TABLE E-1 Coding of the Candidate Risk Factors for Recurrent Instability After a Primary Glenohumeral Dislocation

| Variable | Categories |
| :---: | :---: |
| Occupation | Sedentary work or unemployed Light work Medium work Heavy work Very heavy work |
| Gender | Male Female |
| Age cohort | 15 to 20 years 21 to 25 years 26 to 30 years 31 to 35 years |
| Dislocation side | Left Right |
| Handedness | Left Right |
| Dislocation of dominant shoulder | Dominant <br> Non-dominant |
| Injury mechanism | Fall from less than 2 meters <br> Fall from more than 2 meters <br> Sporting injury <br> Motor vehicle accident <br> Assault <br> Seizure <br> Other |
| Previous instability of other shoulder | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |
| History of dislocation in first degree relatives | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |
| Evidence of generalized ligamentous laxity | Beighton score of 4 or more (hyperlaxity) Beighton score less than 4 |
| Medical comorbidity | Present Absent |
| Compensation claim | Yes <br> No |
| Level of risk of main sport played | Nil <br> Non-contact/general fitness sports Contact or overhead sports |
| Level of participation in sport | Nil <br> Occasional/social <br> Regular amateur Professional |
| Return to sport at three months after the primary dislocation | Did not return to sports Played at reduced level Returned to full sports |
| Return to work or full activities of daily living at six weeks | Did not return Returned |
| Associated greater tuberosity fracture | Present Absent |
| Associated nerve palsy | Present Absent |
| Associated glenoid rim fracture | Present Absent |
| Size of Hill-Sachs lesion | Berganeau Grade I Berganeau Grade II Berganeau Grade III |

TABLE E-2 The Functional Scores and Range of Shoulder Movement in the 54 Patients Who Underwent Assessment at Two Years After Dislocation (for Patients Who Had Not Had Recurrent Instability) or Instability Surgery (for Patients Who Had Operative Treatment for Recurrent Instability)*

| Measurement | Total cohort ( $\mathrm{N}=54$ ) | Nonoperatively treated pts (Group I, $\mathrm{N}=23)$ | Operatively-treated pts (Group II, N=31) | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean percentage deficit in WOSI score | $\begin{aligned} & 30.6(23.4 \text { to } \\ & 37.9) \end{aligned}$ | 31.6 (18.8 to 44.4) | 29.9 (21.5 to 38.4) | 0.83 |
| Mean percentage deficit in DASH score | 5.6 (3.8 to 7.4) | 5.7 (2.6 to 8.7) | 5.6 (3.4 to 7.8) | 0.97 |
| Mean percentage deficit in range of motion compared with the contralateral shoulder |  |  |  |  |
| Abduction | 2.4 (1.1 to 3.7) | 1.3 (0.1 to 2.8) | 3.2 (1.3 to 5.1) | 0.14 |
| Flexion | 1.8 (0.5 to 3.1) | 0.9 (0.1 to 2.1) | 2.5 (0.5 to 4.5) | 0.17 |
| External rotation (arm at side) | 8.1 (4.5 to 11.6) | 3.9 (0.2 to 7.6) | 11.1 (5.7 to 16.5) | $0.04 \dagger$ |
| External rotation (90 ${ }^{\circ}$ abduction) | 6.1 (3.1 to 9.0) | 3.1 (0.1 to 6.0) | 8.3 (3.8 to 12.8) | 0.07 |
| Internal rotation ( $90^{\circ}$ abduction) | 6.5 (3.5 to 9.5) | 4.6 (0.3 to 9.0) | 7.9 (3.8 to 12.0) | 0.29 |

