

1 Epidemiology of Door Crush Injuries- A retrospective cohort study of South Indian
2 Population in a Tertiary care center

3

4 Title Page

5 1. Name : Dr.Ashwin KRISHNAMOORTHY

6 Position : Junior Resident

7 Department : Department of Hand Surgery

8 Affiliation : Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and Research

9 Institutional address :No 1, Ramachandra Nagar, Sri Ramachandra
10 Nagar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600116

11 Ph No : +919003834944

12 Email : winash_001@hotmail.com

13

14 2. Name : Dr.Maithreyi SETHU

15 Position : Assistant Professor

16 Department : Department of Hand Surgery

17 Affiliation : Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and Research

18 Institutional address :No 1, Ramachandra Nagar, Sri Ramachandra
19 Nagar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600116

20 Ph no : +919786577369

21 Email : maithreyi.sethu@gmail.com

22

23 3. Name : Dr.Singaravelu VISWANATHAN

24 Position : Assistant Professor

25 Department : Department of Plastic Surgery

26 Affiliation : Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and Research

27 Institutional address :No 1, Ramachandra Nagar, Sri Ramachandra

28 Nagar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600116

29 Ph no : +919944338822

30 Email : drvsvplastic@gmail.com

31

32

33

34 4. Name : Dr.Srinivasan RAJAPPA

35 Position : Head of Department

36 Department : Department of Hand Surgery

37 Affiliation : Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and Research

38 Institutional address :No 1, Ramachandra Nagar, Sri Ramachandra

39 Nagar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600116

40 Ph : +919791193230

41 Email : d334102@gmail.com

42

43

44 5. Name : Dr. Sathishkumar JAYARAM

45 Position : Head of Department

46 Department : Department of Plastic Surgery

47 Affiliation : Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and Research

48 Institutional address :No 1, Ramachandra Nagar, Sri Ramachandra

49 Nagar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India – 600116

50 Ph no : +919840092048

51 Email : Jsk.plastic@gmail.com

52

53

54 Corresponding Author

55

56 Name : Dr.Maithreyi SETHU

57 Permanent Address : No 19, 6th Cross street, Lake area, Nungambakkam, Chennai,

58 Tamil Nadu, India 600034

59 Present Address : No 19, 6th Cross street, Lake area, Nungambakkam, Chennai,

60 Tamil Nadu, India 600034

61 E-mail Address : maithreyi.sethu@gmail.com

62 Telephone number : +919786577369

63 Fax Number : -

64

65 Abstract

66 More than half of the fingertip injuries in children are due to door jamming injuries.¹⁾²⁾

67 There have been several studies on door crush injuries (DCI) but they pertain to

68 either the paediatric age group or form a part of study of fingertip injuries in a large

69 population. This article caters solely to studying the epidemiology, mechanism of

70 injury, associated risk factors and suggests few simple techniques to avoid DCI.

71

72 Materials:

73 Comparative analysis of the epidemiological data of all the patients with door crush

74 injuries who presented to the Emergencies and the Out Patient Department in the

75 Tertiary care centre was obtained from the MRD. This is a retrospective cohort

76 study between January 2021 to December 2021. Patients with serious concomitant
77 injuries, machine crush injury, heavy falling objects, window crush injury were
78 excluded from the study.

79

80 Results:

81 Of the 34 patients, 27 were male and 7 females. In 33 patients DCI was in the hinge
82 side while only 1 had lock-side, entrance door being the commonest. 35% had first-
83 aid done in a local nursing home before arriving at the hospital. 4 patients left
84 against medical advice, 4 were conservatively treated and 2 had double finger injury.
85 DCI was most common in preschool children. Right side and middle finger were
86 most susceptible. 25% of the injuries happened on Mondays. Of the 36 fingers
87 injured, 69% had pulp, 58% had nailbed and 22% had bony involvement. Primary
88 suturing, local flap cover and K-wiring were the main modalities of treatment.
89 Complications included altered sensation, nail deformity and contracture.

90

91

92 Conclusion:

93 Door crush injury is a major contributor for finger crush injuries in both children and
94 adults. Awareness among parents, the use of safety appliances to prevent
95 accidental door closing, counselling by doctors and nurses greatly help to bring down
96 the number of door crush injuries.

