The Clinical Approach Toward Giant Cell Tumor of Bone

LIZZ VAN DER HEIJDEN,^a P.D. SANDER DIJKSTRA,^a MICHEL A.J. VAN DE SANDE,^a JUDITH R. KROEP,^b REMI A. NOUT,^b CARLA S.P. VAN RIJSWIJK,^c JUDITH V.M.G. BOVÉE,^d PANCAS C.W. HOGENDOORN,^d HANS GELDERBLOM^b

Departments of ^aOrthopedic Surgery, ^bClinical Oncology, ^cRadiology, and ^dPathology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

Disclosures of potential conflicts of interest may be found at the end of this article.

Key Words. Giant cell tumor of bone • GCTB • Denosumab • Radiotherapy • RANK ligand • Curettage • Histopathology • Review

ABSTRACT

We provide an overview of imaging, histopathology, genetics, and multidisciplinary treatment of giant cell tumor of bone (GCTB), an intermediate, locally aggressive but rarely metastasizing tumor. Overexpression of receptor activator of nuclear factor κ B ligand (RANKL) by mononuclear neoplastic stromal cells promotes recruitment of numerous reactive multinucleated giant cells. Conventional radiographs show a typical eccentric lytic lesion, mostly located in the meta-epiphyseal area of long bones. GCTB may also arise in the axial skeleton and very occasionally in the small bones of hands and feet. Magnetic resonance imaging is necessary to evaluate the extent of GCTB within bone and surrounding soft tissues to plan a surgical approach. Curettage with local adjuvants is the preferred treatment. Recurrence rates after curettage with

phenol and polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA; 8%–27%) or cryosurgery and PMMA (0%–20%) are comparable. Resection is indicated when joint salvage is not feasible (e.g., intra-articular fracture with soft tissue component). Denosumab (RANKL inhibitor) blocks and bisphosphonates inhibit GCTB-derived osteoclast resorption. With bisphosphonates, stabilization of local and metastatic disease has been reported, although level of evidence was low. Denosumab has been studied to a larger extent and seems to be effective in facilitating intralesional surgery after therapy. Denosumab was recently registered for unresectable disease. Moderate-dose radiotherapy (40–55 Gy) is restricted to rare cases in which surgery would lead to unacceptable morbidity and RANKL inhibitors are contraindicated or unavailable. *The Oncologist* 2014;19:550–561

Implications for Practice: Giant cell tumor of bone (GCTB) is an intermediate, locally aggressive, primary bone tumor. Ideally, all patients should be treated with intralesional excision with local adjuvant treatment (e.g., phenol, liquid nitrogen, polymethylmethacrylate), achieving joint salvage and optimal functional outcome. In patients with high-risk GCTB or in rare cases of metastatic disease, systemic targeted therapy with the receptor activator of nuclear factor κ B ligand inhibitor denosumab is highly effective and may create an operable situation. Moderate-dose radiotherapy is indicated only for rare cases of unresectable, residual or recurrent GCTB in which denosumab is contraindicated or unavailable for preoperative treatment and when surgery would lead to unacceptable morbidity.

INTRODUCTION

Giant cell tumor of bone (GCTB) is an intermediate, locally aggressive but rarely metastasizing tumor (International Classification of Diseases for Oncology code 9250/1), representing 5% of primary bone tumors and 20% of benign bone tumors [1]. It occurs mostly between the ages of 30–50 years and rarely arises in the immature skeleton. There is a slight predominance for female patients [1, 2]. At presentation, 15%–20% of patients have a pathologic fracture due to substantial cortical destruction followed by relatively minor trauma. GCTB is typically seen solitary, mostly located in the meta-epiphyseal region of long bones (85%) but may also occur in the axial skeleton (10%) or occasionally in the small bones of hands and feet (5%) [2, 3]. At the latter location, so-called giant cell lesion of the small bones—a different entity—should be considered [4]. Approximately 1%–4% of otherwise

conventional patients develop pulmonary metastases [3, 5–9]. These metastases often have relatively indolent behavior. Multifocal GCTB is rare, appearing either simultaneously or metachronously. In these presentations, so-called brown tumors associated with hyperparathyroidism should be ruled out by blood biochemistry because they are histologically barely distinguishable from GCTBs. Malignant transformation has been described in less than 1% of all GCTB and may be either primary (i.e., sarcomatous progression) or, more commonly, secondary (mostly radiation induced) [1].

The main problem in the management of GCTB is local recurrence after surgical treatment: 27%–65% after isolated curettage [2, 3]; 12%–27% after curettage with adjuvants such as high-speed burr, phenol, liquid nitrogen, or polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) [2, 10–12]; and 0%–12% after en bloc

Correspondence: Hans Gelderblom, M.D., Ph.D., Clinical Oncology, Leiden University Medical Center, Postzone K1-62, P.O. Box 9600, 2300 RC Leiden, The Netherlands. Telephone: 31-0-71-526-3057; E-Mail: a.j.gelderblom@lumc.nl Received November 18, 2013; accepted for publication January 22, 2014; first published online in *The Oncologist Express* on April 9, 2014. ©AlphaMed Press 1083-7159/2014/\$20.00/0 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2013-0432>

resection [2, 13]. In clinical practice, the choice of surgical treatment depends mostly on the feasibility of curettage and local adjuvants versus resection but also in part on the expected risk for local recurrence in each individual patient. Soft tissue extension, for example, is commonly present and increases the risk for local recurrence [14, 15]. Pathologic fractures are also common, and although this does not in itself increase recurrence risk, it may render curettage technically more difficult. In general, the aim for joint preservation is justified, considering the benign but locally aggressive nature, young patient population, and significant complications including need for revision surgery after resection and reconstruction with tumor prostheses [16–19].

The clinical challenge in GCTB treatment is to improve local control and broaden indications for intralesional surgery, providing optimal functional and oncological results. This may be aided by the promising results of systemic targeted therapy with receptor activator of nuclear factor κ B ligand (RANKL) inhibitors or bisphosphonates [20–23]. Consequently, a multidisciplinary evaluating system including radiological, histopathological, and clinical features is required as the basis of an optimal treatment protocol. This review addresses most relevant issues concerning diagnosis and multidisciplinary treatment of GCTB and future perspectives.

IMAGING

Conventional radiographs and contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are the most important imaging modalities in diagnosing GCTB, performing local staging, evaluating response to systemic treatment, and detecting local recurrence [24, 25].

The radiographic appearance of GCTB is rather characteristic. GCTB appears as an eccentric, lytic lesion with a non-sclerotic and sharply defined geographic border (narrow zone of transition), located in the metaphysis of long bones and extending to the epiphysis in the subarticular region [26, 27]. The periosteum may be elevated with expansion of the cortex (Fig. 1). In more aggressive lesions, however, the zone of transition can be wide, with cortical breakthrough and extension into surrounding soft tissues (Fig. 2). Matrix mineralization is absent. In short tubular bones of the hands and feet, radiographic features are similar to those in long bones and indistinguishable from the so-called giant cell lesion of the small bones, which is considered another entity [4]. In addition, giant cell tumor of tendon sheath may mimic osseous lesions on radiographs because they are capable of invading bone [28]. The sacrum is the most frequently affected bone within the axial skeleton, but GCTB may also appear in vertebral bodies with extension to pedicles and possibly compression fractures [29].

