

Version 2023

Charcot Foot

Osteo-arthropathy

Key issues and actions in initial management of acute diabetic foot syndrome and foot ulcer (DFS/DFU)



Charcot Foot



Foot

- Mild erythema
- Local warmth
- Swelling
- Painless or little pain
- Initially no wound
- Neuropathy imperative

$\mathbf{1}$

Acute Charcot Foot

until proven otherwise

 $\mathbf{1}$

Medical emergency! Referral to Level 2 or 3 strongly recommended.



 \downarrow

Foot Same as on the left with wound

 \downarrow

Does NOT exclude Acute Charcot Foot (differential diagnosis = ulcer with deep infection or cellulitis)

 \downarrow

Medical emergency in any case

←

Basic premises – Charcot Foot

	Issue	Action/background
	Available evidence	Larger scale intervention studies will probably remain difficult to perform in the field of Charcot Foot. Clinical practice will there- fore continue to rely on small or observational studies, clinical expertise and circumstantial evidence. These limitations highlight the need for an interprofessional team or network approach in the care of patients with Charcot Foot, and consensus-based decision making for challenging cases.
	Classification	 Eichenholtz: 3 stages based on radiological features and foot presentation: development (I), coalescence (II), reconstruction and reconstitution (III) Proposed addition of the prodromal stage 0: x-ray negative, MRI positive (micro-fracture, bone marrow edema, bone bruising) Chantelau: staging approach based on disease activity as demonstrated by MRI (active [A] or inactive [B] disease) and presence of deformity (present [1] or absent [0]) Active disease without deformity (A0): equivalent of «stage 0», desirable stage for disease identification, better chance of healing without deformity Inactive disease without deformity (B0): desirable end result of care Active disease with deformity (A1): Eichenholtz stages I/II Inactive disease with deformity (B1): stable end stage with enhanced risk of ulceration (Eichenholtz stage III) Sanders and Frykberg: 5 anatomical patterns: pattern I – metatarsal/phalangeal joints pattern III – mid-tarsal joints (Chopart joints) pattern IV – ankle and subtalar joint pattern V – calcaneum

ACF – Acute (active) Charcot Foot

Issue	Action/background	Competence & responsibility
Definition	Non-infectious destruction of bone and joint associat with neuropathy, in the acute phase (Stage $0-1$) association with signs of inflammation.	ed iated
Diagnosis	Early diagnosis and timely treatment is crucial becau the rapidly progressive nature of ACF with risk of seve and irreversible foot deformity. High risk of missed diagnosis due to lack of perception the patient and awareness and knowledge among HC regarding this rare condition.	se of ere n by P
Clinical examination	 Signs of peripheral neuropathy (10g monofilament, tuning fork, achilles TR) Unilateral erythema, swelling following minor traum often unnoticed by the patient, initially without ulce may co-exist caused by deformity or swelling Affected foot usually more than 2°C warmer comparaint with the non-affected foot. Often painless, mild pain may be present. Clinical signs may be subtle especially if localized on forefoot 	na, r, but red 1 îî îî the
Differential diagnosis	Cellulitis, trauma, acute gout, deep vein thrombosis, osteomyelitis, activated degenerative arthritis.	Level 1 (2 + 3)
Laboratory	CRP/inflammatory parameters: often normal or non-scifically elevated.	spe
Imaging	Conventional x-ray: for diagnosis confirmation (CAVE negative in early «stage 0», see appendix) and evaluat of deformity. MRI: mandatory as second line if x-ray negative and co signs of ACF. Others: scintigraphy, PET: no added benefit	x-ray tion linical 1 (c) 1

Issue	Action/background	Competence & responsibility	
Prevention	No specific measures beyond general preventive recomendations for diabetic foot.	om-	Level 1 (2 + 3)
Treatment (standard)	 ACF is a medical emergency and should be referred an interprofessional footcare team. → Level 1 Full and quick off-loading and immobilization at proceed development phase (Stage 0 – 1) of the Charcot foot important management strategy to prevent or stop provide deformity. → Level 2 + 3 Initially, emergency hospitalization with temporary be be required for the calming of the inflammatory proceed reducing edema (analogous to complex foot fracture) (crutches). Immobilization in an irremovable total contact cast (1 (alternative: removable TCC or orthotic walker render removable). → Level 2 + 3 Requirements: Specific training of plaster technicians to avoid iatrogications Close follow-up with regular check and adaptation of device according to the changing shape of the foot unment (reduction of swelling leads to misfit of the initia which can cause friction or pressure ulcers) Patient education and verification of feasibility in indication: until resolution of inflammation and swelling cence (Stage 2) (not predictable: often 3–6 months, pla months, longer if hind-foot or ankle involvement). Thrombosis prophylaxis during treatment with an indevice is recommended 	directly Iromal a is the m progress edrest m ess und), walking TCC) red non- tenic con foffload inder treat al device ividual ng, coale possibly	y to nd ost sion hay g aid npli- ing nt- s- up to ble
Treatment (pharmaco- logical)	 Treatment of (frequent) vitamin D deficiency Anti-resorptive agents (bisphosphonates, calcitonin, denosumab), anabolic (teriparatide): insufficient dat general recommendations 	a for	Level 1 (2 + 3)

