Treatment of Lisfranc Joint Injury: Current Concepts

Abstract
Injuries to the tarsometatarsal joint complex, also known as the Lisfranc joint, are relatively uncommon. However, the importance of an accurate diagnosis cannot be overstated. These injuries, especially when missed, may result in considerable long-term disability as the result of posttraumatic arthritis. A high level of suspicion, recognition of the clinical signs of injury, and appropriate radiographic studies are needed for correct diagnosis. When surgery is indicated, closed reduction with percutaneous screw fixation should be attempted. If reduction is questionable, open reduction should be performed. Screw fixation remains the traditional fixation technique.

The Lisfranc joint, also referred to as the tarsometatarsal (TMT) joint complex, is named for Jacques Lisfranc (1790-1847), a French surgeon who served in Napoleon’s army. Lisfranc described an amputation involving the TMT joint secondary to a vascular injury incurred when a soldier fell from a horse with his foot caught in the stirrup. Lisfranc injury has commonly been used to describe injuries to the bases of the five metatarsals (MTs), their articulations with the four distal tarsal bones, and the Lisfranc ligament, a strong interosseous attachment located between the medial cuneiform and the second MT.

Injuries to the TMT joint complex occur in 1 per 55,000 persons each year in the United States, accounting for approximately 0.2% of all fractures. Nearly 20% of these injuries are misdiagnosed or missed on initial radiographic assessment. More Lisfranc injuries are being diagnosed today, likely because of improvements in CT and MRI.

Low-energy trauma accounts for approximately one third of all Lisfranc injuries, with the remainder typically the result of high-energy forces sustained in motor vehicle accidents, industrial accidents, and falls from a height. Midfoot injuries sustained during athletic activity constitute a significant number of low-energy injuries, occurring in up to 4% of American football players per season. A high index of suspicion is needed to accurately diagnose TMT joint injury and attempt to avoid the late sequelae of posttraumatic arthritis.

Anatomy
The Lisfranc complex is made up of bony and ligamentous elements that combine to add structural support to the transverse arch. The bony architecture is composed of nine bones—five MTs and their respective articulations with the cuneiforms medially and the cuboid laterally. The TMT joint complex represents the dividing line between the midfoot and the forefoot.

Several osseous relationships con-
tribute to the intrinsic stability of the TMT joint. The trapezoidal shape of the middle three MT bases and their associated cuneiforms produce a stable arch referred to as the “transverse” or “Roman” arch.11,12 The keystone to the transverse arch is the second TMT joint, a product of the recessed middle cuneiform, which occupies a position 8 mm proximal to the medial cuneiform and 4 mm proximal to the lateral cuneiform.13 This allows five stabilizing structures to articulate with the recessed second MT, thereby enhancing the stability of the TMT joint complex. Anatomic variances frequently predispose to injury. Peicha et al14 showed that persons with Lisfranc injury had a shallower medial mortise depth compared with control subjects. They suggested that adequate mortise depth provides for greater stability by allowing for a stronger Lisfranc ligament.

de Palma et al10 organized the supporting ligamentous array into groups defined by their course (ie, longitudinal, oblique, transverse) and location (ie, dorsal, intersosseous, plantar). The transverse ligaments attach the second through fifth MT bases; there are no such ligaments between the first and second MT bases10,15 (Figure 1). However, situated between the medial cuneiform and second MT base are three oblique ligaments—dorsal, intersosseous, and plantar—which maintain the crucial mortise osseous relationship. The oblique intersosseous ligament, also referred to as the Lisfranc ligament, is the strongest structure supporting the TMT joint complex.16 The ligament is 8 to 10 mm wide and 5 to 6 mm thick, and it is mirrored superiorly and inferiorly by a dorsal and plantar oblique ligament10 (Figure 2). The plantar ligament that runs parallel to the Lisfranc ligament originates on the inferolateral aspect of the medial cuneiform and divides into two bands: the deep band, which inserts into the second MT, and the superficial band, which inserts into the third MT.13

In a biomechanical evaluation, Solan et al16 assessed the strength of each ligamentous set—dorsal, intersosseous, and plantar—by stressing it to failure. They concluded that the Lisfranc ligament was strongest, followed by the plantar ligaments and...
Mechanism of Injury

Most injuries to the TMT complex can be designated as indirect or direct. Indirect injuries can be high energy, as in motor vehicle accidents and falls from a height, or caused by low-energy forces, such as those incurred during athletic activity. Most commonly, indirect injuries are associated with a longitudinal force applied to the forefoot, which is then subjected to rotation and compression. Excessive plantar flexion and abduction forces are the most common individual indirect mechanisms leading to midfoot disruption. As the second MT dislocates or fractures, the MTs move laterally.

