Charcot Arthropathy

Patient Evaluation and Indications for Surgery



Jeremy J. McCormick, M.D. Assistant Professor - Foot and Ankle Surgery Washington University St. Louis, MO



Charcot Arthropathy

Patient Evaluation and Indications for Surgery

Jeremy J. McCormick, M.D.

My disclosures are listed in the AAOS database. I have no potential conflicts with this presentation.

The life of a foot and ankle surgeon...



Not so glamourous...



Each equally important...

Charcot Arthropathy

Patient Evaluation and Indications for Surgery

- Overview on Charcot
- Staging and classification
- Approach to treatment



Charcot Arthropathy

Patient Evaluation and Indications for Surgery

- Overview on Charcot
- Staging and classification
- Approach to treatment



Jean-Martin Charcot

- French neurologist
- 1836 described unique arthropathy in patients with neurosyphilis



Definition

 Progressive, noninfectious, destructive arthropathy in patients with sensory neuropathy





Courtesy of Carroll P. Jones, MD

Who gets it?

- Linked with many diseases associated with peripheral neuropathy
- Described in diabetics in 1936 by William Reilly Jordan
- Diabetes is leading cause
 - Up to 40% will develop neuropathy in first decade of diabetes



It's not getting any better...

- 12.3% (28.9 million) of America adults >20y/o have diabetes
- 25.9% (11.2 million) of American adults >65y/o have diabetes
- By 2050, as many as 1 in 3 American adults will have diabetes

www.cdc.gov/diabetes/statistics



Why diabetes?

- Leads to neuropathy
 - Loss of nitric oxide function
 - Vasoconstriction/IschemiaInjury to nerve cells/function
 - Injury to herve cells/function
- Will not protect weightbearing
- Will not sense a problem



Wukich and Kline – JBJS Am, 2008

Etiology – Multiple Theories

- Neurotraumatic
 - Repetitive micro-trauma





in blood flow

■ Inflammatory mediated

Increase in cytokines >> osteoclastic activity
 Baumhauer et al, 2006

Likely a Combination of Events

- Peripheral neuropathy
- Unrecognized injury
- Repetitive stress on injured structures
- Increased local blood flow



Charcot Arthropathy

Patient Evaluation and Indications for Surgery

- Overview on Charcot
- Staging and classification
- Approach to treatment



Eichenholtz Classification

- Radiographic natural history of changes that occur
- From destructive to consolidation
 - I Fragmentation
 - II Coalescence
 - III Reconstruction
- A fourth stage (O) has been added

Eichenholtz SN (1966) General considerations. In: Eichenholt: Charcot joint: Thomas: Springfield. pp. 3=20.



Stage 0

- Swollen, red, warm foot
- Normal x-rays
- Different than infection
 - Elevation decreases swelling
 - No systemic symptoms



Stage I - Fragmentation

- Swollen, warm, red foot
- Radiographs
 - Osteopenia
 - Fragmentatio
 - Subluxation



Stage II - Coalescence

- Clinical:
 - Decreased swelling
 - Decreased rednes
 - Decreased warmth



Stage II - Coalescence

- Radiographic:
 - Less bone debris
 - More scleros:
 - Bone consolidation



Stage III - Reconstruction

- Inflammation resolved
- Bone fully consolidated
- Generally more stable foot



Courtesy of Carroll P. Jones, MD

Anatomic Location of Charcot

- Sanders and Frykberg:
 - I: Forefoot (least common)
 - II: Midfoot (60%

■ III: Hindfoot

- IV: Ankle
- V: Calcaneu



Charcot Arthropathy Patient Evaluation and Indications for Surgery

- Overview on Charcot
- Staging and classification
- Approach to treatment



Goals of Treatment

- Reach Stage III with a stable plantigrade foot/ankle
- Prevent ulceration
- Avoid infection
- Ideally achieve these goals without surgery



How should we approach this patient?

