Fig. 3A–B Radiographs of a case with previous improperly placed tunnels (Case 3 in table 1). (**A**) Posteroanterior 45° flexion weight-bearing view; (**B**) lateral view. The primary surgery had been performed with a hamstring tendon graft through two high femoral tunnels (*) and a single central tibial tunnel (dotted line). Note two residual Endobuttons used for femoral fixation at the time of primary ACL reconstruction (ACLR) (dotted arrow). A rectangular new femoral tunnel was created in a proper place, whereas the direction of the tibial tunnel was changed to obtain a new tunnel wall of fresh cancellous bone. Note the solid lines of the new tibial tunnels and fixation hardware on the femur and the tibia. The circles show the aperture locations of the new properly placed tunnels.

[2, 14, 37]. However, we recommend grafting over the top of the lateral condyle for those with severe tunnel widening around the original femoral attachment (Fig 7).

On the tibial side, a tunnel placed too anteriorly is easily revisable, whereas a tunnel placed too posteriorly is not. For the latter, the direction of the tunnel should be changed to obtain a new posterior tunnel wall of fresh cancellous bone using a divergent tunnel technique (Fig. 3). This should help the graft to heal to the tunnel wall and resist anterior tibial force. With a tunnel malpositioned by 1 cm or less posteriorly, it may be reasonable to reuse the same tunnel aperture, to avoid merging the two tunnel apertures. When the posterior malpositioning exceeds 1 cm, however, the previous tunnel may be filled with a bone graft or its substitute.

Femoral graft fixation is usually achieved with a 6-mm interference screw (Fig. 3), although additional cortical suspensory fixation may be considered if the fixation is questionable as a result of the previous tunnel.

Tibial fixation is achieved with a modified pullout suture technique using DSP (Double Spike Plate; Smith-Nephew Endoscopy, Andover, MA) and a screw. This technique makes it possible to fix the graft under a predetermined amount of tension [34].

The knee is immobilized in 10° flexion for 1 week with a brace for BTB grafts, whereas the immobilization is continued up to 2 weeks for SMT grafts. After that, passive and active ROM exercises are followed. Partial weight-bearing is allowed at 2 to 3 weeks followed by full weightbearing at 4 to 5 weeks. Full extension or flexion exceeding 130° is not permitted until 5 weeks. Jogging is recommended at 3 to 4 months. Return to strenuous activity is not allowed until 6 months.

Patients and Methods

From June 2004 to December 2008, we treated 31 patients with failed ACLR using the described technique. Our indications for revision ACLR were (1) subjective instability or giving way during strenuous activity or daily activities; (2) positive Lachman and pivot shift tests; and (3) more than 3 mm side-to-side difference with KT-1000 at maximum manual force. The contraindications were: (1) arthrofibrosis: ROM deficit such as an extension or flexion deficit exceeding 10°; (2) deep infection; and (3) severe osteoarthritis. In one patient with massive bone loss, we chose the graft fixation over top of the lateral femoral condyle; this

Fig. 4A–E A case with previous proper rectangular tunnels (Case 12 in Table 1). (**A**) Arthroscopic view of the previous femoral tunnel was densely filled with tendon and bone plug; (**B**) arthroscopic view of the new rectangular femoral tunnel recreated in the same place as that in the previous surgery. The bone-patellar tendon-bone (BTB) graft from the contralateral side was introduced through the same rectangular tibial tunnel after curettage, and the bone plug was fixed to the femoral tunnel with an interference screw. (**C**) Arthroscopic view of BTB graft in situ after fixation. (**D**) Three-dimensional CT of the lateral femoral condyle at 4 weeks after the revision. Note the bone plug fixed with an interference screw (dotted arrow) inside the femoral tunnel; (**E**) three-dimensional CT of the tibial plateau. Note the bone plug located medially inside the properly placed tibial tunnel.

patient was excluded. We also excluded 12 patients who were lost to followup between 1 and 18 months. This left 18 patients' one of whom was excluded because of retear of the graft at 28 months. Thus, the remaining 17 with a mean followup of 38 months with a range from 24 to 73 months were evaluated (Table 1). There were 10 male and seven female patients with a mean age at the revision of 23 years (range, 15–34 years). The mean time from diagnosis of the failure to revision was 2.3 months. No patients were recalled specifically for this study; all data was obtained from medical records and radiographs.

Our followup routines recommended to patients are as follows: (1) a monthly examination including ROM and Lachman and pivot shift tests up to 12 months; (2) examination every 3 months after 12 months to 24 months; (3) examination and plain radiographs at 24 months; and (4) annual examinations from 24 to 60 months. At each examination we completed the IKDC evaluation form [21] and obtained laxity measurement with KT-1000 (MED-metric Corp, San Diego, CA). There were no missing data

from these examinations. Radiographs were taken at followup between 24 and 60 months in 17 patients in whom we obtained the following views: 45° posterior-anterior flexion weightbearing view, lateral view at 90°, and Merchant view.

Results

The femoral tunnel could be created in the center of the anatomic attachment area in 30 of the 31 patients using the RT ACLR technique, whereas the technique could not be applied in one (Fig. 7). The tibial tunnel was successfully created within the tibial attachment area in 29 of the 30 patients, whereas the remaining one required bone grafting to fill out the previous tunnel because of its posterior location. None of the patients underwent staged surgeries.

Of the 18 patients followed for a minimum of 24 months, none reported giving way or subjective

Fig. 5A–E A case with previous properly placed tunnels for double-bundle graft (Case 16 in Table 1). (**A**) Arthroscopic view of the hamstring graft resulting from stretch-out; (**B**) arthroscopic view of the rectangular femoral tunnel aperture created by dilation after graft removal. The bone-patellar tendon-bone (BTB) graft was introduced through the rectangular tibial tunnel created by dilating the previous two tunnels, and the bone plug was fixed to the femoral tunnel with a 7-mm interference screw. (**C**) Arthroscopic view of the revision BTB graft in situ. Note the interference screw used for femoral fixation (dotted arrow). (**D**) Three-dimensional CT at 4 weeks after the revision showing the bone plug fixed with an interference screw inside the femoral tunnel; (**E**) three-dimensional CT at 4 weeks showing the bone plug located medially inside the tibial tunnel.


Fig. 6A–C An illustrative case with previous improperly placed tunnels using a hamstring tendon graft. (**A**) A lateral radiograph showing an improperly placed anterior femoral and slightly posterior tibial tunnels (dotted lines); (**B**) arthroscopic view through the anteromedial portal of the femoral attachment area. Dotted circle shows the previous anterior femoral tunnel aperture, whereas the probe tip denotes the new properly placed tunnel aperture. Note there is no overlapping tunnels; (**C**) a new bone-patellar tendon-bone (BTB) graft was introduced and fixed with an interference screw. Note more than 5-mm distance between the previous tunnel aperture (dotted circle) and the anterior border of the new tunnel. Unfortunately, this patient had undergone an accident leading to femoral bone plug slippage out of the tunnel at 3 weeks and had further surgery to refix the bone plug.

instability. One patient had a tear of the graft at 28 months. Of the remaining 17 patients, 11 were classified as normal and six were categorized as nearly normal by the IKDC evaluation form. Quantitative anterior laxity measurement with KT-1000 showed the mean side-to-side difference at maximum manual drawer force improved to 1.0 ± 1.5 mm with a range from -1 to 4 mm. Fifteen of the 17 patients had no loss of motion or effusion, while the other two

Fig. 7A–B An illustrative case with bone absorption. (A) CT of the right knee before revision. Note the severe bone absorption around the anatomic femoral attachment (dotted line); (B) post-operative lateral radiograph showing femoral graft fixation over top of the lateral condyle.

patients had mild pain and swelling after strenuous activity and showed loss of 5°flexion (Cases 8, 17). Two had a mildly positive Lachman sign with a firm end point and pivot shift test (Cases 1, 2), whereas the remaining 15 were negative on both tests. Of the 12 patients lost to followup at 13 months ranging from 1 to 18 months, none reported subjective instability, limitation of motion, or pain on daily activities at the last examination according to the medical record (Table 2).

One patient sustained a tear of the revision graft and underwent a second revision ACLR with the ipsilateral QTB graft and was not listed in Table 1. Another17-year-old male patient had a fall with the knee hyperflexed, resulting in femoral bone loosening from the tunnel at 3 weeks and underwent refixation of the bone plug. He resumed soccer by 8 months, was playing soccer without instability as of 13 months, and was lost to followup thereafter (not listed in the table) (Fig. 6).

Discussion

Revision ACLR is technically difficult because of pre-existing tunnels in the primary ACLR. Recent published studies suggest the femoral ACL attachment area is crescent-shaped with a maximum width of less than 1 cm [9, 22, 31]. The rectangular tunnel aperture of 5-mm width (50 mm^2 in cross-sectional area) in the RT ACLR as well as the two-tunnel technique is advantageous compared with a single round one of 10 mm (79 mm^2 in cross-sectional

area) to avoid overlapping tunnels at the time of revision ACLR [43, 45]. The femoral tunnel was created in the anatomic center of the attachment area in 97% of our series. In addition, the RT ACLR technique is useful to revise failure after double-bundle ACLR in which two tunnels were properly created along the long axis of the ACL attachment areas. A new rectangular tunnel can be easily created by dilating previous two tunnels (Fig. 5).

We acknowledge limitations of our study. First, we located only 18 of the 30 patients (60%) for followup examination at 24 months or longer. Thus, our observations may not represent those for the larger group. Second, the followup evaluation was performed retrospectively. Third, the minimum followup was relatively short. However, we found the procedure reliably restored stability without substantial loss of motion.

A number of reports describe revision ACLR through a single round tunnel using various kinds of graft including autogenous hamstring, BTB, QTB, or allograft (Table 3). In these studies, 2.1% to 8.2% of the patients showed side-to-side differences in KT measurement greater than 5 mm, whereas none of the patients in our series had values greater than 5 mm or a 2+ pivot shift [44]. Comparing IKDC scores of their studies with those of ours, their results showed 56% to 93% of patients were in the A or B category, whereas 100% of our patients were classified into these categories. Loss of ROM exceeding 5°was reported in 2% to 4% of the patients in several studies [25, 29, 32], whereas no patient lost ROM exceeding 5° in the current study. One possible explanation for this difference could be

Table 1. List of patients with a followup of 24 months or longer

Patient number	Age at revision (years)	Followup (years)	Time from first ACL reconstruction to revision (years)	Diagnosis of graft failure to revision (months)	Cause for revision	Preoperative KT (mm)	Grafts for revision	Meniscal injury at revision	Previous grafts	Previous tunnel aperture position	
										At the tibia	At the femur
1	22	6.1	2.4	1.2	New trauma	10	BTB	LM	SMT	Anatomic × 2	Anatomic × 2*
2	16	5.8	1.8	0.5	New trauma	4	BTB	None	SMT	Anatomic × 2	Anatomic × 2*
3	34[1]	5.7	5.9	4.0	New trauma	4	BTB	None	SMT	Anatomic × 1	High × 2
4	21	2.1	2.1	1.7	Technical failure	6	BTB	LM	SMT	Posterior × 1	High, anterior × 1
5	21	2	2	1.4	Technical failure	16	BTB	MM	SMT	Posterior × 1	High, anterior × 1
6	17	2	1.7	2.9	New trauma	5	BTB	None	SMT	Anatomic × 2	Anatomic × 2*
7	20	2	0.4	3.3	New trauma	10	SMT	LM	BTB	Anatomic × 1	Anatomic × 1
8	32	3.3	3.8	1.5	New trauma	12	BTB	LM	SMT	Anatomic × 2	Anatomic × 2*
9	34	3	8	2.1	Technical failure	5	QTB	None	BTB	Posterior × 1	High, anterior × 1
10	15	2	1	3.5	New trauma	7	BTB	None	SMT	Anatomic × 3	Anatomic × 2*
11	22	2	2.3	2.3	New trauma	9	BTB (contralateral)	LM	BTB	Anatomic × 1	Anatomic × 1
12	19[2]	2.2	8.3	1.9	New trauma	5	BTB (contralateral)	None	BTB	Anatomic × 1	Anatomic × 1
13	20	5.3	2	4.7	New trauma	12	BTB	None	SMT	Anatomic × 2	Anatomic × 2*
14	19	3.5	1.1	1.5	New trauma	7	BTB	MM	SMT	Anatomic × 3	Anatomic × 2*
15	28	2	11.5	1.8	New trauma	4	BTB	MM + LM	SMT	Anatomic × 1	High × 2
16	28[3]	5	3.5	2.0	New trauma	5	BTB	MM	SMT	Anatomic × 2	Anatomic × 2*
17	18	5.5	2.3	2.5	New trauma	4	BTB	None	SMT	Anatomic × 2	Anatomic × 2
Mean ± SD	22.7 ± 6.2	3.5 ± 1.7	3.5 ± 3.1	2.3 ± 1.1	NA	7.4 ± 3.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

[1]Fig. 3; [2]Fig. 4; [3]Fig. 5; * anterior widening of femoral tunnel aperture; BTB = bone-patellar tendon-bone autograft; QTB = quadriceps tendon-bone autograft; SMT = two double-looped semitendinosus tendon autograft; KT = side-to-side difference at manual maximum force with KT-1000 arthrometer; NA = not applicable; MM = medial meniscus; LM = lateral meniscus; contralateral = contralateral leg.

Table 2. Results of the patients with a followup of 24 months or longer

Patient number	Loss of ROM	KT (mm) at followup	IKDC		Complaints
			Subjective assessment	Sports activity level	
1	None	4	Normal	2	None
2	None	3	Nearly normal	2	None
3	None	1	Normal	3	None
4	None	1	Nearly normal	1	None
5	None	2	Normal	3	None
6	None	1	Normal	1	None
7	None	1	Normal	4	None
8	5° flexion	0	Nearly normal	1	Mild pain, swelling after strenuous activity
9	None	1	Normal	4	None
10	None	2	Nearly normal	4	None
11	None	1	Normal	4	None
12	None	−1	Normal	1	None
13	None	2	Normal	3	None
14	None	−1	Normal	4	None
15	None	−1	Nearly normal	3	None
16	None	2	Normal	1	None
17	5° flexion	−1	Nearly normal	3	Mild pain, swelling after strenuous activity
Mean ± SD	NA	1.0 ± 1.5	NA	NA	NA

KT = side-to-side difference at manual maximum force with KT-1000 arthrometer; IKDC = International Knee Documentation Committee score; NA = not applicable.

