





BONE MARROW STIMULATION PROCEDURES

Jean-Marie FAYARD*, Martin HECKI*, Elvire SERVIEN**

*Centre Orthopédique Santy, Lyon, France

**Orthopaedic surgery and sport medicine department, Lyon University Hospital, France

DISCLOSURE

- Arthrex (consultant)
- NewClip Technics (consultant, royalties)
- X Nov (royalties)
- Doct'Up App (owner, developer)

CARTILAGE DEFECTS OF THE KNEE

CARTILAGE DEFECTS OF THE KNEE

Extensive





Arthroplasty

CARTILAGE DEFECTS OF THE KNEE



Focal Isolated



Cartilage Surgery

ICRS GRADING SYSTEM

International Cartilage Repair Society

Grade 1	Nearly normal	Superficial lesions
Grade 2	Abnormal	< 50% of cartilage denth
Grade 3	Severely abnormal	> 50% of cartilage depth
Grade 4	Severely abnormal	Through subchondral bone

Nearly normal Grade 1 Abnormal Grade 2 Severely

abnormal Grade 3

Grade 4

11

SURGICAL SOLUTIONS

PALLIATIVE STIMULATION:

• Marrow Stimulation Procedures

REPAIR TECHNIQUES:

- Osteochondral autograft : Mosaicplasty
- Osteochondral allograft transplantation
- Autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI)
- Matrix-associated ACI (MACI)







MARROW STIMULATION TECHNIQUES

Osteochondral drilling

Pridie (60's)



Motorized 1.5 drill – 18/20 K-Wire Abrasion chondroplasty

Johnson (80's)



Motorized burr

MARROW STIMULATION TECHNIQUES



Microfracture Steadman(90's)



Perforations



JR. STEADMAN



Steadman JR. and al. Microfracture technique for full-thickness chondral defects: technique and clinical results. Oper Tech Orthop. 1997;7:300–4.

Principles

Rebuild « cartilage » with mesenchymal stem cells

Debridment (clean the defect) & multiples holes





Healing cartilage

Clot formation



Procedure





K. Mithoefer and coll. American Journal of Sports Medicine, 2009, Vol. 37, No. 10

Special ancillary







3 – 4 mm deep every 3 - 4 mm





Injury, Int. J. Care Injured (2008) 39S1, S26-S31





www.elsevier.com/locate/injury

Marrow stimulation techniques

MR Steinwachs¹, Th Guggi¹, PC Kreuz²



POSTOP CARE: 3 phases

- Healing phase (week 0-6):

Non WB+++ Edema reduction, ROM recovery, low resistance strenghtening

- **Transition phase (week 6-12):** Progressive WB, gait training

- Remodeling phase (week 13+)
Impact loading & athletics
Pivoting/ jumping 4-6 months
Full sports 9 months



POSTOP CARE: 3 phases

Healing phase (week 0-6):
 Non WB+++
 Edema reduction, ROM recovery, low resistance strenghtening

- **Transition phase (week 6-12):** Progressive WB, gait training

- Remodeling phase (week 13+)
Impact loading & athletics
Pivoting/ jumping 4-6 months
Full sports 9 months



POSTOP CARE: 3 phases

Healing phase (week 0-6):
 Non WB+++
 Edema reduction, ROM recovery, low resistance strenghtening

- **Transition phase (week 6-12):** Progressive WB, gait training

- Remodeling phase (week 13+)
 Impact loading & athletics
 Pivoting/ jumping 4-6 months
 Full sports 9 months



INDICATIONS



2,1 cm²

CONTRAINDICATIONS

- Age > 50
- Inability to follow postop protocol
- Diffuse joint degeneration
- Avascular necrosis





Evidence-Based Status of Microfracture Technique: A Systematic Review of Level I and II Studies

Deepak Goyal, M.B.B.S., M.S.(Orthop), D.N.B.(Orthop), M.N.A.M.S., Sohrab Keyhani, M.D., Eng Hin Lee, M.D., F.R.C.S.C., F.R.C.S.(Edin), F.R.C.S.(Glasg), F.A.M.S., and James Hoi Po Hui, M.D., F.R.C.S.(Edin) Arthroscopy 2013

- 1 to 4 cm²
- Short term improvement in clinical score

38% failure at 10 years Better results in younger patients

Outcomes of Microfracture for Traumatic Chondral Defects of the Knee: Average 11-Year Follow-up

Arthroscopy 2003

J. Richard Steadman, M.D., Karen K. Briggs, M.B.A., Juan J. Rodrigo, M.D., Mininder S. Kocher, M.D., M.P.H., Thomas J. Gill, M.D., and William G. Rodkey, D.V.M.