GCTB was generally categorized radiologically following the system of Campanacci et al. [3] or Enneking et al. [30]; both were purely based on radiographs and are now considered less useful. MRI is more useful for staging and predicting clinical behavior of GCTB [26, 31]. Computed tomography (CT) can be used to assess cortical thinning and pathologic fractures and to monitor fracture consolidation. On MRI, GCTB typically shows low to intermediate signal intensity on T1-weighted sequences and intermediate to high signal intensity on T2-weighted sequences. Areas of low signal intensity can be seen due to

Figure 1. Radiological appearance of giant cell tumor of bone of distal femur. (A, B): Radiographs demonstrating an eccentric, sharply demarcated lytic lesion in the distal femur metaphysis extending to the epiphysis without tumor mineralization. Radiographic features are consistent with giant cell tumor of bone.

hemosiderin deposition, causing local changes in susceptibility, especially on gradient echo sequences (Fig. 3) [32]. A cystic appearance with fluid-fluid levels from secondary cyst formation or aneurysmal bone cyst-like changes is present in

Figure 2. Pre- and post-denosumab radiological appearance of giant cell tumor of bone of proximal radius. **(A, B):** Radiographs of a large, expansile, completely osteolytic lesion in the proximal radius demonstrating a permeative destruction pattern with cortical destruction, consistent with giant cell tumor of bone. **(C, D):** Radiographs demonstrate new bone formation with reconstitution of cortical bone after 5 months of treatment with denosumab.

Figure 3. Giant cell tumor of bone appearance on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). **(A):** T1-weighted MRI demonstrates an eccentric lesion with mild expansion with intermediate signal intensity. **(B):** T2-weighted MRI shows low signal intensity through hemosiderin depositions and high signal intensity through secondary cystic changes. **(C):** T1-weighted MRI with fat suppression after intravenous gadolinium administration demonstrates marked, relatively homogeneous enhancement.

10%–14% of GCTB [1, 26, 27]. Dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI with intravenous gadolinium administration shows early and rapidly progressive enhancement followed by contrast wash-out (Fig. 4) [24, 25, 33].

Clinical and radiographic characteristics usually allow a correct diagnosis. The differential diagnosis includes chondroblastoma, intraosseous ganglion, or subchondral cyst. Chondroblastoma typically occurs in the immature skeleton

and may contain calcifications. Brown tumor of hyperparathyroidism, plasmacytoma, osteolytic metastasis, aneurysmal bone cyst, giant cell lesion of the small bones, and telangiectatic osteosarcoma are included in the differential diagnosis and are sometimes less easy to rule out.

Detection of local recurrence can be difficult because of granulation tissue at the site of curettage followed by bone grafting or reconstruction with PMMA. Increased focal

Figure 4. Different radiological modalities in the diagnosis of giant cell tumor of bone. **(A):** Plain radiograph shows a lytic lesion with extensive cortical destruction and a pathologic fracture in the distal radius. **(B–D):** T1- and T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) shows inhomogeneous low to high signal intensity and marked enhancement after gadolinium administration. **(E–H):** Dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI (DCE-MRI) shows homogeneous enhancement within 6 seconds after gadolinium administration. DCE-MRI can provide functional information on tumor angiogenesis and permeability but will not be part of standard imaging protocols in many centers.

Figure 5. Pre- and post-denosumab histological appearance of giant cell tumor of bone and mechanism of action of denosumab and bisphosphonates. **(A):** Biopsy with numerous, uniformly spaced, multinucleated giant cells and mononuclear stromal cells. **(B):** Surgical specimen after denosumab shows stromal cells, scattered mononuclear spindle cells without evident atypia, and diffuse foamy macrophages; no multinucleated giant cells are seen. **(C):** Mechanism of action of receptor activator of nuclear factor κ B ligand inhibitors and bisphosphonates.

osteolysis around the area of treatment on serial conventional radiographs with high signal intensity on T2-weighted MRI with early dynamic enhancement followed by washout are highly suggestive for local recurrence.

HISTOPATHOLOGY

With appropriate radiographic findings, the diagnosis of GCTB can often be made before surgery. However, core needle biopsy or intraoperative frozen section is advised to establish the final diagnosis before or during surgery, given the aggressive nature of the tumor and its rare tendency of malignant transformation [34, 35]. Macroscopically, GCTB is well vascularized and contains broad bands of cellular or collagenous fibrous tissue. Areas of hemorrhage, hemosiderin deposition, and foamy macrophages can be noted, and

necrosis and hemorrhage are especially common in large-sized GCTBs. In addition, primary GCTB associated with lung nodules commonly shows large areas of hemorrhage and thrombus formation that is not seen in primary GCTB without local or distant recurrence [36]. Reactive bone formation is common after pathologic fracture or open biopsy. Secondary aneurysmatic bone cysts are seen in 10%–14% of GCTB [1, 26, 27].

Microscopically, GCTB is composed of neoplastic and reactive cell populations (Fig. 5). The neoplastic cell population includes rounded mononuclear histiocytic or macrophage-like osteoclast precursor cells and spindle-shaped mononuclear neoplastic “stromal” cells [1, 37]. The stromal cells have poorly defined cytoplasm and spindle-shaped nuclei and show variable degrees of mitotic activity (up to 20 per 10 high-power

Table 1. Recurrence rates after different types of surgical treatment for giant cell tumor of bone

Study	Year	Follow-up, mo (range)	Total			Resection			Curettage without local adjuvants			Curettage with phenol			Curettage with phenol and PMMA			Curettage with PMMA			Curettage with liquid nitrogen			Curettage with liquid nitrogen and PMMA					
			n	n	rec	%	n	rec	%	n	rec	%	n	rec	%	n	rec	%	n	rec	%	n	rec	%	n	rec	%		
Marcove et al. ^a [77]	1978	43 (3–120)	52	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Jacobs et al. [78]	1985	(26–132)	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Capanna et al. [67]	1990	NR	667	—	—	—	280	126	45	147	28	19	33	1	3	187	36	19	20	4	19	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Marcove et al. ^b [75]	1994	147 (24–170)	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
O'Donnell et al. [71]	1994	48 (24–120)	60	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17	3	18	43	12	28	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Alkalay et al. [79]	1996	(24–48)	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	0	0		
Dürr et al. [68]	1999	61 (6–178)	26	—	—	—	7	3	43	11	1	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Malawer et al. [74]	1999	78 (48–180)	102	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Schreuder et al. [76]	1999	34 (18–79)	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Trieb et al. [69]	2001	121 (48–516)	47	—	—	—	14	3	21	12	3	25	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Wittig et al. ^c [81]	2001	54 (49–62)	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	0	0		
Boons et al. [62]	2002	84 (24–372)	36	11	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	25	12	5	42	5	1	20	—	—	—		
Ghert et al. [63]	2002	62 (24–224)	75	24	3	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	3	33	38	6	16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Turcotte et al. ^d [64]	2002	57 (24–192)	186	38	6	16	—	—	—	37	NR	18	U	U	18	62	NR	18	10	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Wada et al. [73]	2002	46 (24–188)	15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	1	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Ward et al. ^e [65]	2002	59 (12–115)	31	7	0	0	—	—	—	9	1	11	14	1	7	1	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Saiz et al. [72]	2004	76 (28–175)	40	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	40	5	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Su et al. [66]	2004	62 (28–138)	87	31	1	3	—	—	—	56	10	18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Abdelrahman et al. [80]	2008	34 (24–40)	28	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	28	1	4	—		
Balke et al. ^e [2]	2008	60 (8–281)	214	18	0	0	55	32	65	—	—	—	42	5	12	91	26	29	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Becker et al. [10]	2008	64 (1–440)	256	48	1	2	65	32	49	—	—	—	50	13	27	69	15	22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Kivioja et al. [11]	2008	60 (3–216)	294	92	11	12	47	24	51	—	—	—	—	—	—	147	32	22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Errani et al. [13]	2010	91 (36–204)	349	149	18	12	—	—	—	136	24	18	64	8	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Gaston et al. [70]	2011	77 (2–319)	330	—	—	—	246	73	30	—	—	—	—	—	—	84	12	14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Klenke et al. [14]	2011	108 (36–233)	118	22	1	5	22	7	32	32	11	34	40	6	15	1	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Lin et al. [84]	2011	58 (36–156)	26	—	—	—	—	—	—	26	3	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Benevenia et al. [129]	2012	55 (10–184)	93	—	—	—	—	—	—	18	4	22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
van der Heijden et al. [15]	2012	96 (24–288)	93	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	75	20	27	18	5	28	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Recurrence rate, mean (range)			6 (0–16)			42 (21–65)			19 (9–34)			17 (3–33)			17 (0–29)			21 (8–42)			6 (0–20)								

^aPMMA was used instead of bone grafts only in later cases, but it is not stated in how many patients.^bIn this study, only GCTB of the sacrum was reported.^cIn this study, only GCTB of the small bones of the hand was reported.^dIn this study, only the overall recurrence rate was given after curettage with different adjuvants (18%) including phenol, PMMA, liquid nitrogen, and combinations thereof. The recurrence rate was further specified only for the use of liquid nitrogen (0%).^eH₂O₂ was used as alternative to phenol as the local adjuvant.

