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Abstract

**Purpose:** This systematic review aimed to identify the available evidence regarding the comparative effectiveness and safety of various operative treatments in adult patients with osteochondral lesions of the talus (OLT).

**Materials and methods:** The PubMed, Embase, ISI Web of Knowledge, and the Cochrane Controlled Trial Register of Controlled Trials were searched from their inception date to September 2019. Two reviewers selected the randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and non-RCTs assessing the comparative effectiveness and safety of various operative treatments for OLT. The meta-analysis was performed using Revman 5.3.

**Results:** Eight studies (1 RCT and 7 non-RCTs) with 375 patients were included in this review. The difference in the American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society (AOFAS) score between the cartilage repair and replacement was not significant. The cartilage regeneration with or without cartilage repair had significant superiority in improving the AOFAS score compared with the cartilage repair. The difference in the magnetic resonance observation of cartilage repair tissue score between the cartilage repair and replacement and between cartilage repair and cartilage repair plus regeneration was significant.

**Conclusions:** Cartilage regeneration and cartilage repair plus regeneration had significant superiority in improving the ankle function and radiological evaluation of OLT, although the trials included did not have high-level evidence. Moreover, which treatment between the 2 was safer could not be addressed in this review as most of the trials did not report the safety outcome. Further studies are needed to define the best surgical option for treating OLT.

**Abbreviations:** ACI = autologous chondrocyte implantation, AOFAS = American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society, BMDC = bone marrow-derived cell, CI = confidence interval, MACI = matrix-induced autologous chondrocyte implantation, MOCART = magnetic resonance observation of cartilage repair tissue, OAT = osteochondral autograft/allograft transplantation, OLT = osteochondral lesions of the talus, PJCAT = particulated juvenile cartilage allograft transplantation, PRP = platelet-rich plasma, RCTs = randomized controlled trials, SMD = standardized mean difference, WMD = weighted mean difference.
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1. Introduction

The osteochondral lesions of the talus (OLT) involve both cartilage and subchondral bone lesions.\textsuperscript{[1]} Patients presenting with OLT are often athletes or have a history of significant ankle trauma within 1 year of symptom onset. The majority of patients are aged 20 to 40 years, and men are more commonly affected than women (1.6:1).\textsuperscript{[2]} Typically, nonspecific ankle pain that corresponds to or not corresponds to the location of the lesion often occurs in patients. Additionally, they often complain of recurrent swelling, weakness, stiffness, and catching of the ankle joint.\textsuperscript{[3]} Available treatment methods may not prevent joint degeneration.

In some patients, sequelae of early-stage foot ankle osteoarthritis form, leading to excess pain and movement restriction in the foot ankle in the long term.\textsuperscript{[4]} Patients with chronic OLT may present with deep, intermittent pain in the ankle joint with weightbearing.\textsuperscript{[5]} These symptoms place the ability to walk, work, and perform sports at risk, which often has a severe impact on the quality of life of active patients, especially athletes.\textsuperscript{[6]}

Nonoperative treatment of OLT includes activity modification, protected weight-bearing, physical therapy, bracing, and use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.\textsuperscript{[7,8]} These treatments are often aimed at treating symptoms, such as pain, rather than providing a cure.\textsuperscript{[9]} In other words, they may relieve symptoms but cannot repair cartilage injuries. Nonoperative treatment is
appropriate for fresh cartilage injuries that are nondisplaced and have a potential for healing depending on their size and location as well as on patient parameters, such as age, socio-professional context, or smoking. This approach may be beneficial to the adolescent population, rather than to the adult population. This is mostly due to the biologic properties of hyaline cartilage, namely its avascularity, limiting the healing potential of the articular surface. Clinically, a systematic review of OLT by Verhagen et al showed that among 201 patients in 14 studies, only 91 (45%) reported successful outcomes with nonoperative treatment.

Many operative treatments have been used to treat OLT, and are usually classified as cartilage repair, cartilage regeneration, and cartilage replacement. Further, the autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI) is a staged technique attributed to cartilage regeneration. It is a cell-based cartilage regeneration technique using chondrocytes cultivated ex vivo. It has been established for treating full cartilage defects of the knee joint in clinical routine, with proven long-term efficacy. It is often used after unsuccessful nonoperative treatment or microfracture, and is currently offered only through a single vendor in the USA. The ACI can be used for larger lesions, but its implementation is limited by cost, the need for 2 separate surgical procedures, and the fact that it requires a stable osseous bed. Cartilage replacement, such as osteochondral autograft/allograft transplantation (OAT), can replace the talus osteochondral lesions with hyaline cartilage. The main benefit of OAT is that these grafts maintain type-II collagen, to reproduce the mechanical, structural, and biochemical properties of the original hyaline articular cartilage. OAT shows a trend toward greater longevity and durability as well as improved outcomes in high-demand patients when compared with other options for osteochondral lesion repair.

