The free flaps used were categorized into three groups: (1) skin grafted muscle, myocutaneous, or fasciocutaneous, (2) free bone flaps, and (3) a combination of multiple free flaps.

Patients were categorized into three groups based on the main type of traumatic injury: (1) patients with soft tissue injury only, (2) patients with injury accompanied by a bone fracture, and (3) patients with (sub) total amputation(s) at the level of the upper extremity.

Questionnaires

Patient-reported outcomes were assessed using three validated questionnaires: the 36-item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36),^{15,16} the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand (DASH) questionnaire,^{17–19} and the Michigan Hand Outcomes Questionnaire (MHQ).^{20,21} The SF-36 gives insight into the general health status of patients based on 36 questions divided into eight domains, a physical component score (PCS), and a mental component score (MCS). The raw scores vary from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating a better functional well-being.^{15,16} The perception of disabilities and symptoms of the upper extremity were evaluated with two specific upper extremity questionnaires: the DASH and MHQ. The DASH is a 30-item questionnaire including physical functioning items, symptom items, and social or role functioning items. Questions are scored on a 5-point Likert scale, and the raw score is transferred to scores ranging from 0 to 100. A higher score indicates more disabilities.^{17–19} The MHQ gives insight into the hand function based on 63 questions organized in six domains, and also separately scores the left and right hands. Questions are scored on a 5-point Likert scale, and the raw scores are transferred to scores ranging from 0 to 100, higher scores indicating a better hand function.^{20,21}

Statistical Analysis

Patient-related variables were analyzed using descriptive statistics presented as means with standard deviations or as numbers with percentages. Univariate analyses using Fisher's exact tests, and nonparametric tests were performed to identify differences between the three groups for categorical and continuous variables, respectively. Spearman's correlation coefficients were used to study relationships between different outcomes. The SF-36 scores were compared with Dutch norms using independent sample Student's *t*-tests.¹⁶ The total DASH score was compared with the normative values reported

by Hunsaker et al using independent sample Student's *t*-tests.²² No imputations were performed for missing data. Two-sided *p*-values of <0.05 were considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using the statistical software SPSS, Version 23 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY).

Results

Patient Characteristics

Sixty-one consecutive patients were identified who had undergone a free flap reconstruction for a posttraumatic upper extremity injury between January 1993 and December 2014.

In group 1, the majority were females (66.7%), in contrast to groups 2 and 3 where the majority was male (89.5 and 88.2%, respectively). Besides sex ($p = 0.012$), no statistically significant differences were found between the three groups with respect to patient demographics (►Table 1).

Injury Characteristics

The mechanisms of injury varied in group 1; in group 2, in most cases, crush injuries were part of the mechanism of injury (57.9%), and in group 3, it concerned crush (29.4%), amputation (29.4%), or blast injuries (41.2%). Besides mechanism of injury ($p < 0.001$), no statistically significant differences were found between the three groups with respect to injury characteristics (►Table 1).

Operation Characteristics

In groups 1 and 3, in all cases, a soft tissue flap was used. In group 2, the majority of reconstructions (73.7%) were with the use of a soft tissue free flap. Besides the flap type used ($p = 0.031$), no statistically significant differences were found between the three groups with respect to operation characteristics (►Table 2).

Postoperative Course and Complications

Twenty-five (40.9%) patients developed a complication, of whom 11 (18%) developed more than one complication. In total, 41 postoperative complications were identified, such as compromised vascularization of the flap (11.5%), surgical site infection (11.5%), skin necrosis (8.2%), partial flap necrosis (8.2%), and complete flap loss (9.8%).

Nineteen (31.1%) patients required reoperation for one or more complications (►Table 3). The majority (63.4%) of complications occurred during the early postoperative period when patients were still admitted to the hospital.

Complete flap loss occurred in six (9.8%) patients, of whom four had extensive crush injury due to machinery, one had extensive crush injury due to a severe traffic accident, and one had an extensive dog bite injury. In case of complete flap loss ($n = 6$), three patients received a salvage pedicled ($n = 2$) or free ($n = 1$) flap reconstruction and one patient received vacuum-assisted closure therapy after which a functional pedicled reconstruction was performed approximately 2 years later. In two cases, a secondary amputation was inevitable due to vascularization problems and progressive necrosis of the flap.

