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## Significance of Problem

- Return-to-sport (RTS) time is a primary concern after ACL reconstruction
- Hop tests can be successfully completed despite presence of movement compensations
- Understanding movement compensations can aid orthopedic surgeons and physical therapists during decision making process for RTS



## Purpose \& Hypothesis

- Assess hop biomechanics between injured and uninjured limb after ACL reconstruction
- We hypothesized that patients who have undergone ACL reconstruction would present with shorter flight times and longer stance times in the injured limb compared to the uninjured limb


Yellow Bracket: Stance Time, Red Line: Flight Time

## Experimental Design



- 35 participants
- Ages 10-25 years
- Within 5-15 months of ACL reconstruction
- No prior knee injury or concomitant posterior cruciate ligament reconstruction
- Plan to return to 50 hours/year of cutting or pivoting sports


## Experimental Design Continued

- All participants demonstrated scores of $>90 \%$ symmetry on physical testing and $>90 \%$ on both self-reported knee function scores
- Return-to-sport components
- Unilateral quadriceps strength
- Two measures of self reported knee function
- IKDC Subjective Knee Form 2000
- Global Rating Scale
- Four single-legged hop tests
- Single hop, triple hop, crossover hop, and $6 m$ timed hop


## Experimental Design Continued



Two Trials on Each Limb

- Single Hop
- Triple Hop
- 6m Timed Hop
*Note: Crossover hop not completed due to narrow width of walkway


## Variables of interest

- Flight time
- Stance time
- Flight-to-stance ratio
- Paired t-tests were used to compare hop characteristics between limbs
- Effect sizes were calculated to evaluate interlimb differences


## Participant Characteristics

| Age at surgery (years) | $17.5 \pm 3.0$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex (F/M) | 51.4\%/48.6\% |  |  |  |
| Mean RTS <br> Time (mo) | $10.8 \pm 2.8$ |  |  |  |
| Graft <br> Types | Quadriceps 12/35 (34\%) | Patellar $15 / 35$ (43\%) | Hamstring 6/35 (17\%) | IT Band 2/35 (6\%) |

## Results

Flight Time


ES= Effect Size
Small Effect $=>0.2$
Medium Effect $=>0.5$
Large Effect $=>0.8$

Triple Hop = avg of total flight time per limb
6m Timed Hop = avg of flight time per hop per limb

## Results Continued

|  | Involved | Uninvolved | p-value | Effect Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Avg. Hop <br> Distance |  |  |  |  |
| 6m Timed <br> Hop (cm) | $135.9 \pm 21.3$ | $140.6 \pm 21.8$ | $<0.001$ | 0.710 |
| Stance Time |  |  |  |  |
| Triple Hop <br> (sec) | $0.726 \pm 0.091$ | $0.706 \pm 0.088$ | 0.162 |  |
| $6 m$ Timed <br> Hop (sec) | $0.265 \pm 0.030$ | $0.262 \pm 0.028$ | 0.140 |  |

## ES= Effect Size

Small Effect $=>0.2$
Medium Effect $=>0.5$
Large Effect $=>0.8$

## Results Continued



ES= Effect Size
Small Effect $=>0.2$
Medium Effect $=>0.5$
Large Effect $=>0.8$

Triple Hop = avg of total flight time per limb divided by avg of total stance time per limb 6m Timed Hop = avg of flight time per hop per limb divided by avg of stance time per limb

## Conclusion

- Interlimb differences in temporospatial hop test characteristics were present in patients who passed return-to-sport testing
- Differences in flight time were larger than differences in stance time
- Movement patterns are not be restored despite meeting traditional benchmarks
- Measuring hop distance and total time (6m timed hop) may be insufficient ${ }^{1,2}$
- Future work: Investigate the impact of hop characteristics to aid ACL recovery through interventions
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