Letters to the Editor
Assessment of bony union following surgical stabilisation for lumbar spondylolysis: a comparative study between radiography and computed tomography

To the Editor:
I read with interest the paper by Pai and Hodgson.1 I noted with concern the statement “clinical results do not correlate with bony union, indicating that bony union is not required to achieve good results.” One could then equally conclude that good results occurred regardless of the surgical intervention. Many of these cases may well have settled without surgery. The authors have fallen into a logical error so common in medical treatment: *post hoc ergo propter hoc* (after this therefore because of this).

If one sets out to perform a bony union or arthrodesis of a spondylolysis (not a stabilisation) and this has not been achieved, then the operation has failed. It reminds me of comments made about the Charnley compression arthrodesis of the hip that became popular in the mid to late 60s. Many authors suggested that a “firm tight” fibrous union was just as satisfactory as a bony arthrodesis. Despite this, the operation rapidly fell into disfavour.

The authors presented a nonunion rate of 50% and argued that despite this the procedure was a good one. It would seem to me to be intellectual nonsense. Would you agree to such an operation after the appropriate informed consent?

J Rush
St Vincent’s Public Hospital
Victoria Parade, Fitzroy
Victoria, Australia
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Authors’ reply
We thank Mr Rush for his comments. The purpose of our article was to report the disparity in bone healing observed between radiographs and computed tomographic (CT) scans, although clinical and radiographic findings have been used widely in the literature.

In a period of 6 years, we observed good to excellent results in 90% using radiographic and clinical assessment. We started CT assessment in 13 of our 20 patients treated consecutively to determine bone healing. Although 90% showed bone healing clinically, only 50% had this confirmed by CT. This prompted the senior surgeon to change his surgical technique to rod and pedicle fixation and assess all cases with CT at one year. It is too early to report the results of this study.

We intended to simply report the disparity between radiological and CT healing rather than recommend any procedures.

VS Pai
Wellington Hospital, Wellington, New Zealand
B Hodgson
Dunedin Hospital, New Zealand
Posterior lumbar interbody fusion versus intertransverse fusion in the treatment of lumbar spondylolisthesis

To the Editor:
I would like to comment on the article by Inamdar et al.1
The authors claimed that “this is the first prospective study to compare the 2 methods.” However, there have been manuscripts comparing these 2 methods in the literature.2,3 The authors concluded that “intertransverse fusion (ITF) has less morbidity and complication than posterior lumbar interbody fusion (PLIF). ITF is recommended because of the simplicity of the procedure, lower complication rate, and good clinical and radiological results.”1 However, they randomly divided the 2 groups regardless of slip degree and slip angle. Posterolateral fusion is a good and valuable option for low-grade spondylolysis but not for high grade.2,3 Dehoux et al.2 have advocated the use of posterior interbody fusion for high-grade spondylolisthesis requiring reduction or when the disc space is still high.2 Correction of sagittal balance and maintenance of disc height is very important for spondylolisthetic patients. Achievement of this fine tuning can easily be done with PLIF.4-5

O Cebesoy
Department of Orthopedics and Traumatology
Gaziantep University Faculty of Medicine
Gaziantep, Turkey

Authors’ reply
There have indeed been 2 previous studies comparing the types of fusion applied to a particular type of listhesis but not spondylolisthesis in general. There might have been an oversight because of the extensive literature. The purpose of our study was to compare the 2 methods of fusion irrespective of the grade of listhesis.

DN Inamdar
Department of Orthopaedic Surgery
Institute of Orthopaedic Research and Accident Surgery
Madurai, India

Residual nonunion following vascularised fibular graft treatment for congenital pseudarthrosis of the tibia: a report of two cases