Table 3. Published results of revision ACL reconstruction

References	Graft (%)				ROM		KT			Failure (%)	IKDC A-B (%)	RTP (%)
	Hamstring	BTB	QTB	Allograft	Extension loss > 5°	Flexion loss > 5°	Mean (mm)	> 5 mm (%)	2+ pivot shift (%)			
Diamantopoulos et al. [11]	42.1	38.3	19.6	0	–	–	0.9	6.6	10.3	–	57.9	–
Ferretti et al. [12]	100	0	0	0	0%	–	2.5	7.1	7.1	10	92.9	–
Salmon et al. [32]	100	0	0	0	4%	4%	2.5	8.2	6.1	10	56	70
Weiler et al. [44]	100	0	0	0	–	–	2.2	2.1	4.2	6	91.7	–
Noyes and Barber-Westin [26]	0	100	0	0	3.6%	0%	2.2	22	22	24		58
Garofalo et al. [16]	0	0	100	0	0%	–	3.1	3	0	–	93	93
Noyes and Barber-Westin [25]	0	0	100	0	–	–	2	19	19	19	81	71.4
O'Neill [29]	44	52	0	0	2%	–	–	6	–	6	84	75
Denti et al. [10]	61.7	38.3	0	0	–	–	–	10	–	–	83.3	78
Battaglia and Miller [6]	15.9	47.6	4.8	31.7	–	–	3.9	21	–	25	71	59
Ahn et al. [1]	37	36	0	26.8	–	–	1.5	3.6	0	–	73.2	–
Grossman et al. [18]	0	20.7	0	79	–	–	2.8	3.4	0	–	79.3	80
Thomas et al. [41]	69.4	30.6	0	0	–	–	1.4	5	2	–	–	–
Fox et al. [14]	0	0	0	100	–	–	1.9	6	3	6	93	–
Shino et al. (current study)	6	88	6	0	0%	0%	1.1	0	0	5.8	100	70.6

KT = side-to-side difference at manual maximum force with KT-1000 arthrometer; IKDC = International Knee Documentation Committee score; RTP = return to play sports.

attributed to femoral tunnel location or distance in its aperture between the primary ACLR and the revision. The ACL femoral attachment area is located in the superior-posterior margin of the lateral wall of the notch and less than 10 mm in width, as shown in recently published studies [9, 13, 15, 20, 22, 31, 39]. We have been consistently locating femoral tunnel aperture inside the attachment area [39] (Figs. 4, 5). Furthermore, a femoral tunnel with 5-mm wide rectangular aperture in RT ACLR might have made it possible not only to avoid overlapping tunnels, but to leave more space between the previous improperly placed tunnels and the new tunnels (Fig. 6).

With this procedure, grafts with or without bone plugs may be used. In some countries (including Japan) allograft tissue is not available owing to cultural philosophy. Thus, our principle graft choice for revision has been the BTB graft from the contralateral knee after the primary ACLR with the ipsilateral BTB graft or from the ipsilateral BTB graft if it had not been used for the primary ACLR. However, the BTB graft may not be appropriate for every patient. For example, some judo wrestlers would not accept graft harvest from the contralateral knee. They prefer an unbalanced dominant leg to well-balanced bilateral legs because of their sport. For these patients, the RT technique could be used with SMT if the double- or triple-bundle procedure could not be applied because of pre-existing tunnel(s). In contrast, rugby or American football players may be willing to have a BTB graft harvest from the contralateral limb.

One of our patients had a fall with the knee hyperflexed, resulting in femoral bone plug slippage out of the tunnel in the early postoperative period. Because the bone quality is attenuated and the previous tunnel is close to the new one in many revision cases, additional cortical fixation may be considered in addition to the interference screw fixation.

The rectangular tunnel technique restores function and stability in the short-term in most patients.

References

1. Ahn JH, Lee YS, Ha HC. Comparison of revision surgery with primary anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction and outcome of revision surgery between different graft materials. *Am J Sports Med.* 2008;36:1889–1895.
2. Andersson C, Odensten M, Good L, Gillquist J. Surgical or non-surgical treatment of acute rupture of the anterior cruciate ligament. A randomized study with long-term follow-up. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1989;71:965–974.
3. Arnold MP, Kooloos J, van Kampen A. Single-incision technique misses the anatomical femoral anterior cruciate ligament insertion: a cadaver study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2001;9:194–199.
4. Bach BR Jr. Revision anterior cruciate ligament surgery. *Arthroscopy.* 2003;19(Suppl 1):14–29.
5. Baer GS, Harner CD. Clinical outcomes of allograft versus autograft in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Clin Sports Med.* 2007;26:661–681.
6. Battaglia TC, Miller MD. Management of bony deficiency in revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using allograft bone dowels: surgical technique. *Arthroscopy.* 2005;21:767.
7. Biau DJ, Tournoux C, Katsahian S, Schranz PJ, Nizard RS. Bonepatellar tendon-bone autografts versus hamstring autografts for reconstruction of anterior cruciate ligament: meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2006;332:995–1001.
8. Biau DJ, Tournoux C, Katsahian S, Schranz PJ, Nizard RS. ACL reconstruction: a meta-analysis of functional scores. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2007;458:180–187.
9. Colombet P, Robinson J, Christel P, Franceschi J-P, Dijian P, Bellier G, Sbihi A. Morphology of anterior cruciate ligament attachments for anatomic reconstruction: a cadaveric dissection and radiographic study. *Arthroscopy.* 2006;22:984–992.
10. Denti M, Lo Vetere D, Bait C, Schonhuber H, Melegati G, Volpi P. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: causes of failure, surgical technique, and clinical results. *Am J Sports Med.* 2008;36:1896–1902.
11. Diamantopoulos AP, Lorbach O, Paessler HH. Anterior cruciate ligament revision reconstruction: results in 107 patients. *Am J Sports Med.* 2008;36:851–860.
12. Ferretti A, Conteduca F, Monaco E, De Carli A, D'Arrigo C. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with doubled semitendinosus and gracilis tendons and lateral extra-articular reconstruction. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2006;88:2373–2379.
13. Feretti M, Ekdahl M, Shen W, Fu FH. Osseous landmarks of the femoral attachment of the anterior cruciate ligament: an anatomic study. *Arthroscopy.* 2007;23:1218–1225.
14. Fox JA, Pierce M, Bojchuk J, Hayden J, Bush-Joseph CA, Bach BR Jr. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with nonirradiated fresh-frozen patellar tendon allograft. *Arthroscopy.* 2004;20:787–794.
15. Friedrich NF, O'Brien WR. Functional anatomy of the cruciate ligaments. In: Jakob RP, Staeubli H-U, eds. *The Knee and the Cruciate Ligaments.* Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 1992:78–91.
16. Garofalo R, Djahangiri A, Siegrist O. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with quadriceps tendon-patellar bone autograft. *Arthroscopy.* 2006;22:205–214.
17. Gianotti SM, Marshall SW, Hume PA, Bunt L. Incidence of anterior cruciate ligament injury and other knee ligament injuries: a national population-based study. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2009;12:622–627.
18. Grossman MG, ElAttrache NS, Shields CL, Glousman RE. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: three- to nine-year follow-up. *Arthroscopy.* 2005;21:418–423.
19. Hefti FL, Kress A, Fasel J, Morscher EW. Healing of the transected anterior cruciate ligament in the rabbit. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1991;73:373–383.
20. Hutchinson MR, Ash SA. Resident's ridge: assessing the cortical thickness of the lateral wall and roof of the intercondylar notch. *Arthroscopy.* 2003;19:931–935.
21. Irrgang JJ, Anderson AF, Boland AL, Harner CD, Neyret P, Richmond JC. International Knee Documentation Committee subjective evaluation form. *Am J Sports Med.* 2006;34:1567–1573.
22. Iwahashi T, Shino K, Nakata K, Otsubo H, Suzuki T, Amano H, Nakamura N. Direct ACL insertion to the femur assessed by histology and three-dimensional volume-rendered computed tomography. *Arthroscopy.* 2010;26:S13–S20.

