Adel Refaat Ahmed

Letter to the Editor

Published online: 3 August 2001
© Springer-Verlag 2001

Dear Sir:

I am writing regarding the article by Natarajan et al. [1] published in July 2000. Natarajan et al. mentioned in the series of 18 patients treated for pathological fractures in osteosarcoma that 13 patients had NED (no evidence of disease), four patients were DOD (dead of disease), and a single patient was AWD (alive with disease). They did not mention that they had some patients who were CDF (continuously disease free), although in Table 1 the patients who are listed as NED had neither local recurrences nor metastases.

The definition of CDF means that the patient in his course of treatment did not develop either local recurrence or distant metastasis, while NED means that the patient in his course of treatment had either local recurrence or distant metastasis, either of them or both were treated promptly, and the patient currently had no evidence of disease [2, 3].

Does Dr. Natarajan, by his NED patients, mean CDF patients?

References

1. Natarajan MV, Govardhan RH, Williams S, Raja Gobal TS (2000) Limb salvage surgery for pathological fractures in osteosarcoma. *Int Orthop* 24:170–172
2. Shin KH, Rougraff BT, Simon MA (1994) Oncologic outcome of primary bone sarcoma of the pelvis. *Clin Orthop* 304:207–217
3. The JOA Committee of Tumors (2000) General rules for clinical and pathological studies on malignant bone tumors, 3rd edn. Kanehara-shuppan, Tokyo, p 78

The author's reply to this letter is available at
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002640100284>

A. Refaat Ahmed (✉)
Orthopedic Oncology and Limb Reconstruction,
Alexandria University, Egypt
e-mail: egyptadel28@hotmail.com
Tel.: +81-27-220-8263, Fax: +81-27-220-8275

A. Refaat Ahmed
Gunma University, 2–17–8 Showa machi, RA 303 Maebashi,
Gunma 371–0034, Japan