Two different plantar flexion mechanisms lead to dorsal joint failure. The first occurs in ankle equinus and metatarsophalangeal joint plantar flexion, with the Lisfranc joint engaged along an elongated lever arm. The joint is “rolled over” by the body; this commonly occurs when a person misses a step or unexpectedly catches the heel or latter half of the foot on the curb as he or she is stepping down. Dorsal displacement caused by plantar flexion can also occur when a force is applied along the long axis of the foot with the foot plantarflexed and the knee anchored on the ground. This is a common mechanism seen in American football players when they are lying prone on the ground and another player falls on the prone athlete’s heel. External rotation on a pronated forefoot is responsible for a substantially unstable Lisfranc ligamentous injury. The injuries can be largely secondary to an abduction stress to the midfoot. This injury pattern is best seen in sports that require use of a stirrup, such as equestrian events and windsurfing. In cases such as these, the forefoot is abducted around a fixed hindfoot, causing dislocation of the second MT and lateral displacement of the remaining MTs.

Direct injuries are usually associated with a crush injury. Depending on the location of force applied to the TMT joint complex, the MTs can undergo plantar or dorsal displacement. These fracture-dislocations are often associated with significant soft-tissue trauma, vascular compromise, and compartment syndrome.

Classification

Several classification systems have been developed and updated in the past century, with the authors displaying a tendency toward using joint incongruity rather than mechanism of injury as a basis for treatment and prognosis. These classification systems are inherently effective in standardizing terminology and allowing for the description of both high- and low-impact injuries; however, they may fall short in determining management and predicting clinical outcome.

In 1909, Quenu and Kuss first described injuries to the TMT joint based on the direction of MT displacement. Several modifications followed, with the most comprehensive being described by Hardcastle et al in 1982. In their experience with TMT injuries, prognosis depended more on joint incongruity than on mechanism of injury.

In 1986, Myerson et al proposed a scheme based on these previous systems to aid in clinical decision making. They classified injuries as follows: type A, total incongruity of the TMT joint; type B1, partial incongruity affecting the first ray in relative isolation (ie, partial medial incongruity); type B2, partial incongruity in which the displacement affects one or more of the lateral four MTs (ie, partial lateral incongruity); and type C1 and C2, a divergent pattern, with partial or total displacement,7 (Figure 3). These same authors coined the phrase tarsometatarsal joint complex in favor of older designations such as Lisfranc or TMT injuries because the former describes all bones and joints involved in TMT fracture-dislocation, including the intercuneiform and naviculocuneiform joints.

In 2001, Chiodo and Myerson presented a column classification of TMT joint injury based on the three mechanical columns of the foot to aid in treatment planning. The first TMT and medial naviculocuneiform joints make up the medial column. The middle column includes the articulations between the second and third TMT joints and those between the middle and lateral cuneiform with the navicular bone. The lateral column consists of articulations between the cuboid and the fourth and fifth MTs. Midfoot motion is highlighted in this system, with strong prognostic implications. Komenda et al reported that posttraumatic arthritis is more common at the base of the second MT, suggesting that incongruity is better tolerated at the medial and lateral columns. The lateral column, which has the greatest amount of sagittal plane motion, is the least likely to be involved in posttraumatic arthritis.
One shortcoming of traditional classification systems is the lack of emphasis on the simple diastasis seen in low-energy athletic injuries. This type of injury may involve the intercuneiform space or the naviculocuneiform joints. In 2002, Nunley and Vertullo²⁴ classified athletic midfoot injuries into three groups based on clinical findings, weight-bearing radiographs, and bone scintigraphy. Athletes with stage I injury had pain only at the Lisfranc complex and increased uptake on bone scan, with negative radiographic findings. Stage II injuries exhibited diastasis between the first and second MTs of 1 to 5 mm greater than that of the contralateral side, without loss of midfoot arch height. Diastasis >5 mm and loss of midfoot arch height signified stage III injury. Nonsurgical treatment of stage I patients and surgical treatment of stage II and III patients led to an excellent result in 93%.

