Bifocal parosteal osteoma of femur: A case report and review of literature

Raffaele Vitiello,¹,² Tommaso Greco,¹,² Luigi Cianni,¹,² Silvia Careri,³ Maria Serena Oliva,¹,² Marco Gessi,¹,² Ivan De Martino,¹ Maria Beatrice Bocchi,¹,² Giulio Maccarao,¹,² Carlo Perisano¹
¹Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Rome; ²Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome; ³Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Institute of Scientific Research, Children’s Hospital Bambino Gesù, Rome, Italy

Abstract

Osteoma is a benign, slowly growing, asymptomatic, bone-forming tumor arising from cancellous or compact bone. Usually a solitary lesion, but in patients with Gardner’s Syndrome it may be multiple. Osteoma may rarely have a parosteal localization. Parosteal osteoma has peculiar radiographic, histologic and clinical features. We describe a case report of a 51-years-old man with a bifocal parosteal osteoma of the femur in a non-syndromic patient. This is the first described patient with a bifocal lesion. In literature only 24 cases of parosteal osteoma are found. Our patient underwent surgery and the lesions were fully excised. At one year follow-up there was no evidence of recurrence.

Introduction

Osteoma is a benign, slowly growing, asymptomatic, bone-forming tumor arising from cancellous or compact bone.¹

Osteomas are most commonly located in the skull (especially is the paranasal sinuses and jaw bones) and facial bones. Long bone involvement with osteoma is rare, with a prevalence of 0.03% of biopsied primary bone tumors.² There are a few reported cases of osteomas of the clavicle,¹,² pelvis,²³ or long bones.²⁴ The tumor occurs most frequently in adults, and more than 78% of the patients are older than 40 years.

Usually osteoma is a solitary lesion, but in patients with Gardner’s Syndrome they may be multiple and associated with intestinal polyyps, fibromatous and other lesions of connective tissue, and epidermal cysts.²³

Rarely, osteoma may have a parosteal localization. Parosteal osteoma (PO) has peculiar radiographic, histologic and clinical features. Radiographically osteoma presents as a solitary, long-standing uniform dense sclerotic lesion attached to the surface of the diaphysis or metadiaphysis.

Multiple parosteal osteomas appear to be exceedingly rare.

They may be incidentally identified as a mass in the skull or mandible, or as the underlying cause of sinusitis or mucocele formation within the paranasal sinuses.

Three histological patterns are recognized:

- ivory osteoma, made of dense bone lacking Haversian system;
- mature osteoma resembles ‘normal’ bone, including trabecular bone often with marrow
- mixed osteoma, a mixture of ivory and mature histology.

The imaging shows very radiodense lesions, similar to the normal cortex, whereas mature osteomas may demonstrate central marrow.³

In the present study, we describe a case of multiple parosteal osteoma STS. We also provide a review of the literature about this topic.

Case Report

In the 2012 came to our attention a 51-years-old man for a moderate painful swelling of the right knee and medial side of the right thigh. Swelling gradually increasing size in the last 15 years very slowly and in the last years appear worsening pain, both hip and knee. He was a bricklayer. The patient denied any history of recent or remote trauma at right leg or history of radiant exposure. He didn’t smoke. He hadn’t familiarity for cardiovascular diseases, cancers or other health problems.

His sister had a similar painless mass at right knee. Nobody in the family suffered of Gardner’s syndrome, fibromatosis, polyposis or poor eyesight. Nobody in the family suffered of Gardner’s syndrome, fibromatosis, polyposis or poor eyesight. At observation of the right knee and medial side of the distal femur, no similar masses was found. No similar masses was found.

The patient refused any excisional surgery. After three years, the patient came back to our attention for the worsening of the pain. A CT-scan (Figure 1) was performed and showed two voluminous exostotic formations with calcific hood. The first mass starting from the small trochanter measures 10x7 cm with an extension of 15 cm; this mass was no mobile and painful at palpation (VAS 6/10). The skin up to the masses was normochronic but hyposensitive. The ROM of the hip and knee were normal. The knee was stable. FABER and FADIR test, Posterior impingement test, log roll test, Thomas test were negative. There was no muscle wasting. The reflexes were normal. No constitutional symptoms were present. A routine blood exam was normal. An X-Ray of the knee showed two voluminous bone masses above the lesser trochanter and on the medial side of the distal femoral epiphysis. An incisional biopsy through a jamshidi needle was performed: the histological examination showed a surface osteoma.
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approach for the distal lesion. The excision was particularly difficult, due to their hardness, and required special scalpels and saws; no prophylactic osteosynthesis was needed.10 Macroscopically both lesions appeared as rounded, stone-hard masses. At histopathological level, they were composed of dense, compact, hypo cellular lamellar bone without cytological atypia. Neither macroscopic nor microscopic there was evidence of cartilage tissue or cartilage cap in the tissue specimens of both lesions.

The patient discharged after 3 days without complications. At 15 days after surgery stitches were removed, the wounds looked flat and regular. The VAS-score pain was 4/10. At one-month follow-up, X-ray control was performed; there were no evidence of pathological mass. The VAS-score was 2/10. After six months, the patient recovered autonomy in all his ADL (Activities of Daily Living) and IDAL (Instrumental Activities of Daily Living). At one-year follow-up there was no evidence of recurrence.