23. Kleiner JB, Roux RD, Amid D, Woo SL-Y, Akeson WH. Primary healing of the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL). *Trans Orthop Res Soc.* 1986;11:131.

24. Nagineni CN, Amiel D, Green MH, Berchuck M, Akeson WH. Characterization of the intrinsic properties of the anterior cruciate and medial collateral ligament cells: an in vitro cell culture study. *J Orthop Res.* 1992;10:465–475.

25. Noyes FR, Barber-Westin SD. Revision anterior cruciate surgery with use of bone-patellar tendon-bone autogenous grafts. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2001;83:1131–1143.

26. Noyes FR, Barber-Westin SD. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using a 2-stage technique with bone grafting of the tibial tunnel. *Am J Sports Med.* 2006;34:678–680.

27. Noyes FR, Matthews DS, Mooar PA, Grood ES. The symptomatic anterior cruciate-deficient knee. Part II. The results of rehabilitation, activity modification, and counseling on functional disability. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1983;65:163–174.

28. Noyes FR, Mooar PA, Matthews DS, Butler DL. The symptomatic anterior cruciate-deficient knee. Part I. The long-term functional disability in athletically active individuals. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1983;65:154–162.

29. O'Neill DB. Revision arthroscopically assisted anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with previously unharvested ipsi-lateral autografts. *Am J Sports Med.* 2004;32:1833–1841.

30. Parkkari J, Pasanen K, Mattila VM, Kannus P, Rimpela A. The risk for a cruciate ligament injury of the knee in adolescents and young adults: a population-based cohort study of 46 500 people with a 9 year follow-up. *Br J Sports Med.* 2008;42:422–426.

31. Purnell ML, Larson AI, Clancy WG. Anterior cruciate ligament insertions on the tibia and femur and their relationships to critical bony landmarks using high-resolution volume-rendering computed tomography. *Am J Sports Med.* 2008;36:2083–2090.

32. Salmon LJ, Pinczewski LA, Russell VJ, Refshauge K. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with hamstring tendon autograft: 5- to 9-year follow-up. *Am J Sports Med.* 2007;35:1064–1069.

33. Shino K, Horibe S, Hamada M, Nakamura N, Nakata K, Mae T, Toritsuka Y. Allograft anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Tech Knee Surg.* 2002;1:78–85.

34. Shino K, Mae T, Maeda A, Miyama T, Shinjo H, Kawakami H. Graft fixation with pre-determined tension using a new device, the double spike plate. *Arthroscopy.* 2002;18:908–911.

35. Shino K, Nakata K, Horibe S, Inoue M, Nakagawa S. Quantitative evaluation after arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Allograft versus autograft. *Am J Sports Med.* 1993;21:609–616.

36. Shino K, Nakata K, Horibe S, Nakamura N, Toritsuka Y, Nakagawa S, Suzuki T. Rectangular tunnel double-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with bone–patellar tendon–bone graft to mimic natural fiber arrangement. *Arthroscopy.* 2008;24:1178–1183.

37. Shino K, Nakata K, Nakamura N, Mae T, Ohtsubo H, Iwahashi T, Nakagawa S. Anatomic ACL reconstruction using two double-looped hamstring tendon grafts via twin femoral and triple tibial tunnels. *Oper Tech Orthop.* 2005;15:130–134.

38. Shino K, Nakata K, Nakamura N, Toritsuka Y, Nakagawa S, Horibe S. Anatomically-oriented ACL Reconstruction with a bone-patellar tendon graft via rectangular socket/tunnels: a snug-fit and impingement-free grafting technique. *Arthroscopy.* 2005;21:1402.e1–1402.e5.

39. Shino K, Suzuki T, Iwahashi T, Mae T, Nakata K, Nakamura N, Nakagawa S. The resident's ridge as an arthroscopic landmark for anatomical femoral tunnel drilling in ACL reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthosc.* 2010;18:1164–1168.

40. Spindler KP, Kuhn JE, Freedman KB, Matthews CE, Dittus RS, Harrell FE Jr. Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction autograft choice: bone-tendon-bone versus hamstring: does it really matter? A systematic review. *Am J Sports Med.* 2004;32:1986–1995.

41. Thomas NP, Kankate R, Wandless F, Pandit H. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using a 2-stage technique with bone grafting of the tibial tunnel. *Am J Sports Med.* 2005;33:1701–1709.

42. Trojani C, Sbihi A, Djian P, Potel J-F, Hulet C, Jouve F, Bussiere C, Ehkirch F-P, Burdin G, Dubrana F, Beaufils P, Franceschi J-P, Chassaing V, Colombet P, Neyret P. Causes for failure of ACL reconstruction and influence of meniscectomies after revision. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2011;19:196–201.

43. van Eck CF, Schreiber VM, Liu T, Fu FH. The anatomic approach to primary, revision and augmentation anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2011;18:1154–1163.

44. Weiler A, Schmeling A, Stohr I, Kaab MJ, Wagner M. Primary versus single-stage revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using autologous hamstring tendon grafts: a prospective matched-group analysis. *Am J Sports Med.* 2007;35:1643–1652.

45. Zantop T, Petersen W. Double bundle revision of a malplaced single bundle vertical ACL reconstruction: ACL revision surgery using a two femoral tunnel technique. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2008;128:1287–1294.

Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Japanese Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS)

Norimasa Nakamura • Ryohei Takeuchi • Takeshi Sawaguchi • Hiroyuki Ishikawa • Tomoyuki Saito • Sabine Goldhahn

Abstract

Background In Japan, only few cross-culturally adapted, internationally used orthopaedic patient self-assessed outcome scores are available. In addition, the high incidence of knee osteoarthritis (OA) suggests the need for validated outcome measures such as the widely used Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) for Japanese populations. The purpose of this study was to provide a crossculturally adapted and validated KOOS questionnaire for further use in national and international clinical projects involving Japanese patients.

Methods The Japanese KOOS was developed according to the standard cross-cultural adaptation guidelines. For validation, the KOOS was tested on 58 patients diagnosed with OA. Reliability was tested using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). Internal consistency or homogeneity was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Construct validity was evaluated by quantifying the correlation between the KOOS and the Japanese OKS and SF-36 questionnaires with Spearmann's correlation coefficients.

Results No major difficulties were encountered during the translation and pre-testing stages. All five KOOS subscales showed adequate reproducibility with ICC values greater than 0.85, high internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha values around 0.90, and high Spearmann's coefficients over 0.50 signifying good correlation between the KOOS subscales and the OKS as well as the majority of the established subscales of the SF-36. No floor and ceiling effects were observed for the five subscales.

Conclusions Our validated Japanese KOOS is a reliable and stable outcomes measure that provides a valuable basis for national and international clinical projects focusing on patient-based assessments in knee OA.