The treatment of OLT is challenging, despite the many operative techniques available. The fact that no systematic review concluded which technique was more effective and safer was a concerning issue for the orthopedists. Therefore, this systematic review aimed to identify and analyze the available evidence regarding the comparative effectiveness and safety of different types of operative treatments in adult patients with OLT.

2. Materials and methods
A systematic review was performed according to the Cochrane systematic review guidelines and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses checklist. All analyses were based on previous published studies, thus no ethical approval and patient consent are required.

2.1. Search strategy
The PubMed, Embase, ISI Web of Knowledge, and Cochrane Controlled Trial Register of Controlled Trials were searched from their inception date to September 2019 to identify studies assessing the comparative effectiveness and safety of operative treatments for OLT without language restriction. The following search terms were used: cartilage, osteochondral, osteochondritis, ankle, talus, talar, astragalus, tibia, and talocrural. The references for all identified studies, including related systematic reviews, were searched manually for additional relevant studies.

2.2. Study selection criteria
The inclusion/exclusion criteria for the population, intervention, comparison, outcomes, and study were defined and applied. The studies were selected by 2 reviewers independently. After deleting the duplications, the titles and abstracts were screened for all identified potential studies. All studies with possible relevance were then retrieved in full text for a comprehensive assessment according to the inclusion criteria; disagreement was resolved by discussion or consensus with a third reviewer.

2.3. Inclusion criteria
2.3.1. Participants. Adult (older than 18 years) patients diagnosed with symptomatic OLT. Symptoms included chronic ankle pain, recurrent swelling, weakness, stiffness, and catching of the ankle joint, which were related to symptomatic OLT.

2.3.2. Intervention and comparison. All types of operative treatments were included. Cartilage repair included bone marrow stimulation (microfracture) and retrograde drilling; cartilage regeneration included ACI, matrix-induced autologous chondrocyte implantation (MACI), platelet-rich plasma (PRP), and bone marrow-derived cell (BMDC) transplantation; and cartilage replacement included OAT.

2.3.3. Outcomes. The primary outcomes were the effectiveness outcome, American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society (AOFAS) score for the function of the talus, and revision rates. The AOFAS score is a numerical system emphasizing the patient’s perception of function and pain. An AOFAS score of 100 to 90 points was considered as excellent, 89 to 80 as good, 79 to 70 as fair, and ≤69 as poor results. The secondary outcomes included radiological outcomes and safety outcomes. The radiological outcome was assessed using the magnetic resonance observation of cartilage repair tissue (MOCART) score. The safety outcome was assessed using the complication rate.

2.3.4. Study. Any published or unpublished randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or non-RCTs were selected, including conference papers.

2.4. Exclusion criteria
Trials focusing primarily on the treatment of patients with multiple cartilage lesions not limited to the talus were excluded. Trials comparing the same type of operative treatment were excluded, such as the open ACI versus arthroscopic ACI, and OAT compared with allograft transplantation. Studies that did not report the eligible outcome or data were excluded. Letters, reviews, animal experiments, case reports, case series, and studies without control were also excluded.

2.5. Data collection and analysis
Two reviewers independently extracted data using a data extraction form. Potential author discord was resolved through discussion or, when necessary, by involving a third author to establish consensus. All study characteristics and data, such as
study population, sample size, and outcome data, were extracted according to a predefined form.

2.6. Quality assessment
Two reviewers assessed the methodological quality independently. The Cochrane Collaboration Guidelines for the risk of bias was used for the quality assessment of RCTs.[23] The items for the risk of bias were divided into 7 domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other types of bias. The bias was described to indicate a low or high risk of bias; “unclear” indicated that the risk of bias was unclear. For non-RCTs, the methodological index for nonrandomized studies checklist was used.[26] The items were scored on a 3-point scale: 0 (not reported), 1 (reported, but not adequate), or 2 (reported and adequate). Any disagreement was resolved by the consensus of all authors.

2.7. Statistical analysis
The meta-analysis was performed using Revman 5.3. The results were expressed as risk ratios for dichotomous outcomes. For continuous outcomes with final data, the weighted mean difference (WMD) or the standardized mean difference (SMD) was used, both with 95% confidence interval (CI). The SMD was applied if the studies used different instruments to measure the same construct. The $I^2$ values were used to assess heterogeneity. A considerable statistical heterogeneity between the studies was assumed if the $I^2$ value was $>50%$.[23] A fixed-effects model was used in the case of no significant heterogeneity; otherwise, a random-effects model was used. Publication bias was tested using the funnel plot.

3. Results
Initially, 1154 potentially relevant studies were identified through electronic and manual searches. Among these, 336 studies due to duplicate publications and 620 studies after screening the titles and abstracts were excluded. Of the remaining 98 studies, 25
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**Figure 1.** Summary of the literature identification and selection process.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cartilage repair versus cartilage replacement</td>
<td>Liberati A 2009[24] Case controlled</td>
<td>Talar dome lesions</td>
<td>Cartilage repair</td>
<td>Cartilage replacement</td>
<td>71.5±21.1 months</td>
<td>8-Point scale, assessing the range of motion, pain, and crepitus; radiographic assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gobbi A 2006[29] RCT</td>
<td>Osteochondral lesions of the talus</td>
<td>11 Patients; microfracture</td>
<td>10 Patients; osteochondral autograft transplantation</td>
<td>53 months (range, 24–119 months)</td>
<td>AOFAS, AHS, SANE, NPI, and MRI findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domayer SE 2012[30] Case controlled</td>
<td>Cartilage repair of the ankle</td>
<td>10 Patients; microfracture</td>
<td>10 Patients; matrix-associated autologous cartilage transplantation</td>
<td>113.8 months in group 1 and 65.4 months in group 2</td>
<td>AOFAS, MRI findings, and ROI analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartilage repair versus cartilage regeneration</td>
<td>Apprich S 2012[31] Case controlled</td>
<td>Stable adjacent cartilage on the talar dome</td>
<td>Cartilage repair</td>
<td>Cartilage regeneration</td>
<td>A minimum follow-up of 18 months</td>
<td>AOFAS and MOCART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tahta M 2017[32] Case controlled</td>
<td>Osteochondral lesions of the talus</td>
<td>46 patients; nanofracture</td>
<td>52 patients; hyaluronic acid-based cell-free scaffold with concentration of autologous bone marrow aspirate</td>
<td>42.2±9.2 months in group 1 and 40.1±11.6 months in group 2</td>
<td>AOFAS, VAS, and MOCART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartilage repair versus cartilage repair + cartilage regeneration</td>
<td>Kim YS 2014[33] Case controlled</td>
<td>Osteochondral lesions of the talus</td>
<td>Cartilage repair</td>
<td>Cartilage repair +cartilage regeneration</td>
<td>27.1 months (range, 22–41 months)</td>
<td>VAS, AOFAS, Tegner scores, and MOCART score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hannon CP 2016[34] Case controlled</td>
<td>Osteochondral lesions of the talus</td>
<td>24 patients; marrow stimulation with an injection of a stromal vascular fraction containing mesenchymal stem cells</td>
<td>22 patients; arthroscopic bone marrow stimulation and concentrated bone marrow aspirate</td>
<td>77.3 months in group 1 and 48.3 months in group 2</td>
<td>FAOS and SF-12 PCS, and MOCART score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murphy EP 2019[35] Case controlled</td>
<td>Osteochondral lesions of the talus</td>
<td>52 patients; microfracture alone</td>
<td>49 patients; microfracture augmented with bone marrow aspirate concentrate and fibrin glue</td>
<td>Minimum follow-up for both groups was 36 months</td>
<td>VAS pain score, FAOS, and revision rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AHS = Ankle Hindfoot Scale, AOFAS = American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society, HSS = Hannover Scoring System, MOCART = magnetic resonance detection of cartilage repair tissue, MRI = magnetic resonance imaging, NPI = numeric pain intensity, RCT = randomized controlled trial, ROI = region of interest, SANE = single-assessment numeric evaluation, VAS = visual analogue scale.
were reviews, 47 were case series, 11 were without eligible outcome, and 7 had the same type of treatment after reading the full text, and hence were excluded. Finally, 8 trials with 375 patients were included in this systematic review. The selection process of the studies is shown in Fig. 1.

### 3.1. Study characteristics

All studies included were published between 2000 and 2019. One was RCT, and the others were non-RCTs. Three trials compared cartilage repair with cartilage replacement, 2 trials compared cartilage repair with cartilage regeneration, and 3 trials compared cartilage repair with cartilage repair plus cartilage regeneration. The treatments included in the cartilage repair were curettage and subchondral drilling, microfracture, nano-aspirate. The follow-up ranged from 18 to 113.8 months. The sample sizes ranged from 10 to 101. The characteristics of trials included in the present meta-analysis are shown in Table 1.

### 3.2. Quality assessment

The methodological quality of the trials is shown in Tables 2 and 3. The quality assessment of the RCTs included the following:

- **Random sequence generation**: Unclear
- **Allocation concealment**: Unclear
- **Blinding of participants and personnel**: Unclear
- **Blinding of outcome assessment**: Low
- **Incomplete outcome data**: Unclear
- **Selective reporting**: Unclear
- **Other types of bias**: Unclear

Low, low risk of bias; High, high risk of bias; and Unclear, the risk of bias was unclear.

RCT = randomized controlled trial.

### 3.3. Effectiveness outcome

The result of the comparison of the AOFAS score is shown in Fig. 2. Two of 3 trials comparing cartilage repair with cartilage replacement reported that the AOFAS score and the difference between the cartilage repair and replacement were not significant (2 trials, 41 participants, WMD = 2.15, 95% CI = −2.90 to 7.20, P = .40). However, prospective calculation of the study size was not reported in any of the trials. Only the trial of Apprich et al included patients consecutively. The trial of Apprich et al reported a minimum follow-up of 18 months, which was conducted because the endpoints were not appropriate to the aim of the study. Only 3 trials reported that the groups were similar in terms of the criteria other than the studied endpoints. All the trials reported statistical analyses, but only 2 of them were adequate.

### 3.4. Radiological outcome

The result of the comparison of the MOCART score is shown in Fig. 3. Both the trials comparing cartilage repair with regeneration reported the MOCART score. Overall, significant differences were observed between cartilage repair and cartilage repair plus regeneration (3 trials, 184 participants, WMD = −4.33, 95% CI = −6.41 to −2.26, P < .0001).

Only one trial reported revision rates; 14 of 52 patients in the cartilage repair group and 6 of 49 in the cartilage repair plus regeneration group required revision.

### Table 2

Methodological quality of the RCTs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of bias</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

Methodological quality of the non-RCTs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A clearly stated aim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusion of consecutive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prospective collection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Endpoints appropriate to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the aim of the study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unbiased assessment of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the study endpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Follow-up period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate to the aim of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Loss to follow-up less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prospective calculation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the study size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criteria in the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case of comparative studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. An adequate control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contemporary groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Baseline equivalence of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Adequate statistical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0, not reported; 1, reported, but not adequate; and 2, reported and adequate.

RCT = randomized controlled trial.
tion reported the MOCART scores, and the difference between the cartilage repair and the replacement was significant (2 trials, 118 participants, WMD = −8.78, 95% CI = −11.26 to −6.30, \( P < .00001 \)).

Two of the 3 trials reported the MOCART score, and the cartilage repair plus regeneration group showed significant superiority compared with the cartilage repair group in improving the MOCART score (2 trials, 118 participants, WMD = −7.39, 95% CI = −11.04 to −3.75, \( P < .0001 \)).

3.5. Safety outcome
The complication rate was reported in 2 trials.\(^{[29,32]}\) Gobbi et al.\(^{[29]}\) reported pain of unknown cause at various intervals after surgery in 2 of 10 patients in the cartilage repair group and complications in 3 of 23 patients in the cartilage replacement group. Tahta et al.\(^{[32]}\) reported that no major complication was seen in any patient; however, the superficial infection was observed in 2 patients in the cartilage regeneration group, which was successfully treated with oral antibiotic therapy.

3.6. Publication bias
The roughly symmetrical funnel plot in Fig. 4 indicates no existence of publication bias in this meta-analysis.

4. Discussion
4.1. Summary of evidence
One systematic review reported on treatment strategies for OLT in 2003. In this previous review, 39 studies describing treatment strategies for OLT were summarized, but no RCT was included.
Moreover, as most of the trials were on nonoperative treatments, no definitive evidence was available to compare the effectiveness of these 2 types of surgical interventions.\[12\] The effect and safety of microfracture and OAT were reviewed in 2016 and 2017 separately. Gross inconsistencies and an underreporting of data between studies were observed. Consequently, pooling was deemed impossible.\[36,37\]

Nine trials with 387 adult patients for OLT were identified in the present study that met the inclusion criteria. The findings of this systematic review indicated that the cartilage regeneration and cartilage repair plus regeneration had significant superiority in improving the function of the ankle and radiological evaluation. The comparative effectiveness between the cartilage repair and replacement could not be confirmed. Moreover, which treatment between the 2 was safer could not be answered in this review as most of the trials did not report the safety outcome.