Discussion

Our search was performed on the PubMed and Cochrane databases using different key-words: parosteal osteoma, juxtacortical osteoma and surface osteoma. The examined range of time was between years 1951 and January 2018. Resulted 165 articles which 144 were excluded based on the language (non English articles) and title because they dealt with different topics, such as non-surface osteomas, syndromic osteomas, veterinary osteomas or other bone neoplasms. The resultant 21 articles were analyzed. In 1951 Geschickter and Copeland coined for the first time the term “parosteal osteoma”.11 PO occur in early adult or in middle life.11 The prevalence has been estimated to be 4.2 per 1000 patients.12 Osteoma that involves the long bone is rare with a prevalence of 0.03 of 1000 patient undergoing bone biopsy for primary tumor.12 PO are located mainly in the skull and the face (paranasal sinuses, jaw bones and facial bones). Multiple osteomas can be associated with Gardner’s syndrome or tuberous sclerosis.13 PO of bones other than skull and face involved lower extremities in the 86% of cases, both diaphyseal and metaphyseal region.3 Histologically it consists entirely of dense sclerotic lamellar bone similar to cortical bone without fibrous stroma. In most cases the typical presentation is a swelling, hard, painful mass that gradually enlarges. PO grows very slow and can reach big size (in the Bertoni review3 one patient has a PO of 20x2.8x3 cm). While PO is often clinically painful and palpable, five asymptomatic cases have been reported.3,14,15 Many other entities can simulate a PO; the differential diagnosis includes: melorheostosis, myositis ossificans, ancient osteochondroma developing in mature bone, secondary reactive bone change and parosteal osteosarcoma.7,14,17 There are no national guidelines for treatment of PO. For his very low growth potential close clinically and radiographically follow-up will avoid extensive and sometimes debilitating treatment.3 After complete surgical excision or surgical debulking the prognosis is excellent without a propensity for local recurrence.3,11 Campanacci suggested a marginal excision without wide margins because the only debulking (intrallesional resection) is usually uneffective and exposes the patient to pain,

Table 1. Overview of the available studies focused on the parosteal osteoma.

| Authors            | Year | Type         | Sex | Age       | Localization |
|--------------------|------|--------------|-----|-----------|--------------|
| Sundaram M et al.  | 1996 | Case series  | 3 F | Mean age 37 | 1 scapula    |
|                    |      |              | 1 M |           | 2 femur      |
|                    |      |              |     |           | 1 fibula     |
| Bertoni F et al.   | 1995 | Case series  | 8 M | Mean age 45 | 1 clavicle   |
|                    |      |              | 6 F |           | 1 humerus    |
|                    |      |              |     |           | 6 femur      |
|                    |      |              |     |           | 4 tibia      |
|                    |      |              |     |           | 2 fibula     |
| Hansford BG et al. | 2014 | Case report  | F   | 45        | Femur        |
| Inokuchi T et al.  | 2014 | Case report  | F   | 51        | Left clavicle|
| Yun SJ et al.      | 2012 | Case report  | M   | 66        | Distal femur |
| Chikuda H et al.   | 2002 | Case report  | F   | 47        | Ulna         |
| Soler Rich R et al.| 1998 | Case report  | M   | 33        | Right iliac bone |
| Houghton MJ et al. | 1995 | Case report  | F   | 47        | Right pubic bone |
to a secondary larger resection of the tumor and to the risks of a double surgery.12,18

In literature only 24 cases of PO are found (Table 1).3,14,15,18-23 The mean age of incidence is 40 years. In 17 cases the PO is located on the lower limb, in 2 cases in the upper limb. In 5 cases the PO location is on flat bones (clavicle, scapula, pelvis). The most frequent localization is the femur (10 cases). All patients underwent surgery (biopsy or biopsy and later excision or primary excision). No complications related to surgery were described. None of the patients needed further surgery after the excision. No recurrence of the lesion was found.

Sundarman treated 4 cases with different localizations (Table 1) and after excision no recurrence of the lesion was found.23

Bertoni performed 9 resections, 4 incisional biopsies, 1 debulking. At the follow-up in 9 cases no evidence of the tumor was found.3 In 2 cases tumor was stable after 10 years, 1 patient died for a metastatic myeloma e 2 were lost in the follow-up.

Hansford and Yun both performed a wide resection of the lesions.15,22 Yun found an osteochondroma together with a parosteal osteoma.15 In both cases there is no follow-up. Sundarman performed a resection of the lesion23. After 2 years FU no clinical or radiological recurrence was found.

To the authors’ knowledge, bifocal PO in non-syndromic patient has not been previously described in the literature.

Only Yun described a simultaneously parosteal osteoma and osteochondroma in the distal femur of a single patient.15 Hansford described a strange case of PO not homogeneously dense and with a separate nodule in the soft tissues.22

**Conclusions**

PO is a rare, benign, slow growing lesion. An accurate diagnosis is important to exclude more aggressive and malignant neoplasms. We present the first case of a bifocal PO of the femur in a non-syndromic patient. The excision of the lesions guaranteed a fast recovery of the patient and a quicker relief from pain. No recurrence of the lesion was found.
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