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Abstract

Purpose: To review the literature comparing graft failure rate between patellar and hamstring tendon autografts placed anatomically and to determine if there are differences in return to preinjury activity levels between autografts. Study Design: Systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression. Methods: The PubMed, MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus, and CINAHL databases were used to identify studies published from January 1, 2000, through March 7, 2014. To compare postoperative outcomes between patellar tendon and hamstring tendon autografts, summary event rates for graft failure and return to preinjury activity level were calculated. A meta-analysis was performed to calculate a summary odds ratio (OR) for graft failure between autografts using the studies that directly compared the 2 autografts. Meta-regression analyses were performed to assess the influence of postoperative follow-up time on graft failure rate. Results: A total of 28 studies reported graft failures for patellar tendon (6 studies) and hamstring tendon (26 studies) autografts used with anatomic ACL reconstruction; 4 of the 28 were comparison studies. Graft failure rate was not significantly different between patellar tendon (7.0% [95% CI, 4.6%-10.5%]) and hamstring tendon autografts (3.9% [95% CI, 2.7%-5.6%]). The odds of graft failure were slightly higher for hamstring tendon autografts (OR, 1.21 [95% CI, 0.63-2.33]), but this difference was not significant (P = .57). The rate of patients returning to preinjury activity levels was not significantly different between patellar tendon (n = 1 study; 58.1% [95% CI, 40.4%-73.9%]) and hamstring tendon autografts (n = 5 studies; 75.6% [95% CI, 43.7%-92.5%]). Overall graft failure rate was positively associated with postoperative follow-up time, but this effect was only significant with hamstring tendon autografts (P \ .05). Conclusion: Differences in graft failure rate between patellar tendon and hamstring tendon autografts were not significant. Although follow-up time was only found to have a significant influence on hamstring tendon graft failure rates, this was likely due to the smaller sample of studies assessing patellar tendon graft failures. Differences in return to preinjury activity levels could not be determined due to the lack of studies assessing that outcome. Both patellar and hamstring tendon autografts demonstrate a low risk of failure and moderately high return to activity level after anatomic ACL reconstruction.
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Background: Recent data from the Danish anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) registry demonstrated increased reoperation rates for hamstring tendon autografts when an anatomic ACL reconstruction is performed. This is consistent with reports of greater time needed for hamstring tendon autografts to mature compared with other autografts.

Purpose: To review the literature comparing graft failure rate between patellar and hamstring tendon autografts placed anatomically and to determine if there are differences in return to preinjury activity levels between autografts.

Study Design: Systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression.

Methods: The PubMed, MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus, and CINAHL databases were used to identify studies published from January 1, 2000, through March 7, 2014. To compare postoperative outcomes between patellar tendon and hamstring tendon autografts, summary event rates for graft failure and return to preinjury activity level were calculated. A meta-analysis was performed to calculate a summary odds ratio (OR) for graft failure between autografts using the studies that directly compared the 2 autografts. Meta-regression analyses were performed to assess the influence of postoperative follow-up time on graft failure rate.

Results: A total of 28 studies reported graft failures for patellar tendon (6 studies) and hamstring tendon (26 studies) autografts used with anatomic ACL reconstruction; 4 of the 28 were comparison studies. Graft failure rate was not significantly different between patellar tendon (7.0% [95% CI, 4.6%-10.5%]) and hamstring tendon autografts (3.9% [95% CI, 2.7%-5.6%]). The odds of graft failure were slightly higher for hamstring tendon autografts (OR, 1.21 [95% CI, 0.63-2.33]), but this difference was not significant (P = .57). The rate of patients returning to preinjury activity levels was not significantly different between patellar (n = 1 study; 58.1% [95% CI, 40.4%-73.9%]) and hamstring tendon autografts (n = 5 studies; 75.6% [95% CI, 43.7%-92.5%]). Overall graft failure rate was positively associated with postoperative follow-up time, but this effect was only significant with hamstring tendon autografts (P < .05).