[^0]TABLE E-3 Summary of the Previously Published Studies on the Rate of Recurrent Instability After a First-Time Traumatic Anterior Glenohumeral Dislocation

| Study | Age range (years) | Number of patients with recurrence | Number of patients with primary dislocation | Recurrence rate (percent) | Follow-up period (average in years) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McLaughlin and Cavallaro $^{1}$$(1950)$ | Under 20 | 7 | 9 | 78 | At least 6 months |
|  | 20 to 40 | 10 | 20 | 50 |  |
| $\mathrm{Rowe}^{2}$ (1956) | Under 20 | 47 | 57 | 83 | 4.8 |
|  | 20 to 40 | 84 | 134 | 63 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Kazar and Relovszky }{ }^{38} \\ & \text { (1969) } \end{aligned}$ | Under 20 | 13 | 28 | 46 | Not stated |
|  | 21 to 40 | 11 | 35 | 31 |  |
| Kiviluoto et al. ${ }^{26}$ (1980) | 16 to 20 | 10 | 18 | 56 | 1 |
|  | 21 to 30 | 9 | 35 | 26 |  |
| Yoneda et al. ${ }^{25}$ (1982) | Average 21.5 | 18 | 104 | 17 | 13 |
| Henry and Genung ${ }^{28}$ (1982) | 12 to 32 | 106 | 121 | 88 | Not stated |
| Simonet and Cofield ${ }^{3}$ (1984) | Under 20 | 21 | 32 | 66 | 4.6 |
|  | 20 to 40 | 17 | 43 | 40 |  |
| Aronen and Regan ${ }^{12}$ (1984) | 18 to 22 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 3 |
| Wheeler et al. ${ }^{11}$ (1989) | 17 to 22 | 35 | 38 | 92 | Minimum 1 |
| Hoelen et al. ${ }^{4}$ (1990) | Under 30 | 35 | 55 | 64 | 4 |
| Marans et al. ${ }^{29} 1992$ | Under 16 | 21 | 21 | 100 | 6.6 |
| Vermeiren et al. ${ }^{31}$ (1993) | Under 20 | 15 | 22 | 68 | 4.5 |
|  | 21 to 30 | 13 | 28 | 46 |  |
| Arciero et al. ${ }^{32}$ (1994) | 18 to 21 | 12 | 15 | 80 | 2 |
| Sandow and Liu ${ }^{35}$ (1996) | 14 to 26 | 17 | 20 | 85 | 1.4 |
| Hovelius et al. ${ }^{21}$ (1996) | 12 to 40 | 118 | 247 | 48 | 10 |
| Kirkley et al. ${ }^{8}$ (1999) | 16 to 30 | 11 | 19 | 58 | Minimum 2 |
| Postacchini et al. ${ }^{30}$ (2000) | 12 to 17 | 24 | 28 | 86 | 7.1 |
| DeBerardino et al ${ }^{36}$ (2001) | 17 to 23 | 4 | 6 | 67 | 1.4 |
| Larrain et al. ${ }^{34}$ (2001) | 17 to 27 | 17 | 18 | 94 | 5.6 |
| Bottoni et al. ${ }^{33}$ (2002) | 19 to 26 | 9 | 12 | 75 | 3 |
| Kralinger et al. ${ }^{5}$ (2002) | 0 to 20 | 2 | 12 | 17 | 3.6 |
|  | 21 to 30 | 19 | 31 | 61 |  |
| Deitch et al. ${ }^{6}$ (2003) | 11 to 18 | 24 | 32 | 75 | 4 |
| Chroustovsky et al. ${ }^{31}$ (2003) | Under 30 | 13 | 20 | 65 | 2.2 |
| te Slaa et al. ${ }^{39}$ (2003) | Under 20 | 9 | 14 | 64 | 5.9 |
|  | 20 to 40 | 16 | 43 | 37 |  |
| Total |  | 772 | 1337 | 58 |  |


[^0]:    *The mean WOSI (Western Ontario Shoulder Index) and DASH (Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand) scores are expressed as a percentage deficit compared with normal function, whereas the mean ranges of shoulder movement are expressed as a percentage of the contralateral shoulder. The $95 \%$ confidence intervals are shown in parentheses. The p values refer to the unpaired $t$ test comparisons of the operatively treated and non-operatively treated groups. †The difference was significant ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ).