97

98

99

100

101 Epidemiology of Door Crush Injuries- A retrospective cohort study of South Indian

102 Population in a Tertiary care center

103

104 Background

105 Doors have been an integral part of human evolution from the time of Egyptians –

106 about 4000 years ago. Sliding and double doors have existed in Roman temples as

107 early as 79 AD. Doors continue to form a vital part of our lives providing us privacy,

108 security and aesthetic benefit. Associated with the advent of doors was the rise in

109 door-related injuries. They came to be known popularly as door crush injuries (DCI).

110 DCI commonly cause fingertip injuries in children as well as adults.

111

112 There are two main varieties of DCI – lock side and the hinge side door crush

113 injuries. It has been found that younger children (<10 years) tend to crush their

114 fingers more on the hinge side (53%) and older children (>10 years) on the lock side

115 (55%) of the door.^{3) 1)}

116 Hand injuries account for nearly 10% of all cases in emergency departments (ED).⁴⁾

117 In the paediatric population, it is found that hand injuries accounted for 1.8-2%^{5) 6)} of

118 attendance in the children's emergency department and out of these, 21-46% were

119 fingertip injuries.^{6) 7)} Nearly half or more of the fingertip injuries in children were due

120 to door jamming injuries.¹⁾²⁾

121 Approximately 4.8 million emergency visits in the USA are attributed to fingertip

122 injuries. India does not have similar statistics,⁸⁾ yet these voluminous figures portray

123 an idea of the magnitude of DCI in all parts of the world.

124

125 There have been several studies on DCI^{5, 8-10}) but they pertain to either the
126 paediatric age group or form a part of study of fingertip injuries in a large population.
127 This article caters solely to studying the epidemiology, possible mechanism of injury,
128 associated risk factors and suggests few simple techniques to avoid door crush
129 injuries.

130

131

132 **Patients and Methods**

133 The data of all the patients with door crush injuries who presented to the Emergency
134 and Out Patient Departments in a Tertiary care centre in South India was obtained
135 from the Medical Record Department. This is a retrospective study spanning over
136 one year from January 2021 to December 2021.

137 Objectives: To study the epidemiology of door crush injuries in a tertiary care centre
138 in South India.

139 Inclusion Criteria:

140 Patients of all age groups with door crush injuries within 2 days of the trauma.

141 Exclusion Criteria:

142 Patients with concomitant serious injuries, other aetiologies of crush such as
143 machine crush injury of heavy falling objects and cut injuries, window crush injury
144 were excluded from the study.

145 Patients with chronic wounds and those treated for the door crush injury in other
146 hospitals were also excluded.

147 All the surgeries were performed by highly experienced surgeons, from the
148 departments of Hand Surgery and Plastic Surgery. The patients were followed for a
149 period of 3 months minimum. Recall bias was avoided by documenting all the

150 findings during the admission and the OPD visits in the follow-up period using
151 tabulated proformas. Loss of follow-up was minimised by telemedicine using audio-
152 visual phone calls. The study was approved by the Institutional Ethical Committee.
153 All the data was collected and analysed using ratios, graphs and charts to calculate
154 the statistics of the epidemiology.

155

156 **Results**

157 There were 34 patients in total and all of them presented in the Emergency
158 Department.

159

- 160 • Most common age group for door crush injury was between 0-5 years which
161 constituted 35% of the case load. There was also another peak in the 21-25
162 years age group making up 14.7% of the total population of DCI.
- 163 • It was found that (Fig 1) in the first three years of age the incidence of DCI
164 was maximum.

