

# World Journal of *Orthopedics*

*World J Orthop* 2022 October 18; 13(10): 876-948



**MINIREVIEWS**

- 876 Hamstring autograft utilization in reconstructing anterior cruciate ligament: Review of harvesting techniques, graft preparation, and different fixation methods  
*Albishi W, Baltow B, Albusayes N, Sayed AA, Alrabai HM*

**STANDARD AND CONSENSUS**

- 891 Baishideng's *Reference Citation Analysis* database announces the first *Journal Article Influence Index* of 104 core journals and a list of high-quality academic journals in orthopedics  
*Wang JL, Ma YJ, Ma L, Ma N, Guo DM, Ma LS*

**ORIGINAL ARTICLE****Retrospective Cohort Study**

- 903 Preoperative and postoperative risk factors for periprosthetic joint infection in primary total hip arthroplasty: A 1-year experience  
*Tella GF, Donadono C, Castagnini F, Bordini B, Cosentino M, Di Liddo M, Traina F*

- 911 Adjunctive platelet-rich plasma and hyaluronic acid injection after arthroscopic debridement in Kellgren-Lawrence grade 3 and 4 knee osteoarthritis  
*Tirtosuharto H, Wiratnaya IGE, Astawa P*

**Retrospective Study**

- 921 Utilising the impact of COVID-19 on trauma throughput to adapt elective care models for more efficient trauma care  
*Kulkarni K, Shah R, Mangwani J, Ullah A, Gabbar O, James E, Dias J*

**Clinical Trials Study**

- 932 Traditional Chinese medicine ointment combined with tuina therapy in treatment of pain and swelling after total knee arthroplasty  
*Xing L, Xu HR, Wang QL, Kong H, Zhang H, Tian J, Ding Y, Yang RX, Zhang L, Jiang B*

**CASE REPORT**

- 940 Derotational osteotomy and internal fixation of a 180° malrotated humerus: A case report  
*Wenning KE, Schildhauer TA, Jones CB, Hoffmann MF*

**ABOUT COVER**

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Orthopedics*, Vito Pavone, MD, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of General Surgery and Medical Surgical Specialties, Section of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, University Hospital Policlinico-Vittorio Emanuele, University of Catania, Catania 95100, Italy. [vpavone@unict.it](mailto:vpavone@unict.it)

**AIMS AND SCOPE**

The primary aim of *World Journal of Orthopedics* (*WJO*, *World J Orthop*) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of orthopedics with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

*WJO* mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of orthopedics and covering a wide range of topics including arthroscopy, bone trauma, bone tumors, hand and foot surgery, joint surgery, orthopedic trauma, osteoarthropathy, osteoporosis, pediatric orthopedics, spinal diseases, spine surgery, and sports medicine.

**INDEXING/ABSTRACTING**

*WJO* is now abstracted and indexed in PubMed, PubMed Central, Emerging Sources Citation Index (Web of Science), Scopus, Reference Citation Analysis, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, China Science and Technology Journal Database, and Superstar Journals Database. The 2022 edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2021 Journal Citation Indicator (JCI) for *WJO* as 0.62. The *WJO*'s CiteScore for 2021 is 2.4 and Scopus CiteScore rank 2021: Orthopedics and Sports Medicine is 139/284.

**RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE**

Production Editor: *Ying-Yi Yuan*, Production Department Director: *Xiang Li*, Editorial Office Director: *Jin-Lei Wang*.

**NAME OF JOURNAL**

*World Journal of Orthopedics*

**ISSN**

ISSN 2218-5836 (online)

**LAUNCH DATE**

November 18, 2010

**FREQUENCY**

Monthly

**EDITORS-IN-CHIEF**

Massimiliano Leigheb

**EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS**

<http://www.wjgnet.com/2218-5836/editorialboard.htm>

**PUBLICATION DATE**

October 18, 2022

**COPYRIGHT**

© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

**INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

**GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

**GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

**PUBLICATION ETHICS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

**PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

**ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

**STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

**ONLINE SUBMISSION**

<https://www.f6publishing.com>



## Hamstring autograft utilization in reconstructing anterior cruciate ligament: Review of harvesting techniques, graft preparation, and different fixation methods

Waleed Albishi, Baraa Baltow, Nora Albusayes, Ameer A Sayed, Hamza M Alrabai

**Specialty type:** Orthopedics

**Provenance and peer review:**

Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Peer-review report's scientific quality classification**

Grade A (Excellent): 0

Grade B (Very good): B

Grade C (Good): C

Grade D (Fair): D

Grade E (Poor): 0

**P-Reviewer:** Singh SP, United States; Zacharia B, India

**Received:** May 14, 2022

**Peer-review started:** May 14, 2022

**First decision:** June 16, 2022

**Revised:** July 16, 2022

**Accepted:** August 15, 2022

**Article in press:** August 15, 2022

**Published online:** October 18, 2022



**Waleed Albishi, Nora Albusayes, Hamza M Alrabai,** Department of Orthopedic Surgery, College of Medicine, King Saud University, Riyadh 11362, Saudi Arabia

**Baraa Baltow,** Department of Orthopedic Surgery, AlHada Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, AlHada 26792, Saudi Arabia

**Ameer A Sayed,** Department of Orthopedic Surgery, King Fahad Armed Forces Hospital, Ministry of Defense, Jeddah 23311, Saudi Arabia

**Corresponding author:** Nora Albusayes, MBBS, Doctor, Staff Physician, Department of Orthopedic Surgery, College of Medicine, King Saud University, 7804 Street No. 18, Riyadh 11362, Saudi Arabia. [nalbusayes@gmail.com](mailto:nalbusayes@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Rupture of the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) is a common orthopedic injury. Various graft options are available for the reconstruction of ruptured ACL. Using the hamstring muscle as an autograft was first described in 1934, and it remains a commonly harvested graft for ACL reconstruction. Hamstring autografts can be harvested using the traditional anteromedial approach or the newer posteromedial technique. An isolated semitendinosus tendon can be used or combined with the gracilis tendon. There are numerous methods for graft fixation, such as intra-tunnel or extra-tunnel fixation. This comprehensive review discusses the different hamstring muscle harvesting techniques and graft preparation options and fixation methods. It provides a comprehensive overview for choosing the optimal surgical technique when treating patients.

**Key Words:** Anterior cruciate ligament; Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction; Graft fixation; Hamstring autograft; Infrapatellar nerve injury; Patient reported outcomes

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

**Core tip:** Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) rupture is a common orthopedic injury and various graft options are available for the reconstruction of a ruptured ACL. This comprehensive review discusses the different hamstring muscle harvesting techniques as well as graft preparation and fixation methods that can be used to guide clinicians in making evidence-based decisions when treating their patients.

**Citation:** Albishi W, Baltow B, Albusayes N, Sayed AA, Alrabai HM. Hamstring autograft utilization in reconstructing anterior cruciate ligament: Review of harvesting techniques, graft preparation, and different fixation methods. *World J Orthop* 2022; 13(10): 876-890

**URL:** <https://www.wjgnet.com/2218-5836/full/v13/i10/876.htm>

**DOI:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.5312/wjo.v13.i10.876>

## INTRODUCTION

The knee is a weight-bearing joint that gains stability through various supportive structures[1]. Limiting tibial translation, cruciate ligaments act as the greatest stabilizing force of the knee[2]. The anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) extends from the posteromedial aspect of the femoral lateral condyle to the tibial eminence in the anteromedial and posterolateral bundles. It functions by preventing anterior displacement of the tibia in the sagittal plane[1,2]. A common orthopedic complaint is the ACL injury. Sanders *et al*[3] reported in his 21-year population-based study that the annual incidence of ACL injury is 68.6 per 100 000 person-years.

The ACL can be injured by either a direct contact force to the knee or a noncontact mechanism by landing or deceleration motion which represents 70% of ACL cases[4]. Boden *et al*[5] described the event as a combination of the misdirected kinetic energies that results in the “twisting event” of a valgus knee and tibial internal rotation in addition to the columnar buckling effect.

Patients usually describe an ACL injury with an audible loud pop followed by an immediately swollen painful knee. Later, incidents of giving way to pivot movements may also occur[6,7]. Examination of the affected extremity is an effective diagnostic tool, whereas magnetic resonance imaging is the main diagnostic confirmatory tool. Although multiple factors influence the management of a patient with a ruptured ACL, limited data support the choice of a purely conservative management[6,8]. Various graft options are available for the reconstruction of a ruptured ACL. The two main graft categories are allografts [bone-patellar tendon-bone (BTB), hamstring, tibialis anterior and posterior, peroneal, Achilles] and autografts (BTB, quadriceps, and hamstring)[9]. The semitendinosus (ST) tendon, which is the hamstring tendon used for ACL rupture (ACLR), is found on the medial side of the knee between layer I (encompassing the sartorius muscle) and layer II (encompassing the superficial medial collateral ligament) as described by Warren *et al*[10] and Nicholas *et al*[11]. The insertion of the ST tendon is on the anteromedial aspect of the tibia on the conjoining structure of the pes anserinus together with the gracilis and sartorius tendons[12,13]. In general, better outcomes found in the literature support the use of autografts than allografts. Moreover, hamstring tendon autograft is one of the optimal choices for reconstructing a ruptured ACL. This is because of the lower failure rates in comparison to that of allografts and avoidance of anterior knee pain found with BTB grafts[9]. In 1934, Galliazi was the first orthopedic surgeon to describe the use of the hamstring tendon as an autograft for ACLR[14]. The aim of this review is to discuss the different hamstring muscle harvesting techniques, graft preparation options, and fixation methods.

The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author’s name, with no spaces.

## METHOD/LITERATURE SEARCH

We searched for the following keywords in the PubMed database: hamstring autograft, hamstring harvest, infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve (IPBSN) injury, saphenous nerve injury, postero-medial hamstring harvest, semitendinosus autograft, gracilis tendon autograft, ACL fixation, and suspensory interference screws. The main review question was “What are the strategies of hamstring autografts available for ACL reconstruction?” and “How are they harvested, prepared, and fixated?” The article collection was not limited to PubMed search of the previously mentioned terms, and further studies were identified and retrieved through citations. Articles were assessed for relevance for inclusion in this review based on the titles and abstracts. The database was searched up to August 22, 2021. Non-English papers and case reports were excluded.



