

## Supplementary article data

# Arthroplasty for tenosynovial giant cell tumors

## 17 patients followed for 0.2 to 15 years

Floortje G M VERSPOOR, Gerjon HANNINK, Anouk SCHOLTE, Ingrid C M VAN DER GEEST,  
and H W Bart SCHREUDER

Department of Orthopedics, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Correspondence: floorverspoor@gmail.com

Submitted 2016-02-06. Accepted 2016-05-03.

Table 3. Quality of life in SF-36 scores for t-GCT patients after arthroplasty

ID	Follow-up, years	Physical functioning	Social functioning	Role physical	SF-36 score		Mental health	Vitality	Bodily pain	General health	Health change
					Role emotional						
Knee											
5	4.0	90	100	100	100		72	60	67	85	50
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
22	5	70	100	0	100		56	35	33	45	50
32	0.2	25	0	0	67		72	75	10	60	25
40	7.8	85	100	75	100		80	55	67	30	25
44	4.4	45	100	100	100		NA	35	80	45	50
56	5.4	85	100	100	100		84	70	100	NA	50
69	4.0	70	87.5	100	100		88	60	80	70	100
75	10.8	35	25	0	0		24	25	33	0	25
105	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
120	2.3	35	25	0	0		28	40	45	15	25
132	2.1	95	100	75	67		80	65	67	55	50
Hip											
1	10.2	90	100	100	100		76	75	70	50	50
3	6.3	100	100	100	100		76	25	100	50	50
34	7.0	100	100	100	100		88	90	100	90	50
92	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
115	14.6	40	37.5	0	100		56	40	10	50	50
General population											
mean		82	87	79	84		77	67	80	73	52
(SD)		(23)	(21)	(36)	(32)		(18)	(20)	(26)	(23)	(19)

SF-36: the 36-item Short Form health survey; NA: not available.

A low score indicates a score more than 1 SD below the mean for the general population.

**Table 4. Quality of life (as reflected by CIS20r scores) at the last follow-up, for t-GCT patients after arthroplasty**

ID	Follow-up, years	CIS20r				Total
		Fatigue	Concentration	Motivation	Physical	
<b>Knee</b>						
5	4.0	8	5	4	3	20
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
22	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
32	0.2	27	12	13	21	73
40	7.8	21	8	4	10	43
44	4.4	18	5	21	11	55
56	5.4	9	5	4	5	23
69	4.0	9	5	4	4	22
75	10.8	50	30	23	17	120
105	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
120	2.3	33	21	13	13	80
132	2.1	17	11	4	3	35
<b>Hip</b>						
1	10.2	18	10	8	9	45
3	6.3	16	5	5	4	30
34	7.0	12	5	4	7	28
92	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
115	14.6	45	19	18	18	100
<b>Healthy individuals mean (SD)</b>		17 (10)	10 (5)	8 (4)	7 (5)	42 (20)

CIS20r: 20-item Checklist Individual Strength questionnaire; NA: not available. High scores (> 1 SD above the mean for healthy individuals) indicate a high level of fatigue, a high level of concentration problems, low motivation, or a low level of physical activity.

**Table 5. Joint function (as reflected by Harris hip score) for t-GCT patients after implantation of a hip prosthesis**

ID	Follow-up, years	Harris hip score
1	7.9	90
3	6.3	95
34	4.0	95
92	9.9	99
115	12.5	77

In the Harris hip score (HHS), activities of daily living and gait account for 47 points, pain for 44, joint movement for 5, and absence of deformity for 4 (giving 100 points in total). Harris defined 90–100 points as being excellent, 80–90 as being good, 70–80 as being fair, and below 70 as being poor.

**Table 6. Joint function (reflected by WOMAC and KSS scores) for t-GCT patients after knee arthroplasty**

ID	Follow-up, years	WOMAC <sup>a</sup>				KSS <sup>b</sup>		Total
		Pain	Stiffness	Physical	Total	Object	Function	
5	4.0	75	75	77	76	87	80	167
7	1.7	65	63	85	79	84	90	174
22	0.5	70	75	69	70	71	55	126
32	0.2	70	50	57	59	53	40	93
40	6.8	95	100	99	98	94	100	194
44	5.3	75	50	66	67	88	40	128
56	3.0	100	100	88	92	93	80	173
69	4.0	85	75	88	87	84	90	174
75	10.8	30	0	22	22	53	50	103
105	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
120	2.3	45	38	47	46	53	50	103
132	2.1	95	75	96	94	94	100	194

NA: not available.

<sup>a</sup> WOMAC: standardized Western Ontario and McMaster Universities osteoarthritis index. In the (0–100) sum scores, higher values indicate less pain, less stiffness, or better physical function.

<sup>b</sup> KSS: Knee Society score was defined as follows: excellent (80–100), good (70–79), fair (60–69), and poor (< 60).