Research Article

The British Journal of Sports Medicine

Revision of ACL Reconstruction: A Review

Saccomanni Bernardino

***Corresponding author**

Saccomanni Bernardino,
Department of Sports Medicine and Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, Italy.

Received Date : May 20, 2024
Accepted Date : May 22, 2024
Published Date : June 22, 2024

ABSTRACT

While several research on initial ACL repair have been published in the last 15 years, there is limited data on revision ACL reconstruction. There have been various case series describing surgeons.

Revision reconstructive surgery cases typically have evidence levels III or IV. The majority of writers found that revision ACL reconstruction has a worse prognosis than primary repair.

Revision ACL reconstruction has been linked to worse subjective knee-related quality of life, with a significant difference in median ratings between main and revision reconstructions (P=0.001). Revision reconstruction is referred to as a'salvage procedure' (16), and it is recommended to spend significant time on counseling.

Despite this, research has demonstrated that the outcomes of revision surgery might be essentially no different from main reconstruction outcomes 6. However, this was merely level IV evidence once more, highlighting the necessity for prospective controlled trials with a high degree of evidence.

This is the goal of the Multicenter ACL Revision Study (MARS) 2. MARS aims to create a prospective longitudinal cohort and offer the best possible evidence to inform clinical practice about revision ACL surgery.

About seventy surgeons are working together to determine the prognosis and independent factors of poor outcomes following revision ACL surgery.

It is evident that higher level research on revision ACL reconstruction is still needed, and the MARS results may assist identify the most effective procedures for revision ACL reconstruction, perhaps leading to better outcomes of this procedure down the road There are no numbers or results in this review.

Keywords : Revision; ACL; Reconstruction.

INTRODUCTION

Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) injuries are frequent, especially during sports activity, and an estimated 100,000 to 200,000 ACL reconstructions are performed annually the USA annually [1,2]. Over the past 20 years, there has been a noticeable advancement in ACL reconstruction surgery, and numerous studies have demonstrated good to exceptional outcomes, making it the preferred course of treatment for individuals experiencing functional instability. While 75 to 95% of patients get good to outstanding stability and pain alleviation [3], 0.7–10% experience recurrent instability as a result of graft failure [4]. Given the high volume of ACL reconstructions now being done, a sizable portion of patients will require a Revision ACL Reconstruction (RACLR) as a result of this failure rate.

This article's goal is to examine the factors that lead to Primary ACL Reconstructions (PACLR) failing, the factors that should be taken into account when organizing and carrying out revisions, and the the result of a surgical revision.

Diverse interpretations exist on what constitutes a "failure" following an ACL reconstruction. What constitutes an unsatisfactory outcome has been determined by a variety of physical and subjective factors, such as increased discomfort, limited motion, recurring episodes of instability, a lower degree of physical activity, a positive Lachman or pivot shift test, or an arthrometric test with a side-to-side difference larger than 5 mm [5].

Usually, there are three types of failure causes [3,4, 6]. The three categories include: • Surgical technique; • Biological failure, or failure of graft integration; and • Traumatic failure.

The surgeon needs to know the full history in addition to performing a physical examination and radiographic evaluation in order to determine the cause of the failure. When thinking about revision, operational records from the initial reconstruction—which include the kind of graft, the fixation technique, and any damage to other ligaments—are also necessary.

Traumatic Failure

Generally speaking, trauma failures can be classified as early (before to graft incorporation) or late (more than six months following rehabilitation). In the event that the graft is traumatized prior to biological integration, excessively forceful rehabilitation***, or going back to sports before the neuromuscular control has been regained might make the knee more vulnerable to repeated damage [7].

Stability in the final stage could arise from a force with

comparable intensity to the trauma experienced at the initial ACL tear. Frequently, this An instant effusion of the knee occurs after reinjury, which could be useful for the patient's assessment [3]. This kind of late failure brought on by recurring trauma affects 5–10% of patients who have resumed their pre-injury level of sport.