4.2. Cartilage regeneration

The cartilage regeneration included ACI, MACI, PRP, and BMDC transplantation. The ACI was first developed by Brittberg et al in 1994.\[39\] In principle, the primary advantage of ACI was that it involved the transplantation of viable, cultured chondrocytes into the defect, thereby facilitating a presumably hyaline-like repair tissue. However, the ACI required a 2-stage operation. An injection of chondrocyte cell suspension under a sutured periosteal flap harvested from the distal end of the tibia was used in the ACI, which was a technically demanding procedure. The potential for cell dedifferentiation, cell leakage, and uneven distribution of cells limited the application of this technique. Then, the MACI was developed on the basis of the ACI, in which harvested chondrocytes were typically cultured on a bioabsorbable, porcine type-I/III collagen membrane before implantation into the defect.\[39\] Also, various other types of matrices existed, including type-I collagen gel and hyaluronic acid-based membrane.\[60\] The MACI was superior to the ACI because of the following reasons: a periosteal graft harvest was avoided, a more even cell distribution was possible, the culturing process prevented the dedifferentiation of chondrocytes, and the procedure could be performed arthroscopically. A meta-analysis concluded that the ACI/MACI was reported to have success rates ranging from 50% to 100% (mean, 89.9%) for the OLT. However, the only 2 trials in this meta-analysis were case series, which did not provide high-level evidence.\[41\] The PRP and BMDC transplantation techniques combined microfracture with the addition of autologous iliac crest spongiosa bone, bone marrow aspirate concentrate, and/or PRP to the lesion using a collagen matrix carrier and fibrin glue to secure the carrier. This technique allowed a 1-step arthroscopic procedure involving the use of autologous tissue with minimal donor-site morbidity.\[42\]

4.3. Cartilage replacement

Cartilage replacement included OAT and particulated juvenile cartilage allograft transplantation (PJCAT). The OAT was first described by Yamashita et al in 1985 for treating lesions in the knee.\[43\] It was primarily reserved for isolated lesions and subchondral cystic lesions of the talus larger than 1cm². If the primary treatment failed to resolve smaller defects with excision, debridement, and bone marrow stimulation, the OAT procedure was considered.\[44\] The OLTs secondary to avascular necrosis have been shown to be at a higher risk of failure because of the decreased vascularity resulting in poor incorporation of the graft.\[45\] The PJCAT entailed the transplantation of fresh juvenile cartilage pieces containing live cells within their native
extracellular matrix. The PJCAT is available only through a single vendor at this time (Denovo; Zimmer). A fibrin adhesive was used to secure the tissue firmly inside the prepared lesion. The particulate nature of the graft obviated the need for perpendicular access, thereby eliminating the use of osteotomies of the medial or lateral malleolus and the potential for nonunion or pain at the site of implants. The graft could also be delivered with an all-arthroscopic technique. Additionally, PJCAT offered the advantages of a shallow learning curve, no graft contouring, no donor-site morbidity, and the performance of a single-stage procedure. The disadvantages of this technique were the absence of long-term data, the limited supply of juvenile donor cartilage, and the risks of disease transmission.

4.4. Limitations of this review

This study was comprehensive with no language restrictions applied, but the small and unpublished trials could not be ruled out. The evidence of this study was limited to the trials with small sample sizes. No subgroup analyses were performed due to the relatively small number of studies. Future studies should include additional trials and sufficient data to perform subgroup analysis so as to explore different estimated effects across different population demographics and patients and injury parameter subgroups. Furthermore, the classification of the different types of treatment might have led to the loss of many unknown information about the trials. Finally, the inherent heterogeneity among included studies due to factors such as surgical centers and instruments, operating experience, and grasp of indications of information about the trials. Future studies should include the best surgical option for treating OLT.

5. Conclusions

Cartilage regeneration and cartilage repair plus regeneration had significant superiority in improving the function of the ankle and radiological evaluation. However, the trials included in this study did not provide high-level evidence. Moreover, which treatment between the 2 was safer could not be addressed in this review because most of the trials did not report the safety outcome. Further studies are needed to define the best surgical option for treating OLT.
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