## GRAFT HARVESTING

### Anteromedial technique

Typically, the hamstring tendon is harvested using the anteromedial approach. The incision is performed medial to the anterior tibial tuberosity and 4–6 cm distal to the joint line. The direction and length of the incision differed based on the surgeon's preference. This is followed by dissection of the subcutaneous tissue until the sartorial tendon in layer I is exposed. Beneath this layer, the semitendinosus and gracilis tendons are found. Once the tendons are identified, harvesting can be performed in two ways: (1) Dissecting the tendons distally, stripping proximally with a closed stripper; and (2) using an open stripper proximally and then stripping distally with a closed stripper. In the first technique, a whip stitch is used for countertraction during harvest. Second, a right-angled retractor is used for countertraction while stripping the tendon[12,13,15,16].

Hamstring tendon harvest may be associated with complications including injury to the medial collateral ligament, premature amputation of the tendon, and injury to the infrapatellar saphenous nerve[12,13,17]. Several methods have been proposed to overcome these complications.

In dissecting through the sartorius tendon in layer I to reach the ST and GT, extreme caution and adequate anatomical knowledge are advocated to avoid injuring the superficial medial collateral ligament immediately below the two tendons in layer II[12,13]. In the new OLIBAS harvesting technique recently published, Olivos-Meza *et al*[17] proposed the use of the tibial tubercle and medial border of the tibia as landmarks for an easier harvest with fewer complications. MCL injury is suggested to be reduced by a couple of maneuvers in the dissection technique. First, the superficial dissection of the subcutaneous tissue using a No. 15 blade with a vertical incision line, followed by blunt dissection medially and laterally with retractors, and further cleaning of any remnants with 360° motion using wet gauze. Second, direct, safe access to the tendons between the sartorius tendon and MCL by blunt introduction of Kelly forceps into the over-elevation landmark representing the gracilis as seen through the incision while the knee is in 90° flexion. The semitendinosus tendon contains multiple accessory bands. Meticulous dissection of such bands is crucial to prevent harvesting of a graft shorter than expected. Before advancement of the stripper, scissors can be used to release bands while the tendon is taut forcefully by a Penrose drain if the surgeon has chosen a proximal to distal grafting direction or by the whip stitch if a distal to proximal direction is preferred[12,13]. Olivos-Meza *et al*[17] urged manual exploration of expansions by introducing the index finger along the tendon path and rotating it 360°. Any expansions felt should be exposed through the incision by a Kelly and cut. Colombet *et al*[18] described another approach in identifying all expansions. By pulling out expansions through the incision one by one using an alternative probe hook maneuver, more expansions are exposed. The stripper could be easily advanced 10 cm without resistance, indicating that no expansions were left. The direction of the stripper is proposed to reduce the risk of premature amputation when it is aimed at the origin of the ST, ischial tuberosity, or lesser trochanter when harvesting the GT[13]. Another issue that might require a surgeon to use another graft is retraction and loss of tendons during stripping. This complication is thought to be reduced in the OLIBAS technique by holding the tip of the tendon perpendicularly with strong forceps and rolling it multiple times until the knuckles of the surgeon's nondominant hand rest on the operated knee while advancing the stripper firmly and gently with the dominant hand[17].

The saphenous nerve gives rise to two branches as it exits the adductor canal: the infrapatellar and sartorial branches[19]. The IPBSN is a small cutaneous nerve supplying the anterior aspect of the knee, anterolateral aspect of the leg, and anteroinferior aspect of the knee joint capsule[20]. The sartorial branch provides sensory innervation to the medial aspect of the leg and ankle[19].

Injury to the IPBSN is a common complication of the anteromedial approach for ACL reconstruction. The reported prevalence of IPBSN injury using the anteromedial approach ranges from 21.1% to 83%[15, 19-29]. This injury can cause hypoesthesia, dysesthesia, painful neuroma, and reflex sympathetic dystrophy[28]. Pagnani *et al*[12] and Solman *et al*[13] implemented a figure of four position with the knee flexed and the hip abducted and externally rotated during harvest. This position allows the saphenous nerve located on top of the gracilis at the posteromedial joint line to relax, reducing the risk of injury. Pękala *et al*[30] also recommended the use of a figure of four position. Despite the use of this configuration, Figueroa *et al*[28] in their prospective study found 77% of patients to have clinical hypoesthesia and electrophysiological denervation of the IPBSN postoperatively using a vertical incision. They concluded that this nerve injury must have occurred during the harvest since the saphenous nerve is far from the incision and would only be at risk during stripping where a sharp instrument is near. Mahmood *et al*[21] have conducted a similar study using an oblique anteromedial incision. They found that 24% of patients complained of hypoesthesia, and the same patients were found to have IPBSN injury on electrophysiological study. Sanders *et al*[15] performed a survey-based study of patients who underwent ACL reconstruction through a vertical anteromedial incision while also utilizing the figure of four position. Among the participants, 74% reported disturbed sensation. In their anatomical analysis, Sanders *et al*[15] concluded that injury to the SBSN and IPBSN can occur during tendon stripping, especially when using a mini-incision that obligates the surgeon to blindly harvest the tendons. An anatomical study aimed at describing the IPBSN course with regard to surgery around the knee was also conducted. The IPBSN was found to have a highly variable course, the most

common variant being the posterior pathway in 56% of the knees (arising along the inferior posterior border of the sartorius muscle), found alone in 28%, and in association with the intramuscular (piercing through the sartorius muscle) and/or the anterior pathway (anterior border of the sartorius muscle) in 28%. Walshaw *et al*[31] also concluded that the IPBSN is mostly damaged during tendon harvesting with the stripper owing to its close proximity to the ST and GT.

The lower prevalence of injury observed in the study by Mahmood *et al*[21] in comparison to Figueroa *et al*[28] and Sanders *et al*[15] can be attributed to the orientation of the incision. This may be attributed to the subcutaneous oblique course of the infrapatellar nerve inferior to the patella that occupies the anteromedial region of the knee with its multiple branches, as reported by Hunter *et al*[32]. Two meta-analyses found that the risk of IPBSN injury during ACL reconstruction was significantly higher with vertical incisions than with oblique incisions[30,33]. Pękala *et al*[34], by simulating differently directed incisions in an ultrasound study on healthy knees, have also documented a similar risk reduction for oblique incision over the vertical incision. Multiple randomized controlled trials have studied the effect of incision direction on this complication. Keyhani *et al*[25], Mousavi *et al*[27], Sabat *et al*[22], Joshi *et al*[23], and Luo *et al*[19] found a decreased risk of IPBSN injury using the oblique incision compared to that with a vertical traditional incision (Table 1).

In contrast, Chen *et al*[29] and Leiter *et al*[35] found no relationship between the incision direction and IPBSN injury. The larger incision length in these two studies may be the reason, as Luo *et al*[19] found that the average distance between the upper edge of the pes anserinus and IPBSN was 0.6 cm. Mahmood *et al*[21] found a significant association between incision length and risk of IPBSN injury. Moreover, the use of a shorter incision was strongly supported in the meta-analysis by Pękala *et al*[30] and Henry *et al*[20] in an anatomical study where they measured the safe distance between an incision and a nerve to be 0.82–0.87 cm (Table 1).

Shorter incisions with adequate access to the hamstring tendons have been proposed. In 2016, Colombet *et al*[18] suggested the use of a small 2-cm vertical incision over the palpable pes anserinus. This incision is intended to decrease the incidence of IPBSN injury and is the cosmetically preferred option. Direct access to the tendons can be achieved by a 3-cm horizontal incision over the fascia following careful soft tissue dissection using Metzenbaum scissors. In the OLIBAS technique, the unique anatomical landmark used for incision placement also plays a role in the use of a smaller vertical/oblique incision (1.5 cm), which allows for cosmetic benefit with direct access to the tendons. The incision is located on a horizontal line drawn between the two landmarks (tibial tubercle and medial border of the tibia) and divided into thirds, and a vertical or oblique incision is made in the second third. The risk of nerve injury is reduced during subcutaneous tissue dissection, as sharp dissection is only performed in a proximal–distal direction, while further medial–lateral dissection is performed bluntly with two Farabeuf retractors[17]. A unique inverted L-shaped incision of the sartorial fascia has been used by multiple surgeons to allow direct access to the hamstring tendons and reduce the risk of nerve injury[15,17,23]. In a cadaveric study, Tillett *et al*[36] proposed a uniquely placed incision, which is claimed to be located in a safe zone where neurological injury is prevented and direct access to tendons is achieved. This incision is inclined approximately 30° from the vertical, starting at a point 3 cm medial to the apex of the tibial tuberosity and ending 5 cm medial to it. The authors used this incision in 45 patients with no complications.

Ultrasound can readily visualize the IPBSN and its main trunks over the pes anserinus, which are at risk during skin incision. Therefore, preoperative identification of the anatomical distribution of the IPBSN by ultrasound is recommended to reduce the incidence of iatrogenic nerve injury by finding a safe area for the incision. However, smaller branches were not detected[30,34]. Regardless of the orientation of the incision, IPBSN iatrogenic injury remains an unavoidable complication of hamstring tendon harvesting using an anteromedial approach. The previous statement was supported by Leiter *et al*[35] since a safe zone to prevent IPBSN injury could not be found and nerve distribution was highly variable regarding the number and orientation of branches. Accordingly, an incision that is as small as possible and preferably oblique should always be the goal to limit the number of possibly injured branches[30,34,35]. Furthermore, multiple studies have demonstrated smaller areas of hypoesthesia in patients with oblique incisions than in those with vertical incision[19,22,35] (Table 1).