Biological Failure

When a patient presents with an unstable knee after reconstruction and there is no discernible technical fault, biological failure should be taken into consideration.

Ligamentization is a complicated biological process that occurs when an autograft or allograft is used to rebuild an ACL. At first, the tendon becomes inflamed and necrotic. Revascularization and fibroblast repopulation occur after this.

The final step entails remodeling the graft and altering the collagenous structure [8]. Failure of any of these processes could result in a large amount of necrosis, hypocellularity, inadequate vascularization, disintegration, fragmentation, or disorganization of the collagen structure, all of which could prevent the graft from integrating [4]. Additionally connected to stress buffering and immunological aspects biological breakdown of the ACL reconstruction.

Surgical Error

The most frequent reason for unsuccessful ACL restorations is poor surgical technique [1,3,4,6,9, 10]. Inadequate notchplasty, misaligned tunnel positioning, incorrect graft tensioning, and graft failure of fixation.

Seventy to eighty percent of ACL repair failures result from improper tunnel placement, with the most frequent mistake being femoral tunnel malpositioning [3]. This may cause the graft to expand, become weaker, and eventually burst. As much as possible, the graft should be positioned posteriorly in the notch without jeopardizing the posterior cortical wall. The most frequent error is placing the graft too far anteriorly, which causes the graft to stretch and graft fixation point to become overly strained during knee flexion [7]. If the tunnel is positioned too far behind A posterior wall blowout is possible [3]. Although it is debatable whether this is detrimental to the graft, this location may also result in the graft being overly tensioned during extension and mildly loose during flexion [6,7].

A typical Lachman test for anterior stability may be achieved if the tunnel is positioned vertically, although this could result in poor rotational stability [3, 7].

Even though it is less frequent, the tunnel's tibial location is crucial, and incorrect placement might result in graft failure. Placement too far anteriorly may result in impingement and complete loss of extension [11], but if it is made too far posteriorly, it may cause laxity in the flexion and impinge on the PCL. Again, inadequate rotational stability may arise from an excessively vertical tunnel [7].

For the rear wall and the "over the top" position to be sufficiently visualized, adequate notchplasty is required for a successful repair. Impingement of the graft may result from an unsatisfactory notchplasty, especially in extension.

When comparing impinged and unimpinged grafts, a change in signal can be seen three months after surgery using Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), which is a valuable technique for evaluating impingement [3].

Appropriate tensioning of the graft has been identified as another crucial surgical component linked to graft failure. The ideal tension remains unknown; therefore, the knee's angle at the moment of fixation seems to be significant, and tissue specificity should be applied. Inadequate revascularization, graft degradation, loss of mobility, and graft straining can all result from excessive tension [12]. The graft fixation sites are more prone to load failure in the early postoperative phase than the actual graft. Therefore, while biological integration is occurring, it is essential that the graft be fastened firmly enough to keep it from sliding inside the tunnels [3,7]. Bone density, the size and integrity of the tunnel, the type of graft, and the anchoring technique all affect the contribute to the fixation's total strength. Although there are many different types of fixation devices, meticulous technique is necessary to ensure a firm fixation, which is necessary if the graft is to resist rigorous rehabilitation programs. [3]

Associated Knee Pathology

It is common for capsular and ligamentous injuries to transpire concurrently with ACL injuries. Failure may result from an increasing load on the graft if these are not identified and treated. One investigation discovered that 86% of their patients requiring revision ACL restoration also needed surgery for related damage to other knee components [13]. Because it is frequently disregarded, posterior lateral instability should be carefully examined prior to surgery in 10-15% of chronic ACL-deficient knees [3].