Contact information regarding the Japanese version of KOOS:

- S. Goldhahn
  AO Clinical Investigation and Documentation,
  Stettbachstrasse 6, 8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland
  e-mail: sabine.goldhahn@aofoundation.org
- N. Nakamura
  Insitute for Medical Science in Sports
  Osaka Health Science University
  1-9-27, Tenma, Kita-ku, Osaka 530-0043, Japan
- T. Saito
  Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Yokohama City University
  School of Medicine, 3-9, Fukuura, Kanazawa-ku,
  Yokohama 236-0004, Japan
- R. Takeuchi and H. Ishikawa:
  Yokosuka Municipal hospital
  1-3-2 Nagasaka, Yokosuka city, Kanagawa, 240-0195, Japan
- T. Sawaguchi
  Department of Orthopaedics and Joint Reconstructive Surgery,
  Toyama Municipal Hospital, 2-1, Imaizumi-Hokubu,
  Toyama 939-8511, Japan

AO Foundation

膝外傷と変形性関節症評価点数 - KOOS

記入日: _____/_____/_____　　　生年月日:_____/_____/_____

苗字: _____　　　名: _____

説明:

この調査では、あなたの膝の状態についてお尋ねします。この情報は、あなたが膝の状態をどのように感じるか、そしてどの
程度日常生活をおこなえるかについて、経過を見るのに役立ちます。
全ての質問に答えて四角のマス (□) にチェックを入れてください。どの質問についても、最も当てはまる項目を1つだけ選び、チェック
クを入れてください。答えに迷う場合は、最も近いと思うものをお選びいただくよう、お願いします。

症状:

これらの質問では、ここ1週間の膝の症状についてお答えください。

S1. 膝に腫れ (はれ) がありますか？

まったくない	まれにある	ときどきある	ひんぱんにある	いつもある
□	□	□	□	□

S2. 膝を動かしたとき、軋み (きしみ) を感じたり、ひっかかる音が聞こえたり、その他の雑音が聞こえたりしますか？

まったくない	まれにある	ときどきある	ひんぱんにある	いつもある
□	□	□	□	□

S3. 動いている最中に膝が引っかかったり、動かなくなったりしますか？

まったくない	まれにある	ときどきある	ひんぱんにある	いつもある
□	□	□	□	□

S4. 膝を完全に伸ばすことができますか？

いつもできる	たいていできる	ときどきできる	ほとんどできない	まったくできない
□	□	□	□	□

S5. 膝を完全に曲げることができますか？

いつもできる	たいていできる	ときどきできる	ほとんどできない	まったくできない
□	□	□	□	□

こわばり:

以下の質問はここ 1 週間のあなたの膝のこわばりについての質問です。こわばりとは膝を動かした時に制限を感じたり、
ゆっくりとしか動かせない状態です。

S6. 朝起きた時にどの程度の膝のこわばりがありますか？

まったくない	すこしある	あるていどある	かなりある	ひどい
□	□	□	□	□

S7. 午後や夕方、座ったり、横になったり、休んだ後にどの程度の膝のこわばりがありますか？

まったくない	すこしある	あるていどある	かなりある	ひどい
□	□	□	□	□

痛み:

P1. 膝の痛みの頻度はどのくらいですか？

まったくない	月に1, 2回	週に1, 2回	毎日に1, 2回	いつも
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

ここ1週間に、以下の動作をした時にどの程度の膝の痛みがありましたか？

P2. 膝をひねったり回したりする時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P3. 膝を完全に伸ばす時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P4. 膝を完全に曲げる時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P5. 平らな場所を歩く時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P6. 階段を上り下りする時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P7. 夜、寝ている時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P8. 座っている時や、横になっている時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

P9. まっすぐ立っている時

まったくいたくない	すこしいたい	あるていどいたい	すごくいたい	ものすごくいたい
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

機能

日常生活:
以下の質問では、あなたの身体機能 についてお尋ねします。これは、あなたの動作や身の回りのことを行う能力のことを指します。
以下のそれぞれの活動について、ここ1週間、あなたの膝が原因で感じた困難の程度をお答えください。

A1. 階段を下りる時

まったく不自由を感じない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	とても困難である	ほとんどできない
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

A2. 階段を上る時

まったく不自由を感じない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	とても困難である	ほとんどできない
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

A3. 座った状態から立ち上がる時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A4. 立っている時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A5. 身をかがめて、床に落ちたものを拾う時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A6. 平らな場所を歩く時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A7. 車の乗り降り

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A8. 買い物に行く時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A9. 靴下やストッキングをはく時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A10. ベッドから起き上がる時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A11. 靴下やストッキングを脱ぐ時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A12. ベッドに横たわっている時 (寝返りをうつなど)

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A13. 浴槽に入る/浴槽から出る時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A14. イスに座っている時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A15. 洋式トイレを使う時

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A16. 大変な家事を行う時 (重い箱を動かす、床を拭くなど)

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

A17. 簡単な家事を行う時 (料理、ちりやほこりを払うなど)

まったく不自由を感じない　　すこし困難である　　　　　ある程度困難である　　　とても困難である　　　ほとんどできない

□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□　　　　　　　　　　□

機能
スポーツおよびレクリエーション活動:
以下の質問では、より高いレベルでの活動を行った際のあなたの身体機能についてお尋ねします。
以下のそれぞれの活動について、ここ1週間、あなたの膝が原因で感じた困難の程度をお答えください。

SP1. しゃがむ時

まったく不自由を感じない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	とても困難である	ほとんどできない
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SP2. 走る時

まったく不自由を感じない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	とても困難である	ほとんどできない
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SP3. ジャンプする時

まったく不自由を感じない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	とても困難である	ほとんどできない
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SP4. 悪い方の膝をひねったり、回したりする時

まったく不自由を感じない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	とても困難である	ほとんどできない
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SP5. ひざまずく時

まったく不自由を感じない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	とても困難である	ほとんどできない
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

生活の質

Q1. どのくらいの頻度で自分の膝の問題を自覚しますか？

まったくない	月に１，２回	週に１，２回	日に１，２回	いつも
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q2. 膝によくない行動を避けるために、生活様式を変えましたか？

まったく変えていない	すこし変えた	ある程度変えた	かなり変えた	完全に変えた
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q3. 膝に自信を持てないことで、どの程度困っていますか？

まったく困っていない	すこし困っている	ある程度困っている	かなり困っている	非常に困っている
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q4. 全体的に、どのくらい膝について困難を感じますか？

まったくない	すこし困難である	ある程度困難である	かなり困難である	非常に困難である
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

質問にお答えいただきありがとうございました。

KNEE

Effects of medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction on patellar tracking

Keisuke Kita · Shuji Horibe · Yukiyoshi Toritsuka ·
Norimasa Nakamura · Yoshinari Tanaka · Yasukazu Yonetani ·
Tatsuo Mae · Ken Nakata · Hideki Yoshikawa · Konsei Shino

Abstract

Purpose Medial patellofemoral ligament (MPFL) reconstruction has been performed to treat recurrent patellar dislocation. However, the effects on patellar tracking have not been well documented, particularly in patients. The purpose of this study is to compare patellar tracking pattern and chondral status at MPFL reconstruction with those at second-look arthroscopy.

Methods Between 1999 and 2008, 71 patients with recurrent patellar dislocation underwent MPFL reconstruction using a double-looped semitendinosus tendon. Of these, 25 knees in 24 patients underwent second-look arthroscopy (at 6–26 months after initial surgery), forming the subject for the present study. No other surgical procedures such as tibial tuberosity transfer, lateral release, or osteotomy were performed in any patients. To assess the patellar tracking pattern, the position of the patella on femoral groove was evaluated arthroscopically during passive knee motion through lateral suprapatellar portal.