CCF – Chronic Charcot Foot

Issue	Action/background	Competence & responsibility	
Diagnosis	Usually straightforward in presence of typical deformit a neuropathic foot (e.g. rocker bottom deformity).	y in (2 + 3)	
Clinical examination	 Signs of peripheral neuropathy (10g monofilament, turfork, achilles TR) Deformities associated with ankle/hind-foot charcot neuroarthropathy (CN) often multi-planar (sagittal: procurvatum/recurvatum; frontal: varus/valgus; rotational: internal/external malalignment). Shortening of the limb from collapse of the distal tibia, talus and calcaneus. No or mild temperature difference (< 2°), no swelling (Stage 3 = Reconstruction). Screen for ulcers/pre-ulcerative lesions +/- infection Assess vascular status Inspect footwear 	ning [2 + 3]	
Laboratory	No role except \rightarrow DFU infection (diabetic foot ulcer)	Level (1) 2 + 3	
Imaging	According to clinical context	Level (1) 2 + 3	

Issue	Action/background	Competenc responsib	ce & oility
Conservative Treatment	 Orthopedic footwear: → Minor deformity and affection of the forefood (Sanders / Frykberg pattern I – II, see append > semi-orthopedic shoes, orthopedic shoe w modification (orthotic insole, roller bar). → Major deformity and affection of the mid- ar foot (Sanders / Frykberg pattern II – V, see an > orthopedic shoe made to measure. Close follow-up, repeatedly stressing the comp necessity of continuous wearing of the shoes in outdoor. 	t l <u>ix)</u> ith ppendix) velling n- and	Level 2 + 3
Surgical Treatment	 Primary indication: Severe deformity and install cast-able, brace-able or shoe-able. Other indications: impending ulceration/recurr despite optimal offloading, inability to heal and presence of osteomyelitis and/or significant pathers. Possible Procedures: realignment osteotomy of nent bone, realignment arthrodesis of the affect deformed joints. Cave: internal fixation is not remended in the presence of infection and ulcer. <i>intervention in the absence of ulceration or unsideformity may not be advisable, as it is not witter a multi-disciplinary approach of a castisfactory results.</i> 	oility, not ent ulcers ulcer, in. f promi- cted and ecom- <i>Surgical</i> stable chout risk. ementa- dedicated chieve	Level 3
Follow-up	Monitor ulcer risk, verify realization of preventivures (e.g. wearing of orthopedic footwear).	'e meas-	*Level 1 + 3

Subgroup neuropathic DFS

Marc Egli, chair [8] – Thomas Böni [13] – Sandro Fraternali [14] – Mario Malgaroli [2] – Christina Ruob [3] – Katrin Schimke [8]

Working Group DFS

Bettina Peter-Riesch, chair [8] – Ulf Benecke [6] Lucia Blal [6] – Thomas Böni [13] – Bernard Chappuis [8] – Angela Cottier [1] – Emanuel Christ [8] Astrid Czock [4] – Marc Egli [8] – Sandro Fraternali [14] – Christian Frei [12] – Isabelle Hagon-Traub [8] Axel Haine [7] – Mario Malgaroli [2] – Dieter Mayer [5] – Salah Qanadli [10] – Christina Ruob [3] – Katrin Schimke [8] – Claude Schoenenweid [8] – Philippe Stirnimann [14] – Ilker Uckay [9] – Véronique Urbaniak [11]

Organizations

- [1] Swiss Family and Child Doctors
- [2] Swiss Organisation of Podiatry
- [3] pharmaSuisse
- [4] QualiCCare
- [5] Swiss Society of Vascular Surgery
- [6] Swiss Association for Woundcare
- [7] Swiss Society of Angiology
- [8] Swiss Society of Endocrinology and Diabetology
- [9] Swiss Society of Infectiology
- [10] Swiss Society of Vascular and Interventional Radiology
- [11] Swiss Interest Group of Diabetes Nurses
- [12] Swica Insurances
- [13] Swiss orthopaedics
- [14] Foot and Shoe Association



All QualiCCare member organizations are listed under: https://qualiccare.ch/ mitgliedschaft/mitglieder



QualiCCare association Rütistr. 3a | 5400 Baden | www.qualiccare.ch

References

- **1** Rogers LC, et al. The Charcot foot in diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2011 Sep;34(9):2123-9.
- 2 Rogers LC, Frykberg RG. The Charcot Foot. Med Clin North Am. 2013;97(5):847-56.
- 3 Molines L, Darmon P, Raccah D. Charcot's foot: newest findings on its pathophysiology, diagnosis and treatment. Diabetes Metab. 2010 Sep;36(4):251-5.
- 4 Schade VL, Andersen CA. A literature-based guide to the conservative and surgical management of the acute Charcot foot and ankle. Diabet Foot Ankle. 2015 Mar 19;6:26627.
- 5 Bus SA, et al. International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot. Footwear and offloading interventions to prevent and heal foot ulcers and reduce plantar pressure in patients with diabetes: a systematic review. Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2016;32 Suppl 1:99-118.
- 6 Holmes C, et al. Charcot stage 0: A review and consideratons for making the correct diagnosis early. Clin Diabetes Endocrinol. 2015 Dec 18;1:18.
- 7 Wukich DK, et al. Surgical management of Charcot neuroarthropathy of the ankle and hindfoot in patients with diabetes. Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2016;32 Suppl 1:292-6.
- 8 Chantelau EA, Grützner G. Is the Eichenholtz classification still valid for the diabetic Charcot foot? Swiss Med Wkly. 2014;144:w13948.