Smoking

Smoking has long been recognized as a significant risk factor for the emergence of problems following surgical procedures [14]. A study investigating how smoking affects the repair of the ACL [15] discovered that compared to the non-smoking group, the smokers had a significantly lower mean International Knee Documentation Committee (IKDC) score, more frequent and intense pain, a higher side-to-side knee laxity score, and a lower likelihood of returning to their pre-injury level of sport. The number of patients who required revision surgery for each group was not disclosed in the experiment; nonetheless, it is possible to speculate that smoking could be associated with worse outcomes as there was a lower mean IKDC score

and fewer participants who returned to their pre-injury level of sport.

CONCLUSION

Over the previous two to three decades, there has been a rise in the number of primary Anterior Cruciiate Ligament (ACL) reconstructions, which has increased the demand for revision ACL reconstructions.
furthermore. The precise pathophysiology and causation of ACL repair failure are complex and yet unknown. A number of major issues, including poor surgical technique, damage, "biological failure" of the transplant, and patient factors like smoking, have been identified as the main causes of a failed outcome. Seventy to eighty percent of ACL reconstruction failures result from improper tunnel placement, with the most frequent mistake being femoral tunne malpositioning [13]. A thorough history taking process and meticulous preoperative planning are essential for a successful revision procedure. In the previous fifteen years, there has been a There are numerous published research on original ACL reconstruction, however the literature on revision ACL reconstruction is quite thin. Most of these writers came to the conclusion that revision ACL reconstruction has a less favorable result than initial ACL reconstruction. It has been said that revision reconstruction is a "salvage procedure" [16] and that patients should spend a lot of time before surgery counseling them and going over their expectations.

REFERENCES

1. Carson EW, Anisko EM, Restrepo C, Panariello RA, O'Brien SJ, Warren RF. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: etiology of failures and clinical results. J Knee Surg. 2004; 17: 127-132.

2. Spindler KP. The Multicenter ACL Revision Study (MARS): a prospective longitudinal cohort to define outcomes and independent predictors of outcomes for revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. J Knee Surg. 2007; 20: 303-307.

3. Fagelman M, Freedman KB. Revision reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament: evaluation and management. Am J Orthop. 2005; 34: 319-328.

4. Menetrey J, Duthon VB, Laumonier T, Fritschy D. "Biological failure" of the anterior cruciate ligament graft. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2008; 16: 224-231.

5. Johnson DL, Swenson TM, Irrgang JJ, Fu FH, Harner CD. Revision anterior cruciate ligament surgery: experience from Pittsburgh. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1999: 100-109.

6. 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.

7. George MS, Dunn WR, Spindler KP. Current concepts review: revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Am J Sports Med. 2006; 34: 2026-2037.

8. Fu FH, Bennett CH, Lattermann C, Ma CB. Current Trends in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: Part 1: Biology and Biomechanics of Reconstruction. Am J Sports Med. 1999; 27: 821-830.

9. Fules PJ, Madhav RT, Goddard RK, Mowbray MA. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using autografts with a polyester fixation device. Knee. 2003; 10: 335-340.

10. Getelman MH, Friedman MJ. Revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery. J Am Acad Orthop Surg. 1999; 7: 189-198.

11. Howell SM, Clark JA. Tibial tunnel placement in anterior cruciate ligament reconstructions and graft impingement. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1992; 187-195.

12. Jaureguito JW, Paulos LE. Why grafts fail. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1996; 25-41.

13. Eberhardt C, Kurth AH, Hailer N, Jager A. Revision ACL reconstruction using autogenous patellar tendon graft. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2000; 8: 290-295.

14. Moller AM, Villebro N, Pedersen T, Tonnesen H. Effect of preoperative smoking intervention on postoperative complications: a randomised clinical trial. Lancet. 2002; 359: 114-117.

15. Karim A, Pandit H, Murray J, Wandless F, Thomas NP. Smoking and reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2006; 88: 1027-1031.

16. Bach BR, Jr. ACL reconstruction: revisited, revised, reviewed. J Knee Surg. 2004; 17: 125-126.