Conclusion: Differences in graft failure rate between patellar tendon and hamstring tendon autografts were not significant. Although follow-up time was only found to have a significant influence on hamstring tendon graft failure rates, this was likely due to the smaller sample of studies assessing patellar tendon graft failures. Differences in return to preinjury activity levels could not be determined due to the lack of studies assessing that outcome. Both patellar and hamstring tendon autografts demonstrate a low risk of failure and moderately high return to activity level after anatomic ACL reconstruction.
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Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries account for more than 50% of all knee injuries, and they often become a functional limitation during activities of daily living if left untreated. Before the 21st century, transtibial ACL reconstruction (ACLR) was the primary surgical treatment for restoring joint stability, returning patients to their previous levels of activity, and reducing the risk of subsequent joint injuries. Graft placement for transtibial ACLR is performed by drilling the femoral tunnel through the tibial tunnel, making the position of the femoral tunnel largely dependent on the position of the tibial tunnel. However, this technique commonly places the graft in a more vertical position relative to the native ACL, which has been
shown to cause residual joint instability and inferior functional outcomes. Since the early 2000s, surgical techniques for ACLR have evolved to restore the anatomy of the native ACL in attempts to improve postoperative outcomes.

“Anatomic” ACLR is defined as a functional restoration of the ACL to its native dimensions, orientation, and insertion. The prime distinction of anatomic ACLR involves placing the graft in the same position as the native ACL by drilling the tunnels through the tibial and femoral ACL footprints. To match the footprints of the native ACL, the tibial and femoral tunnels must be drilled independent of one another using an anteromedial drilling technique. In this technique, the position of the tibial tunnel is identical to transtibial ACLR, but instead of drilling transtibially to create the femoral tunnel, a second portal is made anteromedially (medial to the patellar tendon) to more accurately target the femoral footprint of the ACL. This technique allows the graft to better reflect the anatomic position of the ACL and aims to restore its native function.

Over the past decade, anatomic ACLR has demonstrated superior outcomes compared with transtibial ACLR with regard to joint stability, return to activity, and the risk for subsequent ipsilateral knee surgery. However, recent data from the Danish ACL registry demonstrate an increased revision rate with anatomic ACLR techniques, but when stratifying their data by autograft type, anatomically placed hamstring tendon (HT) autografts demonstrated 2 times the risk of revision (relative risk, 2.2) compared with transtibially placed HT autografts, while there were no risk differences between reconstruction techniques for patellar tendon (PT) autografts. European countries primarily use HT autografts when performing ACLRs due to the negative outcomes often associated with PT autografts (ie, donor-site morbidity, loss of knee-extensor mechanism, and increased risk of developing patellofemoral disorders). Conversely, HT autografts are known to lead to increased joint laxity, hamstring weakness, and slower graft-tunnel healing, which may explain why a higher risk of revision was observed for HT autografts. Numerous systematic reviews and meta-analyses have been published within the past 15 years comparing postoperative outcomes between PT and HT autografts, but there is mixed evidence with regard to which autograft has the higher risk of failing. However, no publications have compared graft failure rate between these 2 autografts when placed via an anatomic ACLR technique.

The primary purpose of this study was to systematically review, synthesize, and critically appraise the literature comparing graft failure rate between PT and HT autografts when an anatomic ACLR technique is used. Our secondary purpose was to compare the rate of patients who return to their preinjury levels of activity based on the type of autograft they received for anatomic ACLR. Return to preinjury activity level (RTAL) is an important postoperative outcome because it encompasses both function and quality of life. By using both graft failure rate and RTAL rate as our outcome measures, it allows us to better delineate the success of anatomic ACLR when comparing the autografts. We hypothesized that HT autografts would demonstrate a significantly greater failure rate than PT autografts but that RTAL rate would not differ between the two.

METHODS

Review Protocol

The PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines (www.prisma-statement.org) were used to conduct our systematic review and meta-analysis. The PRISMA checklist is available in the Appendix (available in the online version of this article at http://ajsm.sagepub.com/supplemental).

Information Sources

The databases used for the electronic search included PubMed, MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus, and CINAHL. The latter 3 databases were searched using EBSCOhost. Our search was restricted to English-language publications, human subject studies, and academic journal articles from January 1, 2000, through March 7, 2014.

Search

The search strategy is presented in Table 1. Hand-searched articles were identified through the reference lists of the articles included in the qualitative synthesis.