- 72 patients 11 years FU
- Improvement in pain and functional scores



Better results patients < 45yo

Long-term results after microfracture treatment for full-thickness knee chondral lesions in athletes

KSSTA 2013

Alberto Gobbi • Georgios Karnatzikos • Anup Kumar

- 61 athletes / 15 years FU
- Deterioration of the clinical outcomes expected at 2 and 5 years

Long-term results after microfracture treatment for full-thickness knee chondral lesions in athletes

KSSTA 2013

Alberto Gobbi • Georgios Karnatzikos • Anup Kumar

- 61 athletes / 15 years FU
- Deterioration of the clinical outcomes expected at 2 and 5 years

MFC > LFC

MFC > Patella

Long-term results after microfracture treatment for full-thickness knee chondral lesions in athletes

KSSTA 2013

Alberto Gobbi • Georgios Karnatzikos • Anup Kumar

- 61% athletes / 15 years FU
- Deterioration of the clinical outcomes expected at 2 and 5 years

Good long term outcomes in patients <31 Yo with lesions < 400mm²

Degenerative changes: older patients and large lesions

RESULTS Microfractures vs Mosaïcplasty

Ten-year follow-up of a prospective, randomized clinical study of mosaic osteochondral autologous transplantation versus microfracture for the treatment of osteochondral defects in the knee joint of athletes

Rimtautas Gudas ¹¹, Agne Gudaite, Arnoldas Pocius, Asta Gudiene, Emilis Cekanauskas, Egle Monastyreckiene, Algidas Basevicius

60 patients, 10 years FU

AJSM 2012 Level 1

Failure at final FU OAT: 14% MF: 38% Return to sport at the same level : OAT:75% MF:37%

RESULTS Microfractures vs Mosaïcplasty

Osteochondral Autograft Transfer Versus Microfracture in the Knee: A Meta-analysis of Prospective Comparative Studies at Midterm

Arthroscopy 2016

Lesions > 3 cm2

Ayoosh Pareek ¹, Patrick J Reardon ¹, Jeffrey A Macalena ², Bruce A Levy ¹, Michael J Stuart ¹, Riley J Williams 3rd ³, Aaron J Krych ⁴

249 patients67 months FU

OATS > return to sport OATS lower failure rate

RESULTS Microfractures vs Mosaïcplasty

Osteochondral Autograft Transfer Versus Microfracture in the Knee: A Meta-analysis of Prospective Comparative Studies at Midterm

Arthroscopy 2016

Ayoosh Pareek ¹, Patrick J Reardon ¹, Jeffrey A Macalena ², Bruce A Levy ¹, Michael J Stuart ¹, Riley J Williams 3rd ³, Aaron J Krych ⁴

249 patients67 months FU

No difference for lesions < 3 cm²

RESULTS Microfractures vs ACI

A randomized trial comparing autologous chondrocyte implantation with microfracture. Findings at five years

JBJS 2007

Gunnar Knutsen ¹, Jon Olav Drogset, Lars Engebretsen, Torbjørn Grøntvedt, Vidar Isaksen, Tom C Ludvigsen, Sally Roberts, Eirik Solheim, Torbjørn Strand, Oddmund Johansen

80 patients 5 years FU

> Significant improvement in both group 23% failure both group

RESULTS Microfractures vs ACI

A Randomized Multicenter Trial Comparing Autologous Chondrocyte Implantation with Microfracture: Long-Term Follow-up at 14 to 15 Years

JBJS 2007

Gunnar Knutsen ¹, Jon Olav Drogset ², Lars Engebretsen ³, Torbjørn Grøntvedt ², Tom C Ludvigsen ³, Sverre Løken ³, Eirik Solheim ⁴, Torbjørn Strand ⁴, Oddmund Johansen ⁵

No difference between the two groups 32 % failure microFx vs 42% ACI

RESULTS Microfractures vs Microfractures « plus »



Take-home Message Microfracture

- To considere as a primary treatment for small osteochondral lesion (< 2cm²) in young patients
 - Minimally invasive
 - Not demanding
 - Low cost
 - Low Morbidity

Copyright © 2021 by The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, Incorporated

CURRENT CONCEPTS REVIEW Chondral Lesions of the Knee: An Evidence-Based Approach

MAJ Travis J. Dekker, MD, USAF, MC, Zachary S. Aman, MS, BA, Nicholas N. DePhillipo, PhD, MS, ATC, CSCS, LT COL Jonathan F. Dickens, MD, USA, MC, Adam W. Anz, MD, and Robert F. LaPrade, MD, PhD

ADDRESS COMORBIDITIES



Thank You



www.centre-orthopedique-santy.com

CRUCIATE LIGAMENT



Journées Lyonnaises de Chirurgie du Genou

3 - 5 OCTOBER 2024 LYON CONVENTION CENTRE

www.lyon-knee-congress.com