In the other two patients, a secondary amputation was inevitable due to vascular compromise of the distal upper

extremity due to the extensiveness of trauma without options for revascularization. A free flap was used as coverage of the stump.

No statistically significant differences were found between the three groups with respect to the postoperative course (►Table 3).

Patient-Reported Outcomes

Forty-eight patients were eligible for PROMs, of whom 21 (44%) responded to the questionnaires (►Fig. 1), with a mean follow-up time of 9.7 ± 6.2 years. Patients who responded to the questionnaires had a significantly higher mean age compared with those who did not respond ($p = 0.023$). Besides age, no other significant differences in patient, trauma, and postoperative characteristics were found between responders and nonresponders (►Table 4).

No statistically significant differences were found between the three groups in terms of mean SF-36 MCS ($p = 0.651$), SF-36 PCS ($p = 0.776$), DASH score ($p = 0.189$), and total MHQ score ($p = 0.413$) (►Table 5).

The severity of injury, timing of operation, level of injury, and the occurrence of postoperative complications were associated with neither the total MHQ scores of the injured hand ($p = 0.385$, $p = 0.608$, $p = 0.693$, and $p = 0.104$, respectively) nor the DASH scores ($p = 0.185$, $p = 0.802$, $p = 0.484$, and $p = 0.157$, respectively).

Patients reported significantly poorer MHQ scores of their injured side compared with their noninjured side, with a mean total hand score of 66.0 ± 23.0 versus 85.8 ± 14.7 , respectively ($p = 0.005$). Still, 57% of the patients were satisfied with the overall hand function of the injured side.

The SF-36 "bodily pain" score showed a significant correlation with the DASH score ($\rho = -0.48$; $p = 0.032$) and the total MHQ score ($\rho = 0.49$; $p = 0.037$). The raw pain score of the MHQ significantly correlated with the DASH score ($\rho = 0.56$; $p = 0.017$) but not with PCS ($\rho = -0.35$; $p = 0.139$) and MCS ($\rho = -0.23$; $p = 0.339$).

Patients from the current study, on average, reported poorer DASH scores (24.2 ± 23.5) compared with the general population ($p = 0.015$). Furthermore, patients reported much poorer SF-36 PCS and "role limitations due to physical health" scores compared with Dutch norms ($p = 0.004$ and $p = 0.016$, respectively). For the other SF-36 domains and MCS, no differences were found (►Table 6).

Discussion

Severe traumatic upper extremity injuries pose a challenge in preserving the upper limb and often necessitate microvascular reconstruction. These reconstructions are necessary not only for soft tissue repair, but also to maintain an adequate upper extremity function. Nevertheless, knowledge on the outcomes after microsurgical reconstruction of these extensive upper extremity injuries, including long-term patient-reported outcomes, is missing. The current study showed that after more than 10 years follow-up, patients reported poorer QoL and functional outcomes compared with the general population. However, these results were not related to operation

Table 1 Patient characteristics of 61 patients with a free flap reconstruction for a severe posttraumatic upper extremity injury

	Soft tissue injury only (n = 6)	(Open) fracture (n = 38)	(Sub) total amputation (n = 17)	p-Value
Mean age ± SD, y	40.0 ± 5.9	36.6 ± 15.2	38.2 ± 15.8	0.854
Mean BMI ± SD, kg/m ²	22.7 ± 2.9	24.6 ± 4.0	23.9 ± 6.6	0.719
Sex				
Male	2 (33.3%)	34 (89.5%)	15 (88.2%)	0.012
Female	4 (66.7%)	4 (10.5%)	2 (11.8%)	
Smoker				
No	3 (50.0%)	22 (61.1%)	11 (73.3%)	0.550
Yes	3 (50.0%)	14 (38.9%)	4 (26.7%)	
Comorbidities				
No	6 (100%)	34 (89.5%)	16 (94.1%)	0.493
Yes		4 (10.5%)	1 (5.9%)	
Injured side				
Left	3 (50.0%)	20 (52.6%)	12 (70.6%)	0.418
Right	3 (50.0%)	18 (47.4%)	5 (29.4%)	
Dominant side injured				
No	2 (33.3%)	18 (47.4%)	11 (73.3%)	0.393
Yes	2 (33.3%)	15 (39.5%)	3 (17.6%)	
Unknown	2 (33.3%)	5 (13.2%)	3 (17.6%)	
Location of defect				
Upper arm/elbow	1 (16.7%)	3 (7.9%)	1 (5.9%)	0.633
Forearm	2 (33.3%)	13 (34.2%)	3 (17.6%)	
Wrist/hand	3 (50.0%)	22 (57.9%)	13 (76.5%)	
Extension trauma				
Trauma limited to the upper extremity	6 (100%)	34 (89.5%)	15 (88.2%)	0.514
Polytrauma		4 (10.5%)	2 (11.8%)	
Mechanism of injury				
Crush	1 (16.7%)	16 (42.1%)	5 (29.4%)	<0.001
Avulsion	1 (16.7%)	1 (2.6%)		
Degloving		3 (7.9%)		
Crush and degloving	1 (16.7%)	4 (10.5%)		
Crush and avulsion		2 (5.3%)		
Amputation		1 (2.6%)	5 (29.4%)	
Firework/blast injury		2 (5.3%)	7 (41.2%)	
Sharp/bite injury	2 (33.3%)	1 (7.9%)		
Burn injury	1 (16.7%)			
Bone fracture		6 (15.8%)		