Diagnosis

Lisfranc joint injuries can be difficult to accurately diagnose because gross lateral deviation or subluxation of the forefoot is less common than subtle midfoot injury. Patients often present with inability to bear weight and with swelling in the midfoot region. Examination of the foot reveals forefoot and midfoot edema as well as plantar arch ecchymosis (ie, plan-
Other signs suggestive of midfoot forefoot with the hindfoot fixed on abduction and pronation of the foot. A stress test may be performed. The clinician grasps the first and second MTs and moves them in plantar flexion and dorsiflexion (ie, piano key test) as well as abduction and adduction, noting any discomfort or subluxation in the midfoot. The first and second MTs should also be stressed divergently. Compartment syndrome should be ruled out in patients who present with severe traumatic midfoot injuries that are accompanied by significant swelling and pain. The dorsalis pedis pulse should be evaluated because blood flow may be compromised secondary to severe dislocation of the second MT.

### Radiographic Imaging
Lisfranc injuries are a challenge to diagnose; approximately 20% of injuries go unrecognized, likely secondary to the difficulty encountered with standard radiographic imaging. Many so-called sprains present with non–weight-bearing radiographs that are difficult to interpret. In a recent study, Nunley and Vertullo found that 50% of athletes with midfoot injuries had normal non–weight-bearing radiographs. Initial imaging of a suspected Lisfranc injury should include routine AP, lateral, and oblique views of the foot, with the image taken parallel to the midfoot joints. To aid in the diagnosis of more subtle injuries, a weight-bearing film with both feet on a single cassette is obtained. This last view serves as a stress view of the foot. It is helpful to explain this to the patient before obtaining the film so that compliance with evenly distributed weight bearing can be obtained. An AP abduction-pronation stress view is occasionally used to demonstrate instability when initial radiographs are normal. However, this may require an ankle block or general anesthesia because of the presence of pain; thus, it is rarely performed.

AP radiographs are used to demonstrate malalignment of the first and second TMT joints, whereas incongruity at the third and fourth joints are better visualized on a 30° oblique view. On the lateral view, the dorsal and plantar aspects of the MTs should correspond with the cuneiform and cuboid. A tangential line drawn through the medial aspect of the medial cuneiform and navicular should intersect the first MT base. Lateral weight-bearing radiographs can be used to identify flattening of the longitudinal arch as well as dorsal displacement at the second TMT joint (Figure 4).

Radiographic studies are done to determine whether an injury is stable or unstable. The AP radiograph should show alignment of the medial border of the second MT and the medial border of the middle cuneiform. The oblique view should show alignment of the medial border of the fourth MT and the medial border of the cuboid. Close examination of these lines for displacement will help the clinician with subtle cases. Diastasis between the first MT–medial cuneiform and second MT of 2 mm greater than on the contralateral side, or TMT joint subluxation of 2 mm greater than on the contralateral side, indicates instability and is an indication for surgical intervention (Figure 5). Diastasis between the first and second MT in the injured midfoot is considered normal provided that it measures <2.7 mm. Avulsion of the second MT base or medial cuneiform produces a fleck sign, as described by Myerson et al. The AP and oblique radiographs should be investigated for this finding. The most common abnormality in Lis-
Franc injuries is the lateral step-off at the second TMT joint.

**Additional Imaging**

Additional studies may be helpful, including bone scans, MRI, and CT. Bone scans are typically reserved for patients with a midfoot injury but with negative radiographic findings.\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^3\) When plain radiographs and the physical examination are equivocal, MRI can be used to provide excellent depiction of the soft tissues.\(^6\)\(^,\)\(^3\)\(^2\) Additionally, in the high-level athlete, MRI may provide information to help the treating physician make a determination on return-to-play status. In a recent study evaluating the predictive value of MRI for midfoot instability, Raikin et al\(^6\) found that MRI demonstrating a rupture or grade 2 sprain of the plantar ligament between the first cuneiform and the bases of the second and third MTs is highly predictive of midfoot instability, and these patients should be treated with surgical stabilization. CT is recommended in patients presenting with high-energy injuries in which improved detection and delineation of fractures is required. However, subtle displacement may not be demonstrated because this is a non–weight-bearing study. These images may demonstrate comminution and intraarticular extension or interposed soft tissues not appreciated on the initial radiographic assessment.\(^3\)\(^3\)

**Management**

The key to successful management is the determination whether to use surgical stabilization. Regardless of the severity of injury, the goal of treatment is a painless, plantigrade, stable foot. Maintenance of anatomic alignment seems to be the critical factor in achieving a satisfactory result, but it does not guarantee it.

Other factors, such as energy of the injury, cartilage damage, and soft-tissue injuries, can compromise the final outcome. Most of the literature supports that anatomic alignment is necessary, and good or excellent results have been achieved in 50% to 95% of patients with anatomic alignment, compared with 17% to 30% of patients with nonanatomic alignment.\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^7\)\(^,\)\(^2\)\(^7\)\(^,\)\(^3\)\(^4\)

**Nonsurgical**

Any measurable disturbance in normal radiographic anatomy may be an indication of instability and the need for surgical consideration. The key to selecting a nonsurgical option lies in ensuring that surgical intervention is not necessary. Table 1 lists five steps that can be used to determine whether a patient requires surgical treatment. Evaluation of subtle Lisfranc injury is time-consuming and potentially expensive, but we feel that, when possible, a diagnosis should be made without subjecting a patient to anesthesia. The last resort, stress examination under anesthesia, is rarely required. Patient consent should be obtained for possible open reduction and internal fixation (ORIF) if a stress examination is deemed to be necessary.

The patient with minimal ambulatory ability, an insensate foot, or preexisting inflammatory arthritis may be best treated nonsurgically. Reconstruction with midfoot arthrodesis can be performed later if pain persists. The authors prefer to use a CAM walking boot for 6 to 10 weeks in patients with stable injuries that can be managed nonsurgically. Weight bearing is allowed as tolerated, and follow-up weight-bearing radiographs are obtained 2 weeks after injury to ensure there are no changes in alignment. Subsequently, a brief 3- to 6-week course of physi-
cal therapy to work on gait training and balance is often helpful. We have found it of help to transition these patients into a comfort supportive shoe with a full-length total contact orthosis. It typically takes approximately 4 months for these patients to recover from a nonsurgical Lisfranc injury; patients should be informed of this time frame at the onset of treatment.

Surgical
Unstable injuries, even subtle ones, are managed surgically. Subtle Lisfranc injuries are occurring with increasing frequency, likely because of greater participation in high-demand sports. Obvious injuries in multiple trauma patients are not often missed, but more subtle injuries are a common source of continued disability. Careful examination of the trauma patient is required with any foot injury, as there are often distracting injuries that may delay the diagnosis.

The timing of surgery is predicated on resolution of swelling, when the skin begins to wrinkle. In more severe injuries, 3 weeks of bulky Jones splinting and elevation is required before it is safe to perform surgery. Commercially available ice therapy units can be placed over the splint and may help expedite local pain relief and reduction in swelling, before and after surgery. Ideally, Lisfranc injuries are best managed within the first 2 weeks following the inciting event, but we have treated many injuries up to 6 weeks posttrauma with successful anatomic reduction and outcome.

ORIF is our preferred technique for subtle and obvious injuries. The presence of osteochondral fragments, soft-tissue interposition, and clear visualization of the reduction are the primary factors for our preference for ORIF. The midfoot TMT joints have poor tolerance to mild malalignment as joint contact area is reduced, predisposing to arthritis. Moreover, closed reduction may be blocked or inhibited by bone fragments or soft tissue, and the accuracy of assessing 1 to 2 mm of subluxation radiographically is limited.

Some authors believe closed reduction under fluoroscopic guidance should be attempted first because percutaneous screw fixation has been used successfully in the past. Dorsal incisions centered over the involved joints are used to approach the midfoot; small bone fragments are excised, and larger pieces may be fixed. Many forms of fixation are available depending on the nature of the injury and surgeon preference.

For more obvious Lisfranc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical examination</td>
<td>Plantar bruising, painful piano key test, midfoot swelling</td>
<td>Obtain weight-bearing radiographs unless injury is obvious with non-weight-bearing images</td>
<td>Weight-bearing radiographs are always useful, but oblique views may be helpful for the tentative patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td>Loss of arch on comparative weight-bearing lateral radiograph, widening between the first and second metatarsal bases on comparative AP views, fleck sign</td>
<td>ORIF is indicated with positive results. External rotation views are necessary when there is uncertainty based on plain radiographs or the patient cannot bear weight. When uncertainty remains, MRI is useful.</td>
<td>Any measurable subluxation is an indication for ORIF. When in doubt, proceed with further tests. On MRI, edema indicates midfoot injury, and subluxation confirms Lisfranc injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>Edema at the tarsometatarsal joint, bone bruise, subluxation, or ligament tear</td>
<td>If edema but no ligament tear or subluxation, then CT is recommended. Perform ORIF in the presence of subluxation or a clear ligament tear.</td>
<td>MRI is more sensitive to edema in subtle injuries. CT may better illustrate subluxation, but MRI may show both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1 mm of subluxation</td>
<td>Strong evidence for Lisfranc injury when edema is noted on MRI and subluxation on CT. ORIF is indicated.</td>
<td>MRI with edema and no ligament tear combined with normal CT requires stress examination under anesthesia, with possible ORIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stress examination</td>
<td>Subluxation</td>
<td>ORIF</td>
<td>When negative, treat as a sprain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIF = open reduction and internal fixation
fracture-dislocation, screw fixation has been shown to have lower rates of redisplacement and faster return to weight bearing postoperatively compared with Kirschner wire (K-wire) fixation. Small-fragment (3.5 mm) cortical screw fixation is recommended for the first, second, and third TMT joints. The fourth and fifth joints may be pinned with K-wires. K-wire fixation is usually removed at 6 weeks postoperatively, whereas screws are left in place for 4 months. A short leg non–weight-bearing cast is used for the first 3 weeks, and a CAM boot is used for the next 3 to 5 weeks, progressing to full weight bearing by 8 weeks postoperatively. Patients are usually allowed to return to a shoe with an orthosis at 3 months after surgery, and screws are typically removed 4 months postoperatively.

Progressive physical therapy, which usually is initiated after full weight bearing has begun, is used for balance, gait training, and edema control. Once the percutaneous incisions have healed following screw removal, physical therapy is recommended for 4 to 6 weeks, if necessary. Primary arthrodesis may be indicated in cases of severe cartilage damage, preexisting midfoot arthritis, and delayed diagnosis as well as in select patients with neuropathic injuries. Primary arthrodesis has been shown to be a reliable method of surgical treatment.

In a randomized prospective study, Ly and Coetzee compared ORIF with primary arthrodesis in patients with a primary ligamentous injury. They found that patients treated with primary arthrodesis had a quicker recovery, a higher foot function index score, and a superior return to function than those who underwent ORIF. In a recent prospective study evaluating all types of Lisfranc complex injuries, no difference was seen in functional outcome between groups treated with ORIF versus primary arthrodesis. However, the reoperation rate was significantly lower in the fusion group than in the ORIF group, in whom routine removal of hardware was performed (17% versus 79%, P < 0.05). Additional prospective studies are needed to define what subset of patients will benefit from primary arthrodesis before making this the definitive recommended treatment.

**Future Techniques in Surgical Management**

Concerns exist regarding the potential damage that may be caused by traditional screw placement across the TMT joints, possibly resulting in the late development of posttraumatic arthritis and a poor outcome. We consider using dorsal plating for bridging fixation of comminuted fractures with bony fragments in the TMT joints (Figure 6) and total ligamentous injuries (Figure 7), and as an alternative surgical treatment in certain cases, such as joint damage and loss of fixation. We use dorsal plating in approximately 10% of patients with comminuted joint injuries. The concern for joint damage resulting from screw fixation across the TMT joints is eliminated. Although K-wire fixation minimizes the articular damage, redisplacement rates are unacceptably high. Moreover, given the potentially slow healing rate of pure ligamentous injuries, plating provides prolonged fixation. Wound problems are not more common with plating than with wire fixation. The postoperative regimen is the same, although the surgeon can elect to leave the plate in place. Hand plating sets are

---

**Figure 6**

A, AP weight-bearing radiograph demonstrating Lisfranc injury with a comminuted fracture at the second metatarsal base with joint impaction (type B2). The first, second, and third joints were involved at the time of surgery.

B, AP radiograph following open reduction and internal fixation using a one-third tubular plate demonstrating screw fixation and bridge plating of the second joint with good reduction.
often useful for this technique, and dorsal plate fixation has been shown to be as biomechanically sound as screw fixation.\textsuperscript{39} Painful hardware has not been a concern, and removal is not common with properly placed low-profile plating systems. Weight bearing is advanced rapidly, similar to screw fixation, and the remainder of the postoperative course is similar, less the need for hardware removal.

Subtle Lisfranc injuries are the most difficult to diagnose and manage. These injuries often have intercuneiform extension, with the injury exiting through the medial naviculo-cuneiform facet (Figure 8, A). Most surgeons believe that pure ligamentous injuries take far longer to heal than do their bony counterparts,\textsuperscript{38} and a novel approach to these difficult cases may improve outcomes with a more rapid return to sports. The authors may use Mini Tightrope (Arthrex, Naples, FL) or EndoButton (Smith & Nephew Endoscopy, Andover, MA) fixation. The EndoButton is placed across the base of the second MT into the medial cuneiform, mimicking the Lisfranc ligament (Figure 8, B). In cadaver specimens, this technique has been found to provide stability similar to that provided by screw fixation.\textsuperscript{40} A small-fragment cortical screw is placed across the intercuneiform joint; alternatively, an additional EndoButton may be used (Figure 8, B) to stabilize the disruption between the cuneiforms. When gross instability remains between the navicular and cuneiform following such fixation, the surgeon may need to add K-wire fixation across this joint. The wiring is removed prior to weight bearing. The postoperative protocol with the EndoButton is the same as that for screw or plate fixation, and removal is not needed.

These alternative treatments have not been used by enough surgeons and for a long enough time to indicate whether they offer results comparable or superior to those of traditional techniques. However, they may offer promise for reducing the incidence of posttraumatic arthritis. Further prospective studies are needed to compare the various techniques.

**Summary**

The diagnosis of subtle Lisfranc injury may be delayed or missed altogether. Such injuries are predisposed to chronic instability, deformity, and pain.\textsuperscript{12,31,36} Salvage includes ORIF or arthrodesis with the goal of restoring...
plantigrade alignment and alleviating pain. We have performed ORIF as late as 6 weeks after injury with acceptable results.

Patients expect to have a normally functioning foot that is completely pain free even after the most severe injury. In reality, following ORIF using any of various internal fixation techniques, patients can expect to have a well-aligned foot that is stable but potentially stiff, with a variable amount of residual pain. The patient likely will be able to perform most activities that he or she enjoys, but perhaps not all of them. A thorough discussion regarding the length of recovery, the magnitude of the injury, and potential complications is essential.

Not all patients who present with a Lisfranc injury require surgery, and it is important for the clinician to sort through the medical history before making a final decision. Relative contraindications for surgical intervention may include insensate feet (e.g., Charcot midfoot), inflammatory arthritis, nonambulatory status, and severe medical comorbidity. Even patients treated nonsurgically require appropriate immobilization, physical therapy, and orthotic support.

When surgery is indicated, an attempt at closed reduction under fluoroscopy with percutaneous screw fixation should be attempted. When the adequacy of the reduction is questionable, the surgeon should not hesitate to perform open reduction. Screw fixation remains the traditional fixation technique, although there is evidence to suggest that primary arthrodesis may be superior for the purely ligamentous midfoot injury. Future studies should involve newer fixation techniques and compare them with traditional surgical techniques.
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