Results Before MPFL reconstruction, the patella in all patients was shifted laterally throughout the entire range of knee motion. Immediately after MPFL reconstruction, patellar malalignment was corrected in all cases. On second-look arthroscopy, two different patellar tracking patterns were observed. In 9 knees, the patella was located on the center of the femoral groove throughout the range of motion. Meanwhile, in the remaining 16 knees, the patella was shifted laterally at knee extension and migrated to the center of femoral groove with increased knee flexion. No significant deteriorations in chondral status were seen on second-look arthroscopy.

Conclusion The present study revealed that not all improved patellar trackings after MPFL reconstruction remained intact at follow-up. Chondral status in patellofemoral joint was not aggravated by MPFL reconstruction.

Level of evidence Therapeutic studies, Level IV.

Keywords Lateral patellar dislocation · Medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction · Second-look arthroscopy · Patellar tracking pattern · Chondral status

K. Kita (✉) · N. Nakamura · T. Mae · K. Nakata ·
H. Yoshikawa
Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Osaka University Graduate
School of Medicine, 2-2 Yamada-oka, Suita,
Osaka 565-0871, Japan
e-mail: keikita@hera.eonet.ne.jp

S. Horibe · Y. Tanaka · Y. Yonetani
Department of Sports Orthopaedics, Osaka Rosai
Hospital, 1179-3, Nagasone-cho, Kita-ku, Sakai, Osaka, Japan

Y. Toritsuka
Department of Orthopaedic Sports Medicine, Kansai Rosai
Hospital, 3-1-69, Inaba-so, Amagasaki, Hyogo, Japan

K. Shino
Faculty of Comprehensive Rehabilitation, Osaka Prefecture
University, 3-7-30, Habikino, Habikino, Osaka, Japan

Introduction

Recurrent lateral patellar dislocation, subluxation and functional instability commonly occur in patients with various combinations of predisposing factors, such as general joint laxity, abnormal Q angle, abnormal patellar morphology, femoral trochlear aplasia, and patella alta [3, 16, 30]. Movement of the patella thus varies between individuals [40]. The importance of the medial patellofemoral ligament (MPFL) as the primary soft-tissue restraint to lateral displacement of the patella has recently been corroborated by several studies [5, 7, 9, 17], and the MPFL

🐋 Springer

is always injured to some extent during traumatic lateral patellar dislocations [20, 29]. Many operative techniques to reconstruct the MPFL have been described [2, 8, 23, 25, 35, 37]. Good midterm clinical results with up to 97% patient satisfaction and up to 10 years follow-up have been reported [31, 38], and MPFL reconstruction has become the first choice for treating recurrent patellar dislocation. Several reports have described the good effects of MPFL reconstruction on patellofemoral kinematics and contact pressure [4, 14, 26, 33, 34]. However, all these studies used normal cadaveric knees and examined only just after MPFL reconstruction. In many knee ligament reconstruction surgeries such as anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, posterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, and medial collateral ligament reconstruction, biomechanical properties of implanted grafts are known to change with the effects of stress relaxation and graft remodeling [1, 42]. Although such physiological factors may also be relevant to MPFL reconstruction, it is unknown whether the restored patellar maltrackings remain intact for a long while, particularly in practical patients with a variety of predisposing factors. Furthermore, no previous reports showed clearly whether MPFL reconstruction improved or damaged the patellofemoral articular surface. The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether the patellar tracking restored by MPFL reconstruction is maintained for a long time, comparing the patellar kinematics of patients at MPFL reconstruction with that at second-look arthroscopy. To evaluate the effect of MPFL reconstruction on patellofemoral joint surfaces, chondral status at second-look arthroscopy was also compared with that at initial surgery. The hypothesis of the present study was that the patellar tracking pattern at second-look arthroscopy might differ from that immediately after MPFL reconstruction, and MPFL reconstruction did not aggravate the articular surfaces.

Materials and Methods

Between 1999 and 2008, 71 patients underwent MPFL reconstruction using a double-looped semitendinosus tendon at our hospital. All patients were diagnosed with recurrent or habitual patellar dislocation by physical examinations, with positive apprehension sign in all cases. Four patients with a history of prior knee surgery (medial tubercle transfer in two, lateral retinaculum release in two) were excluded from the present investigation. In the present study, 24 patients (25 knees; 18 women, 6 men) underwent second-look arthroscopy at median of 13.2 months postoperatively (range, 6–26 months). Median age at the time of MPFL reconstruction was 22.7 years (range, 13–43 years). Prior to MPFL reconstruction, informed consent was obtained from all patients for hardware removal with

simultaneous second-look arthroscopy 1 year after the initial surgery. The surgery was performed only when the patient was willing to undergo the procedure at postoperative follow-up.

Surgical Technique

All reconstructions were performed using a modified "dual tunnel medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction" technique reported by Toritsuka et al. [39]. First, chondral status and patellar tracking were carefully evaluated by arthroscopy. A semitendinosus autograft was then harvested through a 3-cm incision over the pes anserius. The semitendinosus tendon was exposed and released from muscle using a tendon stripper. The distal end (17 cm) of the tendon was used and was doubled over. Both free ends of the graft were connected with a No. 3 braided polyester suture using Krackow suture technique.

A small 1-cm incision was made on the lateral side of the patella, and a skin incision of approximately 5 cm in length was made from the medial patellar edge to the medial femoral epicondyle. With the patella reduced in the femoral groove, the distance between the two anatomical insertions of MPFL was measured, and the exact length of the tendon was determined. Two guidewires were transversely inserted, one from proximal one-third of the medial edge of the patella and another from the center of the patella. Patellar guidewires were overdrilled using a 4.5-mm cannulated reamer to create sockets 15 mm in depth (Fig. 1). Care was taken not to violate the chondral surface or the anterior cortex of the patella. Until 2003, patellar bone tunnels were created from the medial to the lateral

Fig. 1 Schematic view of MPFL reconstruction

side of the patella using a 4.5-mm cannulated reamer. However, the bone tunnel technique was changed to a bone socket technique in 2003 after one patient suffered patellar fracture in relation to bone tunnel procedure 2 months after MPFL reconstruction. Another guidewire was inserted from superoposterior portion of the medial femoral epicondyle toward the proximal cortex of the lateral femoral condyle. The guidewire was overdrilled with an EndoButton® drill (Smith & Nephew Endoscopy, Andover, MA), and 5- to 6-mm socket was drilled to a depth of 20 mm at the anatomical femoral insertion of the MPFL (Fig. 1).

The center of the graft was pulled into the femoral socket to a depth of pre-determined length and was fixed using an EndoButton® on the proximal cortex of the lateral femoral condyle. The two free ends of the graft were pulled into the bone sockets of the patella, and the two No. 3 braided polyester sutures connected to the graft were fixed by an EndoButton® on the lateral side of the patella at 45° of knee flexion. At this time, care was taken not to overtense the graft. After fixation of both sites, negative manual lateral dislocation of the patella was confirmed and patellar tracking was then evaluated arthroscopically (Fig. 1).

Postoperative Management

For 2 weeks after MPFL reconstruction, the knee was immobilized with a brace at 45° of knee flexion. After the brace was removed, passive- and active-assisted range of knee motion was started. Weight bearing was gradually increased to full at 4 weeks postoperatively. Running was allowed at 3 months, followed by a return to previous sporting activity at 6 months.