Abbreviation: SD, standard deviation.

Note: The significant value is shown in bold.

indication, complications, severity of injury, level of injury, and timing of operation. As expected, chronic pain correlated with poorer functional outcomes and the injured side obviously was associated with poorer results compared with the uninjured side. Still, a majority of the patients were satisfied with the obtained results.

Severe upper extremity injuries typically need complex and extensive surgery, leading to long operative times, prolonged hospitalization, and an increased risk of complications. In the current study, 11% of the patients developed a postoperative surgical site infection, all at the recipient site. In the available literature, postoperative infections after free

Table 2 Operation characteristics of 61 patients with a free flap reconstruction for a severe posttraumatic upper extremity injury

	Soft tissue injury only (n = 6)	(Open) fracture (n = 38)	(Sub) total amputation (n = 17)	p-Value
Operation time, hours:minutes	9:27 ± 2:59	10:58 ± 3:57	10:33 ± 2:52	0.600
Ischemia time, hours:minutes	1:22 ± 0:45	1:31 ± 0:44	1:31 ± 0:58	0.917
Indication for free flap				
Soft tissue defect	5 (83.3%)	26 (68.4%)	15 (88.2%)	0.231
Functional reconstruction	1 (16.7%)	12 (31.6%)	2 (11.8%)	
Specification functional reconstruction				
Nerve and tendon reconstruction		3 (7.9%)	1 (5.9%)	0.404
First web space reconstruction		1 (2.6%)		
Posttraumatic arthroses/nonunion with pain/functional limitations	1 (16.7%)	7 (18.4%)		
Stabilization and nerve reconstruction		1 (2.6%)		
Tendon reconstruction + soft tissue defect			1 (5.9%)	
Timing of operation				
< 6 wk	5 (83.3%)	24 (63.2%)	13 (76.5%)	0.362
> 6 wk	1 (16.7%)	13 (34.2%)	3 (17.6%)	
Flap type				
Soft tissue flap	6 (100%)	28 (73.7%)	17(100%)	0.031
Bone flap		9 (23.7%)		
Combination of multiple flaps		1 (2.6%)		
Type of arterial anastomosis				
End-to-side	1 (16.7%)	16 (42.1%)	9 (52.9%)	0.265
End-to-end	4 (66.7%)	13 (34.2%)	6 (35.3%)	
Missing	1 (16.7%)	9 (23.7%)	2 (11.8%)	
Type of venous anastomosis				
End-to-side		2 (5.3%)	2 (11.8%)	0.496
End-to-end	5 (83.3%)	28 (73.7%)	13 (76.5%)	
Missing	1 (16.7%)	8 (21.1%)	2 (11.8%)	

Note: The significant value is shown in bold.

flap reconstruction of upper extremity injuries have been reported in 7 to 28% patients.^{5,10,12,13,23}

In line with previous studies, the complete free flap survival rate in the present study was 90%.^{10,24,25} The majority of the patients with total flap loss had severe and extensive crush injuries. In case of vascular flap compromise, the flap salvage rate after reexploration was 54%, which is in line with our previous study on risk factors for free flap failure in 1,530 free flaps.²⁶

