CASE REPORT

Glenoid osteolysis after arthroscopic labrum repair with a bioabsorbable suture anchor
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Bioabsorbable suture anchors are commonly used for arthroscopic repair of rotator cuff and labrum lesions. They provide soft-tissue attachment to bone. They have been introduced to avoid complications such as artefacts on MRI scans, commonly seen with metal anchors. However, bioabsorbable implants may lead to other problems such as local osteolysis, cyst formation, soft tissue inflammation and release of implant fragments into the joint space. The author describes the case of a professional female volleyball player, who presented osteolysis of the superior pole of the glenoid after arthroscopic repair of a SLAP lesion with a PLLA suture anchor. This is the first reported case of glenoid osteolysis after arthroscopic insertion of a bioabsorbable suture anchor. The author feels that the cause of osteolysis was a biological response to mechanical stress.
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INTRODUCTION

Many bioabsorbable implants are available for the treatment of rotator cuff and labral injuries. They consist of polylactic acid polymers (PLLA, PDLA and PDLLA) (15) and others. These implants have the same fixation strength as metal anchors. They produce minimal artefacts on MRI scans. They dissolve spontaneously and are replaced with bone (9), but they may also cause osteolysis, cyst formation, soft tissue inflammation and release of implant fragments into the joint space (4, 12, 18). Glueck et al (7) described a case of extensive osteolysis of the humeral head after rotator cuff repair with a PLDLA suture anchor. The authors describe the case of a patient who presented an excavation of the superior pole of the glenoid after arthroscopic repair of a SLAP lesion with a PLLA suture anchor. The patient was informed that his data would be submitted for publication and gave his agreement.

CASE REPORT

In May 2002 a 25-year-old female competitive volleyball player presented with pain in the right shoulder since 4 months after a fall on the outstretched arm, especially at sports. She had a full range of motion. No signs of rotator cuff lesion...
were found. There was no evidence of instability. The O’Brien test and the crank test were positive. Plain radiographs were practically normal. MRI scans showed a SLAP lesion.

Appropriate conservative therapy, including non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, physiotherapy and rest, was started without result. Subsequently, the patient underwent an arthroscopy, which revealed a type II SLAP lesion. Arthroscopic repair was performed with a PLLA double loaded bioabsorbable suture anchor. The postoperative course was uneventful and the patient restarted playing volley 4 months after surgery. Eight months after the operation the shoulder pain recurred at sporting. The O’Brien test was again positive. Medication and physical therapy did not bring relief. Ten months after surgery radiographs and CT-scans showed a large lytic lesion in the superior pole of the glenoid in the area of the suture anchor (fig 1, 2). A second arthroscopy was then performed, 12 months after the first one. Partial failure of the repair was noted. The labrum and the sutures were debrided; a cavity was now seen in the superior pole of the glenoid in the area of the initial suture anchor (fig 3). This time a non-absorbable suture anchor was used for repair. Histologic examination of the tissue harvested from the bony defect in the superior pole of the glenoid showed a foreign body granuloma.

At follow-up, 6 months later, the patient was symptom free and there was no evidence of recurrence.

**DISCUSSION**

Bioabsorbable anchors are commonly used in rotator cuff and labral arthroscopic repair, for soft-tissue attachment to bone. The use of bio-
absorbable implants has been introduced to avoid complications such as artefacts on MRI scans, commonly seen with metal anchors (1, 12, 18). Furthermore they facilitate revision surgery, help avoid the sequelae associated with permanent devices which can dislodge, and do not need to be removed (17). They consist of various polylactic acid polymers: PLDLA, PLLA and PDLA. The duration of the resorption process of the anchors is variable and depends on the polymer composition (3). It ranges from 6 months for PDLA anchors to 2 or 3 years for PLLA anchors (2, 16). Ideally, anchors will degrade, as soft tissue healing progresses, and gradually will allow more stress to be applied as the tissue can tolerate it (17). When considering the use of absorbable suture anchors it is very important to know the rate of healing response of the soft tissue to the bone, because it determines how rapidly the surgical construct can tolerate stress. In fact healing may not occur if fixation of the soft tissue to the bone is insecure (13, 14).

Bioabsorbable implants may lead to complications such as local osteolysis, cyst formation, soft tissue inflammation and release of implant fragments into the joint space (4, 12, 18). All these complications may compromise the outcome of repair. The literature provides ample information about failure of bioabsorbable devices used in the knee and the shoulder. Cummins et al (5) described migration of portions of an absorbable screw into the subacromial space after rotator cuff repair. Freehill et al (6) reported synovitis due to PLLA tacks used for arthroscopic shoulder stabilization. Martinek et al (10) described a case of osteolytic tubial enlargement in association with pretilial cyst formation, after ACL reconstruction and PLDLA interference screw fixation. Müller et al (11) reported 7 cases of osteolysis after open anterior shoulder stabilization with PLDLL anchors. The author describes, for the first time in literature, a case of osteolysis of the superior pole of the glenoid after arthroscopic repair of a SLAP lesion with a PLLA suture anchor. A similar excavation of the glenoid was already described after open shoulder stabilization (11).

The cause of this osteolysis is not clear, but it has been interpreted by some authors as a foreign-body reaction leading to loosening of the implant (6). Kääb et al (8) considered other reasons for osteolysis, such as micromotion of the anchor due to the attachment of the ligaments and others, alteration of the implant due to production process or sterilization, and heat necrosis induced by drilling. It is possible that in the case reported here the anchor developed small microcracks due to stress, which speeded up the degradation of the polymer. In this way, decrease of pH of the surrounding tissues might have led to osteolysis and foreign body reaction. In other words, the osteolysis was a biological response to mechanical stress.

After all, many studies have demonstrated that bioabsorbable devices are a good option for the fixation of capsuloligamentous structures to bone. The low incidence of complications and the multiple advantages explain their extensive use in orthopaedic surgery (8, 17).
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