Evaluation

All patients were evaluated preoperatively, postoperatively, and by second-look arthroscopy. Clinical data included the incidence of recurrent subluxation and dislocation, lateral patellar hypermobility [21], lateral patellar apprehension, and Kujala score [22]. Radiographs of the knee, including a conventional anteroposterior view, lateral view, 30° skyline view, and Merchant's view, were taken at each of the three time points. The skyline view was used for measuring lateral tilt [12], and Merchant's view was used for measuring congruence angle [27] (Fig. 2). Insall-Salvati ratio at the three time points was measured on the lateral view [19]. Arthroscopically, patellar tracking was evaluated at 0° through 60° of knee flexion through a lateral suprapatellar portal. A median ridge of the patella located above the middle third of the femoral groove was defined as "centrally located", while a ridge located lateral to the middle third of femoral groove was defined as "laterally shifted". Evaluation of patellar movement was repeated three times, and it was confirmed that patellar tracking pattern was same in each time. Patellar trackings were recorded on video disc and verified by two skilled orthopedic surgeons postoperatively. Chondral status of patellofemoral joint according to the Outerbridge classification was also evaluated at initial surgery and second-look arthroscopy. The view during arthroscopic operations was kept clear by means of irrigation and tourniquet. The pressure of irrigation fluid was set to 40 mmHg, and the pressure of air tourniquet was set to 300 mmHg.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the paired t-test, one factor analysis of variance, Mann–Whitney U test, and the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. Values of $P < 0.05$ were defined as significant.

Results

No patient reported re-dislocation of the patella in the follow-up period. All patients showed full range of motion at the time of second-look arthroscopy. One patient, who had not been allowed to return to sports activity, had

Fig. 2 Measuring methods on radiograph. **a** 30° skyline view. Lateral tilt angle was defined as an angle with *line A* to *B*. **b** Merchant view. *C* congruence angle, *D* sulcus angle

suffered patellar fracture during badminton 2 months after MPFL reconstruction and underwent open reduction and internal fixation. In terms of passive patellar hypermobility, abnormal lateral patellar movement was found in all cases preoperatively. At final follow-up, all patellae were firmly fixed on the femoral groove and no abnormal hypermobility was found in any case. While 22 knees showed clear improvements in apprehension sign, positive results were still evident in 3 cases. Median Kujala score improved from 73 (66–82) pre-operatively to 95 (85–100) at second-look arthroscopy.

Radiographic Findings

Median sulcus angle was 147.7° (130–170°). Preoperatively, median lateral tilt angle, median congruence angle, and Insall-Salvati ratio were −8.0° (−44 to 20°), 20.8° (−25 to 80°), and 1.1 (0.8–1.4), respectively (Table 1). Immediately after MPFL reconstruction, these three indices had improved. However, at final follow-up, these indices had returned toward preoperative values to some extent (Table 1). Although patellar maltracking was reduced in all cases immediately after surgery, the position had shifted laterally to some extent at follow-up (Fig. 3a–c).

Patellar tracking

At arthroscopic evaluation prior to MPFL reconstruction, patellae in all cases had shifted laterally for all knee flexion angles (Fig. 4a–d). Immediately after MPFL reconstruction, all preoperative patellar maltracking was reduced, and patellae were congruent with femoral groove in 0–60° of range of motion (Fig. 4e–h). At second-look arthroscopy, tensed reconstructed grafts were recognized arthroscopically from the inside of the joint in all cases (Fig. 5). In 9

knees, the patella was always located above the center of the femoral groove within 0–60° of range of motion and thus classified as "centrally located type". In 16 knees, the patella was located in a "laterally shifted" position at knee extension, moving on the center of the femur and becoming congruent with the femoral groove as the angle of knee flexion increased. This pattern was classified as "laterally shifted type".

No demographic data affected the difference in patellar tracking between the two groups (Table 2). However, 3 patients who complained of positive apprehension sign at follow-up were classified as "laterally shifted type". Kujala scores, sulcus angles, and preoperative lateral tilt angles were not different between the two groups (Table 3). Only median preoperative congruence angle, which was 9.2° (−25 to 52°) in "centrally located type" and 26.5° (−2 to 85°) in "laterally shifted type", differed significantly according to various preoperative factors ($P = 0.03$; Table 3).

Chondral Status

At MPFL reconstruction, cartilage lesions on the patellofemoral joint were observed in 96% of patients. At second-look arthroscopy, no obvious deterioration in chondral status was seen. The patella cartilage in "centrally located type" patients showed little change, compared with that at MPFL reconstruction (Fig. 6a). In the "laterally shifted type", 2 patients displayed slight deteriorations in the patella surface and 6 patients showed improvement in lesions (4 lesions, grade 4; 2 lesions, grade 2; Fig. 6b). The femur showed no deterioration in the chondral status in "laterally shifted type" patients, while 4 of 9 patients with "centrally located type" exhibited slight deterioration in the chondral surfaces (Fig. 6c, d).

Table 1 Radiographic measurement

| Median (range)	Before MPFL reconstruction	After MPFL reconstruction	Second-look arthroscopy	Significance (P value)
Lateral tilt angle (°)	−8.0 (−44 to 20)	5.5 (−16 to 20)	−3.8 (−48 to 18)	<0.05
Congruence angle (°)	20.8 (−25 to 80)	−11.8 (−64 to 45)	9.3 (−27 to 92)	<0.05
Insall-Salvati ratio	1.1 (0.8 to 1.4)	1.0 (0.8 to 1.3)	1.1 (0.8 to 1.4)	<0.05

One-factor ANOVA

Fig. 3 Radiographs of Merchant's view at the three time points. **a** Before surgery, **b** Immediately after surgery, **c** Second-look arthroscopy

Fig. 4 Arthroscopic view of the patellofemoral joint at MPFL reconstruction. Arthroscopic view of the patellofemoral joint at 0° (**a**), 15° (**b**), 30° (**c**), 60° (**d**) before surgery and 0° (**e**), 15° (**f**), 30° (**g**), 60° (**h**) immediately after surgery

Fig. 5 Arthroscopic view of reconstructed MPFL at second-look arthroscopy. *Arrowheads* indicate a reconstructed MPFL

Discussion

The most important finding in the present study was that not all instances of reduced patellar tracking remained intact despite good clinical outcomes, even if patellar maltracking had been completely restored just after MPFL reconstruction. Arthroscopically evaluated patellar tracking patterns at follow-up were divided into two types: with 36% of patellar trackings classified as "centrally located type", and 64% classified as "laterally shifted type". All patellar tracking patterns of the three cases complaining of positive patellar apprehension were "laterally shifted type". Preoperative radiographic measurements revealed a significant difference only in the congruence angle between the two groups. No significant deteriorations in chondral status were seen on second-look arthroscopy. However, grade 1 cartilage damages that had not been recognized in initial surgery was observed in the femoral groove for 44% of the "centrally located type" patients and in the central ridge of the patella for 13% of "laterally shifted type" patients,

Although MPFL reconstruction has become the first choice for treating recurrent patellar dislocation and good midterm clinical results with up to 97% patient satisfaction and up to 10 years of follow-up have been reported [31], patellar tracking after MPFL reconstruction, particularly in

Table 2 Demographic data of "centrally located type" and "laterally shifted type"

Median (range)	Centrally located type	Laterally shifted type	Significance (*P* value)
Patient age (years old)	25.6 (15–39)	22.1 (13–43)	n.s.
Duration from injury to MPFL reconstruction (years)	10.2 (1.6–23.3)	6.7 (0.2–22.7)	n.s.
Duration from initial surgery to second-look arthroscopy (months)	10.5 (6.7–26.0)	14.2 (5.9–31.1)	n.s.
Kujala score at second-look arthroscopy	95 (85–100)	94 (81–100)	n.s.
Apprehension sign at second-look arthroscopy (−/+)*	(9/0)	(13/3)	–

Paired *t*-test

* (−/+) represents that apprehension sign is negative/positive

**Table 3** Preoperative radiographic findings in "centrally located type" and "laterally shifted type"

Median (range)	Centrally located type	Laterally shifted type	Significance (P value)
Sulcus angle (°)	147.6 (138 to 156)	147.7 (130 to 170)	n.s.
Lateral tilt angle (°)	−0.5 (−13 to 8)	−11.7 (−44 to 20)	n.s.
Congruence angle (°)	9.2 (−25 to 52)	26.5 (−2 to 85)	0.03
Insall-Salvati ratio	1.2 (1.0 to 1.4)	1.1 (0.8 to 1.4)	n.s.