![Table 1: Stepwise PubMed/EBSCOhost Search Strategy]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>PubMed</th>
<th>EBSCOhost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Search “ACL OR anterior cruciate ligament”</td>
<td>7578</td>
<td>13,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Search “reconstruct”</td>
<td>85,384</td>
<td>95,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Search “anatomic OR anteromedial portal OR native”</td>
<td>72,627</td>
<td>80,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Search “cadaver OR allograft”</td>
<td>42,881</td>
<td>46,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Search “#1 AND #2”</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>6848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Search “#5 AND #3”</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Search “#6 NOT #4”</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bolded numbers indicate the final number of articles that were searched through after the search term strategy was performed in each database.
Eligibility Criteria

Only those studies providing level 3 evidence or higher (based on the Oxford Levels of Evidence) were assessed in this review. For a study to be included in the qualitative synthesis, both an anatomic (or anteromedial portal) technique and autograft (PT or HT) had to be used for the ACLR. Follow-up assessments after surgery had to involve either objective ACL graft failure (retear or primary revision) confirmed via magnetic resonance imaging and/or first-look arthroscopy or subjective physical activity status with a minimal postoperative follow-up period of 24 months. We chose a cutoff of 24 months because most ACLR outcome studies included a minimum 2-year postoperative follow-up assessment. There were no restrictions on study design, but the studies had to involve human subjects who were diagnosed with a primary ACL tear (via magnetic resonance imaging or arthroscopy) and subsequently underwent anatomic ACLR. Studies were excluded if an anatomic ACLR technique was not performed, an allograft was used to reconstruct the ACL, follow-up assessments were conducted less than a mean of 24 months after surgery, or if there were no data reported on either graft failure or return to preinjury physical activity levels. Those patients who reportedly developed a Cylops lesion were removed from the analyses.

Study Selection

The study selection process used for this systematic review consisted of 4 stages. After articles were identified through the electronic search and duplicates were removed (stage 1), their titles and abstracts were screened by one of the authors (C.M.G.) to determine if they were applicable for the purpose of the systematic review (stage 2). Once screened, the same author assessed the remaining articles for eligibility by reading through each of the methods and results sections (stage 3). Those studies deemed eligible were included in the qualitative synthesis along with the hand-searched articles (stage 4) by consensus of 2 authors (C.M.G. and C.A.J.). If the 2 authors disagreed on a decision to include or exclude an article and they could not come to a consensus, a third author (D.L.J.) was brought in to make the final decision. If studies were discovered to have shared data, only the most recent study was included.

An initial total of 938 hits were identified through PubMed and EBSCOhost (MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus, and CINAHL). After removing the duplicates between the databases, 433 articles remained. Of these 433 articles, 375 were excluded after screening their titles and abstracts. The primary reasons for excluding these articles were irrelevancy and if the outcomes mentioned in the abstract did not entail graft integrity or physical activity measures. The methods and results sections of the remaining 58 articles were then read to determine if they were eligible for inclusion. Forty of the articles were excluded because they did not use an anatomic ACLR technique, reported neither graft failure numbers nor the rate of patients who returned to preinjury activity levels, or shared data with an included study. Lastly, 10 additional articles were added to the qualitative synthesis after searching through the reference lists of the remaining 18

Figure 1. Search strategy used for study selection.

Data Extraction

Data extraction of the included studies was performed by one author (C.M.G.), and a second author (C.A.J.) checked the extracted data for accuracy. A spreadsheet was used for each autograft type (PT and HT) to organize and store data, including reference, study design, mean follow-up period after ACLR, sample size, type of autograft harvest, type of graft bundle used, type of graft fixation used (femoral and tibial), number of graft failures, and number of patients who returned to their preinjury activity levels.

Summary Measures

Summary event rates were analyzed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (Biostat). The event rates (in percentages) for graft failure and RTAL were the primary measures of treatment effect based on autograft type used for anatomic ACLR. Graft failures were classified as retears or primary ACL revisions, and RTAL was derived from either the International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form (question 10) or the Tegner activity scale. Summary event rates were calculated by weighing event rates from each individual study according to their sample size and variability. Summary event rates
were calculated for all data extracted from the studies and when dividing the data by autograft type (PT vs HT). By examining the 95% CIs of the summary event rates for PT and HT autografts, differences can be reported if there is overlap between the CIs of the 2 autografts.

The secondary measures included mean sample size, mean postoperative follow-up time, and mean Coleman Methodology Score (CMS) scores. We were interested in both the overall mean values from all studies included in the review and the mean values when separating the data by autograft type (PT vs HT). These secondary measures were considered useful for understanding study characteristics and interpreting the results. Differences in secondary measures between PT and HT autografts were assessed using independent sample t tests. These statistical tests were performed using SPSS version 22 (SPSS Inc), with the significance level established a priori at P ≤ .05.

To calculate a summary odds ratio (with 95% CI) between the 2 autografts, we also performed a meta-analysis on the studies that prospectively compared graft failure data with PT and HT autografts. A forest plot was generated from the meta-analysis displaying the weighted odds ratios (ORs) of the included studies and a summary OR. Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software was used to perform these analyses. Statistical significance was defined as P ≤ .05 (95% CI did not cross 1).

Synthesis of Results

Given the observed heterogeneity in study designs and sample sizes among the studies, random-effects DerSimonian and Laird models were used for the meta-analyses. To support the use of the random-effects model, we also conducted statistical tests of heterogeneity. The P value of the Cochran Q statistic (test for heterogeneity) was used to test the null hypothesis that event rates were the same in all studies (P > .05). To quantify the effect of heterogeneity in the studies’ results, an I² statistic was also calculated (I² = 100% × (Q − df)/Q). The I² describes the percentage of total variation across studies that are due to heterogeneity instead of chance. Moderate to high values of I² (~50% or higher) suggest the use of a random-effects model for meta-analysis to explain the effect of heterogeneity.

Meta-regression Analyses

To assess the effect of follow-up duration on both the graft failure rate and RTAL rates, respectively, we performed 2 separate meta-regression analyses. Mean postoperative follow-up duration was labeled as the continuous moderator and used as the covariate (predictor) in the regression analysis predicting the log odds of the events of interest (graft failure rate and RTAL rate). All anatomic ACLR studies included in the systematic review that provided graft failure and RTAL event rates were included in the meta-regression. If follow-up duration was found to have a significant influence (regression slope P ≤ .05) on either graft failure rate or RTAL rate, subgroup meta-regression analyses were conducted for each autograft type (PT and HT) to determine if mean follow-up duration had a significant effect on either outcome depending on which autograft was used for anatomic ACLR. To reduce the potential effect of heterogeneity, random-effects (method of moments) models were used for the meta-regression analyses.

Publication Bias

To detect for signs of publication bias, we created a standard funnel plot by plotting the log odds of the event rate against standard error. The event rate chosen to be used for the funnel plot (graft failure or RTAL) was the event reported in most included studies.

Quality Assessment

To assess study quality, we used the CMS for each of the included studies. The CMS is a tool created to assess the methodological quality of surgical outcome studies. It consists of 18 questions that assess characteristics such as study design and sample size, with a score ranging from 0 to 100 (100 representing a perfect score). The main object of the tool is to identify the influence of chance, bias, and confounding factors on the reported results. It was originally developed for the surgical management of patellar tendinopathy, but over the years, it has been modified for various orthopaedic conditions such as Achilles tendinopathy, meniscectomy, and articular cartilage repair. For the purposes of this review, the CMS was used for ACLR.

RESULTS

Study Characteristics

The 28 studies provided data on a total of 2407 subjects who had previously undergone anatomic ACLR. For each study, patient characteristics were extracted and organized into tables by autograft type to allow for comparison between autograft types. Study characteristics for PT autografts and HT autografts can be seen in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. Most of the included studies (26 studies) consisted of HT autografts (2032 subjects), while only 6 studies used PT autografts (375 subjects). Four studies were comparative studies that examined both PT and HT autografts. All studies were either randomized clinical trials (evidence level 2) or prospective cohorts (evidence level 3). Half (3/6) of the PT autograft studies were randomized clinical trials (level 2 evidence), whereas 62% (16/26) of HT autograft studies were randomized clinical trials. After data were extracted for the primary outcome measures, all 28 studies reported graft failure data, with only 5 of those studies reporting RTAL data. Of the 5 studies, only 1 provided RTAL data on PT autografts (31 subjects), while the other 4 studies concerning HT autografts (310 subjects).

Outcome Measures

All summary event rates are reported in Table 4. The summary graft failure rate and RTAL rate from all anatomic
ACLR studies were 4.6% (95% CI, 3.4%-6.3%) and 71.7% (95% CI, 45.4%-88.5%), respectively. When comparing graft failure rate and RTAL rate between PT and HT autografts, no significant differences were observed (overlapping 95% CIs). The summary ORs for graft failure derived from the meta-analysis of the 4 comparative studies (see Figure 2) were not significant (1.21; 95% CI, 0.63-2.33; \(P = .57\)). Only 1 comparative study provided RTAL data for PT autografts.\(^{52}\) Therefore, it was not possible to perform a meta-analysis to determine the odds of RTAL between autografts.