Abbreviations: —, no data; GCTB, giant cell tumor of bone; NR, not reported; PMMA, polymethylmethacrylate; rec, recurrence; U, unknown.

fields). Mononuclear stromal cells also express smooth muscle actin, which may be useful in the differential diagnosis of giant cell-rich lesions of bone because its expression differs between several primary bone tumors [38].

The reactive cell population includes numerous large, reactive, multinucleated, osteoclast-like giant cells causing lacunar bone resorption [1, 37]. Osteoclast-like giant cells have eosinophilic cytoplasm and vesicular nuclei (up to 20–50) with prominent nucleoli and are often larger than normal osteoclasts.

Regarding the functional molecular biology of GCTB, RANKL is highly expressed by neoplastic mononuclear stromal cells [39–41]. RANK-RANKL interaction and macrophage colony-stimulating factor (M-CSF) play important roles in osteoclastogenesis by stimulating recruitment of osteoclastic cells from blood-born mononuclear osteoclast precursor cells that differentiate into multinucleated osteoclast-like giant cells [37, 42–45]. This is supported by the fact that giant cells in GCTB have an osteoclast-like phenotype ($CD45^{+}$, $CD68^{+}$, $CD33^{+}$, $CD14^{-}$, $CD51^{+}$, $CD163^{-}$, $HLA-DR^{-}$) [44, 45]. $CD33^{+}$, which is characteristic for GCTB, may constitute a novel therapeutic target, analogous to the treatment of acute myeloid leukemia with gemtuzumab, an anti- $CD33$ antibody [44]. Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) signaling, a tyrosine kinase expressed by neoplastic mononuclear stromal cells, supports stromal cell proliferation and promotes osteoclastogenesis in the presence of M-CSF [46]. EGFR expression was more frequent in recurrent and metastatic disease, suggesting that it may be related to disease progression [46].

Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) signaling, a tyrosine kinase expressed by neoplastic mononuclear stromal cells, supports stromal cell proliferation and promotes osteoclastogenesis in the presence of M-CSF. EGFR expression was more frequent in recurrent and metastatic disease, suggesting that it may be related to disease progression.

There are also several RANKL-independent mechanisms of osteoclastogenesis expressed by GCTB; known RANKL substitutes are tumor necrosis factor- α , interleukin-6, and tumor growth factor- β [37]. Recently, other cytokines and growth factors including a proliferation-inducing ligand, B-cell activating factor, nerve growth factor, insulin-like growth factor I (IGF-I), and IGF-II demonstrated osteoclastogenesis and formation of multinucleated giant cells capable of lacunar bone resorption [37]. Although less potent than RANKL, these substitutes may form alternative therapeutic targets for GCTB.

Cathepsin K is the principal protease exclusively expressed in osteoclast-like giant cells that actively absorb bone, resulting in the osteolysis associated with GCTB [47]. This could be triggered by overexpression of transcription factor CCAAT/enhancer binding protein β , but exact etiology remains unclear [48].

Recently, an in vivo model for growing GCTB cell lines on chick chorioallantoic membranes was developed and may offer new perspectives with which to test therapeutic agents and monitor their effects [49].

Cytogenetically, telomeric associations—a chromosomal end-to-end fusion seen in 50%–70% of GCTBs—are the most common chromosomal aberrations [50, 51]. Telomere length maintenance is an important key factor in the pathogenesis of GCTB, probably through a structural telomere protective-capping mechanism [52]. GCTB expresses telomerase maintenance markers (human telomerase reverse transcriptase and promyelocytic leukemia body-related antigens) in mononuclear rounded osteoclast precursor cells and spindle-shaped mononuclear neoplastic stromal cells [52]. There is a moderate reduction in telomere length [52, 53]; however, telomere dysfunction is not the only factor responsible for genetic instability [53, 54]. Recently, a driver mutation has been identified in H3F3A in 92% of GCTBs; these alterations were found exclusively in stromal cells and not in precursor or mature osteoclasts [55]. In addition, it has been hypothesized that chromosomal instability may be caused by centrosome abnormalities, through erroneous mitotic segregation during cell-cycle progression [56]. Centrosome amplification and aneuploidy were reportedly higher in recurrent and metastatic GCTB, suggesting a relation with clinical behavior [57, 58]. Allelic losses of 1p, 9q, and 19q are common in primary, recurrent, and metastatic GCTB [50]. Mutations of TP53 and HRAS are seen in secondary malignant GCTB and thus may play a role in malignant progression [59, 60]. However, even if nuclear TP53 expression may indicate potential suppressor gene damage, there might be TP53 abnormalities that do not result in tumor formation, implicating other causes of genomic instability [57].

Primary malignancy in GCTB is seen at initial diagnosis as an area of high-grade sarcoma within an otherwise conventional GCTB. In secondary malignant GCTB, a high-grade sarcoma arises subsequent to previous radiation or surgical treatment, and the pre-existing GCTB is not always evident anymore. Atypical mitotic figures are suggestive of malignancy.

In view of the current treatment modalities, histopathological features of GCTB have not yet been clearly predictive for clinical behavior, including risk for recurrent or metastatic disease [61]; however, the abovementioned novelties may offer new approaches for predicting clinical behavior based on histopathological, genetic, and functional findings.

SURGERY

The most important challenge in surgical management of GCTB of the long and small bones is the relatively high recurrence rate after curettage, mostly diagnosed within 2 years after index surgery [11]. Although recurrence rates are lowest after en bloc resection (0%–16%), curettage with local adjuvants is preferred because it presents less morbidity and functional impairment [2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 62–66]. When local adjuvants are not utilized, the mean recurrence rate is ~42% (21%–65%) [2, 10, 11, 14, 67–70]. The most established standard treatment with acceptable recurrence rates is curettage with local adjuvant application of phenol and PMMA (3%–33%) [2, 10, 13–15, 63–65, 67, 71, 72] or PMMA alone (0%–29%) [2, 10, 11, 14, 15, 62–65, 67, 70, 71, 73]. Centers specialized in cryosurgery apply liquid nitrogen with bone grafts or PMMA, resulting in recurrence rates of 8%–42% [62, 64, 67, 74–78] and 0%–20% [62, 79–81], respectively (Table 1).

With extensive curettage, a large oval window is made in the cortex, creating sufficient exposure of the tumor cavity and taking the fracture risk into account. GCTB is then carefully curetted with curettes of different sizes, followed by high-speed burring of cavity walls. When using phenol, cavity walls are phenolized with protection of surrounding soft tissues, followed by rinsing with alcohol and neutralizing with repeated (high-speed pulse) lavage. This is repeated two to three times. Although phenol is effective on GCTB *in vitro*, infiltration depth *in vivo* is unknown [82], and beneficial effects of phenol when used combined with PMMA are currently under debate [11, 14, 15]. Complications resulting from phenol use include chemical burns, and caution is warranted in the vicinity of neurovascular structures and soft tissues [83, 84]. With cryosurgery, a liquid nitrogen spray is used, allowing for more equal freezing of cavity walls and better penetration into bone compared with pouring liquid nitrogen directly into the cavity. Thermocouples placed in the tumor cavity and surrounding soft tissues are advisable to monitor freezing [85]. Soft tissues should be irrigated with warm fluids to protect from thermal injury. Three cycles of rapid freezing (-50°C) and slow thawing (20°C) are performed to increase margins up to 2 cm, comparable with marginal resection [77, 86]. Complication rates of 12%–50% have been reported after use of liquid nitrogen, including postoperative fracture, skin necrosis, (transient) nerve palsy, and infection [74, 78, 86]. Whereas postoperative fractures were the most important concern after cryosurgery in the past, adequate monitoring of freezing temperatures and prophylactic osteosynthesis in selected cases have decreased fracture rates dramatically (from 25%–50% [77, 78] to 0%–7% [62, 74]). Several options exist for filling the cavity, which can be left empty awaiting new bone formation during partial immobilization [70, 87, 88] or may be filled with cancellous bone grafts [64, 83, 89]. However, reported recurrence rates are high after both options, and this may only be adequate after use of a potent local adjuvant such as cryosurgery. The most commonly used technique is filling with PMMA, which hypothetically lowers recurrence risk through its hyperthermic properties. Furthermore, it provides immediate mechanical support and facilitates early detection of local recurrences [2, 10, 11]. Complication rates of 13%–25% have been reported after use of PMMA, including cement leakage into joints or surrounding soft tissues and osteoarthritic changes. PMMA is recommended as a filling and local adjuvant [2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 90, 91].

Local recurrence risk is strongly increased by soft tissue extension (20%–25% of all GCTBs) [14, 15]. Curettage with adjuvants is reasonable depending on the extent of the soft tissue component. If initially inoperable, neoadjuvant systemic targeted therapy may facilitate intralesional surgery at a later stage, avoiding more invasive surgery. Pathologic fractures are also common (15%–20%) but do not appear to increase local recurrence risk [15], contrary to previous suggestions [71]. Recent studies confirmed both resection and curettage as viable treatment options for GCTB with a pathologic fracture [92]. If joint salvage is feasible, GCTB with a pathologic fracture can safely be curetted. With extra-articular fractures, consolidation may be awaited before surgery; with intra-articular fractures, immediate curettage should be performed. Resection should be considered for dislocated intra-articular fractures or fractures with soft tissue extension or when

structural integrity cannot be regained [92–95]. Young age has also been suggested to increase risk for recurrence [11, 14] but was not confirmed by others [15].

Secondary osteoarthritis may result from curettage with PMMA in large subchondral GCTB [70, 89, 96]. This relatively low risk would be increased after repeated curettage for recurrence, with close proximity to articular cartilage [89, 97], and with large subchondral defects [96, 97].

Generally, curettage with PMMA can be repeated for recurrence because it presents acceptable re-recurrence rates of 14%–22% [93, 94]. Although 1%–4% of patients have pulmonary metastases at primary presentation, a higher incidence was noted after multiple recurrences (10%–15%), but this seemed independent from surgical treatment [93, 94]. Location in distal radius was thought to have an increased risk for metastases [6], but this was not generally confirmed [7].

Considering the above-mentioned points, en bloc resection should be considered in case of multiple recurrent or unresectable GCTB, impossible joint salvage, extensive cortex destruction (i.e., insufficient cortex left to curette), and extensive soft tissue involvement. Defects can be reconstructed with endoprosthetic replacement, structural allografts, or a combination [98]. The most important disadvantages are higher complication risk, subsequent need for revision surgery, and decreased function [16, 19, 99]. En bloc resection can also be performed in expendable bones (e.g., proximal fibula, distal ulna, iliac wing), in which a bony reconstruction is not required and functional outcome is not likely to be affected.

Postoperative treatment after curettage consists of functional mobilization and immediate full weight bearing for most patients. With reduced bone integrity (i.e., pathologic fracture, large oval window or close relation to the joint), only partial weight bearing is allowed during the first 6–12 weeks. After resection and endoprosthetic reconstruction, immediate full weight bearing is allowed. Follow-up protocol, based on the National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines for GCTB and the European Society for Medical Oncology guidelines for low-grade sarcoma, consists of physical examination and radiographs, MRI and/or CT of the surgical site as clinically indicated to detect local recurrences and complications, and chest imaging to detect pulmonary metastases every 6 months during the first 2 years postoperatively and annually thereafter for at least 10 years [34, 35].

Surgical management of GCTB in axial skeleton and sacrum (2%–8% of all GCTBs) is more challenging because of often late discovery, large size, spinal or pelvic instability, and involvement of nerve roots [100–102]. Preoperative arterial embolization can be performed as primary treatment [100, 103–105] or as preoperative treatment reducing intraoperative hemorrhage [100, 106, 107]. Total spondylectomy for vertebral GCTB or en bloc resection for sacral GCTB may result in severe morbidity with bleeding, infection, and neurological deficits, and total spondylectomy for sacral GCTB may result in bladder, rectal, and sexual dysfunction; therefore, the procedure should not be considered as primary treatment [107–109]. Marginal resection is less mutilating and can be performed in small vertebral lesions and sacral GCTB distal from S3 [100]. Curettage is less invasive, and advantages are salvage of nerve roots and visceral structures and maintenance of intrinsic spinal or pelvic support;

Figure 6. Multidisciplinary treatment recommendations for GCTB. *, With extra-articular pathologic fractures, preoperative fracture healing may be delayed, whereas immediate surgery is required with intra-articular pathologic fractures. **, Caution is warranted with local adjuvants (e.g., phenol, alcohol, liquid nitrogen) in case of involvement of soft tissues or neurovascular structures because it may induce (severe) necrosis. Abbreviations: GCTB, giant cell tumor of bone; MR, magnetic resonance.

Total spondylectomy for vertebral GCTB or en bloc resection for sacral GCTB may result in severe morbidity with bleeding, infection, and neurological deficits, and total spondylectomy for sacral GCTB may result in bladder, rectal, and sexual dysfunction; therefore, the procedure should not be considered as primary treatment.

however, it results in relatively high recurrence rates of 10%–37% because complete removal is difficult and adequate local adjuvants are absent [102, 110, 111]. Caution is warranted with the application of local adjuvants such as phenol or liquid nitrogen in the vicinity of neurovascular structures [75, 112]. After curettage, spinal or pelvic stability should be assessed and stabilization performed if needed. If at least S1 is preserved after intralesional resection, reconstruction is generally unnecessary. If S1 is partially or completely resected, stabilization with ilio-lumbar screw fixation is preferred.

SYSTEMIC THERAPY

In light of the current understanding of molecular biology of GCTB, systemic targeted therapy has been introduced, in addition to existing surgical treatment options, with the aim of facilitating intralesional surgery at a later stage instead of performing more mutilating surgery for the most complex cases.

Bisphosphonates bind to bone mineral and are assumed to inhibit GCTB-derived osteoclast formation, migration, and osteolytic activity at sites of bone resorption and to promote apoptosis of osteoclasts (Fig. 5). Over the past decade, there has been some experience with bisphosphonate zoledronic acid as systemic therapy for GCTB [22, 113, 114]. In most reported inoperable tumors, stabilization of local and metastatic disease was achieved. These were, however, small retrospective series with different other treatments; therefore, the level of evidence is low. Currently, a phase II randomized study with zoledronic acid is ongoing in high-risk GCTB patients after surgery (<http://www.clinicaltrials.gov>, NCT00889590).