Mann–Whitney U test

patients, has not been described. Radiologic findings showed that all patellar maltracking was reduced immediately after MPFL reconstruction. However, tracking position had shifted somewhat laterally by second-look arthroscopy. Deie et al. reported clinical and radiologic results of MPFL reconstruction using transferred semitendinosus tendon 5 years after surgery [11]. They concluded that congruence angle, tilting angle, and lateral shift ratio were within normal ranges at 5 years postoperatively. However, detailed examination of their data showed that the three indices were improved at 6 months after reconstruction, but tended to return toward preoperative values to some extent. This fact is consistent with the present results, which found a lateral shift in the patella at follow-up. As a tensed graft was recognized from inside the joint in all cases and relatively good results were obtained in this

series, the transplanted graft might undergo remodeling or stress relaxation without breaking [18], and the graft might function as a seatbelt to reinforce lateral displacement of the patella. Yamada et al. reported 3-dimensional morphological differences in the articular surface of the femoral trochlea in patients with recurrent dislocation of the patella using 3-dimensional computational models [41]. They concluded that the lateral border of articular cartilage of the trochlea in patients was located more laterally than in the control group. The two patellar tracking patterns observed in this study might have been caused by the unique patellofemoral congruency in recurrent patellar dislocation patients, as cases with subdislocation of the patella at knee extension showed significantly higher congruence angles. Furthermore, patients with patellar subluxation exhibit a tight lateral retinaculum [15]. With larger

Fig. 6 Chondral status at MPFL reconstruction and at second-look arthroscopy.
a Chondral status of the patella in "centrally located type".
b Chondral status of the patella in "laterally shifted type".
c Chondral status of the femur in "centrally located type".
d Chondral status of the femur in "laterally shifted type"

congruence angle, the tighter and shorter the lateral reti-naculum is considered to be. The reconstructed MPFL may be matched to the proper length by remodeling depending on individual patello-femoral congruence and tightness of the lateral retinaculum. However, all three cases with positive apprehension sign remaining at follow-up were classified into "laterally shifted type". For such cases, other surgical procedure such as lateral retinaculum release or tibial tuberosity transfer may be necessary, although further examination of this issue is needed before such recommendations can be made.

Patellar tracking of normal and abnormal subjects has been investigated using radiograph, computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, and arthroscopy by many authors [6, 12, 36]. Arthroscopically, quantitative evalua-tion of the patellar position is impossible. Brossmann et al. reported that the arthroscopic patellar tracking pattern correlated with motion-triggered cine magnetic resonance imaging [6]. By simplifying the classification of arthro-scopic patellofemoral alignment, they minimized the influence of subjective impressions by operators. Arthro-scopic evaluation of patellar tracking in the present study might have been subjective, but arthroscopy remains an important technique for evaluating patellofemoral prob-lems. In the present study, although the subluxing patella was not centered on the femoral groove with increased knee flexion before surgery and patellar maltracking had been reduced immediately after surgery, arthroscopic patellar tracking patterns observed at second-look arthros-copy could be simply classified into two types, retrospec-tively. The influence of operator subjectivity was thus considered minimal. The pressure of irrigation fluid is another important factor affecting arthroscopic patellar tracking. Delaunay and Kapandji reported that serum inflow affected patella-trochlear centralization [13]. In the present study, to avoid differing effects of irrigation pres-sure on patellar tracking, the pressure was set to 40 mmHg in each case. The tracking pattern in the present study might not reflect the true pathology, but the present find-ings could provide useful information regarding alterna-tions in patellar tracking after MPFL reconstruction.

Although movement of the patella varies among patients with recurrent patellar dislocation [40], the two patellar tracking patterns were observed only with reconstruction of the MPFL anatomically without any procedure for various predisposing factors. Sandmeier et al. compared patellar tracking in cadaveric knees with medial restraints intact, either sectioned or reconstructed [34]. They concluded that, with a lateral force applied to the patella, patellar tracking changed significantly with loss of the medial restraints and improved after MPFL reconstruction using a gracilis tendon. They also noted that patellar tracking was not completely restored, and the reconstructed MPFL tended

to overconstrain the specimens, particularly under knee extension. Ostermeier et al. compared the effects of two different techniques of MPFL reconstruction using cadav-eric knees and concluded that both reconstruction tech-niques created sufficient stabilization of the patella, but that patellar position was slightly overmedialized following MPFL reconstruction with a semitendinosus autograft, which could lead to overload on the medial retropatellar cartilage [32]. The present results are partially in accor-dance with their results, with the patella medialized and overconstrained immediately after reconstruction. How-ever, both studies used cadaveric knees, and patellar tracking immediately after MPFL reconstruction was evaluated in vitro. Cadaveric studies do not always throw light on the true pathology of lateral patellar dislocation and MPFL reconstruction, as lateral patellar dislocation caused by various predisposing factors and physiological effects such as graft remodeling cannot be evaluated. Therefore, patellar tracking patterns in actual patients approximately 1 year after surgery were investigated.

In "centrally located type" knees, the patella was always centered in the femoral groove from 0° to 60° of knee flexion. This type of patellar tracking might differ from normal patellar tracking, as the median ridge of the patella lies lateral to the center of the trochlea in the normal knee from 0 to 30° of flexion, then moves medially to become centered in the femoral groove at between 30° and 60° of flexion [10]. In fact, 44% of the chondral status of the femoral groove in the "centrally located type" cases was deteriorated to grade 1 at second-look arthroscopy. This suggested that, in some cases, MPFL reconstruction was overtensioned immediately after surgery. Meanwhile, in the "laterally shifted type", the patella was located lat-eral to the center of the femoral groove and become cen-tered with an increase in knee flexion angle. Two of 16 "laterally shifted type" patients showed deterioration at the central ridge of the patella. This fact suggests that the return of incongruence caused that excessive lateral pres-sure would also return. Even though the same MPFL reconstruction in all cases was performed, different pat-terns of patellar tracking were observed. In some cases, the reconstructed MPFL might be overtensed immediately after surgery. In other cases, the reconstructed graft might undergo graft remodeling or stress relaxation, and exces-sive lateral pressure might return. Long-term follow-up is needed to assess the progression of osteoarthritis. Any important factors contributing to the two types of patellar tracking could not be identified in this study. Several specific imaging protocols designed for patellofemoral disorders have been reported, including axial view with lateral rotation of the leg, measurement of patellar height, and crossing sign [12]. The crossing sign could not be investigated for systematically due to the difficulty in