Following microsurgical reconstruction of severe upper extremity injuries, the affected limb often keeps suffering from functional impairment,^{8,10,27} which has been previously found by other studies using PROMs.²⁸⁻³² Although the reported DASH scores (8-71) and MHQ scores (47-77) ranged considerably, all authors emphasized limb preservation as the treatment of choice.²⁸⁻³² Our results corroborate these findings and support the statement that extensive reconstruction is the preferred and often the only treatment possible for limb and/or function preservation. Although the

mean DASH scores (24) and the mean total MHQ scores (66) from the present study imply significant functional impairment, over half of the patients reported to be satisfied. This satisfaction may indicate the effect of coping after such severe trauma.³³⁻³⁶ The patient-reported upper extremity function and QoL, which in the current study were poorer compared with the general population, indicate the long-term impact on daily functioning of severe upper extremity injuries and stresses the need for good patient counseling and patient expectation management.³⁷

Pain appeared to be an important factor that negatively affected long-term functional outcomes and QoL. The results of the present study showed a negative correlation between chronic pain and total scores of the DASH, MHQ, and SF-36. This is in accordance with previous studies, which also reported chronic pain as a long-term disabling symptom after extremity injuries.^{4,38,39} Therefore, early adequate pain management is advocated to improve long-term functional outcomes and QoL.^{4,39} Besides pain, no other significant predictive factors

Table 3 Postoperative admission time and complications of 61 patients with a free flap reconstruction for a severe posttraumatic upper extremity injury

	Soft tissue injury only (n = 6)	(Open) fracture (n = 38)	(Sub) total amputation (n = 17)	p-Value
Admission, d	28.7 ± 20.5	19.7 ± 14.3	19.8 ± 10.8	0.476
Postoperative complication				
No	3 (50.0%)	24 (63.2%)	9 (52.9%)	0.695
Yes	3 (50.0%)	14 (36.8%)	8 (47.1%)	
Reoperation due to complication				
No	1 (16.7%)	2 (5.3%)	3 (17.6%)	0.435
Yes	2 (33.3%)	12 (31.6%)	5 (29.4%)	
Complications that required reoperation				
Vascular compromise flap	1 (16.7%)	6 (15.8%)	4 (23.5%)	
Partial flap necrosis	1 (16.7%)	2 (5.3%)	1 (5.9%)	
Total flap loss	1 (16.7%)	5 (13.2%)		
Infection		1 (2.6%)		
Other		3 (7.9%)		
Total flap loss				
No	5 (83.3%)	33 (86.8%)	17 (100%)	0.121
Yes	1 (16.7%)	5 (13.2%)		
Secondary amputation				
No	6 (100%)	35 (92.1%)	16 (94.1%)	0.617
Yes		3 (7.9%)	1 (5.9%)	


**Fig. 1** Flowchart of the responders to the patient-reported outcome measures. Group 1: patients with soft tissue injury only. Group 2: patients with injury accompanied by a bone fracture. Group 3: patients with (sub) total amputation(s) at the level of the upper extremity.

Table 4 Characteristics of 27 nonresponders compared with 21 responders with a free flap reconstruction for a severe posttraumatic upper extremity injury

	Nonresponders (n = 27)	Responders (n = 21)	p-Value
Mean age ± SD, y	32.4 ± 13.6	41.7 ± 13.3	0.023
Mean follow-up time ± SD, y	10.1 ± 6.2	9.7 ± 6.2	0.851
Sex			
Male	25 (92.6%)	15 (71.4%)	0.115
Female	2 (7.4%)	6 (28.6%)	
Smoker			
No	13 (52.0%)	13 (65.0%)	0.380
Yes	12 (48.0%)	7 (35.0%)	
Comorbidities			
No	25 (92.6%)	20 (95.2%)	1.000
Yes	2 (7.4%)	1 (4.8%)	
Type of injury			
Soft tissue injury only	1 (3.7%)	3 (14.3%)	0.374
Fracture	19 (70.4%)	12 (57.1%)	
(sub) total amputation	7 (25.9%)	6 (28.6%)	
Dominant side injured			
No	14 (51.9%)	11 (52.4%)	0.626
Yes	8 (29.6%)	8 (38.1%)	
Unknown	5 (18.5%)	2 (9.5%)	
Extension trauma			
Trauma limited to the upper extremity	25 (92.6%)	18 (85.7%)	0.641
Polytrauma	2 (7.4%)	3 (14.3%)	
Timing of operation			
< 6 wk	17 (65.4%)	14 (70.0%)	0.741
> 6 wk	9 (34.6%)	6 (30.0%)	
Complicated course			
No	16 (59.3%)	13 (61.9%)	0.853
Yes	11 (40.7%)	8 (38.1%)	

Abbreviation: SD, standard deviation.
 Note: The significant value is shown in bold.

