

# Welcome

isakos.com/2023 • #ISAKOS2023



 $\mathbf{H}$ 



Proprioceptive and Clinical Outcomes of Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction with Remnant Tissue Preservation Technique: A Comparison According to the Preserved Tissue Length

#### Hasan Bombacı, Prof.<sup>1</sup>

Bugra Basalan, MD.<sup>2</sup> Özgul Öztürk, PhD.<sup>3</sup> Onur Aydogdu, PhD.<sup>4</sup> Zübeyir Sarı, Prof.<sup>4</sup>

1 Yeditepe University, Deparment of Orthopedics and Traumatology, Istanbul, Turkey

2 Haydarpaşa Numune Research and Training Hospital, Deparment of Orthopedics and Traumatology, Istanbul, Turkey

3 Acıbadem University, Department of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation, Istanbul, Turkey

4 Marmara University, Department of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation, Istanbul, Turkey





# Disclosures: The authors have nothing to disclose.



### Introduction

The anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) remnant may theoretically increase ligamentization process depends on viable tissue on the remnant <sup>1,2</sup>.

There is no consensus in the literature regarding the effects of remnant-preserving anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction (ACLR) on clinical and proprioceptive outcomes and its superiority over the standard surgical procedure.



#### Purpose

To compare the proprioceptive and clinical outcomes of the knee joint after ACLR with two different lengths of preserved remnant tissue.





### Methods





Figure An example of remnant-preservation method



Patients with accompanying ligament or meniscal injuries were excluded.

#### Single-bundle

## Remnant preservation method

### Hamstring autograft

### 18 – 40 years old

Tegner activity scale Lysholm knee scoring scale. Joint position sense (JPS) test at 20°, 50°, and 70°

Group 1 (n = 36) ≤ 1/3 of the original length preserved 61 subjects ACLR According to the length of the remnant preserved

Group 2 (n = 25) More than 1/3 of the original length preserved









54 men 7 women

Mean age = 30.44 ± 6.92 years

Mean BMI =  $26.93 \pm 4.30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ 

Mean follow-up time = 2.58 ± 0.97 years





#### Comparison of groups in terms of demographic and clinical characteristics

| Variables                                  | Group 1<br>(n = 36)<br>Mean (SD) | Group 2<br>(n =25)<br>Mean (SD) | Mean Difference<br>(95 % CI) | P value |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|
| Age, years                                 | 28.75 (7.63)                     | 30.44 (6.92)                    | -1.69 (-5.52 to 2.14)        | 0.381   |
| BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>                     | 26.58 (4.89)                     | 27.44 (3.29)                    | -0.86 (-3.10 to 1.38)        | 0.446   |
| Lysholm Score                              | 89.25 (10.67)                    | 85.96 (12.93)                   | 3.29 (-2.77 to 9.36)         | 0.282   |
| Tegner Activity Score                      | 5.25 (1.25)                      | 4.96 (1.33)                     | 0.29 (-0.38 to 0.96)         | 0.397   |
| Reproduction of Passive<br>Position at 20° | 4.12 (1.39)                      | 3.34 (1.47)                     | 0.77 (0.03 to 1.51)          | 0.042   |
| Reproduction of Passive Position at 50°    | 3.90 (2.36)                      | 3.24 (1.66)                     | 0.66 (-0.43 to 1.76)         | 0.231   |





### Hong et al. 2012<sup>3</sup>

### Remnant-preserving ACLR vs standart technique (n = 90). The IKDC, KT-1000, and proprioception recovery did not differ between the groups.

### The present study

# No difference for Lysholm and Tegner scores between the groups.















### Conclusion

- Patients who underwent remnant-preserving ACLR obtained similar clinical results regardless of the amount of preserved tissue length.
- Despite having similar clinical scores, preserving more remnant tissue may improve proprioceptive restoration compared to less remnant tissue preserved knee joint.



### References

1 Hu, J., Qu, J., Xu, D., Zhang, T., Zhou, J., & Lu, H. (2014). Clinical outcomes of remnant preserving augmentation in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a systematic review. Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy, 22, 1976-1985.

- 2 Xie, H., Fu, Z., Zhong, M., Deng, Z., Wang, C., Sun, Y., & Zhu, W. (2022). Effects of remnant preservation in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Frontiers in Surgery, 1319.
- 3 Hong, L., Li, X., Zhang, H., Liu, X., Zhang, J., Shen, J. W., & Feng, H. (2012). Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with remnant preservation: a prospective, randomized controlled study. The American Journal of Sports Medicine, 40(12), 2747-2755.
- 4 Lee, B. I., Kwon, S. W., Kim, J. B., Choi, H. S., & Min, K. D. (2008). Comparison of clinical results according to amount of preserved remnant in arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using quadrupled hamstring graft. Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery, 24(5), 560-568.