The mean (±SD) sample size of the studies included in this review was 75.2 ± 60.3 patients. There were no significant differences in mean sample size between PT (62.5 ± 50.4 patients) and HT (78.2 ± 62.9 patients) autograft data (\(t(30) = -0.57, P = .58\)). The mean follow-up time for all

### TABLE 2
Characteristics of Studies Using Patellar Tendon Autografts for Anatomic Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (Year)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Mean Follow-up, mo</th>
<th>Sample Size, n</th>
<th>Harvest Type</th>
<th>Bundle</th>
<th>FemFix</th>
<th>TibFix</th>
<th>GF, n</th>
<th>RTAL, n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felmet (2010)(^{14})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>BPTB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>BBPF</td>
<td>BBPF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otsuka et al (2003)(^{44})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BPTB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinczewski et al (2007)(^{46})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>BPTB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajovic et al (2011)(^{52})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>BPTB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner et al (2005)(^{62})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>BPTB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wipfler et al (2011)(^{63})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>BPTB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>BBPF</td>
<td>Sutures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)BAIS, bioabsorbable interference screws; BBPF, bone block press-fit; BPTB, bone–patellar tendon–bone; FemFix, femoral fixation; GF, graft failure; IS, metal interference screws; PC, prospective cohort; RCT, randomized clinical trial; RTAL, returned to preinjury activity level; SB, single bundle; TibFix, tibial fixation.

### TABLE 3
Characteristics of Studies Using Hamstring Tendon Autografts for Anatomic Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (Year)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Mean Follow-up, mo</th>
<th>Sample Size, n</th>
<th>Harvest Type</th>
<th>Bundle</th>
<th>FemFix</th>
<th>TibFix</th>
<th>GF, n</th>
<th>RTAL, n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aglietti et al (2007)(^{1})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aglietti et al (2010)(^{2})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Sutures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahdén et al (2013)(^{31})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferretti et al (2008)(^{15})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobbi et al (2012)(^{20})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussein et al (2012)(^{23})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussein et al (2012)(^{24})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim et al (2009)(^{26})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagodzinski et al (2010)(^{27})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>IS/BBPF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvela et al (2008)(^{29})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>BAIS/IS</td>
<td>BAIS/IS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondo et al (2008)(^{31})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondo et al (2012)(^{32})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxdal et al (2006)(^{33})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>BAIS/IS</td>
<td>BAIS/IS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunez et al (2012)(^{30})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinczewski et al (2007)(^{48})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaweski et al (2009)(^{49})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajovic et al (2011)(^{52})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stener et al (2010)(^{74})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>BAIS/IS</td>
<td>BAIS/IS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun et al (2011)(^{55})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun et al (2011)(^{56})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen et al (2013)(^{57})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB/DB</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohyama et al (2011)(^{59})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner et al (2005)(^{62})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>BAIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wipfler et al (2011)(^{63})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Knotted</td>
<td>Sutures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasuda et al (2006)(^{65})</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaffagnini et al (2008)(^{66})</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>STG</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)BAIS, bioabsorbable interference screws; BBPF, bone block press-fit; CP, cross-pins; DB, double bundle; EB, endobutton; FemFix, femoral fixation; GF, graft failure; IS, metal interference screws; PC, prospective cohort; RCT, randomized clinical trial; RTAL, returned to preinjury activity level; SB, single bundle; ST, semitendinosus; STG, semitendinosus and gracilis; SWB, swing bride; TibFix, tibial fixation.
studies was 52.7 ± 40.4 months. When examining mean postoperative follow-up time between autograft types, a significant difference between PT (88.2 ± 50.5 months) and HT (44.5 ± 33.7 months) autograft data was observed ($\chi^2(30) = 2.61, P = .01$).

Due to graft failure being reported in all included studies, statistical tests for heterogeneity were used to determine if graft failure rates were the same in all studies. The results from the Cochran $Q$ test rejected the null hypothesis, revealing that there was heterogeneity across the studies ($Q(31) = 56.1, P = .004$). Furthermore, the $I^2$ statistic revealed that nearly half of the total variation observed across studies was due to heterogeneity instead of chance ($I^2 = 44.7\%$). These findings justified the choice of using a random-effects model for conducting the analyses.

Meta-regression Results

The results of the meta-regression analyses can be observed in Table 5. Mean postoperative follow-up time was a significant predictor of graft failure rate after anatomic ACLR ($Z = 2.70, P = .007$) as revealed by the meta-regression on all 28 studies that reported graft failure data. The subgroup meta-regression analyses on autograft type revealed that follow-up time was a significant predictor for graft failure rate when HT autografts were used for anatomic ACLR ($Z = 1.99, P = .047$), with graft failure rates increasing as the length of follow-up time increased. This same effect did not achieve statistical significance for PT autografts ($Z = 0.84, P = .401$). However, the overlapping 95% CIs observed between the PT (95% CI, –0.007 to 0.018) and HT (95% CI, 0.0 to 0.02) regression slopes demonstrated no significant differences. Based on the 5 studies that reported RTAL data, follow-up time was not found to significantly predict RTAL rate after anatomic ACLR ($Z = –0.33, P = .74$). Due to there being only 1 study that reported RTAL data for PT autografts, there were insufficient data to perform subgroup meta-regression analyses on RTAL rate by autograft type.

Quality Assessment

The overall mean (±SD) CMS score for all 28 studies was 81.6 ± 6.8 out of a possible 100 points, indicating that the studies included in the systematic review were of moderate to high methodological quality. There were no significant differences in mean CMS scores between PT (80.2 ± 7.7) and HT (82.1 ± 6.7) autograft data ($t(30) = –0.63, P = .53$).

Publication Bias

Since all studies included in this review reported graft failure data, funnel plots were created by plotting the log odds of graft failure rate against the standard error. When examining the standard funnel plot (Figure 3), some asymmetry can be observed, suggesting a publication bias for graft failure data.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this systematic review was to synthesize and critically appraise the literature comparing event rates for graft failure and RTAL between PT and HT autografts when using an anatomic ACLR technique. Graft failure rate was not significantly different between PT autografts (7.0%) and HT autografts (3.9%), with both demonstrating a low occurrence of graft failure. However, it must be considered that the mean postoperative follow-up period from the PT autograft data (88.2 months) was significantly longer than that for the HT autograft data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Statistics for each study</th>
<th>ORs and 95% CIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinczewski et al</td>
<td>1.737 0.648-4.657 1.098 .272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajovic et al</td>
<td>0.450 0.076-2.656 –0.862 .378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner et al</td>
<td>1.114 0.314-3.954 0.168 .867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wipfner et al</td>
<td>1.182 0.216-4.457 0.193 .847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.209 0.627-2.333 0.567 .571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{a}$Event rates are in log odds units. SE, standard error. $^{b}$Statistically significant predictive effect ($P \leq .05$).
(44.5 months). This discrepancy suggests that if the mean postoperative follow-up time between the 2 autografts were equal, an increased number of HT graft failures would have accrued, and the failure rate observed for HT autografts would have likely been more similar to that of the PT autografts.

The results from the meta-regression analysis of all available data revealed that mean postoperative follow-up time positively influenced graft failure rate. Interestingly, the subgroup meta-regression analyses demonstrated that failure rate for HT autografts was significantly influenced by follow-up time, but this same effect was not significant for PT autografts. Although the slope of the regression line for HT (0.01) and PT (0.005) autografts appears to be different, their respective 95% CIs overlap. Furthermore, when plotting follow-up time by graft failure rate, the durability of both autografts appears to be equally influenced by time (Figure 4). The failure to achieve statistical significance in the PT autograft analysis was likely due to the small sample of studies providing PT graft failure data (PT = 6 data samples, HT = 26 data samples). Therefore, if more PT autograft data were available, follow-up time may have exhibited the same predictive effect on PT graft failures. However, to support the above hypotheses, more long-term follow-up anatomic ACLR studies on HT autografts and studies reporting graft failure data from PT autografts are needed.

While the summary OR (1.21) derived from the meta-analysis suggested a slightly higher odds of failure with HT autografts, this finding was not significant ($P = .57$). Furthermore, the 95% CI crossed 1, which verifies that little confidence can be given to differences in graft failure rate between the 2 autografts. Thus, neither autograft choice placed patients at greater odds for graft failure after anatomic ACLR. These findings further support our initial finding of no significant differences in graft failure rate between PT and HT autografts. However, the failure rates for PT and HT autografts are both 8.8%. These graft failure rates are in agreement with those reported in our results, because they demonstrate no significant differences. Given that these 4 studies directly compared graft failures between PT and HT autografts, they provide high-level evidence to reject differences in graft failure rate between PT and HT autografts.