165

166 Figure 1: No. of cases of DCI vs Age

167

- 168 • The Male: Female sex ratio was found to be 27:7.
- 169 • Two patients had DCI involving two fingers. In both scenarios middle and ring
170 fingers were injured, the rest had only single finger injury.
- 171 • Ratio of percentage of finger involvement

172 Middle - 11 30.6%

173 Index - 9 25%

174 Little - 8 22.2%

175 Ring - 6 16.7%

176 Thumb 2 5.56%

177

- 178 • DCI were more common on the right side, 21 right vs 13 left.
- 179 • Mode of injury: Hinge side injuries were predominant as compared to the lock
- 180 side with 33 on the side of the Hinge and only 1 on the lock-side.
- 181 • Car door vs house door (Table 1): 11.8% of the injuries were due to vehicle
- 182 door crush while a majority 76% was due to door crush injury in their
- 183 residence. Of these, 44% were entrance doors and 21%-bedroom doors.

184

185 Table 1: Doors involved in door crush injuries

DOOR INVOLVED IN THE INJURY	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE OF CASES
Bathroom	4	11.76
Entrance	15	44.12
Bedroom	7	20.59
Car Door	3	8.82
Bus	1	2.94
Gate	4	11.76
Total	34	100

186

- 187 • Place of injury: Home was the most common site at which the injury occurred.
188 This is most probably due to Covid when many people were working from
189 home and there was no school for most of the study period.
- 190 • Time during the day: Most common times of injury were 3 pm and 9 pm when
191 around 12% if the injuries occurred.
- 192 • There was a peak of DCI on Mondays, constituting around ¼ of the cases
193 (23.5%) (Table2).

194

195 Table 2: Door crush injury vs day of the week

DAY OF WEEK	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Monday	8	23.5
Tuesday	2	5.9
Wednesday	5	14.7
Thursday	4	11.8
Friday	6	17.6
Saturday	3	8.8
Sunday	6	17.6
Total	34	100

- 196 • The most common first aid given was dressing in local nursing homes for
197 achieving haemostasis (35%) followed by applying ice packs (14%) (table 3).

198

199 Table 3: First Aid

FIRST AID	NUMBERS	PERCENTAGE
Outside	12	35.29

Icepack	5	14.71
Ink	1	2.94
Coffee powder	1	2.94
None	15	44.12

200

- 201
- 69% of the patients had injured their pulp which needed at least one suture,
- 202
- 58% had nail bed injury while only 22% had sustained bony injury (Table 4).
- 203
- There were 3 patients who had fracture proximal to the fingertip. First with a
- 204
- distal and middle phalanx fracture of the injured ring finger, second with a
- 205
- terminal phalanx base fracture of the little finger and the third with a middle
- 206
- phalanx fracture on the injured little finger.
- 207
- 27.78% of the DCI were amputations or sub-total amputations (Table 5).

208

209 Table 4: Injured components of the finger

INJURED COMPONENT	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
PULP (inclusive of all pulps injuries)	25	69.44
NAIL BED(inclusive of all nailbed injuries)	21	58.33
BONE(Inclusive of all bony injuries)	8	22.22
PULP +NAILBED +BONE	6	16.67
PULP +NAILBED	11	30.56
PULP+BONE	1	2.78
NAILBED +BONE	1	2.78
DORSAL SOFT TISSUE INJURY/LOSS	1	2.78

210

211 Table 5: Amputation levels in door crush injuries

ALLEN TYPE	CASES	PERCENTAGE IN TOTAL CASES
ALLEN I	1	2.78
ALLEN II	4	11.11
ALLEN III	3	8.33
ALLEN IV	2	5.56

212

- 213 • 11.8% of the patients were treated conservatively and another 11.8% refused
- 214 treatment and left against medical advice.
- 215 • Pulp and Nail Bed Suturing were the most common surgical treatment given
- 216 followed by Flap cover and shortening of the finger (Table 6). Replant was not
- 217 a viable requirement or option for any of the patients.

218

Table 6: Surgical treatment for door crush injuries

TREATMENT	NO OF CASES	PERCENTAGE OF CASES
Pulp Suturing	23	67.65
Nail Bed Suturing	20	58.82
Flap	6	11.65
Shortening closure	2	5.88
Nail bed grafting	1	2.94
Composite graft	1	2.94
K wire	1	2.94
Skin graft	1	2.94

- 219 • Two patients had altered sensation-one hyperaesthesia (was dissatisfied with
- 220 the treatment) and one with reduced sensation at the end of 3 months after

221 the treatment, one patient required secondary suturing and one patient had
222 nail plate deformity (Hook Nail). One patient who developed flexion
223 contracture of distal interphalangeal joint was dissatisfied with the loss of
224 function of the joint.