Table 5 Long-term patient-reported outcomes of 21 patients with a free flap reconstruction for a severe posttraumatic upper extremity injury

	Soft tissue injury only (n = 3)	(Open) fracture (n = 12)	(Sub) total amputation (n = 6)	p-Value
SF-36 PCS, mean ± SD	43.7 ± 9.9	46.1 ± 8.3	42.6 ± 12.3	0.776
SF-36 MCS, mean ± SD	46.8 ± 14.0	53.6 ± 10.7	51.2 ± 10.7	0.651
DASH total score, mean ± SD	30.3 ± 30.6	17.0 ± 21.8	34.2 ± 22.9	0.189
MHQ total score of the injured side, mean ± SD	76.0 ± 5.0	68.7 ± 26.3	55.9 ± 17.4	0.413

Abbreviations: DASH, Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand questionnaire; MHQ, Michigan Hand outcomes Questionnaire; MCS, mental component score; PCS, physical component score; SD, standard deviation; SF-36, 36-item Short-Form Health Survey.

for a poor functional outcome could be identified, possibly due to the low power of the current study.

The response rate to the questionnaires was rather low despite reminder phone calls and a second mailing. The low

response rate can be explained by factors associated with nonresponse, such as younger age, and male sex, since the majority of the current study population were young males.^{40,41} Other studies reported poorer outcomes of nonresponders than

Table 6 SF-36 and DASH patient-reported outcomes of 21 patients with a free flap reconstruction for a severe posttraumatic upper extremity injury compared with the general population

	Study population	General population	<i>p</i> -Value
SF-36: physical functioning			
<i>n</i>	21	1,718	0.279
Mean ± standard deviation	79.2 ± 16.3	83.2 ± 22.6	
SF-36: role limitations due to physical health			
<i>n</i>	21	1,693	0.004
Mean ± standard deviation	53.6 ± 43.5	76.6 ± 36.1	
SF-36: bodily pain			
<i>N</i>	21	1,729	0.059
Mean ± standard deviation	65.3 ± 26.5	75.0 ± 23.3	
SF-36: role limitation due to emotional problems			
<i>N</i>	21	1,686	0.835
Mean ± standard deviation	81.0 ± 37.4	82.5 ± 32.8	
SF-36: general health perception			
<i>N</i>	21	1,705	0.859
Mean ± standard deviation	70.1 ± 18.2	70.9 ± 20.6	
SF-36: vitality			
<i>N</i>	21	1,715	0.654
Mean ± standard deviation	66.7 ± 19.2	68.6 ± 19.3	
SF-36: social functioning			
<i>N</i>	21	1,729	0.308
Mean ± standard deviation	79.2 ± 25.4	84.2 ± 22.3	
SF-36: mental health			
<i>N</i>	21	1,714	0.448
Mean ± standard deviation	74.0 ± 18.1	76.9 ± 17.4	
SF-36: PCS			
<i>N</i>	21	1,657	0.016
Mean ± standard deviation	44.7 ± 9.4	50.0 ± 10.0	
SF-36: MCS			
<i>N</i>	21	1,657	0.363
Mean ± standard deviation	52.0 ± 10.8	50.0 ± 10.0	
DASH: total score			
<i>N</i>	20	1,706	0.015
Mean ± standard deviation	24.2 ± 23.5	10.1 ± 14.7	

Abbreviations: DASH, Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand questionnaire; MCS, mental component score; PCS, physical component score; SF-36, 36-item Short-Form Health Survey.

Note: The significant value is shown in bold.

responders.^{42,43} However, besides older age, no differences in patient, clinical, and operation characteristics were found between responders and nonresponders. Therefore, we presume that responders were representative of the entire patient cohort.

This study was limited by its retrospective design, which resulted in missing data. Although no statistically significant differences were found, these missing data in combination with the rather low response rate could have resulted in some bias. Another limitation was the large variation in patients and

their injury and operation characteristics. Based on the type of injury, patients were categorized into three groups to be able to make meaningful comparisons. However, there still remained large intragroup variations in the mechanisms of injury, severity of injury, extensiveness of injury, and operation characteristics, probably causing a large variation in clinical and patient-reported outcomes. However, the power of the current study was too small to correct for these variations and perform multivariate analysis. Therefore, these outcomes should be interpreted with care.