### Posteromedial technique

To avoid some of the aforementioned complications, Franz *et al*[37] pioneered a new approach in harvesting the hamstring tendon from the popliteal fossa. Franz's technique starts with the leg in a figure of four position, with the knee in 60° flexion, allowing for relaxation and protection of the saphenous nerve. The incision is made horizontally on the popliteal crease on top of the semitendinosus tendon, which is palpable in the posteromedial aspect of the popliteal fossa. A visible anatomical landmark to help locate the incision is the Jobert's groove, which is described by Prentiss, representing the space between the adductor muscle group from the ST. Vertical dissection of the fascia follows. A FiberTape suture is looped around the tendon. The tendon is pulled out through the incision while the knee is flexed to 90°, permitting visualization and dissection of the distal accessory insertions, and avoiding premature graft amputation. Distal-to-proximal harvesting is carried out with an open stripper first to release proximally. Afterwards, a closed tendon stripper is advanced to release the tendon from its insertion distally while palpating the stripper on the anteromedial aspect of the tibia with caution not

**Table 1 Incision direction/length, neurological injury, area of hypoesthesia**

Ref.	Direction/length of incision	Prevalence of IPBSN injury	Area of hypoesthesia
Keyhani <i>et al</i> [23], 2019	Vertical: 3.8 cm; Oblique: 2.7 cm	IPBSN 40%; Vertical 56.8%; Oblique 25%	Vertical 34.2 cm <sup>2</sup> ; Oblique 9.6 cm <sup>2</sup>
Mousavi <i>et al</i> [25], 2018	Vertical: 5.1 cm; Oblique: 3.8 cm	IPBSN 83%; Vertical 95.8%; Oblique 61.3%	Vertical 59.9 cm <sup>2</sup> ; Oblique 11.5 cm <sup>2</sup>
Sabat <i>et al</i> [29], 2012	Vertical: 4.1 cm; Oblique 3.8 cm	<sup>1</sup> IPBSN 48%; <sup>1</sup> Vertical 76%; <sup>1</sup> Oblique 32%	<sup>1</sup> Vertical: 44.6 cm <sup>2</sup> ; <sup>1</sup> Oblique: 14.4 cm <sup>2</sup>
Joshi <i>et al</i> [23], 2016	Vertical: 3 cm; Oblique: 3 cm	IPBSN 21.1%; Vertical 25%; Oblique 16.36%	N/M
Luo <i>et al</i> [19], 2007	Vertical 3.4 cm; Oblique: 3.3 cm	IPBSN 48%; Vertical 65.7%; Oblique 24%	Vertical: 48 cm <sup>2</sup> ; Oblique: 8.4 cm <sup>2</sup>
Sharaby <i>et al</i> [29], 2019	Vertical 5 cm; Oblique: 5.2 cm	IPBSN: 69.2%; Vertical: 39.5%; Oblique: 24%	N/M
Mahmood <i>et al</i> [21], 2020	Oblique: 2.9 cm	IPBSN: 24%	Oblique: 3.9 cm <sup>2</sup>
Figueroa <i>et al</i> [28], 2008	Vertical: 1.8 cm	IPBSN: 77%	Vertical: 3.6 cm <sup>2</sup>
Sanders <i>et al</i> [15], 2007	Vertical: 1.5-2 cm	IPBSN: 19%	N/M
Ochiai <i>et al</i> [24], 2017	Vertical: 1.8-2.5 cm	21.1%	N/M

<sup>1</sup>Six months postoperatively.

IPBSN: Infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve (total prevalence of hypoesthesia over the infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve distribution measured clinically); N/M: No mention.

to perforate the skin. The same incision can be used to harvest the gracilis if the surgeon chooses to follow the same procedure[37].

Kodkani *et al*[38] implemented a posteromedial technique with some modifications. A small incision (1–1.5 cm) was made horizontally at the same location as described by Franz. To grant better access to the tendons, the knee was flexed at 30° and externally rotated. Knee flexion was increased for optimal identification and cutting of distal fibrous bands. After freeing the tendon proximally, the distal insertion was released while the knee was completely flexed and internally rotated. In a review of eight cases, Kodkani *et al*[38] reported zero intraoperative and postoperative complications, and all patients had satisfactory cosmetic results. Letartre *et al*[39] further modified this technique. During the procedure, the surgeon conveniently faced the posterior aspect of the knee. This view was achieved while the hip was flexed, and the knee flexed at 20°. An assistant held the limb up by the foot and applied external rotation. A 3–4-cm horizontal incision over the palpable ST was then made. Proximally, the tendon was harvested at 120° flexion. Distal harvesting was performed using a closed, short stripper. In an evaluation of 90 patients prospectively, a complete failure of harvest was reported during their first attempt for the posteromedial approach that required conversion to the anterior approach. In another case, the gracilis was harvested mistakenly instead of the semitendinosus, while in two cases, the ST alone resulted in a weak graft that was reinforced by the gracilis. In addition, no premature ambulation of the graft or sensory deficit occurred in any of the patients.

Wilson *et al*[40] described a vertical posteromedial incision. This incision was made while the leg was in a figure of four position, starting from the popliteal crease where the ST was palpable and extended 2–3 cm proximally. The longitudinal orientation of the incision was thought to improve wound healing, prevent wound complications, and provide a cosmetically appealing option. The tendon was extracted from the wound, and fibrous extensions were dissected until no calf pinching was visible, which indicated missed bands. Proximal to distal stripping was then performed.

A double incision technique using both an anterior and a posterior incision was described by Prodromos *et al*[41] with a posterior 2-cm incision while the knee was in 30° flexion in a figure of four position. The incision could be performed vertically or horizontally using the ST as a starting point. Both the ST and GR were pulled out through the wound and held by Penrose drains. The anterior 2-cm incision was made at the ST insertion, as guided by the surgeon's index finger, following the course of the tendon from the posterior, and tenting the skin which marks the location. The incision was obliquely inclined at 45° in relation to the tibia and perpendicular to the pes anserinus. The tendon was harvested proximally with an open stripper from the anterior incision and passed through the posterior incision. At this point, the tendon could be delivered through an anterior incision, and distal release was initiated by cutting the periosteum along the superior and inferior edges of the pes anserinus with a scalpel. Strong pulling of the tendons resulted in periosteal elevation of 1 cm approximately along with the tendon. The attached part of the periosteum was incised sharply. This was thought to increase the length of the tendon by adding 1 cm of periosteum and approximately 2 cm of pes anserinus. Accessory tendons were cut with a no. 15 blade or Metzenbaum scissors as they obscured the advancement of the stripper. In a chart review of 175 patients who underwent this technique, no intraoperative difficulties or complications were encountered. The wounds healed without further complications except for one



**Table 2 Advantages of using the posteromedial approach to harvest hamstring tendons**

Advantages of the posteromedial hamstring harvesting approach over the anteromedial approach
Better cosmetic appearance
Lower risk of infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve injury
Direct visualization of the bands attached to the hamstring tendons which facilitate their release
Lower risk of premature amputation of the harvested grafts
Easier approach when harvesting of a single tendon is desired
Lower risk of medial collateral ligament injury
Smaller incision for the tibial drill guide with the advantage of placing the incision in the desired location

incidence of anterior cellulitis that was managed conservatively with antibiotics. Wound healing and cosmesis were thought to be superior in the posterior incision. In fact, 80% of patients thought they had a better scar appearance compared to that of others who underwent ACL reconstruction[41].

Khanna *et al*[42] recently described a posterior hamstring harvesting technique for pediatric and adolescent subjects. The incision was made horizontally 2–3 cm in length over the palpable ST, while the leg was abducted, and externally rotated. A proximal-to-distal harvest was adopted. The semitendinosus accessory band was excised and the gracilis was harvested in a similar manner. A total of 214 patients were followed up for a minimum of 6 mo for complication analysis. In all cases, the tendons were identified intraoperatively, and no incidence of premature graft transection was reported. No wound healing issues, painful scars, restriction of knee motion due to incision location, or neurovascular injuries were observed. The patient also reported no cosmetic concerns.

### **Anteromedial versus posteromedial technique**

The traditional anteromedial hamstring harvest was compared with the posteromedial approach as described by Franz *et al*[37]. They conducted a randomized controlled trial (RCT) with 100 patients and found that the average ST harvest time was significantly lower in the posteromedial group. Although the harvested graft was sufficient in length for both groups, the average length was significantly longer in the anteromedial group with a 2-cm difference. Fourteen percent of patients in the anteromedial group reported sensory deficits along the distribution of the saphenous nerve, compared to zero sensory issues in the posteromedial group. Pain scores using the visual analog scale were similar in both groups. No wound complications were found in the posteromedial group, whereas one case in the anteromedial group had a superficial wound infection which was treated conservatively with oral antibiotics. Patients who underwent a posteromedial incision had a significantly smaller incision than those who underwent a vertical anteromedial incision.

Shu *et al*[43] retrospectively reviewed 29 patients who underwent a posteromedial harvest as described by Wilson *et al*[40]. Among these patients, 22 underwent an anteromedial harvest. Operative and tourniquet times were significantly lower in the posteromedial group. This could be explained by the ease of tendon and accessory band identification using the posteromedial approach. The posteromedial group also had a reduced risk of unintentionally harvesting the gracilis. Both groups had no incidence of premature tendon amputation or IPBSN injury. The patients were then contacted for subjective knee scores, including Knee Osteoarthritis and Outcomes Score, Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index, and International Knee Documentation Committee score (IKDC). All scores showed no significant differences between the two groups.

In the posteromedial incision, tendons are readily identified, and adequate exposure of all extensions and accessory insertions can be achieved[38,40]. Specifically, the most important ST accessory insertion found in 90% of patients is attached to the medial head of gastrocnemius. This band is found 2.6 cm below the posterior incision and 7.6 cm away from the anterior approach[44]. Posterior direct access to the tendon can be achieved even in obese patients, as the tendons are palpable posteriorly and have little subcutaneous tissue coverage[37]. Roussignol *et al*[44] found that a 3-cm posterior incision was sufficient in identifying tendons and cutting accessory insertions with the complete avoidance of premature transection of the graft.

Neurological injury of the saphenous nerve and its branches is avoided in a posterior approach, as the nerve is protected from the sharp stripper by the sartorial fascia that is left intact in this technique[38, 44]. Therefore, none of the studies included in this review reported such complications following the posteromedial approach (Table 2).

In a prospective clinical study, Ochiai *et al*[24] reported a low IPBSN injury rate of 21.1% following an anteromedial approach using a vertical incision. This may be explained by the long follow up of 24 mo compared with the 77% at 3 wk post reconstruction in the study by Figueroa *et al*[28]. Luo *et al*[19], Sabat *et al*[22], Leiter *et al*[35], and Chen *et al*[29] reported that the area of sensory disturbances healed over time. Similarly, Joshi *et al*[23] reported gradual improvement in paresthesia within a year. Recovery was

also noted to be faster with an oblique incision than with a vertical incision. A hypothesis generated to support the difference was that in the oblique incision, IPBSN injury results in neuropraxia, while the vertical incision results in a neurotmesis injury[23]. Sabat *et al*[22] and Mousavi *et al*[27] reported higher satisfaction rates in patients who underwent oblique incision than in those who underwent vertical incision. In contrast, Grassi *et al*[33] reported that the incision orientation had no impact on the Lysholm score or patient subjective satisfaction. Ochiai *et al*[24] reported no significant difference in Lysholm score, visual analog scale pain score, patient-based SF-36, and presence of anterior knee pain in relation to IPBSN injury. However, patients with IPBSN were found to be significantly less satisfied than patients without this complication[21]. Apart from the above-mentioned studies, Sanders *et al*[15], Keyhani *et al*[25], Figueroa *et al*[28], and Sabat *et al*[22] reported that the majority of patients with a neurological injury post-operatively thought that it had no significant effect on their daily activities.

## GRAFT PREPARATION

Once the hamstring tendons are completely harvested, muscular remnants are removed. Based on the choice to harvest the semitendinosus alone or together with the gracilis, the preparation differs. For a four-strand (quadrupled) semitendinosus graft (4-ST), the ST is folded with a nonabsorbable suture in the middle, and the two ends are stitched with a nonabsorbable suture. The graft is folded again with a nonabsorbable suture in the middle, held on a suspensory device, and whipstitched from proximal to distal. In case both semitendinosus and gracilis (2ST-2GT) are harvested, a four-strand graft is created with both tendons folded and loaded on a suspensory device. A nonabsorbable suture is passed twice around the free ends, and the tendons are whipstitched with a nonabsorbable suture once from distal to proximal, and again from proximal to distal[45]. These graft options are most commonly used when hamstring autografts are preferred[46].

### 4ST versus 2ST-2GT hamstring autograft

To guide the choice between 4ST and 2ST-2GT autografts, multiple investigators have compared patient-reported outcomes as well as hamstring muscle strength following ACL reconstruction. Ardern *et al*[47] stated that harvesting the gracilis along with the semitendinosus resulted in a deficit in isometric strength at deep knee flexion angles. Furthermore, Sharma *et al*[46] also found a large difference between ST autograft subjects and STGT autograft subjects in isometric strength at deep flexion angles in a meta-analysis. A significant decrease in active knee flexion angle after STGT harvesting has been reported[46,47]. Similar with isometric strength, active knee flexion is evaluated while the hip is in relative extension, aiding in demonstrating hamstring muscle insufficiency. A significant difference in isokinetic peak torque was found by Chin *et al*[48]. This deficit is rarely found in the literature because the isokinetic flexion peak torque is generated at shallow angles that are produced by the contraction of the biceps femoris rather than the semitendinosus and/or gracilis. Additionally, the peak torque is measured while the hip is flexed to 90, a suboptimal position for the hamstring to flex the knee[47].

In an RCT, Tashiro *et al*[49] evaluated hamstring muscle strength and compared the results between patients who had both tendons harvested and patients with isolated ST harvest. The STGT group had significantly weaker isometric and isokinetic hamstring strength than the group with preserved gracilis. Both groups were found to have significantly weaker hamstrings at angles of 70° and deeper in isokinetic and isometric evaluations compared to the preoperative status. Similarly, Nakamura *et al*[50] found a significant hamstring strength deficit identified using isokinetic testing at 90° in both groups. However, no difference was observed between the STGT and ST groups. A significantly lower active knee flexion angle in the STGT group was found. Hu *et al*[51] reported a significantly higher strength deficit in the STGT group during isometric flexion at 90°. A trend of increasing deficit with increasing angle was also noted[49,51]. A loss in active knee flexion angle was significantly higher in the STGT group than in the ST group in a prospective review by Adachi *et al*[52]. However, no significant difference was reported in hamstring isokinetic strength evaluation[52]. Yosmaoglu *et al*[53] in another prospective review reported a significantly higher hamstring isokinetic deficit in flexion at 60° in subjects post-STGT autograft harvest than in subjects post-ST autograft harvest. Three RCTs by Carter *et al*[54], Karimi-Mobarakeh *et al*[55], and Gobbi *et al*[56]; two prospective cohort studies by Inagaki *et al*[57] and Segawa *et al*[58], and three retrospective studies by Ardern *et al*[59], Barenius *et al*[60], and Lipscomb *et al*[61] found no difference in flexion hamstring strength deficit after ACL reconstruction with an isolated ST harvest or a combined ST and GT harvest. Of the studies included in this review, only two investigated rotational muscle strength and compared patients after STGT autograft and ST autograft. Segawa *et al*[58] in their prospective review have reported a significantly higher deficit of internal rotation at 30° and 120° in the STGT group. This same strength deficit was found to be significantly more common in females than in males. Additionally, Gobbi *et al*[56] found a significantly greater deficit in isokinetic internal and external rotation at 60°.

The large number of articles with different study designs that reported no difference in hamstring strength between the two groups could be attributed to the method of strength evaluation used[47].

**Table 3 Hamstring graft preparation techniques: summary of results**

Graft preparation		
Ref.	Study design	Results/conclusion
Ardern <i>et al</i> [47], 2009	Systematic review	ST-GT autograft have a significantly higher deficit in isometric strength at knee flexion $\geq 70^\circ$ . Significant standing knee flexion angle deficit in the ST-GT autograft group.
Sharma <i>et al</i> [46], 2015	Meta-analysis	ST-GT group had a significantly higher isokinetic hamstring strength deficit at $60^\circ$ . ST-GT group had a significantly higher isometric hamstring strength deficit at $90^\circ$ , $105^\circ$ , $110^\circ$ . ST-GT group had a significantly higher standing knee flexion angle deficit.
Chin <i>et al</i> [48], 2018	Meta-analysis	ST-GT group had a significantly increased s deficit in isokinetic peak torque when compared with ST group for flexion at $60^\circ/\text{s}$ at 2-yr follow-up, and flexion at $180^\circ/\text{s}$ at 1- and 2-yr follow-up.
Tashiro <i>et al</i> [49], 2003	RCT	ST-GT group had a significantly increased deficit in isokinetic peak torque measured at knee flexion $60^\circ/\text{s}$ at $80^\circ$ , $90^\circ$ , $110^\circ$ when compared with ST group at 18 mo postoperatively. ST-GT group had a significantly higher isometric hamstring strength deficit at $70^\circ$ measured in sitting position at 18 mo postoperatively. ST-GT group had a significantly higher isometric hamstring strength deficit at $70^\circ$ and $90^\circ$ measured in prone position at 18 mo postoperatively. Both groups showed significant isometric and isokinetic strength deficit when compared to preoperative measures.
Nakamura <i>et al</i> [50], 2002	Consecutive sample, case-control study	ST-GT group had a significantly higher standing knee flexion angle deficit. Decreased isokinetic torque at $90^\circ$ in both groups.
Hu <i>et al</i> [51], 2020	Retrospective comparative	ST-GT group had a significantly higher isometric hamstring strength deficit at $90^\circ$ flexion. Significant difference in the KOOS pain score.
Adachi <i>et al</i> [52], 2003	Prospective review	ST-GT group had a significantly higher standing knee flexion angle deficit.
Yosmaoglu <i>et al</i> [53], 2011	Prospective review	ST-GT group had a significantly higher hamstring isokinetic flexion strength deficit at $60^\circ/\text{s}$ .
Carter <i>et al</i> [54], 1999	RCT	No difference in isokinetic strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups, measured at $180^\circ/\text{s}$ and $300^\circ/\text{s}$ . Majority of patients had activity limitation at 6 mo postoperatively.
Karimi-Mobarakeh <i>et al</i> [55], 2014	RCT	No difference in isometric strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups, measured at $90^\circ$ flexion, extension, adduction, or abduction. No difference in patient outcome measures between ST-GT and ST groups.
Gobbi <i>et al</i> [56], 2005	RCT	ST-GT group had a significantly higher hamstring isokinetic internal and external rotation strength deficit at $60^\circ/\text{s}$ .
Inagaki <i>et al</i> [57], 2013	Prospective comparative	No difference in isokinetic strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups, measured at $60^\circ/\text{s}$ . No difference in anterior laxity, or knee ROM. No difference in patient reported outcomes.
Segawa <i>et al</i> [58], 2002	Prospective study	ST-GT group had a significantly higher hamstring isokinetic internal rotation at $120^\circ/\text{s}$ and $30^\circ/\text{s}$ .
Ardern <i>et al</i> [59], 2010	Retrospective comparative	No difference in isometric strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups, at $30^\circ$ , $90^\circ$ , or $105^\circ$ . No difference in isokinetic strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups, measured at $60^\circ$ , $90^\circ$ , and $105^\circ$ or $60^\circ/\text{s}$ and $180^\circ/\text{s}$ . No difference in standing knee flexion angle between ST-GT and ST groups.
Barenus <i>et al</i> [60], 2013	Retrospective study	No difference in isokinetic strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups, at $20^\circ$ , and $90^\circ$ measured at $60^\circ/\text{s}$ . No difference in isometric strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups at $90^\circ$ .
Lipscomb <i>et al</i> [61], 1982	Retrospective study	No difference in isokinetic strength deficit between ST-GT and ST groups, measured at $60^\circ/\text{s}$ and $240^\circ/\text{s}$ .

ST-GT: Semitendinosus and gracilis; ST: Semitendinosus; RCT: Randomized control trial; KOOS: Knee osteoarthritis and outcomes score.

Most studies assessed the strength deficit with isokinetic testing which was done in a sitting position while the hip was  $90^\circ$  flexed, a position that did not allow the ST and GT muscles to contract concentrically to produce knee flexion where a deficit could be spotted. Another explanation is that the isokinetic peak torque is usually measured at shallow angles. Here, knee flexion is elicited mostly by biceps femoris contraction, while the semitendinosus and gracilis muscle function is best evaluated at deeper angles[47]. In contrast, a reported strength deficit was elicited by Ardern *et al*[59] as a result of poor rehabilitation or early assessment, where the muscles have not recovered fully.

Despite the significance in hamstring strength, the previously mentioned studies reported no difference in subjective patient-reported outcome scores[46-49,55-60]. In addition, Hu *et al*[51] found a significant difference in the pain section of the knee injury and osteoarthritis outcome score. This can be attributed to the fact that the strength deficit is only observed in such deep angles and is not utilized by most people in their daily activities and is specifically used by athletes in gymnastics, judo, and wrestling (Table 3)[46,47,52].

## GRAFT FIXATION

Currently, there are many methods for femoral-sided graft fixation in ACL reconstruction. They can be categorized into two main types: intra-tunnel fixation (interference screw) and extra tunnel fixation (cortical fixation devices or femoral loops). Fixation of soft tissue grafts is generally considered a weak point early in the postoperative course after ACL reconstruction[62]. Therefore, many different devices have been developed for soft-tissue femoral fixation[63]. Despite numerous options, the gold standard for femoral fixation has not yet been identified[63].

### **Suspensory fixation**

Fixation methods can be categorized into compression, expansion, and suspension. Suspensory devices can be subdivided into cortical (metal plates with or without suture loops), cancellous, and corticocancellous devices[64]. Suspensory fixation devices can maximize the amount of graft in the femoral tunnel, thereby improving the outcomes of ACL reconstruction. Suspensory devices commonly feature a button that rests on the cortex of the femur and a loop that holds the folded soft tissue ACL graft in position until healing can occur[65-68]. This technique can avoid common problems that occur with interference screw fixation, such as divergent screw placement, laceration of sutures or grafts by screw threads, and increasing difficulty of revision surgery in the presence of screws[69].

### **Interference screw fixation**

Because of its capacity to resist cyclic movements, one of the most efficient fixation devices are interference screws. The interference screw is a conical threaded device inserted into the bone tunnel, compressing the graft against the tunnel walls, and fixing it in the desired position. Although it is more commonly used on the tibial side; this screw can also be used for femoral fixation. Interference screws may be composed of metals or bioabsorbable materials[70]. A review article by Debieux *et al*[70] showed no difference in self-reported knee function and patients' postoperative activity levels when comparing bioabsorbable interference screws with metallic interference screws. However, bioabsorbable screws may be associated with overall treatment failures, including implant breakage during surgery.

### **Suspensory fixation versus interference screw fixation**

There is no consensus on the best method to achieve hamstring autograft fixation during ACL reconstruction. Intra-tunnel fixation methods predominantly rely on the use of metal or bioresorbable interference screws. Extra-tunnel fixation methods rely on buttons, staples, or washer-post combinations placed outside the tunnel over the adjacent cortical bone surface[71]. Based on the literature review, each fixation has its own advantages and disadvantages for achieving early and long-term successful ACL reconstruction. Regarding the incidence of graft lengthening under cyclical loads after ACL reconstruction, Boutsiadis *et al*[72] assessed anterior knee laxity following primary ACLR. They found that the use of an adjustable loop suspensory fixation device for femoral fixation was associated with noninferior postoperative anterior knee laxity results compared with interference screw fixation at a minimum 2-years' follow-up. The operative pivot shift was the only significant risk factor for postoperative residual anterior knee laxity > 3 mm.

Regarding tunnel widening, a meta-analysis comparing the clinical results of the all-inside (ACLR) technique using suspensory cortical button fixation to a whole tibial tunnel drilling technique with interference screw fixation has shown that all-inside ACLR with suspensory cortical button fixation was not clinically superior in terms of functional outcomes, knee laxity measured with an arthrometer, or re-rupture rate. However, the advantage of using suspensory cortical button fixation is the ability to utilize a thicker graft and a lower rate of tibial tunnel widening[73]. In addition, Baumfeld *et al*[74] found significantly more femoral tunnel widening associated with the endobutton suspensory fixation system compared to double cross-pin fixation in the tunnel. However, they found a significant difference in the amount of tibial tunnel widening between the groups in this study[74]. A prospective comparative study by Sabat *et al*[75] compared the incidence of tunnel widening in patients who underwent ACL reconstruction with a quadrupled hamstring graft using either endobutton CL or Transfix on the femoral tunnel side and bioabsorbable interference screws in the tibial tunnel using computed tomography scans. Femoral tunnel widening was significantly lower in the Transfix group than in the EndoButton group. Regarding tunnel drilling techniques, Saygi *et al*[76] investigated the effect of tunnel undersizing (tight fit ACL reconstruction technique) on tunnel widening and overall clinical outcomes compared with conventional ACL reconstruction techniques. They concluded that undersized drilling might be preferred when using button fixation to reduce tunnel widening and improve clinical satisfaction.

Each fixation device has biomechanical properties that have been demonstrated in several studies. Shen *et al*[77] compared cross-pin to endobutton-CL femoral fixation and found that they are equally strong and safe fixation options for ACL reconstruction. However, cross-pin fixation has significantly less displacement of the femur-graft-tibia complex than endobutton-CL fixation in response to the cyclic loading test. Thus, it could be considered when early aggressive rehabilitation following ACL reconstruction is required. Milano *et al*[64] found that corticocancellous suspension fixation obtained



Table 4 Hamstring graft fixation techniques: summary of results

Graft fixation		
Ref.	Study design	Results/conclusion
Boutsiadis <i>et al</i> [72], 2018	Cohort study; level of evidence, 3	No difference in postoperative anterior knee laxity at a minimum 2 yr follow-up between interference screw and ALSF device for femoral fixation. The preoperative pivot shift is the only significant risk factor for postoperative residual anterior knee laxity more than 3 mm.
Shanmugaraj <i>et al</i> [81], 2020	Systematic review and meta-analysis	No significant differences in complication rates between femoral press-fit and femoral metal interference screw fixation. Press-fit fixation had significant improvements in functional outcome scores postoperatively and had significantly reduced postoperative bone tunnel enlargement compared to bioabsorbable fixation.
Debieux <i>et al</i> [70], 2016	Review	No difference in self-reported knee function and levels of activity between bioabsorbable and metallic interference screws. Bioabsorbable screws may be associated with more overall treatment failures, including implant breakage during surgery.
Han <i>et al</i> [62], 2012	Level II, systematic review of level I and II studies	At a minimum of 2 yr follow-up, comparable outcomes based on objective IKDC, Lysholm knee scale, and Tegner activity level survey results were found, as well as anterior knee joint laxity measurements between intra-tunnel and extra-tunnel fixation. Intra-tunnel fixation began jogging/running earlier than patients who received extra-tunnel fixation. However, return to sports timing was comparable between the groups.
Hu <i>et al</i> [80], 2017	Systematic review and meta-analysis	The significantly decreased instrumented side-to-side anterior-posterior laxity difference achieved by cross-pin transfixation appears to be of limited clinical significance when compared with interference screw fixation in primary hamstring ACLR.
Fu <i>et al</i> [73], 2020	Systematic review and meta-analysis	Suspensory cortical button fixation was not clinically superior to interference screw fixation in functional outcomes, knee laxity measured with arthrometer, or re-rupture rate. The advantage of using suspensory cortical button fixation was that a thicker graft could be used for reconstruction, and brought less tibia tunnel widening compared with bioabsorbable interference screw fixation.
Saccomanno <i>et al</i> [63], 2014	Systematic review of randomized controlled trials	There are no short- to medium-term differences in knee-specific outcome measures between cortical button femoral graft fixation and suspensory transfemoral fixation. In addition, radiological evidence of tunnel widening does not seem to affect short- to medium-term clinical outcomes.
Speziali <i>et al</i> [79], 2014	Systematic review of level I and II therapeutic studies	Side-to-side anterior-posterior tibial translation was $1.9 \pm 0.9$ , $1.5 \pm 0.9$ , $1.5 \pm 0.8$ , $2.2 \pm 0.4$ mm for metallic interference screw, bioabsorbable screw, cross-pin and suspensory device, respectively. Rate of failure was 6.1%, 3.3%, 1.7% and 1.2% for bioabsorbable interference screw, metallic interference screw, cross-pin and suspensory device, respectively.
Baumfeld <i>et al</i> [74], 2008	Retrospective review	There was significantly more femoral tunnel widening associated with the use of the endobutton suspensory fixation system compared to the use of double cross-pins fixation.
Milano <i>et al</i> [64], 2006	Biomechanical analysis	Corticocancellous suspension fixation offer the best results in terms of graft elongation, fixation strength, and stiffness. Cancellous suspension fixation was homogeneous with other suspension fixation mechanisms but significantly weaker. Interference screws, both metallic and absorbable, showed low failure load but greatest graft elongation.
Sabat <i>et al</i> [75], 2011	Level II, prospective comparative study	Femoral tunnel widening was significantly less in the Transfix group compared with the endobutton group.
Saygi <i>et al</i> [76], 2015	Therapeutic case series, level IV	Undersize drilling technique is preferred in button fixation in order to reduce tunnel widening and improve clinical satisfaction.
Shen <i>et al</i> [77], 2008	Biomechanical comparison study	The cross-pin fixation is a good option for early aggressive rehabilitation following ACL reconstruction due to has significantly less displacement of femur-graft-tibia complex than that of endobutton-CL fixation in response to the cyclic loading test.
Vertullo <i>et al</i> [78], 2019	Controlled laboratory study	The suspensory fixation constructs exhibited small yet statistically significant biomechanical differences among each other. Tibial screw fixation had lower ultimate failure load and higher total elongation.

ALSF: Adjustable-loop suspensory fixation; IKDC: International Knee Documentation Committee; ACLR: Anterior cruciate ligament rupture; ACL: Anterior cruciate ligament; CL: Cruciate ligament.

with transcondylar devices offered the best results in terms of graft elongation, fixation strength, and stiffness. Cancellous suspension fixation was homogeneous with other suspension fixation mechanisms but was significantly weaker. Interference screws, both metallic and absorbable, showed a low failure load but the greatest graft elongation. They concluded that the mechanical behavior of cortical suspension fixation was strictly correlated with the area of the contact surface between the hardware and cortical bone and the structural properties of the implant. Vertullo *et al* [78] conducted a biomechanical study comparing quadrupled tendon graft constructs with adjustable loop suspensory fixation to four-strand graft constructs secured with screws and a femoral fixed-loop device. They found small, yet significant, biomechanical differences between the different techniques. In addition, they found that tibial screw fixation resulted in a lower ultimate failure load and higher total graft elongation. Another study compared the different fixation techniques for ACLR. On the femoral side, a cross-pin, a metallic interference screw, a bioabsorbable interference screw, and a suspensory device were used in 32.3%, 27.3%, 24.8%, and 15.5% of the patients, respectively. On the tibial side, a metallic interference screw, a

bioabsorbable interference screw, a screw and plastic sheath, a screw post, and a cross-pin were used in 38.7%, 31%, 15.7%, 12.8%, and 1.7% of the patients, respectively. The side-to-side anterior-posterior tibial translation was  $1.9 \pm 0.9$ ,  $1.5 \pm 0.9$ ,  $1.5 \pm 0.8$ , and  $2.2 \pm 0.4$  mm for metallic interference screw, bioabsorbable screw, cross-pin, and suspensory device, respectively. The rate of failure was 6.1%, 3.3%, 1.7%, and 1.2% for the bioabsorbable interference screw, metallic interference screw, cross-pin, and suspensory device, respectively. Two-thirds of the patients achieved good-to-excellent clinical outcomes. Several pitfalls that affect current fixation techniques, such as graft tensioning and graft tunnel motion, remain unaddressed[79]. Moreover, Saccomanno *et al*[63] compared the cortical button with transfemoral suspensory fixation. They suggested that there were no short- to medium-term differences in the knee-specific outcome measures. In contrast, a meta-analysis by Hu *et al*[80] found a decrease in instrumented side-to-side anteroposterior laxity when cross-pin transfixation was used. However, the difference appears to have limited clinical significance compared with interference screw fixation. In addition, a 2-year clinical outcome study found that patients who underwent ACL reconstruction with intra-tunnel or extra-tunnel fixation had comparable results based on objective IKDC, Lysholm knee scale, Tegner activity level survey, anterior knee joint laxity measurements, and time to resume sports. Patients who received intra-tunnel fixation began full weight-bearing, jogging, and running earlier than patients who received extra-tunnel fixation[62]. Finally, a meta-analysis showed that the overall graft failure and revision rates with press-fit fixation for ACLR were low. There were no significant differences in the complication rates between patients who underwent femoral press-fit or femoral metal interference screw fixation. Patients who underwent press-fit fixation for ACLR had significant improvements in functional outcome scores post-operatively and significantly lower postoperative bone tunnel enlargement than patients who underwent bioabsorbable fixation. Thus, early evidence suggests that press-fit fixation is a good option for patients undergoing ACLR (Table 4)[81].

## CONCLUSION

Multiple surgical maneuvers and approaches have been reported to avoid complications when reconstructing a ruptured ACL. For a hamstring tendon autograft, a shorter oblique anteromedial incision has been suggested to reduce the incidence of local neurological injuries compared to that with a longer vertical incision. The posteromedial harvesting approach is associated with fewer complications and better cosmetic outcomes. Sparing the gracilis tendon when harvesting the hamstring tendon can reduce the strength deficit postoperatively at deeper angles utilized by athletes. Several hamstring autograft fixation methods are available, but the optimum method is yet to be determined. Further studies are required to establish a safer surgical approach.

## FOOTNOTES

**Author contributions:** Albishi W devised the project, main conceptual ideas, and proof outline; Baltow B, Albusayes N, and Sayed AA retrieved articles from the database and examined for relevance; Albishi W, Albusayes N, and Sayed AA wrote the manuscript in consultation with Baltow B and Arabai HM.

**Conflict-of-interest statement:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

**Open-Access:** This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

**Country/Territory of origin:** Saudi Arabia

**ORCID number:** Waleed Albishi 0000-0003-2088-4678; Bara Baltow 0000-0001-6236-9194; Nora Albusayes 0000-0003-2178-1961; Ameer A Sayed 0000-0002-8568-7467; Hamza M Alrabai 0000-0002-7486-1087.

**S-Editor:** Zhang H

**L-Editor:** Kerr C

**P-Editor:** Zhang H

## REFERENCES

- 1 **Tompson JC.** Netter's Concise Orthopaedic Anatomy. Elsevier, 2016
- 2 **Augustine RW.** The unstable knee. *Am J Surg* 1956; **92**: 380-388 [PMID: [13354860](#) DOI: [10.1016/s0002-9610\(56\)80110-4](#)]
- 3 **Sanders TL, Maradit Kremers H, Bryan AJ, Larson DR, Dahm DL, Levy BA, Stuart MJ, Krych AJ.** Incidence of Anterior Cruciate Ligament Tears and Reconstruction: A 21-Year Population-Based Study. *Am J Sports Med* 2016; **44**: 1502-1507 [PMID: [26920430](#) DOI: [10.1177/0363546516629944](#)]
- 4 **Griffin LY, Agel J, Albohm MJ, Arendt EA, Dick RW, Garrett WE, Garrick JG, Hewett TE, Huston L, Ireland ML, Johnson RJ, Kibler WB, Lephart S, Lewis JL, Lindenfeld TN, Mandelbaum BR, Marchak P, Teitz CC, Wojtys EM.** Noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injuries: risk factors and prevention strategies. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 2000; **8**: 141-150 [PMID: [10874221](#) DOI: [10.5435/00124635-200005000-00001](#)]
- 5 **Boden BP, Torg JS, Knowles SB, Hewett TE.** Video analysis of anterior cruciate ligament injury: abnormalities in hip and ankle kinematics. *Am J Sports Med* 2009; **37**: 252-259 [PMID: [19182110](#) DOI: [10.1177/0363546508328107](#)]
- 6 **Cimino F, Volk BS, Setter D.** Anterior cruciate ligament injury: diagnosis, management, and prevention. *Am Fam Physician* 2010; **82**: 917-922 [PMID: [20949884](#)]
- 7 **Walsh WM, McCarty EC, Madden CC.** Knee Injuries. In: Madden C, Putukian M, McCarty E, Young C. Netter's Sports Medicine. Elsevier, 2021
- 8 **Shea KG, Carey JL.** Management of anterior cruciate ligament injuries: evidence-based guideline. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 2015; **23**: e1-e5 [PMID: [25795769](#) DOI: [10.5435/JAAOS-D-15-00094](#)]
- 9 **Lin KM, Boyle C, Marom N, Marx RG.** Graft Selection in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Sports Med Arthrosc Rev* 2020; **28**: 41-48 [PMID: [32345925](#) DOI: [10.1097/JSA.0000000000000265](#)]
- 10 **Warren LF, Marshall JL.** The supporting structures and layers on the medial side of the knee: an anatomical analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1979; **61**: 56-62 [PMID: [759437](#)]
- 11 **Nicholas JA, Hershan EB.** The Lower Extremity and Spine in Sports Medicine. St. Louis: Mosby, 1995: 657-694
- 12 **Pagnani MJ, Warner JJ, O'Brien SJ, Warren RF.** Anatomic considerations in harvesting the semitendinosus and gracilis tendons and a technique of harvest. *Am J Sports Med* 1993; **21**: 565-571 [PMID: [8368418](#) DOI: [10.1177/036354659302100414](#)]
- 13 **Solman CG Jr, Pagnani MJ.** Hamstring tendon harvesting. Reviewing anatomic relationships and avoiding pitfalls. *Orthop Clin North Am* 2003; **34**: 1-8 [PMID: [12735196](#) DOI: [10.1016/s0030-5898\(02\)00025-1](#)]
- 14 **Davarinos N, Neill BJO, Curtin W.** A Brief History of Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Adv In Orthop Surg* 2014 [DOI: [10.1155/2014/706042](#)]
- 15 **Sanders B, Rolf R, McClelland W, Xerogeanes J.** Prevalence of saphenous nerve injury after autogenous hamstring harvest: an anatomic and clinical study of sartorial branch injury. *Arthroscopy* 2007; **23**: 956-963 [PMID: [17868834](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2007.03.099](#)]
- 16 **Miller MD, Browne JA, Cole BJ, Cosgarea AJ, Owens BD.** Operative Techniques: Knee Surgery: Second Edition. Elsevier, 2017: 1-393
- 17 **Olivos-Meza A, Suarez-Ahedo C, Jiménez-Aroche CA, Pantanali N, Valdez-Chávez MV, Pérez-Jiménez FJ, Olivos-Díaz B, Olivos-Gárce NA, González-Hernández A, Ibarra C.** Anatomic Considerations in Hamstring Tendon Harvesting for Ligament Reconstruction. *Arthrosc Tech* 2020; **9**: e191-e198 [PMID: [32021795](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.eats.2019.09.021](#)]
- 18 **Colombet P, Graveleau N.** Minimally Invasive Anterior Semitendinosus Harvest: A Technique to Decrease Saphenous Nerve Injury. *Arthrosc Tech* 2016; **5**: e139-e142 [PMID: [27274445](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.eats.2015.10.011](#)]
- 19 **Luo H, Yu JK, Ao YF, Yu CL, Peng LB, Lin CY, Zhang JY, Fu X.** Relationship between different skin incisions and the injury of the infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve during anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2007; **120**: 1127-1130 [PMID: [17637238](#) DOI: [10.1097/00029330-200707010-00002](#)]
- 20 **Henry BM, Tomaszewski KA, Pękala PA, Graves MJ, Pękala JR, Sanna B, Mizia E.** Oblique incisions in hamstring tendon harvesting reduce iatrogenic injuries to the infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2018; **26**: 1197-1203 [PMID: [28573437](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-017-4590-y](#)]
- 21 **Mahmood A, Nag H, Srivastava AK.** Clinical and electrophysiological assessment of injury to infrapatellar branch(es) of saphenous nerve during anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using oblique incision for hamstring graft harvest: A prospective study. *Knee* 2020; **27**: 709-716 [PMID: [32563427](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.knee.2020.04.021](#)]
- 22 **Sabat D, Kumar V.** Nerve injury during hamstring graft harvest: a prospective comparative study of three different incisions. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2013; **21**: 2089-2095 [PMID: [23073817](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-012-2243-8](#)]
- 23 **Joshi A, Kayastha N, Shrestha S, Kc BR.** Infra Patellar Branch of Saphenous Nerve Injury during Hamstring Graft Harvest: Vertical versus Oblique Incisions. *J Nepal Health Res Counc* 2016; **14**: 180-185 [PMID: [28327683](#)]
- 24 **Ochiai S, Hagino T, Senga S, Yamashita T, Oda K, Haro H.** Injury to infrapatellar branch of saphenous nerve in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using vertical skin incision for hamstring harvesting: risk factors and the influence of treatment outcome. *J Orthop Surg Res* 2017; **12**: 101 [PMID: [28655325](#) DOI: [10.1186/s13018-017-0596-x](#)]
- 25 **Keyhani S, Kazemi SM, Sajjadi MM, Elmi A.** A Comparison between Oblique and Vertical Incisions on the Hamstring Tendon Harvesting in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction and Infrapatellar Branch Injury of the Saphenous Nerve. *Rev Bras Ortop (Sao Paulo)* 2020; **55**: 374-379 [PMID: [32616985](#) DOI: [10.1055/s-0039-1692695](#)]
- 26 **Papastergiou SG, Voulgaropoulos H, Mikalef P, Ziogas E, Pappis G, Giannakopoulos I.** Injuries to the infrapatellar branch(es) of the saphenous nerve in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with four-strand hamstring tendon autograft: vertical versus horizontal incision for harvest. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2006; **14**: 789-793 [PMID: [16328463](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-005-0008-3](#)]
- 27 **Mousavi H, Mohammadi M, Aghdam HA.** Injury to the Infrapatellar Branch of the Saphenous Nerve during ACL Reconstruction with Hamstring Tendon Autograft: A Comparison between Oblique and Vertical Incisions. *Arch Bone Jt*

- Surg* 2018; **6**: 52-56 [PMID: [29430496](#) DOI: [10.5812/atr.11146](#)]
- 28 **Figueroa D**, Calvo R, Vaisman A, Campero M, Moraga C. Injury to the infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve in ACL reconstruction with the hamstrings technique: clinical and electrophysiological study. *Knee* 2008; **15**: 360-363 [PMID: [18583136](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.knee.2008.05.002](#)]
  - 29 **Chen X**, Bickham SR, Liu HF, Dosunmu OI, Hurley JE, Li MJ. 25 Gb/s transmission over 820 m of MMF using a multimode launch from an integrated silicon photonics transceiver. *Opt Express* 2014; **22**: 2070-2077 [PMID: [24515216](#) DOI: [10.1364/OE.22.002070](#)]
  - 30 **Pekala PA**, Tomaszewski KA, Henry BM, Ramakrishnan PK, Roy J, Mizia E, Walocha JA. Risk of iatrogenic injury to the infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve during hamstring tendon harvesting: A meta-analysis. *Muscle Nerve* 2017; **56**: 930-937 [PMID: [28120438](#) DOI: [10.1002/mus.25587](#)]
  - 31 **Walshaw T**, Karuppih SV, Stewart I. Erratum to "The course and distribution of the infra patellar nerve in relation to ACL reconstruction" [*Knee* 22 (2015) 384-388]. *Knee* 2016; **23**: 1174 [PMID: [27681096](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.knee.2016.05.002](#)]
  - 32 **Hunter LY**, Louis DS, Ricciardi JR, O'Connor GA. The saphenous nerve: its course and importance in medial arthrotomy. *Am J Sports Med* 1979; **7**: 227-230 [PMID: [474860](#) DOI: [10.1177/036354657900700403](#)]
  - 33 **Grassi A**, Perdida F, Samuelsson K, Svantesson E, Romagnoli M, Raggi F, Gaziano T, Mosca M, Ayeni O, Zaffagnini S. Association between incision technique for hamstring tendon harvest in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction and the risk of injury to the infra-patellar branch of the saphenous nerve: a meta-analysis. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2018; **26**: 2410-2423 [PMID: [29423546](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-018-4858-x](#)]
  - 34 **Pekala PA**, Miza E, Henry BM, Popielusko P, Loukas M, Tomaszewski KA. Injury to the infrapatellar branch of the saphenous nerve during tendon graft harvesting for knee ligament reconstruction: An ultrasound simulation study. *Clin Anat* 2017; **30**: 868-872 [PMID: [28514510](#) DOI: [10.1002/ca.22904](#)]
  - 35 **Leiter J**, Peeler J, McRae S, Wiens S, Hammond A, Froese W, MacDonald P. The Effect of Graft Harvest and Skin Incision Angle on Sensory Disturbance in ACL Reconstruction With Semitendinosus-Gracilis Tendon Graft: A Randomized Controlled Trial and Cadaveric Study. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2020; **8**: 2325967120948954 [PMID: [32974411](#) DOI: [10.1177/2325967120948954](#)]
  - 36 **Tillett E**, Madsen R, Rogers R, Nyland J. Localization of the semitendinosus-gracilis tendon bifurcation point relative to the tibial tuberosity: an aid to hamstring tendon harvest. *Arthroscopy* 2004; **20**: 51-54 [PMID: [14716279](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2003.11.003](#)]
  - 37 **Franz W**, Baumann A. Minimally invasive semitendinosus tendon harvesting from the popliteal fossa versus conventional hamstring tendon harvesting for ACL reconstruction: A prospective, randomised controlled trial in 100 patients. *Knee* 2016; **23**: 106-110 [PMID: [26753501](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.knee.2015.09.001](#)]
  - 38 **Kodkani PS**, Govekar DP, Patankar HS. A new technique of graft harvest for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with quadruple semitendinosus tendon autograft. *Arthroscopy* 2004; **20**: e101-e104 [PMID: [15483531](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2004.07.016](#)]
  - 39 **Letartre R**, Isida R, Pommepuy T, Miletic B. Horizontal posterior hamstring harvest. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2014; **100**: 959-961 [PMID: [25453925](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.otsr.2014.08.002](#)]
  - 40 **Wilson TJ**, Lubowitz JH. Minimally invasive posterior hamstring harvest. *Arthrosc Tech* 2013; **2**: e299-e301 [PMID: [24266003](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.eats.2013.04.008](#)]
  - 41 **Prodromos CC**, Han YS, Keller BL, Bolyard RJ. Posterior mini-incision technique for hamstring anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction graft harvest. *Arthroscopy* 2005; **21**: 130-137 [PMID: [15689860](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2004.09.010](#)]
  - 42 **Khanna K**, Janghala A, Pandya NK. Use of Posterior Hamstring Harvest During Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction in the Pediatric and Adolescent Population. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2018; **6**: 2325967118775597 [PMID: [29900181](#) DOI: [10.1177/2325967118775597](#)]
  - 43 **Shu HT**, Bodendorfer BM, Michaelson EM, Argintar EH. Posteromedial versus Anteromedial Hamstring Tendon Harvest for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: A Retrospective Comparison of Accidental Gracilis Harvests, Outcomes, and Operative Times. *J Knee Surg* 2019; **32**: 1121-1127 [PMID: [30449022](#) DOI: [10.1055/s-0038-1675796](#)]
  - 44 **Roussignol X**, Bertiaux S, Rahali S, Potage D, Duparc F, Dujardin F. Minimally invasive posterior approach in the popliteal fossa for semitendinosus and gracilis tendon harvesting: an anatomic study. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2015; **101**: 167-172 [PMID: [25701163](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.otsr.2014.12.009](#)]
  - 45 **Vinagre G**, Kennedy NI, Chahla J, Cinque ME, Hussain ZB, Olesen ML, LaPrade RF. Hamstring Graft Preparation Techniques for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Arthrosc Tech* 2017; **6**: e2079-e2084 [PMID: [29349000](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.eats.2017.08.031](#)]
  - 46 **Sharma A**, Flanagan DC, Randall K, Magnussen RA. Does Gracilis Preservation Matter in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction? *Arthroscopy* 2016; **32**: 1165-1173 [PMID: [26874800](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2015.11.027](#)]
  - 47 **Ardern CL**, Webster KE. Knee flexor strength recovery following hamstring tendon harvest for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a systematic review. *Orthop Rev (Pavia)* 2009; **1**: e12 [PMID: [21808674](#) DOI: [10.4081/or.2009.e12](#)]
  - 48 **Chin BZ**, Wee IJY, Syn NL, Krishna L. Arthroscopic Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Semitendinosus Alone and Semitendinosus with Gracilis Tendon Autografts. *J Knee Surg* 2019; **32**: 796-803 [PMID: [30206911](#) DOI: [10.1055/s-0038-1669950](#)]
  - 49 **Tashiro T**, Kurosawa H, Kawakami A, Hikita A, Fukui N. Influence of medial hamstring tendon harvest on knee flexor strength after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. A detailed evaluation with comparison of single- and double-tendon harvest. *Am J Sports Med* 2003; **31**: 522-529 [PMID: [12860539](#) DOI: [10.1177/31.4.522](#)]
  - 50 **Nakamura N**, Horibe S, Sasaki S, Kitaguchi T, Tagami M, Mitsuoka T, Toritsuka Y, Hamada M, Shino K. Evaluation of active knee flexion and hamstring strength after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using hamstring tendons. *Arthroscopy* 2002; **18**: 598-602 [PMID: [12098120](#) DOI: [10.1053/jars.2002.32868](#)]
  - 51 **Hu A**, Lawton CD, Nelson P, Selley RS, Sweeney P, Tuttle J, Johnson DJ, Balderama ES, Gryzlo SM, Terry MA. Assessment of Flexion Strength Following Single- Versus Double-Hamstring Tendon Harvest for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Arthroscopy* 2020; **36**: 1409-1416 [PMID: [32001278](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2020.01.019](#)]



- 52 **Adachi N**, Ochi M, Uchio Y, Sakai Y, Kuriwaka M, Fujihara A. Harvesting hamstring tendons for ACL reconstruction influences postoperative hamstring muscle performance. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2003; **123**: 460-465 [PMID: [12920536](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00402-003-0572-2](#)]
- 53 **Yosmaoglu HB**, Baltaci G, Ozer H, Atay A. Effects of additional gracilis tendon harvest on muscle torque, motor coordination, and knee laxity in ACL reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2011; **19**: 1287-1292 [PMID: [21298255](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-011-1412-5](#)]
- 54 **Carter TR**, Edinger S. Isokinetic evaluation of anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: hamstring versus patellar tendon. *Arthroscopy* 1999; **15**: 169-172 [PMID: [10210074](#) DOI: [10.1053/ar.1999.v15.0150161](#)]
- 55 **Karimi-Mobarakeh M**, Mardani-Kivi M, Mortazavi A, Saheb-Ekhtiari K, Hashemi-Motlagh K. Role of gracilis harvesting in four-strand hamstring tendon anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a double-blinded prospective randomized clinical trial. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2015; **23**: 1086-1091 [PMID: [24531357](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-014-2890-z](#)]
- 56 **Gobbi A**, Domzalski M, Pascual J, Zanazzo M. Hamstring anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: is it necessary to sacrifice the gracilis? *Arthroscopy* 2005; **21**: 275-280 [PMID: [15756179](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2004.10.016](#)]
- 57 **Inagaki Y**, Kondo E, Kitamura N, Onodera J, Yagi T, Tanaka Y, Yasuda K. Prospective clinical comparisons of semitendinosus versus semitendinosus and gracilis tendon autografts for anatomic double-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *J Orthop Sci* 2013; **18**: 754-761 [PMID: [23793303](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00776-013-0427-9](#)]
- 58 **Segawa H**, Omori G, Koga Y, Kameo T, Iida S, Tanaka M. Rotational muscle strength of the limb after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using semitendinosus and gracilis tendon. *Arthroscopy* 2002; **18**: 177-182 [PMID: [11830812](#) DOI: [10.1053/jars.2002.29894](#)]
- 59 **Ardern CL**, Webster KE, Taylor NF, Feller JA. Hamstring strength recovery after hamstring tendon harvest for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a comparison between graft types. *Arthroscopy* 2010; **26**: 462-469 [PMID: [20362824](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2009.08.018](#)]
- 60 **Barenus B**, Webster WK, McClelland J, Feller J. Hamstring tendon anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: does gracilis tendon harvest matter? *Int Orthop* 2013; **37**: 207-212 [PMID: [23052280](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00264-012-1672-9](#)]
- 61 **Lipscomb AB**, Johnston RK, Snyder RB, Warburton MJ, Gilbert PP. Evaluation of hamstring strength following use of semitendinosus and gracilis tendons to reconstruct the anterior cruciate ligament. *Am J Sports Med* 1982; **10**: 340-342 [PMID: [7180953](#) DOI: [10.1177/036354658201000603](#)]
- 62 **Han DL**, Nyland J, Kendzior M, Nawab A, Caborn DN. Intratunnel versus extratunnel fixation of hamstring autograft for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy* 2012; **28**: 1555-1566 [PMID: [22560484](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2012.02.021](#)]
- 63 **Saccomanno MF**, Shin JJ, Mascarenhas R, Haro M, Verma NN, Cole BJ, Bach BR Jr. Clinical and functional outcomes after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using cortical button fixation versus transfemoral suspensory fixation: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Arthroscopy* 2014; **30**: 1491-1498 [PMID: [25064753](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2014.05.028](#)]
- 64 **Milano G**, Mulas PD, Zirano F, Piras S, Manunta A, Fabbriani C. Comparison between different femoral fixation devices for ACL reconstruction with doubled hamstring tendon graft: a biomechanical analysis. *Arthroscopy* 2006; **22**: 660-668 [PMID: [16762706](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2006.04.082](#)]
- 65 **Chang CB**, Choi JY, Koh IJ, Lee KJ, Lee KH, Kim TK. Comparisons of femoral tunnel position and length in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: modified transtibial versus anteromedial portal techniques. *Arthroscopy* 2011; **27**: 1389-1394 [PMID: [21889869](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2011.06.013](#)]
- 66 **Wang JH**, Kim JG, Lee DK, Lim HC, Ahn JH. Comparison of femoral graft bending angle and tunnel length between transtibial technique and transtibial technique in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2012; **20**: 1584-1593 [PMID: [22120838](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-011-1781-9](#)]
- 67 **Zantop T**, Ferretti M, Bell KM, Brucker PU, Gilbertson L, Fu FH. Effect of tunnel-graft length on the biomechanics of anterior cruciate ligament-reconstructed knees: intra-articular study in a goat model. *Am J Sports Med* 2008; **36**: 2158-2166 [PMID: [18669984](#) DOI: [10.1177/0363546508320572](#)]
- 68 **Ekdahl M**, Wang JH, Ronga M, Fu FH. Graft healing in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2008; **16**: 935-947 [PMID: [18633596](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-008-0584-0](#)]
- 69 **Barrett GR**, Noojin FK, Hartzog CW, Nash CR. Reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament in females: A comparison of hamstring versus patellar tendon autograft. *Arthroscopy* 2002; **18**: 46-54 [PMID: [11774141](#) DOI: [10.1053/jars.2002.25974](#)]
- 70 **Debieux P**, Franciozi CES, Lenza M, Tamaoki MJ, Magnussen RA, Faloppa F. Bioabsorbable vs metallic interference screws for graft fixation in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016 [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.cd009772](#)]
- 71 **Chen NC**, Brand JC Jr, Brown CH Jr. Biomechanics of intratunnel anterior cruciate ligament graft fixation. *Clin Sports Med* 2007; **26**: 695-714 [PMID: [17920961](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.csm.2007.06.009](#)]
- 72 **Boutsiadis A**, Panisset JC, Devitt BM, Mauris F, Barthelemy R, Barth J. Anterior Laxity at 2 Years After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Is Comparable When Using Adjustable-Loop Suspensory Fixation and Interference Screw Fixation. *Am J Sports Med* 2018; **46**: 2366-2375 [PMID: [30015501](#) DOI: [10.1177/0363546518784005](#)]
- 73 **Fu CW**, Chen WC, Lu YC. Is all-inside with suspensory cortical button fixation a superior technique for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery? *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2020; **21**: 445 [PMID: [32635920](#) DOI: [10.1186/s12891-020-03471-3](#)]
- 74 **Baumfeld JA**, Diduch DR, Rubino LJ, Hart JA, Miller MD, Barr MS, Hart JM. Tunnel widening following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using hamstring autograft: a comparison between double cross-pin and suspensory graft fixation. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2008; **16**: 1108-1113 [PMID: [18791702](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-008-0606-y](#)]
- 75 **Sabat D**, Kundu K, Arora S, Kumar V. Tunnel widening after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a prospective randomized computed tomography--based study comparing 2 different femoral fixation methods for hamstring graft. *Arthroscopy* 2011; **27**: 776-783 [PMID: [21624672](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2011.02.009](#)]
- 76 **Saygi B**, Karaman O, Sirin E, Arslan I, Demir A, Oztermeli A. Comparison of different femoral fixation implants and fit

- techniques for tunnel widening and clinical outcome in ACL reconstruction using hamstring autograft. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2016; **136**: 241-247 [PMID: [26471986](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00402-015-2348-x](#)]
- 77 **Shen HC**, Chang JH, Lee CH, Shen PH, Yeh TT, Wu CC, Kuo CL. Biomechanical comparison of Cross-pin and Endobutton-CL femoral fixation of a flexor tendon graft for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction--a porcine femur-graft-tibia complex study. *J Surg Res* 2010; **161**: 282-287 [PMID: [19524939](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.jss.2009.01.015](#)]
- 78 **Vertullo CJ**, Piepenbrink M, Smith PA, Wilson AJ, Wijdicks CA. Biomechanical Testing of Three Alternative Quadrupled Tendon Graft Constructs With Adjustable Loop Suspensory Fixation for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Compared With Four-Strand Grafts Fixed With Screws and Femoral Fixed Loop Devices. *Am J Sports Med* 2019; **47**: 828-836 [PMID: [30789779](#) DOI: [10.1177/0363546518825256](#)]
- 79 **Speziali A**, Delcogliano M, Tei M, Placella G, Bartoli M, Menghi A, Cerulli G. Fixation techniques for the anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: early follow-up. A systematic review of level I and II therapeutic studies. *Musculoskelet Surg* 2014; **98**: 179-187 [PMID: [25269758](#) DOI: [10.1007/s12306-014-0338-8](#)]
- 80 **Hu B**, Shen W, Zhou C, Meng J, Wu H, Yan S. Cross Pin Versus Interference Screw for Femoral Graft Fixation in Hamstring Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Clinical Outcomes. *Arthroscopy* 2018; **34**: 615-623 [PMID: [29066266](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.arthro.2017.07.031](#)]
- 81 **Shanmugaraj A**, Mahendralingam M, Gohal C, Horner N, Simunovic N, Musahl V, