

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Comments on: ''Osteochondral lesions of the talus: Current concept'' by O. Laffenêtre published in Orthop Traumatol Surg Res 2010;96: 554-66

## Dear Editor,

We read with interest Dr. Laffenêtre [1] current concept review article, ''Osteochondral lesions of the talus: Current concept'' (Epub ahead of print, 2010 July 14). It provides a detailed and useful description of treatment options for osteochondral talar lesions, with considerations for decision making.

The author states that ''arthroscopy appears to be the most effective procedure for lesions smaller than  $1 \text{ cm}^{2}$ '', refering to articles in which no distinction is made between lesion size and outcome [2–5]. Furthermore, the author states that ''larger lesions (> 1 cm) should be filled, either with cancellous bone or with an osteochondral graft or using autogenous chondrocyte implantation''. We disagree with the author concerning the cutoff point of  $1 \text{ cm}^2$ .

Zengerink et al. [6], in 2010, reported in a systematic review of treatment strategies for osteochondral talar lesions, a mean success rate of 85% after debridement and bone marrow stimulation including lesions up to 1.5 cm in size. For autogenous chondrocyte implantationt, cancellous bone graft, and osteochondral graft for large lesions, a mean succes rate of 76%, 61%, and 87% was reported, respectively [6]. In different current concepts reviews [7-9], debridement and bone marrow stimulation is recommended for primary lesions with a diameter less than 1.5 cm or a surface area less than 1.5 cm [10]. A cancellous bone graft, osteochondral graft or autogenous chondrocyte implantation is recommended for secondary lesions or lesions with a diameter greater than 1.5 cm. Han et al. [11], in 2006, confirmed that good clinical and radiographic results are obtained after arthroscopic debridement and bone marrow stimulation for lesions up to 1.5 cm in size, also in the presence of subchondral cysts. Recently, a cutoff point of a defect area of approximately  $1.5 \text{ cm}^2$  was determined on 120 ankles as a risk of clinical failure of the arthroscopic bone marrow stimulation techniques [12].

Looking at the currently best available evidence [6,10-12], it is clear that treatment with debridement and bone marrow stimulation for isolated talar lesions is the primary treatment of choice for lesions of up to 15 mm in diameter. At this time, alternative treatment options are mainly indicated for secondary and large lesions. Their effectiveness needs to be evaluated in larger series with long-term results.

## **Disclosure of interest**

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest concerning this article.

## References

- [1] Laffenetre O. Osteochondral lesions of the talus: Current concept. Orthop Traumatol Surg Res. 2010;96:554-66.
- [2] Loomer R, Fisher C, Lloyd-Smith R, Sisler J, Cooney T. Osteochondral lesions of the talus. Am J Sports Med 1993;21(1):13–9.
- [3] Pritsch M, Horoshovski H, Farine I. Arthroscopic treatment of osteochondral lesions of the talus. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1986;68(6):862-5.
- [4] Kelberine F, Frank A. Arthroscopic treatment of osteochondral lesions of the talar dome: a retrospective study of 48 cases. Arthroscopy 1999;15(1):77–84.
- [5] Parisien JS. Arthroscopic treatment of osteochondral lesions of the talus. Am J Sports Med 1986;14(3):211-7.
- [6] Zengerink M, Struijs PA, Tol JL, van Dijk CN. Treatment of osteochondral lesions of the talus: a systematic review. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc 2010;18(2):238–46.
- [7] Amendola A, Panarella L. Osteochondral lesions: medial versus lateral, persistent pain, cartilage restoration options and indications. Foot Ankle Clin 2009;14(2):215–27.
- [8] Giannini S, Vannini F. Operative treatment of osteochondral lesions of the talar dome: current concepts review. Foot Ankle Int 2004;25(3):168–75.
- [9] van Dijk CN, van Bergen CJ. Advancements in ankle arthroscopy. J Am Acad Orthop Surg 2008;16(11):635–46.

DOIs of original articles:10.1016/j.otsr.2010.06.001, 10.1016/j.otsr.2011.04.002.

<sup>1877-0568/\$ -</sup> see front matter @ 2011 Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. doi:10.1016/j.otsr.2011.03.014

- [10] Chuckpaiwong B, Berkson EM, Theodore GH. Microfracture for osteochondral lesions of the ankle: outcome analysis and outcome predictors of 105 cases. Arthroscopy 2008;24(1):106–12.
- [11] Han SH, Lee JW, Lee DY, Kang ES. Radiographic changes and clinical results of osteochondral defects of the talus with and without subchondral cysts. Foot Ankle Int 2006;27(12):1109–14.
- [12] Choi WJ, Park KK, Kim BS, Lee JW. Osteochondral lesion of the talus: is there a critical defect size for poor outcome? Am J Sports Med 2009;37(10):1974–80.

M.L. Reilingh\* C.N. van Dijk Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Academic Medical Center, University of Amsterdam, PO Box 22660, 1100 Amsterdam, Netherlands

> \* Corresponding author. E-mail address: m.l.reilingh@amc.uva.nl (M.L. Reilingh)