Use of BTB Autograft for Revision ACL Reconstruction Results in Lowest Risk of Failure

Isabel Anna Wolfe, Peter Kyriakides, Michael Ross Moore, Ryan Isber, Eric Jason Strauss, Laith M Jazrawi¹, Guillem Gonzalez-Lomas, Kirk A Campbell

¹Center For Musculoskeletal Care

INTRODUCTION: The primary purpose of this study was to assess failure rates in revision ACL reconstruction and to determine the influence of age, graft selection, and lateral augmentation procedures. A secondary purpose was to determine patient-reported outcomes following revision reconstruction at intermediate-term follow-up.

METHODS: This was a retrospective study at a tertiary academic medical center. The electronic medical record was queried for current procedural terminology (CPT) codes for ACL reconstructions (29888) from June 2011 – October 2022. Patients with concomitant osteotomy were excluded. Demographic information including age, gender, and BMI was obtained from the EMR query. Graft types and lateral augmentation procedures were identified through manual review of operative notes. Failure rates were recorded based on documentation of ACL graft failure in clinic notes or by patient report on phone follow-up. Patient-reported outcomes including return to sport, VAS pain scores, and KOOS-Jr scores were obtained for patients reached for phone follow-up.

RESULTS: One-hundred sixty patients who underwent revision ACL reconstruction at our institution were included. Median follow-up was 4.4 years (range 2.0-11.9 years). Overall failure rate at final follow-up was 18.1%. The rate of failure differed based on graft selection (p=.022), with the lowest failure rates in BTB autograft reconstruction (5.7%). Regression analysis controlling for age, length of follow-up, and lateral augmentation procedures identified BTB autograft reconstruction to be a significant independent predictor of failure, with 0.19 lower odds of failure (95% CI 0.051-0.67) compared to other graft choices (p=.010). Although it was not statistically significant (p=0.132), concomitant LET at time of revision ACL was shown to have a lower rate of failure (9.1%) when compared to ALL reconstruction (25%) and no lateral augmentation (28.6%). Patient-reported outcomes at final follow-up were not different based on graft choice. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:

Even when controlling for age and lateral augmentation procedures, BTB autograft reconstruction was protective against failure at a median 4.4-year follow-up after revision ACL reconstruction. Careful consideration of patient characteristics and postoperative goals is necessary in determining graft choice and lateral augmentation procedures. If available, strong

consideration should	be	given	for	using	BP	ТΒ	aute	ograft	for	revision	ACL	reconstruction
Figure 1. Graft Selection in Entire Cohort vs. Patients >40 Years of Age	Figure 2. Adjusted Odds Ratios for Revision ACL Failure				Table 1. Characteristics of Patients with Failure vs. No Failure after Revision ACLR				Table 2. Patient-Rep	orted Outcomes after Revision		
60						Failure (n = 29)	No Failure (n = 128)	p-value		(n=26) (n	r Graft p-value =50)	
50	LET-		Odds	Ratios	Male Female	19 (18.1%) 10 (19.2%)	86 (81.9%) 42 (80.8%)	.869	VAS pain score* KOOS-JR score* Return to Sport*	5.0 [0, 17.5] 10.0 84.6 [79.9, 100.0] 84.6 [7]	0, 30.0] .438 .3, 100.0] .363	
40	BTB autograft -	tograft- (95% Cl)	CI) Ag BM	r P	33.8 [28.4, 45.3] 25.5 [23.8, 28.5]	30.4 [25.0, 37.6]	.718	Any les Same les	Any level 14 (58.3%) 23 (62.2%) .594 Same level 7 (29.2%) 10 (28.6%) .788 "Continuous variables reported as median [IOR]			
	-			Gri	ft BTB Autograft off tissue Autograft	3 (5.7%) 3 (27.3%)	50 (94.3%) 8 (72.7%)	.022	*Continuous variable *Calculated for the fi	*Commous variables reported as median [IQR] *Calculated for the fifty-nine patients who reported they	y had played a sport prior to ACLR	d played a sport prior to ACLR
23 -	Follow-up-				BTB Allograft oft tissue Allograft	18 (23.1%) 5 (33.3%)	60 (76.9%) 10 (66.7%)					
33	Age -	•		Lat	eral augmentation ^b None ALL	8 (28.6%) 4 (25.0%)	20 (71.4%) 12 (75.0%)	.132				
0 873 873 disput Qued Card Karabing Herening Tables Advices adapted avloyed adaptin adaptin adaptin adaptin	0.		10	Pri	e revision	3 (9.1%)	30 (90.9%)	.133				
autopen antipen antipen antipen attention antipen alliquit.		Odds of Failu	re	*Cor	Yes No tinuous variables rep	7 (31.8%) 22 (16.3%) orted as median []	15 (68.2%) 113 (83.7%) 0R1					
				*Cal	ulated for patients w	ho had surgery in	2018 or later					