Recently, denosumab has become a new treatment option for locally advanced GCTB. Denosumab is a RANKL inhibitor that blocks osteoclast maturation and thus its osteolytic properties (Fig. 5) [21, 111]. Denosumab is a fully human monoclonal antibody [115] that is approved for osteoporosis treatment in postmenopausal women at risk for fracturing; to increase bone mass in patients with prostate or breast cancer who are at risk for fracture due to androgen deprivation therapy or aromatase inhibitor therapy, respectively; and for the prevention of skeletal-related events in patients with bone metastases from solid tumors. In addition, denosumab has been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of adults and skeletally mature adolescents with GCTB that is unresectable or when surgical resection is likely to result in severe morbidity [23]; it is currently pending approval by the European Medicines Agency. A first open-label phase II study has shown clear clinical benefits in the treatment of GCTB [20]. In 86% of patients (30 of 35), there was an objective response to denosumab therapy, defined as $\geq 90\%$ elimination of giant cells on histological evaluation or no radiographic progression of the lesion. Only a small minority of these patients underwent intralesional surgery after denosumab, and to date, it remains unknown whether local recurrence rate will be affected by denosumab treatment. Data with longer follow-up will follow and will provide more information on a possible lowering effect of denosumab on the recurrence rate. The interim analysis of a second and larger study ($n = 282$) was recently published and confirmed the high efficacy of denosumab in GCTB [23]. Ninety-six percent of surgically unsalvageable patients had no disease progression after a median follow-up of 13 months. Seventy-four of 100 patients with tumors needing morbid surgery at study entry had no surgery and 16 of 26 patients underwent less morbid surgery after a median follow-up of 9.2 months. Long-term treatment may be required for long-term local tumor control. The most important side effects are headache and bone pain (1%–10%), osteonecrosis of the jaw (1%–2%), and hypocalcaemia and hypophosphatemia ($<0.01\%$) [20, 23, 116, 117].

A first open-label phase II study has shown clear clinical benefits in the treatment of GCTB. In 86% of patients (30 of 35), there was an objective response to denosumab therapy, defined as $\geq 90\%$ elimination of giant cells on histological evaluation or no radiographic progression of the lesion.

In response to denosumab treatment, sclerosis and reconstitution of cortical bone is seen on conventional radiographs and CT (Fig. 2) [27]. On dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI, later enhancement followed by slower washout compared with index MRI may indicate response to treatment. Furthermore, reduced uptake is seen on fluorodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) after denosumab treatment, suggesting that FDG-PET may be a sensitive monitor for the response to denosumab [20]. Histopathologically, a strong decrease of reactive osteoclast-like giant cells ($\geq 90\%$) and a reduced number of neoplastic stromal cells were seen after denosumab treatment, in addition to new formation of nonproliferative dense fibrous tissue and woven bone [21].

Denosumab is clearly an active drug in GCTB treatment and has an acceptable toxicity profile. Consequently, it should be standard for unresectable disease to facilitate intralesional surgery at a later stage, avoiding more invasive surgery. Data on the use of denosumab for metastatic GCTB are scarce; it is hoped that final data of the open-label phase II trial will provide more knowledge about this matter.

RADIATION THERAPY

Curettage with local adjuvants is the mainstay of treatment for GCTB. With the advent of neoadjuvant systemic targeted therapy using RANKL inhibitors, promising short-term phase II results with regard to local control have been obtained. However, even after neoadjuvant systemic treatment, extensive soft tissue involvement and axial localization (e.g., sacral lesions) can offer challenges for a satisfactory surgical approach.

In the past, moderate-dose radiotherapy (40–55 Gy) has been shown to be effective as primary treatment in unresectable GCTB or in cases of residual or recurrent disease when surgery would result in unacceptable morbidity. Most studies were retrospective and included only limited numbers of patients over a considerable time span. In this setting, reported 5-year local control was approximately 80% and ranged between 62% and 90% [118–128]. Risk factors for local recurrence or residual disease after radiotherapy are large size (>8.5 cm) and recurrent disease [125].

Radiotherapy may induce (secondary) malignant transformation, which is of concern especially because most patients are relative young (presenting between 30 and 50 years of age). The reported risk of malignant transformation varies between 0% and 5% [118, 120, 122, 124, 126].

In the era of RANKL inhibitors, the role of radiotherapy in the treatment of GCTB needs to be redefined. Currently, there are no data on the use of radiotherapy in combination with RANKL inhibitors for the treatment of primary unresectable or recurrent GCTB. However, given the promising short-term results of phase II studies with RANKL inhibitors so far, use of

radiotherapy should be restricted to those rare cases of unresectable, residual, or recurrent GCTB in which treatment with RANKL inhibitors is not possible or has been proven to be ineffective and when surgery would lead to unacceptable morbidity (often in an axial location).

CONCLUSION

GCTB is an intermediate, locally aggressive but rarely metastasizing tumor [1]. Treatment decisions should be made by a multidisciplinary team consisting of dedicated experts in the field of musculoskeletal oncology and should include radiography, dedicated MRI, histopathological assessment, and planned surgery, supplemented with systemic targeted therapy if indicated (Fig. 6).

Ideally, all patients should be treated with intralesional excision with local adjuvant treatment (e.g., phenol, liquid nitrogen, PMMA), achieving joint salvage and optimal functional outcome. Concurrently, recurrence risk should be minimized to rates similar to those reported after en bloc resection. In this regard, curettage with local adjuvants is safe in patients with GCTB confined to bone or with a pathologic fracture in which joint salvage is feasible. For soft tissue extension, the feasibility of intralesional surgery depends on the extent of the soft tissue component. For GCTB in the axial skeleton, feasibility of intralesional surgery depends on the involvement of neurovascular structures and soft tissue extension.

In patients with high-risk GCTB (e.g., large cortical defects; large soft tissue components; localization in vertebrae, sacrum, or pelvis; and multiple recurrent GCTB), acceptable recurrence rates are not achievable with intralesional surgery alone, and these patients are ideally suited for systemic targeted therapy with RANKL inhibitors or bisphosphonates. Denosumab was associated with tumor responses and reduced the need for morbid surgery; further data on possible delay or avoidance of recurrent disease and further investigation of the duration and dose of denosumab as a therapy for GCTB is warranted. Consequently, neoadjuvant therapy

with denosumab should be standard treatment for unresectable disease to facilitate intralesional surgery at a later stage, avoiding more invasive surgery. Long-term effects as well as optimal therapy duration still warrant further study. For patients who require immediate surgery due to intra-articular pathologic fracture or spinal cord compression, adjuvant systemic targeted therapy might reduce recurrence risk, but this is still unknown and is currently under study.

Use of moderate-dose radiotherapy (40–55 Gy) should be limited to rare cases of unresectable, residual, or recurrent GCTB in which denosumab is not available, is contraindicated, or is not effective and when surgery would lead to unacceptable morbidity.

In conclusion, we propose multidisciplinary integrated recommendations for the management of GCTB, including radiological, histopathological, and surgical aspects. Especially for patients with high-risk GCTB, multidisciplinary treatment should be optimized with respect to immediate local control and optimal functional outcome. The role for systemic targeted therapy needs to be further explored.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under Grant Agreement no. 278742 (Eurosarc).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conception/Design: Hans Gelderblom, Lizz van der Heijden, P.D. Sander Dijkstra, Pancras C.W. Hogendoorn

Manuscript writing: Hans Gelderblom, Lizz van der Heijden, P.D. Sander Dijkstra, Michiel A.J. van de Sande, Judith R. Kroep, Remi A. Nout, Carla S.P. van Rijswijk, Judith V.M.G. Bovée, Pancras C.W. Hogendoorn

Final approval of manuscript: Hans Gelderblom, Lizz van der Heijden, P.D. Sander Dijkstra, Michiel A.J. van de Sande, Judith R. Kroep, Remi A. Nout, Carla S.P. van Rijswijk, Judith V.M.G. Bovée, Pancras C.W. Hogendoorn

DISCLOSURES

The authors indicated no financial relationships.