Conclusion

Free flap reconstruction of severe upper extremity injuries is an effective method to manage extensive posttraumatic defects of the upper extremity. At 10 years of follow-up, the injury and its treatment continued to have a clear impact on daily QoL, with chronic pain being an important factor negatively affecting functional outcomes and QoL.

Funding
None.

Conflict of Interest
None declared.

References

- Hegge T, Neumeister MW. Mutilated hand injuries. *Clin Plast Surg* 2011;38(04):543–550
- Rosberg HE, Carlsson KS, Dahlin LB. Prospective study of patients with injuries to the hand and forearm: costs, function, and general health. *Scand J Plast Reconstr Surg Hand Surg* 2005;39(06):360–369
- Matsuzaki H, Narisawa H, Miwa H, Toishi S. Predicting functional recovery and return to work after mutilating hand injuries: usefulness of Campbell's Hand Injury Severity Score. *J Hand Surg Am* 2009;34(05):880–885
- Meyer TM. Psychological aspects of mutilating hand injuries. *Hand Clin* 2003;19(01):41–49
- Harrison BL, Lakhiani C, Lee MR, Saint-Cyr M. Timing of traumatic upper extremity free flap reconstruction: a systematic review and progress report. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2013;132(03):591–596
- Stevanovic M, Sharpe F. Functional free muscle transfer for upper extremity reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2014;134(02):257e–274e
- Bumbasirevic M, Stevanovic M, Lesic A, Atkinson HD. Current management of the mangled upper extremity. *Int Orthop* 2012;36(11):2189–2195
- Panattoni JB, Ahmed MM, Busel GA. An ABC technical algorithm to treat the mangled upper extremity: systematic surgical approach. *J Hand Surg Am* 2017;42(11):934.e1–934.e10
- Dolan RT, Butler JS, Murphy SM, Cronin KJ. Health-related quality of life, surgical and aesthetic outcomes following microvascular free flap reconstructions: an 8-year institutional review. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2012;94(01):43–51
- Prasarn ML, Helfet DL, Kloen P. Management of the mangled extremity. *Strateg Trauma Limb Reconstr* 2012;7(02):57–66
- Cano SJ, Browne JP, Lamping DL. Patient-based measures of outcome in plastic surgery: current approaches and future directions. *Br J Plast Surg* 2004;57(01):1–11
- Gupta A, Lakhiani C, Lim BH, et al. Free tissue transfer to the traumatized upper extremity: risk factors for postoperative complications in 282 cases. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg* 2015;68(09):1184–1190
- Derderian CA, Olivier WA, Baux G, Levine J, Gurtner GC. Microvascular free-tissue transfer for traumatic defects of the upper extremity: a 25-year experience. *J Reconstr Microsurg* 2003;19(07):455–462
- Wormald JCR, Rodrigues JN. Outcome measurement in plastic surgery. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg* 2018;71(03):283–289
- Ware JE Jr, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care* 1992;30(06):473–483
- Aaronson NK, Muller M, Cohen PD, et al. Translation, validation, and norming of the Dutch language version of the SF-36 Health Survey in community and chronic disease populations. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1998;51(11):1055–1068
- Hudak PL, Amadio PC, Bombardier C; The Upper Extremity Collaborative Group (UECG). Development of an upper extremity outcome measure: the DASH (Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand) [corrected]. *Am J Ind Med* 1996;29(06):602–608
- 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. *J Hand Ther* 2001;14(02):128–146
- Veehof MM, Slegers EJ, van Veldhoven NH, Schuurman AH, van Meeteren NL. Psychometric qualities of the Dutch language version of the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand questionnaire (DASH-DLV). *J Hand Ther* 2002;15(04):347–354
- Chung KC, Pillsbury MS, Walters MR, Hayward RA. Reliability and validity testing of the Michigan Hand Outcomes Questionnaire. *J Hand Surg Am* 1998;23(04):575–587
- Chung KC, Hamill JB, Walters MR, Hayward RA. The Michigan Hand Outcomes Questionnaire (MHQ): assessment of responsiveness to clinical change. *Ann Plast Surg* 1999;42(06):619–622
- Hunsaker FG, Cioffi DA, Amadio PC, Wright JG, Caughlin B. The American academy of orthopaedic surgeons outcomes instruments: normative values from the general population. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2002;84(02):208–215
- Hsu CC, Lin YT, Lin CH, Lin CH, Wei FC. Immediate emergency free anterolateral thigh flap transfer for the mutilated upper extremity. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2009;123(06):1739–1747
- Sauerbier M, Ofer N, Germann G, Baumeister S. Microvascular reconstruction in burn and electrical burn injuries of the severely traumatized upper extremity. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2007;119(02):605–615
- Godina M. Early microsurgical reconstruction of complex trauma of the extremities. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1986;78(03):285–292
- Las DE, de Jong T, Zuidam JM, Verweij NM, Hovius SER, Mureau MAM. Identification of independent risk factors for flap failure: a retrospective analysis of 1530 free flaps for breast, head and neck and extremity reconstruction. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg* 2016;69(07):894–906
- Malahias M, Jordan DJ, Hindocha S, Khan W, Juma A. The development and future of reconstructive and microvascular surgery of the hand. *Open Orthop J* 2014;8(01):415–422
- Chung KC, Yoon AP, Malay S, Shauver MJ, Wang L, Kaur S; FRANCHISE Group. Patient-reported and functional outcomes after revision amputation and replantation of digit amputations: the FRANCHISE multicenter international retrospective cohort study. *JAMA Surg* 2019;154(07):637–646
- Sabapathy SR, Satbhai NG. Microsurgery in the urgent and emergent management of the hand. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med* 2014;7(01):40–46
- Pet MA, Morrison SD, Mack JS, et al. Comparison of patient-reported outcomes after traumatic upper extremity amputation: replantation versus prosthetic rehabilitation. *Injury* 2016;47(12):2783–2788
- Stanger K, Horch RE, Dragu A. Severe mutilating injuries with complex macroamputations of the upper extremity - is it worth the effort? *World J Emerg Surg* 2015;10:30
- Kremer T, Bickert B, Germann G, Heitmann C, Sauerbier M. Outcome assessment after reconstruction of complex defects of the forearm and hand with osteocutaneous free flaps. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2006;118(02):443–454, discussion 455–456
- George JM, Scott DS, Turner SP, Gregg JM. The effects of psychological factors and physical trauma on recovery from oral surgery. *J Behav Med* 1980;3(03):291–310
- Jayakumar P, Overbeek CL, Lamb S, et al. What factors are associated with disability after upper extremity injuries? A systematic review. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2018;476(11):2190–2215