225 Table 7: Complications of door crush injury

COMPLICATIONS	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	DISSATISFIED(Nos)
Altered Sensation	2	7.14	1
Secondary suturing	1	3.57	-
Nail Deformity	1	3.57	-
Contracture	1	3.57	1

226

227 Discussion

228 The incidence of door crush injury was found to be prevalent among the paediatric
229 age group 1- 4 yrs. Several studies have indicated that maximum door crush injuries
230 and fingertip injuries occurred at 5 – 6 years age.⁵⁾¹¹⁾¹⁰⁾ In the present study, a
231 smaller, second peak was seen in the 20-25 years age group, where the individuals
232 seemed to be in a hurry when the accident happened.

233 Predominant DCIs were sustained by males when compared to females in both the
234 paediatric and adult population. This has been established in several other studies
235 too where males constituted around 60-70% of the paediatric patients.^{4) 6) 2) 9)}

236 Paediatric age group of less than 5 years and male sex seem to a non-modifiable
237 risk factor for door crush injuries pointing towards the need for a better-quality
238 supervision by the parents.

239 Middle finger was the commonest finger to be injured. This is concurrent with other
240 studies on paediatric door crush injuries and is being attributed to the length of the
241 finger.^{8), 11)}

242 On comparing the sides, right sided injuries seem to be more common than the left
243 (23 vs 13) in all age groups.

244

245 Except one patient, all sustained injury at the side of the hinge and in most of the
246 paediatric cases the person who closed the door was not aware of the child standing
247 on the other side with the finger at the hinge of the door. There were also two
248 incidences of the wind suddenly closing in on the door when the patient was placing
249 his finger on the hinge. Other studies have also reported that hinge side is
250 commoner for DCI as the child is not under direct vision of the person closing the
251 door.⁷⁾

252 The comparison of DCI during vacation or at schools and offices could not be
253 computed as we attribute most of the accidents happening in residences during the
254 times of Covid lockdowns when children and most adults were home bound for most
255 of the period.

256 Nearly 1/4th of the injuries happened on Monday, in the beginning of the week when
257 the anxiety and stress levels are generally higher after the relaxing weekend.

258

259 A complex injury is defined as either an injury to more than one of the anatomical
260 components of the hand (bone, flexor/extensor tendon, joint, nerve and arteries) or
261 total/subtotal amputations through the middle or proximal phalanges.²⁾ In this study,
262 70% of the patients had pulp injuries and 59% had nail bed injuries. This statistic is

263 similar to that of Claudet et al where nail plate was damaged in 60% of digital
264 lesions.¹¹⁾

265 Around 29% of the injuries were associated with fracture of the terminal phalanx.
266 5.9% of the patients also had fracture of the proximal or middle phalanx of the finger.
267 Studies show that the misdiagnosis rate of hand fractures is 8% with the leading
268 cause of misdiagnosis being misinterpretation of epiphyses as fractures followed by
269 missing multiple fractures.¹²⁾ It is important to remember to clinically examine the
270 entire hand as the chances of missing out on a fracture is very high in a DCI due to
271 these reasons.

272

273 25% of the patients had sustained amputations out of which 33.3% was Allen 2 and
274 33.3% was Allen 3. Studies show that finger amputations accounted for up to 91.6%
275 of all paediatric traumatic amputations.⁶⁾ And amputations contribute to 0.84% of
276 hand injuries.⁴⁾

277

278 Suboptimal management of these injuries can result in persistent pain, abnormal
279 sensation, finger shortening, nail deformity, joint stiffness, and reduced grip
280 strength.⁸⁾ Only one of the 34 patients in our series developed the complication of
281 flexion contracture of the distal interphalangeal joint and had restriction of movement
282 of the joint. 20.5% (7) of the patient noticed shortening of the finger, 5.8% (2) had
283 altered sensation in the fingertip, 2.9% (1) patient developed a nail deformity and
284 overall, two patients were dissatisfied with the result. Limitation of the study is that
285 around six months of study period was during either partial or complete lockdown for
286 COVID.