Our findings refute those of a recent study from the Danish ACL registry that compared the risk of ACL revision surgery between anatomic and nonanatomic ACLR techniques.$^{50}$ They found anatomic ACLR to be associated with an increased risk of revision compared with nonanatomic techniques, but when stratifying their analyses by autograft type, this difference was only true for patients who received HT autografts (relative risk, 2.2) and not for those who received PT autografts. Therefore, it was concluded that patients who receive HT autografts are at a greater risk of failure when an anatomic ACLR technique is performed. A major limitation of their study is that they only reported data on ACL revisions and did not capture data on patients who tore their ACL graft but had not undergone a revision. This prevented them from reporting true event rates because they did not account for those patients who tore their graft and have yet to undergo a revision surgery. An advantage of this current review is that we defined graft failure as either an ACL revision or graft tear (excluding Cyclops lesions), thus allowing us to more accurately report the event rate for graft failure.

Within the past 30 years, there have been a number of systematic reviews and meta-analyses comparing postoperative outcomes between PT and HT autografts, not specifically comparing the graft placement technique (anatomic or nonanatomic) used for ACLR.$^{8,17,19,34-36,51,53}$ Even with this breadth of literature, the evidence for differences in graft failure rate remains inconclusive. Some of these studies$^{17,19,51}$ reported lower graft failure rates for PT autografts compared with HT autografts, while
the other studies have reported no significant differences between the 2 autografts with regard to graft failure rate. A possible explanation as to why a higher graft failure rate was observed in some of the studies could be due to the slower bone-tunnel healing rate of HT autografts compared with PT autografts. It has been established that more time (>1 year) is needed for HT autografts to fully mature compared with nonsynovialized grafts such as PT autografts. Therefore, a more delayed return to dynamic activities may be warranted for patients with HT autografts.

A higher graft failure rate for anatomic ACLR compared with nonanatomic techniques has previously been reported in a systematic review by Alentorn-Geli et al. Their results indicated that 5.7% of patients in the anatomic ACLR group sustained graft failures, while only 2.3% of patients in the nonanatomic ACLR group failed. Their graft failure rate for anatomic ACLR was similar to what was reported in this review (4.6%). However, anatomic ACLR has repeatedly been shown to be superior in restoring anterior-posterior and rotational stability in the knee compared with nonanatomic techniques, thus allowing patients to return to dynamic activities sooner. It has been demonstrated that anatomically placed grafts carry greater loads compared with nonanatomically placed grafts. It is hypothesized that patients who receive anatomic ACLR are more likely to return to dynamic activities too soon, exposing their graft to greater loads and therefore putting them at a greater risk for failure before their graft has fully matured. These patterns may help to explain why early ACL graft failure and revision rates have been reported to be higher for anatomic ACLR compared with nonanatomic techniques. However, this causal relationship cannot be determined until more studies report return to activity data after anatomic ACLR.

The true advantage of anatomic ACLR techniques may not lie in the first 2 postoperative years but in the long-term condition of the knee. While transtibial ACLR has relatively low early graft failure rates, the rate of long-term failure due to degenerative changes and osteoarthritis is tremendous. More than half of transtibial ACLR patients demonstrated radiographic evidence of grade 2 or higher degenerative changes at 14 years. As such, the potential advantages of improved anterior-posterior and rotational stability associated with anatomic techniques may not be realized until longer follow-up is available.

Return to Preinjury Activity Levels

The event rate of patients who return to their preinjury activity levels after ACLR is a postoperative measure that is underreported in outcome studies but largely determines the degree of recovery in patients. The RTAL rate reported in this review appears to be different between PT and HT autografts (58.1% vs 75.6%, respectively), but due to only a single PT study reporting RTAL and the wide CIs observed among HT studies, a true statistical difference between the 2 autografts could not be concluded. The RTAL rate reported for PT autografts in this review is derived from 1 study by Sajovic et al that examined 11-year follow-up outcomes. Although this study provided a high level of evidence, being a randomized clinical trial, it should still be interpreted with caution since the data were extracted from one sample. More prospective, comparative studies that report RTAL data in patients who have undergone anatomic ACLR are needed to perform meta-analyses and truly assess differences in RTAL rate between PT and HT autografts.