To the Editor:
I read with interest the article by Sulaiman et al.1 Although union was achieved in both cases, the follow-up was very short at 4 months. It is well known that
refracture is common despite the initial solid clinical and radiographic union. Perhaps the authors could give us a longer-term follow-up on this complex condition.
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To the Editor:
I read with interest the article by Yeung et al.1 Although clubfoot is a very common problem, researchers have still not reached a consensus on a reproducible description or assessment of the foot. The authors classified their patients’ conditions as severe clubfoot deformity according to the Dimeglio classification.2 Two methods were used to hold the feet for radiograph taking: strapping the ankle with tapes versus dorsiflexion with a wooden block. The authors were unable to measure the talocalcaneal angles on the anteroposterior radiographs using forced dorsiflexion. Figures 4b and 5b showing the feet being held flat against the X-ray plate are less likely to give good-quality radiographs. It is recommended that the tube be tilted cranially 30 degrees in order to see the rudimentary eccentric ossifying nuclei in cartilage enlarging these small feet.3–5 The method recommended by Beatson and Pearsons5 for the measurement of talocalcaneal index was devised to outline the nuclear shadows of both talus and calcaneus. For anteroposterior view, the feet are held flat soles against the plate below, knees bent to 45 degrees and X-ray tube tilted cranially 30 degrees. This shows both the nuclei crossing each other making the anterior talocalcaneal angle. For lateral view, the feet are

S Ibrahim
Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology
Hospital Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Authors’ reply
We agree with the concern about refracture in the long term despite the initial solid clinical and radiographic union. Cases 1 and 2 were operated in August 2000 and July 2003, respectively, and solid union was achieved at 4 months; no refracture was observed despite no external protection at 5 and 3 years, respectively. Use of an intramedullary nail minimises the risk of refracture1,2 and we do not plan to remove the nails in both cases. The nail may have to be changed to a longer one to ensure prolonged and adequate internal splintage.1

AR Sulaiman
School of Medical Sciences
Universiti Sains Malaysia
Kota Bharu, Kelantan, Malaysia
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Radiographic assessment of congenital talipes equinovarus: strapping versus forced dorsiflexion

To the Editor:
I read with interest the article by Yeung et al.1 Although clubfoot is a very common problem, researchers have still not reached a consensus on a reproducible description or assessment of the foot. The authors classified their patients’ conditions as severe clubfoot deformity according to the Dimeglio classification.2 Two methods were used to hold the feet for radiograph taking: strapping the ankle with tapes versus dorsiflexion with a wooden block. The authors were unable to measure the talocalcaneal angles on the anteroposterior radiographs using forced dorsiflexion. Figures 4b and 5b showing the feet being held flat against the X-ray plate are less likely to give good-quality radiographs. It is recommended that the tube be tilted cranially 30 degrees in order to see the rudimentary eccentric ossifying nuclei in cartilage enlarging these small feet.3–5 The method recommended by Beatson and Pearsons5 for the measurement of talocalcaneal index was devised to outline the nuclear shadows of both talus and calcaneus. For anteroposterior view, the feet are held flat soles against the plate below, knees bent to 45 degrees and X-ray tube tilted cranially 30 degrees. This shows both the nuclei crossing each other making the anterior talocalcaneal angle. For lateral view, the feet are
supported from below, holding the soles against a specially designed apparatus which allows the feet to be radiographed in lateral view. This was the lateral talocalcaneal measurement of the talocalcaneal index. The sum of the 2 angles is called talocalcaneal index. The cranial tilt of the tube eliminates the possible overlapping of shadows from the other bones.

Holding the feet in 30 degrees of planter flexion during this procedure has been advocated. This may explain why the authors were unable to measure the angles in anteroposterior views between the talus and calcaneus. Drawing lines along the medial edge of the talus and the lateral border of the calcaneus during measurements has been recommended.

The angles obtained by the authors were rather borderline, with the talocalcaneal angle being 19.4° in the anteroposterior and 22° in the lateral radiographs. The difference between the groups was small. Even with strapping, it was quite difficult to keep the feet still, so there might be room for strong sedation in these children.

Use of wooden block dorsiflexion is very unlikely to correct the severe multiplanar deformity, nor to bring it into one plane as is desirable when obtaining lateral X-rays.

The lower end of the fibula lies markedly posterior in the lateral views and is likely to be a source of error in the measurement of angles and may even show the head of the talus flattened. Inclusion of a few radiographs in the article would have been helpful.

A uniform method that can give reproducible results is needed so that the grades of deformity and results of treatment can be measured with minimal inter- and intra-observer differences.

FN Hussain
Department of Orthopedic Surgery
Post Graduate Medical Institute
Lahore General Hospital, Pakistan
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