287

288 Prevention and Implication

289 There are no regulatory bodies for advocating safety measures to prevent DCI even
290 in developed countries. But there a few commercially available items which might
291 help reduce their incidence such as the rubber stopper in door at lock side, triangle
292 shaped plastic stopper at bottom of door preventing closure, Australian plastic door
293 guard at hinge side, Danish “pinch free” door.³⁾ Along with the safety door closure
294 systems coupled with improved supervision, child-safety counselling by doctors and
295 nurses should become a routine.⁴⁾

296

297 Conclusion

298 Door crush injury is a major contributor for finger crush injuries and contributes a
299 large percentage of upper limb amputations. Preschool is the most vulnerable age
300 group though it is also seen in adults. Majority of patients are males. The most
301 common mechanism of injury is accidentally closing the door without the awareness
302 of a person on the other side with the finger placed in the hinge. Middle finger is the
303 most commonly injured finger. Nearly a fourth of the DCIs are amputations, some
304 not very noticeable and some more serious leading to social stigma. As with all
305 problems, prevention is better than cure. Awareness among parents and
306 caregivers, routine counselling by doctors (paediatricians) and nurses, use of
307 protective and preventive gadgets to prevent sudden accidental closure of doors are
308 found to be useful and can bring down the incidence of DCIs.

309

310 Acknowledgements

311 None

312

313 Funding

314 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
315 commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

316

317 Conflict of Interest

318 None

319

320 References

- 321 1. Vulcan JOSP, Heffernan-Colman C, Watson W. CHILD ACCIDENT AND INJURY PREVENTION
322 RESEARCH IN OTHER THAN ROAD ACCIDENTS PART I OVERVIEW OF CHILD INJURIES IN
323 VICTORIA. 1991:
- 324 2. Ljungberg E, Rosberg HE, Dahlin LB. H A N D I N J U R I E S I N Y O U N G C H I L D R E N. Journal
325 of Hand Surgery. 2003;28(4):376–80.
- 326 3. Doraiswamy N v. Childhood finger injuries and safeguards. Injury Prevention. 2015;5:298–
327 300.
- 328 4. Panagopoulou P, Antonopoulos CN, Iakovakis I, et al.. Traumatic hand amputations among
329 children in Greece: Epidemiology and prevention potential. Injury Prevention.
330 2012;18(5):309–14.
- 331 5. ALEXANDRA FETTER-ZARZEKA, MADELINE MATAR JOSEPH. Hand and fingertip injuries in
332 children. PEDIATRIC EMERGENCY CARE. 2002;18(5):341–5.
- 333 6. Satku M, Puhaindran ME dward, Chong AK hin S. Characteristics of Fingertip Injuries in
334 Children in Singapore. Hand Surg. 2015;20(3):410–4.
- 335 7. Doraiswamy N v, Baig H. Isolated ®nger injuries in children Ð incidence and aetiology. Injury.
336 2000;(8):571–3.
- 337 8. Samantaray SA, Oommen J, Thamunni CV, et al.. Fingertip injury epidemiology: an Indian
338 perspective. Journal of Plastic Surgery and Hand Surgery. 2021;
- 339 9. Abdullah Foraih Al-Anazi. Fingertip injuries in paediatric patients — experiences at an
340 emergency centre in Saudi Arabia. Journal of Pakistan Medical Association. 2013;63(6):675–9.
- 341 10. Med S, Macgregor DM, Hiscox JA. FINGERTIP TRAUMA IN CHILDREN FROM DOORS. Scottish
342 Medical Journal. 1999;44(4):114–5.
- 343 11. Claudet I, Toubal K, Carnet C, et al.. Quand les portes claquent, les doigts craquent! Archives
344 de Pediatrie. 2007;14(8):958–63.
- 345 12. Chew EM, Chong AKS. Hand fractures in children: Epidemiology and misdiagnosis in a tertiary
346 referral hospital. Journal of Hand Surgery. 2012;37(8):1684–8.

347

348