Our results also revealed that 71.7% of the patients for whom RTAL data were provided returned to their preinjury activity levels after anatomic ACLR. This value was in agreement with what we expected for anatomic ACLR. In a retrospective comparative study, Franceschi et al observed that at a minimum postoperative follow-up of 5 years, more than 80% of the patients who underwent anatomic ACLR (with HT autografts) returned to their preinjury activity levels, whereas only 65% of patients returned to their preinjury activity levels after nonanatomic ACLR. Furthermore, studies comparing these 2 ACLR techniques have demonstrated that patients who have undergone an anatomic technique return to activities of daily living sooner and have better subjective knee outcome scores than those who have undergone nonanatomic techniques. Since anatomic ACLR has been shown to restore functional knee stability more effectively than nonanatomic techniques, it is logical to assume that patients’ knees will feel more like “normal,” making them more likely to return to the same activities they had participated in before sustaining an ACL injury.

Quality of Literature

The overall CMS score for all 28 studies included in this systematic review was 81.6 out of 100. This score was encouraging given the number of case series and retrospective studies that were included. Despite the moderately high CMS score of the studies included in this review, the strength of recommendation of this review can only be considered as evidence level 2.12 When examining the CMS scores by autograft type, differences in methodological quality can be observed. The studies assessing both PT and HT autografts scored moderately high on the CMS (80.2/100 and 82.1/100, respectively). The most common reasons why studies lost points on the CMS were because they did not report the reliability/validity of their outcome measures, or the investigators were not independent of the surgeon.

Limitations

Several limitations involved in this review should be considered when interpreting the results. Of 28 studies included in this review, only 4 prospectively compared postoperative outcomes between autograft types used for anatomic ACLR. For the rest of the studies, we extracted cohort data on patients who underwent anatomic ACLR and whose data were specified by autograft type. The literature on postoperative outcomes after anatomic ACLR has been published only within the past decade; thus, it was foreseen that there would be a limited number of high-level
evidence studies. We did not elect to only review the 4 aforementioned studies because our aim was to provide a comprehensive review on all available evidence to answer our clinical question.

Another limitation of this review was that the data samples and mean postoperative follow-up periods were not equal between autograft types. The number of data samples was substantially higher for HT autografts (26 samples) compared with PT autografts (6 samples). Although the PT autograft studies provided nearly 400 patients, the more than 2000 patients provided by the HT autograft studies gives them an advantage related to representation of the data. Conversely, the PT autograft studies demonstrated a longer mean postoperative period of more than 7 years (almost 4 years longer than the HT studies). Although an inclusion criterion was that postoperative outcome data must be reported at least 24 months after anatomic ACLR to be included in this review, we did not put a limit on the length of follow-up. If the follow-up periods for the HT autograft studies were the same length as the PT autograft studies, we may have observed a greater number of subsequent graft failures in that population. This hypothesis is further supported by the meta-regression data demonstrating a significant relationship between follow-up time and graft failure rate among HT autograft studies.

Lastly, we were unable to determine whether there were differences in the time span from anatomic ACLR to graft failure between PT and HT autografts. These data would have provided insight into the longevity and the temporal failure trends of both autografts and whether these characteristics were different between the two. Assessing the time to failure of anatomically placed autografts was a preliminary goal of this review. However, during the data extraction process, it became evident that only a minority of the studies included in this review provided time-to-failure information on those patients who sustained graft failure after anatomic ACLR. Although we found postoperative follow-up time to have a positive association with graft failure rate, there were not enough data available for us to determine when most of these graft failures took place after surgery or whether there were temporal differences between autografts. Time to failure is a factor that warrants attention and should be assessed to gain more knowledge about the durability of surgical techniques used with ACLR.

CONCLUSION

The results from this review demonstrated a low rate of graft failure for anatomic ACLR, with no significant differences in failure rates between PT and HT autografts. Furthermore, there was no difference in the odds of graft failure between PT and HT autografts when using an anatomic ACLR technique. Graft failure rates for anatomic ACLR were influenced by postoperative follow-up time, but this effect was significant only for HT autografts. This same temporal effect was not demonstrated with PT graft failure rates, likely due to the smaller sample of studies compared with HT autografts. Just over 70% of the patients who underwent anatomic ACLR were observed to return to their preinjury levels of activity, with no differences between autografts. Due to the lack of randomized clinical trials comparing postoperative outcomes between autografts used for anatomic ACLR, we are unable to definitively conclude that one graft is superior with regard to achieving a successful recovery. Since graft integrity and returning patients to their preinjury activity levels largely define surgical success, it is strongly encouraged that further research be conducted assessing these postoperative outcomes in patients who have undergone anatomic ACLR. In addition, future investigations comparing postoperative outcomes between surgical techniques are encouraged to account for differences in postoperative follow-up time when conducting their analyses.
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