- 35 Giladi AM, Ranganathan K, Chung KC. Measuring functional and patient-reported outcomes after treatment of mutilating hand injuries: a global health approach. *Hand Clin* 2016;32(04):465–475
- 36 Chan J, Spencer J. Adaptation to hand injury: an evolving experience. *Am J Occup Ther* 2004;58(02):128–139
- 37 Galanakos SP, Bot AG, Zoubos AB, Soucacos PN. Psychological and social consequences after reconstruction of upper extremity trauma: methods of detection and management. *J Reconstr Microsurg* 2014;30(03):193–206
- 38 Gustafsson M, Hagberg L, Holmefur M. Ten years follow-up of health and disability in people with acute traumatic hand injury: pain and cold sensitivity are long-standing problems. *J Hand Surg Eur Vol* 2011;36(07):590–598
- 39 Egeler SA, de Jong T, Luijsterburg AJM, Mureau MAM. Long-term patient-reported outcomes following free flap lower extremity reconstruction for traumatic injuries. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2018;141(03):773–783
- 40 Aerny-Perreten N, Domínguez-Berjón MF, Esteban-Vasallo MD, García-Riolobos C. Participation and factors associated with late or non-response to an online survey in primary care. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2015;21(04):688–693
- 41 Hutchings A, Neuburger J, Grosse Frie K, Black N, van der Meulen J. Factors associated with non-response in routine use of patient reported outcome measures after elective surgery in England. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2012;10:34
- 42 Kim J, Lonner JH, Nelson CL, Lotke PA. Response bias: effect on outcomes evaluation by mail surveys after total knee arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2004;86(01):15–21
- 43 Bot AGJ, Anderson JA, Neuhaus V, Ring D. Factors associated with survey response in hand surgery research. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2013;471(10):3237–3242