- Needs to be a team approach...
 - Orthopaedic surgeon
 - Medicine
 - Endocrine
 - \blacksquare Vascular
 - Orthotist/prosthetist
 - Physical therapist
- Maintain high index of suspicion...

How should we approach this patient?

- History
 - Timing and mechanism
 - Is the patient aware of injury?
 - ? Neuropathy
 - Systemic illness



- Understand the patient and possible risk factors...
 - HgbA1c, ulcers, vascular disease, renal failure, etc.

How should we approach this patient?

- Physical exam
 - Vascular
 - \blacksquare Motor
 - Sensory neuropathy?
- Protective sensation?
 - Semmes-Weinstein monofilamen
 - Associated with risk of Charcot
- Look for other signs
 - Claw toes
 - Ulcer/amputation





The Challenge...

- Majority are morbidly obese
- Extreme difficulty complying with treatment
- Medical comorbidities
- Poor potential for healing
- Immunocompromised
- High risk of ulceration



Stage I – Non-op Treatment

- Total Contact Cast
- Immobilization is critical
- Minimize deformity
- Control swelling
- Offload foot
- 2-3 months if possible

■ Follow closely



Can You Keep Them NWB?

- Very difficult
- Probably only 50% compliance
- Even if WB may still achieve good result
 De Souza, et al – IB(S, 2008
- Err on the side of casting for too long...



Stages II - Non-op Treatment

 Charcot Restraint Orthotic Walker (CROW)

■ Other AFO



Stages III – Non-op Treatment

- In-depth shoeCustom insert
- Life long
- Educate the patient



Non-op is NOT Easy!

- 23% required bracing > 18 months
- 49% risk of recurrent ulceration
- Ulceration increases risk of amputation
- 2.7% annual rate of amputation



Saltzman – CORR, 2005

Surgical Indications

- Unstable, unbraceable deformity
- Recurrent ulceration
- Deep infection
- Deformity at high-risk for ulceration



Charcot Arthropathy

Patient Evaluation and Indications for Surgery

- Overview on Charcot
- Staging and classification
- Approach to treatment



Take Home Points

- Understand the natural progression of Charcot
- Early recognition and treatment
 Maintain a high index of suspicion
- Achieve early stability and maintain alignment through casting

Thank you...



Charcot Arthropathy: Internal Fixation

VuMedi Webinar July 2014 Carroll P. Jones MD OrthoCarolina Foot and Ankle Institute Charlotte, NC

Disclosures: AAOS Website.

Paid consultant for Wright Medical Technology and have been involved in the development of Charcotspecific implants.

Goals of Treatment

- Reach consolidation phase with a stable plantigrade foot/ankle
- Prevent ulceration/infection
- Ideally achieve these goals nonoperatively

Nonop treatment 70% successful

- Clinically plantigrade foot
- Radiographically plantigrade
 Pinzur et al; FAI 1993
 Fabrin et al; Diabetes Care 2000
 Pinzur et al; FAI 2004

Surgical Indications

- Unstable, unbraceable deformity
- Recurrent ulceration
- Deep infection
- · Deformity at high-risk for ulceration

Clinical Challenge

- Limited Level-I evidence
- · Effective clinical algorithm
 - Nonop (total contact cast)
 - Exostectomy
 - Surgical correction: internal fixation
 - Surgical correction: external fixation



Ankle/Hindfoot Charcot

- Arthrodesis provides the most reliable and durable correction and stability
- Most deformities can be corrected intraoperatively
- Typically include both ankle and ST joints for levels of fixation
- Internal fixation reserved for relatively "clean" cases

Case Example

- 70 yo diabetic neuropathy
- 4 month h/o ankle deformity
- Unable to ambulate



Transfibular Approach



Joint Preparation



Reduced Mortise





TTC Intramedullary Rod

- Load-sharing device (vs plate/screw fixation)
- Bridge ankle and ST joints
- Percutaneous insertion
- Soft-tissue friendly
- Low metal/hardware exposure (intraosseous)
- Frame can be added if necessary

Midfoot Charcot















Surgical Approach





Internal Fixation



How Much Fixation?



Charcot-Indicated Plates



What About Beaming?

- Relatively new technique for Charcot (1997?)
- Similar to rebar in construction
- Concrete has very poor tensile properties
- Rebar + concrete: magnitudes stronger



What is Beaming?

- Intraosseous fixation bridging one or multiple joints
- Screw, rod , or bolt
- Most commonly used in the medial column









My Technique

- Evolving...
- 6.5 mm solid bolt stainless steel system
- Retrograde 1st ray/talus bolt
- Retrograde lateral column bolt
- Rarely augment with plate fixation





Caveats

- TAL critical
- Prepare all joints that the bolts cross
- Bone graft defects (typically allograft)
- NWB in TCC for 8-10 weeks
- Transition to extra-depth shoe/insert

Results

Charlotte experience

- 6 patients
- Minimum 6 month f/u
- All clinically/radiographically healed
- No deep infections
- One required plantar lateral exostectomy 4 months postop

Conclusions

- Consider internal fixation for unstable ankle and mid/hindfoot Charcot in absence of deep infection
- Adjunctive external fixation should be considered
- Beaming very promising for midfoot need for greater variety of sizes

Thank You!





Michael S. Pinzur, MD Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery Loyola University health System

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM

A MEMBER OF 🛞 TRINITY



Favorable Outcome

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM

× 🚳

Ulcer and Infection-Free

Able to ambulate independently with commercially-available therapeutic shoes custom accommodative foot orthoses



LOYOLA UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM Who needs surgery? 1. Non-plantigrade foot with overlying ulcer and osteomyelitis 2. Clinically and radiographically nonplantigrade foot 3. Painful neuropathic non-union A MEMBER OF 🛞 TRINITY H **Principles of Static Ring**



Able to **OBTAIN** correction of deformity Obstacles to MAINTAIN correction: vitamin D deficient / poor quality bone poor host

Motor Balancing



OF 🚳 11



Gastrocnemius muscle lengthening or Tendon Achilles lengthening



























































LOYOLA UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM

Static Ring Fixation Obtain correction at surgery Difficulty with maintaining correction Richard Gellman, MD Summit Orthopaedics Portland, OR

Dynamic External Fixation in Charcot Reconstruction

Definition

- Dynamic = gradual deformity correction using Ilizarov multiplanar external fixation
- Most corrections with Taylor Spatial Struts
 Simple length prime or distruction with thread
- Simple lengthenings or distraction with threaded rods
- Some ankle equinus corrections in lighter patients with universal hinges

Goal

 Create a stable, plantigrade, ulcer-free foot below an aligned leg

Patient Indication

- Unbraceable, unstable deformity
- <u>+</u> Recurrent ulceration
 Non ambulatory patients wanting alternative to
- amputation
 Patients need to understand that this is limb salvage surgery.
 Risk of amputation or need for future reconstructions 20%



Patient Selection

- Deformities that can't be acutely corrected
 - Too severe
 - plantigrade foot not obtainable despite heroic attemp at soft tissue release, bone shortening,
 - Poor soft tissue, unsafe to make requisite surgical dissections
 - Acute correction would lead to unwanted arthrodesis such as a pantalar or TCC

Advantages

- Safe to operate on contracted or previously operated soft tissue
- Maintains bone length, may limit need for arthrodesis
- Lower deep infection rate
- Ability to allow limited weight bearing due to strength of frames

Surgical Experience

 Best to have applied quite a few static Holding Frames before attempting dynamic frames

Deformity Types

- Ankle
- Combined Foot Deformity = hindfoot and midfoot deformities
- Midfoot

Ankle Deformity

- Examples: ankle equinus contracture, neuropathic ankle fx/dx, AVN talus, distal tibia collapse
- Apply standard 2 ring tibial base frame, one long foot ring and connect lower tibial ring to foot ring with Taylor Spatial struts
- If deformity at tibiotalar joint, insert a talar neck wire and attach to foot ring. This focuses distraction, correction across ankle joint





