A letter regarding: Traumatic fracture of the medial coronoid process in 24 dogs

Dirsko J. F. von Pfeil1,2; Mark Albrecht3; Mathieu Glassman1
1Friendship Surgical Services of the Friendship Hospital for Animals, Washington, District of Columbia, USA; 2Michigan State University, Department of Small Animal Clinical Sciences, East Lansing, Michigan, USA; 3Gallatin Veterinary Hospital, Bozeman, Montana, USA

Dear Sir,

Congratulations on the recently published study of Tan et al. “Traumatic fracture of the medial coronoid process in 24 dogs” (1). This paper aims to describe traumatic fracture of the medial coronoid process in dogs as a clinically distinct disease. It is a review of medical records (2006–2015), identifying 24 dogs that were arthroscopically treated. For 15 of these dogs a 16-week follow-up was provided. The conclusion of this work is that the clinical presentation and arthroscopic findings suggest that traumatic fracture exists and is unrelated to congenital elbow dysplasia.

We noted that the title and initial group of cases refer to 24 dogs, but final follow-up is only provided for 15. We wonder whether the nine dogs for which no final follow-up was available ought to have been excluded?

For these 15 dogs, final follow-up is very limited (16 weeks) and, while this is acknowledged in the section of limitations, we feel longer follow-up could have provided additional significant information. Indeed, the authors describe data over a nine-year period, which implies that longer follow-up was possible. Six months or longer is what journals often request as a minimum follow-up, thus it was surprising to us to read that in this study 16 weeks of follow-up were accepted for publication. Importantly, in humans, long-term follow-up has been shown to reveal crucial information (2, 3). We understand that follow-up was not the focus of this study but would still encourage both editors and future authors to provide outcome of at least six months or longer.

It appears that the authors had a “gut feeling” about this condition being traumatic and write that other reports (plural) showed no degeneration, but the reference provided for this statement is a case report (singular) by Görtz et al. (4). While this might be a spelling error that was not caught by the reviewers, the study by Tan and colleagues would have indeed benefited from histopathological examination of the collected samples, in order to have more definitively concluded a traumatic aetiology (1). Histopathological examination of removed medial coronoid fragments was described by another study, showing clearly that fracture of the medial coronoid process is a degenerative process (5). We have seen similar “clean” joints with a straightforward fracture of the medial coronoid process in younger dogs as described by Tan et al., and wonder if it might be worth a discussion regarding whether or not the syndrome of a true traumatic fracture of the medial coronoid process (“jump down syndrome”) really exists (1). Without providing histopathological evidence showing features associated with acute trauma to the bone, the author’s hypothesis remains just that, a hypothesis.

We were also surprised by the absence of objective data from a pressure-sensitive walkway.

Despite these shortcomings, we would like to congratulate the authors on this contribution to the veterinary literature and we look forward to learning more about this specific condition.

Sincerely,

Dirsko J. F. von Pfeil, Mark Albrecht, Mathieu Glassman
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