REFERENCES

- Athanasou NA, Bansal M, Forsyth R et al. Giant cell tumour of bone. In: Fletcher CD, Bridge JA, Hogendoorn PC, eds. WHO Classification of Tumours of Soft Tissue and Bone. Lyon, France: IARC Press, 2013:321–324.
- Balke M, Schremper L, Gebert C et al. Giant cell tumor of bone: Treatment and outcome of 214 cases. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2008;134:969–978.
- Campanacci M, Baldini N, Boriani S et al. Giant-cell tumor of bone. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1987;69:106–114.
- Forsyth R, Jundt G. Giant cell lesion of the small bones. In: Fletcher CD, Bridge JA, Hogendoorn PC, eds. WHO Classification of Tumours of Soft Tissue and Bone. Lyon, France: IARC Press, 2013:320.
- Siebenrock KA, Unni KK, Rock MG. Giant-cell tumour of bone metastasising to the lungs. A long-term follow-up. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1998;80:43–47.
- Tubbs WS, Brown LR, Beabout JW et al. Benign giant-cell tumor of bone with pulmonary metastases: Clinical findings and radiologic appearance of metastases in 13 cases. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1992;158:331–334.
- Dominkus M, Ruggieri P, Bertoni F et al. Histologically verified lung metastases in benign giant cell tumours—14 cases from a single institution. *Int Orthop* 2006;30:499–504.
- Rock MG, Pritchard DJ, Unni KK. Metastases from histologically benign giant-cell tumor of bone. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1984;66:269–274.
- Kay RM, Eckardt JJ, Seeger LL et al. Pulmonary metastasis of benign giant cell tumor of bone. Six histologically confirmed cases, including one of spontaneous regression. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1994;219–230.
- Becker WT, Dohle J, Bernd L et al. Local recurrence of giant cell tumor of bone after intralesional treatment with and without adjuvant therapy. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2008;90:1060–1067.
- Kivioja AH, Blomqvist C, Hietaniemi K et al. Cement is recommended in intralesional surgery of giant cell tumors: A Scandinavian Sarcoma Group study of 294 patients followed for a median time of 5 years. *Acta Orthop* 2008;79:86–93.
- Algawahmed H, Turcotte R, Farrokhhyar F et al. High-speed burring with and without the use of surgical adjuvants in the intralesional management of giant cell tumor of bone: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sarcoma* 2010;586090.
- Errani C, Ruggieri P, Asenzio MA et al. Giant cell tumor of the extremity: A review of 349 cases from a single institution. *Cancer Treat Rev* 2010;36:1–7.
- Klenke FM, Wenger DE, Inwards CY et al. Giant cell tumor of bone: Risk factors for recurrence. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2011;469:591–599.
- van der Heijden L, van de Sande MA, Dijkstra PD. Soft tissue extension increases the risk of local recurrence after curettage with adjuvants for giant-cell tumor of the long bones. *Acta Orthop* 2012;83:401–405.
- Henderson ER, Groundland JS, Pala E et al. Failure mode classification for tumor endoprostheses: Retrospective review of five institutions and a literature review. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2011;93:418–429.
- Jeys LM, Suneja R, Chami G et al. Impending fractures in giant cell tumours of the distal femur: Incidence and outcome. *Int Orthop* 2006;30:135–138.
- McDonald DJ, Sim FH, McLeod RA et al. Giant-cell tumor of bone. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1986;68:235–242.
- Shehadeh A, Noveau J, Malawer M et al. Late complications and survival of endoprosthetic reconstruction after resection of bone tumors. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2010;468:2885–2895.

20. Thomas D, Henshaw R, Skubitz K et al. Denosumab in patients with giant-cell tumour of bone: An open-label, phase 2 study. *Lancet Oncol* 2010;11:275–280.
21. Branstetter DG, Nelson SD, Manivel JC et al. Denosumab induces tumor reduction and bone formation in patients with giant-cell tumor of bone. *Clin Cancer Res* 2012;18:4415–4424.
22. Balke M, Campanacci L, Gebert C et al. Bisphosphonate treatment of aggressive primary, recurrent and metastatic giant cell tumour of bone. *BMC Cancer* 2010;10:462.
23. Chawla S, Henshaw R, Seeger L et al. Safety and efficacy of denosumab for adults and skeletally mature adolescents with giant cell tumour of bone: Interim analysis of an open-label, parallel-group, phase 2 study. *Lancet Oncol* 2013;14:901–908.
24. van der Woude HJ, Verstraete KL, Hogendoorn PC et al. Musculoskeletal tumors: Does fast dynamic contrast-enhanced subtraction MR imaging contribute to the characterization? *Radiology* 1998;208:821–828.
25. Verstraete KL, Van der Woude HJ, Hogendoorn PC et al. Dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging of musculoskeletal tumors: Basic principles and clinical applications. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 1996;6:311–321.
26. Murphey MD, Nomikos GC, Flemming DJ et al. From the archives of AFIP. Imaging of giant cell tumor and giant cell reparative granuloma of bone: Radiologic-pathologic correlation. *Radiographics* 2001;21:1283–1309.
27. Chakraborty CJ, Forrester DM, Gottsegen CJ et al. Giant cell tumor of bone: Review, mimics, and new developments in treatment. *Radiographics* 2013;33:197–211.
28. De Schepper AM, Hogendoorn PC, Bloem JL. Giant cell tumors of the tendon sheath may present radiologically as intrinsic osseous lesions. *Eur Radiol* 2007;17:499–502.
29. Mulder JD, Kroon HM, Schütte HE et al. Giant cell tumor of bone. In: Mulder JD, Kroon HM, Schütte HE, eds. *Radiologic Atlas of Bone Tumors*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., 1993:483–506.
30. Enneking WF, Spanier SS, Goodman MA. A system for the surgical staging of musculoskeletal sarcoma. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1980;106–120.
31. Rock M. Curettage of giant cell tumor of bone. Factors influencing local recurrences and metastasis. *Chir Organi Mov* 1990;75(suppl):204–205.
32. Aoki J, Tanikawa H, Ishii K et al. MR findings indicative of hemosiderin in giant-cell tumor of bone: Frequency, cause, and diagnostic significance. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1996;166:145–148.
33. Verstraete KL, Lang P. Bone and soft tissue tumors: The role of contrast agents for MR imaging. *Eur J Radiol* 2000;34:229–246.
34. ESMO/European Sarcoma Network Working Group. Bone sarcomas: ESMO clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol* 2012;23(suppl 7):vii100–vii109.
35. Biermann JS. Updates in the treatment of bone cancer. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2013;11(suppl):681–683.
36. Alberghini M, Kliskey K, Krenacs T et al. Morphological and immunophenotypic features of primary and metastatic giant cell tumour of bone. *Virchows Arch* 2010;456:97–103.
37. Hemingway F, Taylor R, Knowles HJ et al. RANKL-independent human osteoclast formation with APRIL, BAFF, NGF, IGF I and IGF II. *Bone* 2011;48:938–944.
38. Hemingway F, Kashima TG, Mahendra G et al. Smooth muscle actin expression in primary bone tumours. *Virchows Arch* 2012;460:525–534.
39. Thomas DM. RANKL, denosumab, and giant cell tumor of bone. *Curr Opin Oncol* 2012;24:397–403.
40. Roux S, Amazit L, Meduri G et al. RANK (receptor activator of nuclear factor kappa B) and RANK ligand are expressed in giant cell tumors of bone. *Am J Clin Pathol* 2002;117:210–216.
41. Morgan T, Atkins GJ, Trivett MK et al. Molecular profiling of giant cell tumor of bone and the osteoclastic localization of ligand for receptor activator of nuclear factor kappaB. *Am J Pathol* 2005;167:117–128.
42. Liao TS, Yurgelun MB, Chang SS et al. Recruitment of osteoclast precursors by stromal cell derived factor-1 (SDF-1) in giant cell tumor of bone. *J Orthop Res* 2005;23:203–209.
43. Clézardin P. The role of RANK/RANKL/osteoprotegerin (OPG) triad in cancer-induced bone diseases: Physiopathology and clinical implications [in French]. *Bull Cancer* 2011;98:837–846.
44. Forsyth RG, De Boeck G, Baelde JJ et al. CD33 + CD14- phenotype is characteristic of multinuclear osteoclast-like cells in giant cell tumor of bone. *J Bone Miner Res* 2009;24:70–77.
45. Maggiani F, Forsyth R, Hogendoorn PC et al. The immunophenotype of osteoclasts and macrophage polykaryons. *J Clin Pathol* 2011;64:701–705.
46. Balla P, Moskovszky L, Sapi Z et al. Epidermal growth factor receptor signalling contributes to osteoblastic stromal cell proliferation, osteoclastogenesis and disease progression in giant cell tumour of bone. *Histopathology* 2011;59:376–389.
47. Lindeman JH, Hanemaaijer R, Mulder A et al. Cathepsin K is the principal protease in giant cell tumor of bone. *Am J Pathol* 2004;165:593–600.
48. Ng PK, Tsui SK, Lau CP et al. CCAAT/enhancer binding protein beta is up-regulated in giant cell tumor of bone and regulates RANKL expression. *J Cell Biochem* 2010;110:438–446.
49. Balke M, Neumann A, Szuhai K et al. A short-term in vivo model for giant cell tumor of bone. *BMC Cancer* 2011;11:241.
50. Rao UN, Goodman M, Chung WW et al. Molecular analysis of primary and recurrent giant cell tumors of bone. *Cancer Genet Cytogenet* 2005;158:126–136.
51. Gorunova L, Vult von Steyern F, Storlazzi CT et al. Cytogenetic analysis of 101 giant cell tumors of bone: Nonrandom patterns of telomeric associations and other structural aberrations. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 2009;48:583–602.
52. Forsyth RG, De Boeck G, Bekaert S et al. Telomere biology in giant cell tumour of bone. *J Pathol* 2008;214:555–563.
53. Schwartz HS, Dahir GA, Butler MG. Telomere reduction in giant cell tumor of bone and with aging. *Cancer Genet Cytogenet* 1993;71:132–138.
54. Panagopoulos I, Mertens F, Domanski HA et al. No EWS/FLI1 fusion transcripts in giant-cell tumors of bone. *Int J Cancer* 2001;93:769–772.
55. Behjati S, Tarpey PS, Presneau N et al. Distinct H3F3A and H3F3B driver mutations define chondroblastoma and giant cell tumor of bone. *Nat Genet* 2013;45:1479–1482.
56. Moskovszky L, Dezsö K, Athanasou N et al. Centrosome abnormalities in giant cell tumour of bone: Possible association with chromosomal instability. *Mod Pathol* 2010;23:359–366.
57. Moskovszky L, Szuhai K, Krenács T et al. Genomic instability in giant cell tumor of bone. A study of 52 cases using DNA ploidy, relocalization FISH, and array-CGH analysis. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 2009;48:468–479.
58. Antal I, Sági Z, Szendrői M. The prognostic significance of DNA cytophotometry and proliferation index (Ki-67) in giant cell tumors of bone. *Int Orthop* 1999;23:315–319.
59. Oda Y, Sakamoto A, Saito T et al. Secondary malignant giant-cell tumour of bone: Molecular abnormalities of p53 and H-ras gene correlated with malignant transformation. *Histopathology* 2001;39:629–637.
60. Saito T, Mitomi H, Izumi H et al. A case of secondary malignant giant-cell tumor of bone with p53 mutation after long-term follow-up. *Hum Pathol* 2011;42:727–733.
61. Wang H, Wan N, Hu Y. Giant cell tumour of bone: A new evaluating system is necessary. *Int Orthop* 2012;36:2521–2527.
62. Boons HW, Keijser LC, Schreuder HW et al. Oncologic and functional results after treatment of giant cell tumors of bone. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2002;122:17–23.
63. Ghert MA, Rizzo M, Harrelson JM et al. Giant-cell tumor of the appendicular skeleton. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2002;201–210.
64. Turcotte RE, Wunder JS, Isler MH et al. Giant cell tumor of long bone: A Canadian Sarcoma Group study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2002;248–258.
65. Ward WG Sr, Li G 3rd. Customized treatment algorithm for giant cell tumor of bone: Report of a series. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2002;259–270.
66. Su YP, Chen WM, Chen TH. Giant-cell tumors of bone: An analysis of 87 cases. *Int Orthop* 2004;28:239–243.
67. Capanna R, Fabbri N, Bettelli G. Curettage of giant cell tumor of bone. The effect of surgical technique and adjuvants on local recurrence rate. *Chir Organi Mov* 1990;75(suppl):206.
68. Dürr HR, Maier M, Jansson V et al. Phenol as an adjuvant for local control in the treatment of giant cell tumour of the bone. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 1999;25:610–618.
69. Trieb K, Bitzan P, Lang S et al. Recurrence of curetted and bone-grafted giant-cell tumours with and without adjuvant phenol therapy. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2001;27:200–202.
70. Gaston CL, Bhumbra R, Watanuki M et al. Does the addition of cement improve the rate of local recurrence after curettage of giant cell tumours in bone? *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2011;93:1665–1669.
71. O'Donnell RJ, Springfield DS, Motwani HK et al. Recurrence of giant-cell tumors of the long bones after curettage and packing with cement. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1994;76:1827–1833.
72. Saiz P, Virkus W, Piasecki P et al. Results of giant cell tumor of bone treated with intralesional excision. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2004;221–226.
73. Wada T, Kaya M, Nagoya S et al. Complications associated with bone cementing for the treatment of giant cell tumors of bone. *J Orthop Sci* 2002;7:194–198.
74. Malawer MM, Bickels J, Meller I et al. Cryosurgery in the treatment of giant cell tumor. A long-term followup study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1999;176–188.
75. Marcove RC, Sheth DS, Brien EW et al. Conservative surgery for giant cell tumors of the sacrum. The role of cryosurgery as a supplement to curettage and partial excision. *Cancer* 1994;74:1253–1260.
76. Schreuder HW, Keijser LC, Veth RP. Beneficial effects of cryosurgical treatment in benign and low-grade-malignant bone tumors in 120 patients [in Dutch]. *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk* 1999;143:2275–2281.

77. Marcove RC, Weis LD, Vaghaiwalla MR et al. Cryosurgery in the treatment of giant cell tumors of bone: A report of 52 consecutive cases. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1978;275:289.
78. Jacobs PA, Clemency RE Jr. The closed cryosurgical treatment of giant cell tumor. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1985;149:158.
79. Alkalay D, Kollender Y, Mozes M et al. Giant cell tumors with intraarticular fracture. Two-stage local excision, cryosurgery and cementation in 5 patients with distal femoral tumor followed for 2-4 years. *Acta Orthop Scand* 1996;67:291-294.
80. Abdelrahman M, Bassiony AA, Shalaby H et al. Cryosurgery and impaction subchondral bone graft for the treatment of giant cell tumor around the knee. *HSS J* 2009;5:123-128.
81. Wittig JC, Simpson BM, Bickels J et al. Giant cell tumor of the hand: Superior results with curettage, cryosurgery, and cementation. *J Hand Surg Am* 2001;26:546-555.
82. Gortzak Y, Kandel R, Dehesi B et al. The efficacy of chemical adjuvants on giant-cell tumour of bone. An in vitro study. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2010;92:1475-1479.
83. Blackley HR, Wunder JS, Davis AM et al. Treatment of giant-cell tumors of long bones with curettage and bone-grafting. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1999;81:811-820.
84. Lin WH, Lan TY, Chen CY et al. Similar local control between phenol- and ethanol-treated giant cell tumors of bone. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2011;469:3200-3208.
85. Schreuder HW, van Egmond J, van Beem HB et al. Monitoring during cryosurgery of bone tumors. *J Surg Oncol* 1997;65:40-45.
86. Veth R, Schreuder B, van Beem H et al. Cryosurgery in aggressive, benign, and low-grade malignant bone tumours. *Lancet Oncol* 2005;6:25-34.
87. Prosser GH, Baloch KG, Tillman RM et al. Does curettage without adjuvant therapy provide low recurrence rates in giant-cell tumors of bone? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2005;211-218.
88. Yanagawa T, Watanabe H, Shinozaki T et al. Curettage of benign bone tumors without grafts gives sufficient bone strength. *Acta Orthop* 2009;80:9-13.
89. Suzuki Y, Nishida Y, Yamada Y et al. Re-operation results in osteoarthritic change of knee joints in patients with giant cell tumor of bone. *Knee* 2007;14:369-374.
90. Bini SA, Gill K, Johnston JO. Giant cell tumor of bone. Curettage and cement reconstruction. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1995;245-250.
91. Fraquet N, Faizon G, Rosset P et al. Long bones giant cells tumors: Treatment by curettage and cavity filling cementation. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2009;95:402-406.
92. van der Heijden L, Dijkstra PD, Campanacci DA et al. Giant cell tumor with pathologic fracture: Should we curette or resect? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2013;471:820-829.
93. Balke M, Ahrens H, Streitbueger A et al. Treatment options for recurrent giant cell tumors of bone. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2009;135:149-158.
94. Klenke FM, Wenger DE, Inwards CY et al. Recurrent giant cell tumor of long bones: Analysis of surgical management. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2011;469:1181-1187.
95. Dehesi BM, Jaffer SN, Griffin AM et al. Joint salvage for pathologic fracture of giant cell tumor of the lower extremity. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2007;459:96-104.
96. Chen TH, Su YP, Chen WM. Giant cell tumors of the knee: Subchondral bone integrity affects the outcome. *Int Orthop* 2005;29:30-34.
97. Van der Heijden L, van de Sande MA, Heineken AC et al. Mid-term outcome after curettage with polymethylmethacrylate for giant cell tumor around the knee: Higher risk of radiographic osteoarthritis? *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2013;95:e1591-e1610.
98. Mankin HJ, Hornicek FJ. Treatment of giant cell tumors with allograft transplants: A 30-year study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2005;439:144-150.
99. Jeys LM, Grimer RJ, Carter SR et al. Periprosthetic infection in patients treated for an orthopaedic oncological condition. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2005;87:842-849.
100. Thangaraj R, Grimer RJ, Carter SR et al. Giant cell tumour of the sacrum: A suggested algorithm for treatment. *Eur Spine J* 2010;19:1189-1194.
101. Martin C, McCarthy EF. Giant cell tumor of the sacrum and spine: Series of 23 cases and a review of the literature. *Iowa Orthop J* 2010;30:69-75.
102. Guo W, Ji T, Tang X et al. Outcome of conservative surgery for giant cell tumor of the sacrum. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:1025-1031.
103. Hosalkar HS, Jones KJ, King JJ et al. Serial arterial embolization for large sacral giant-cell tumors: Mid- to long-term results. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2007;32:1107-1115.
104. Lackman RD, Khoury LD, Esmail A et al. The treatment of sacral giant-cell tumours by serial arterial embolisation. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2002;84:873-877.
105. Lin PP, Guzel VB, Moura MF et al. Long-term follow-up of patients with giant cell tumor of the sacrum treated with selective arterial embolization. *Cancer* 2002;95:1317-1325.
106. Balke M, Streitbueger A, Budny T et al. Treatment and outcome of giant cell tumors of the pelvis. *Acta Orthop* 2009;80:590-596.
107. Balke M, Henrichs MP, Gosheger G et al. Giant cell tumors of the axial skeleton. *Sarcoma* 2012;410973.
108. Sar C, Eralp L. Surgical treatment of primary tumors of the sacrum. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2002;122:148-155.
109. Wuisman P, Lieshout O, Sugihara S et al. Total sacrectomy and reconstruction: Oncologic and functional outcome. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2000;192-203.
110. Ruggieri P, Mavrogenis AF, Ussia G et al. Recurrence after and complications associated with adjuvant treatments for sacral giant cell tumor. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2010;468:2954-2961.
111. Xu W, Li X, Huang W et al. Factors affecting prognosis of patients with giant cell tumors of the mobile spine: Retrospective analysis of 102 patients in a single center. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013;20:804-810.
112. Kollender Y, Meller I, Bickels J et al. Role of adjuvant cryosurgery in intralesional treatment of sacral tumors. *Cancer* 2003;97:2830-2838.
113. Tse LF, Wong KC, Kumta SM et al. Bisphosphonates reduce local recurrence in extremity giant cell tumor of bone: A case-control study. *Bone* 2008;42:68-73.
114. Yu X, Xu M, Xu S et al. Clinical outcomes of giant cell tumor of bone treated with bone cement filling and internal fixation, and oral bisphosphonates. *Oncol Lett* 2013;5:447-451.
115. Kostenuik PJ, Nguyen HQ, McCabe J et al. Denosumab, a fully human monoclonal antibody to RANKL, inhibits bone resorption and increases BMD in knock-in mice that express chimeric (murine/human) RANKL. *J Bone Miner Res* 2009;24:182-195.
116. Adler RA, Gill RS. Clinical utility of denosumab for treatment of bone loss in men and women. *Clin Interv Aging* 2011;6:119-124.
117. Cavalli L, Brandi ML. Targeted approaches in the treatment of osteoporosis: Differential mechanism of action of denosumab and clinical utility. *Ther Clin Risk Manag* 2012;8:253-266.
118. Shi W, Indelicato DJ, Reith J et al. Radiotherapy in the management of giant cell tumor of bone. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2013;36:505-508.
119. Bhatia S, Miszczyk L, Roelandts M et al. Radiotherapy for marginally resected, unresectable or recurrent giant cell tumor of the bone: A rare cancer network study. *Rare Tumors* 2011;3:e48.
120. Ruka W, Rutkowski P, Morysiński T et al. The megavoltage radiation therapy in treatment of patients with advanced or difficult giant cell tumors of bone. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2010;78:494-498.
121. Caudell JJ, Ballo MT, Zagars GK et al. Radiotherapy in the management of giant cell tumor of bone. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2003;57:158-165.
122. Chakravarti A, Spiro IJ, Hug EB et al. Megavoltage radiation therapy for axial and inoperable giant-cell tumor of bone. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1999;81:1566-1573.
123. Feigenberg SJ, Marcus RB Jr, Zlotecki RA et al. Radiation therapy for giant cell tumors of bone. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2003;207-216.
124. Malone S, O'Sullivan B, Catton C et al. Long-term follow-up of efficacy and safety of megavoltage radiotherapy in high-risk giant cell tumors of bone. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1995;33:689-694.
125. Miszczyk L, Wydmański J, Spindel J. Efficacy of radiotherapy for giant cell tumor of bone: Given either postoperatively or as sole treatment. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2001;49:1239-1242.
126. Nair MK, Jyothirmayi R. Radiation therapy in the treatment of giant cell tumor of bone. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1999;43:1065-1069.
127. Bennett CJ Jr, Marcus RB Jr, Million RR et al. Radiation therapy for giant cell tumor of bone. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1993;26:299-304.
128. Schwartz LH, Okunieff PG, Rosenberg A et al. Radiation therapy in the treatment of difficult giant cell tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1989;17:1085-1088.
129. Benevenia J, Patterson FR, Beebe KS et al. Comparison of phenol and argon beam coagulation as adjuvant therapies in the treatment of stage 2 and 3 benign-aggressive bone tumors. *Orthopedics* 2012;35:e371-e378.