Ankle Equinus

- Always perform percutaneous achilles lengthening or tenotomy first in equinus corrections
- Set up TSF program as apex anterior deformity with origin at center of talar dome
- Hold in corrected position of at least 10 degrees dorsiflexion for 6 weeks to prevent recurrence

Ankle Deformity/multiplanar

- Ideal for contracted longstanding ankle/hindfoot dislocations
- For a more rapid correction, especially with infected cases, I perform talectomy, antibiotic bead placement, deformity correction
- Stage Tibia-Calcaneal fusion in 4-6 weeks
- Frames can be set up to allow insertion of 16 cm hindfoot fusion nails

Neuropathic Ankle Fx/Dx









Ankle Deformity/multiplanar

- 59 yom DM
 Morbid obesity
 Longstanding lateral peritalar dislocation (PTTD gone wild)
- on talar head, I&D site by his podiatrist
- Not able to walk



Deformity: short, laterally translated



Step 1: talectomy, abx beads, TSF



Step 2: deformity correction, 2wks post op



Step 3: staged tib-cal arthrodesis



Hindfoot fusion nail; conversion to holding frame



2 mo. post fusion, 4 mo. total time in frame



Stable at one year



Combined Foot Deformity

- Severe valgus peritalar dislocation, rigid equinovarus foot
- Hindfoot and midfoot both in varus or valgus
- Set up like Ankle equinus frame except talar neck wire attaches to distal tibia by long hinges. This stabilizes the ankle joint (talus in the mortise) so that correction occurs through the subtalar, talonavicular, calcanealcuboid joint complex

Combined Foot Deformity

- Forefoot deformity of aDduction or aBduction can be acutely corrected with "drag" olive wires
- May need to pin toes
- In severe deformities, may need to prevent weight bearing for first 1-2 weeks until the sole of the foot is more plantigrade

Rigid Equinovarus (not Charcot)









Midfoot Deformity

- Apply tibial base frame
- Place U-ring along posterior aspect of distal tibia on lateral view
- Attach full ring that encircles the forefoot
- Place at least 3 wires into metatarsals for sufficient strength of fixation
- Attach struts after insertion of first forefoot wire to make strut attachment easier

"Butt Plate" set up



Midfoot Deformity

- May need to first distract (lengthen) 10-15 mm in order to disengage midfoot bones prior to correction of angular or translational deformity
- TSF software pretty good for midfoot correction
- Option to set up as tibia but have forefoot correlate to proximal tibia

Midfoot Deformity and Ankle Equinus

- 57 yom with DM.
 Chronic midfoot ulceration over 10 years Failed debridements
- and CROW
- Teaches nursing at local college



Deformity



Step 1: Debridement & TSF

- Gradual correction of midfoot rocker bottom and abduction contracture with frame
- Safer for lateral skin



Step 2: Gradual correction over 2 wks



Step 3: fusion & equinus correction

- application
 Staged triple and 1st TMT arthrodesis
 Frame modification to
- correct equinus





Equinus correction



7 wks post frame removal



Acute Charcot, active ulcer







Note Drag Wires





Staged Arthrodesis



Healed despite deep infection





Late triple arthrodesis



Common Pitfalls

- Lack of experience with static frames prior of attempting dynamic frames
 Challenges of placing sufficient number of wires to create a stable and strong frame in small areas of the foot
 Challenge of working around struts
 Experience in running TSF programs
 Experience in applying frames in a manner to

- Experience in applying frames in a manner to allow strut application and decrease strut changes

Common Pitfalls

- Keeping wire fixation away from osteotomies and internal fixation
- Aggressively managing pin site infections
- Planning frame modifications in the OR to replace broken or loose wires before catastrophic failure occurs
- Need to perform staged arthrodesis to maintain correction
- Gradual transitions after frames are removed with walking casts and AFOs

gellman@summitdocs.com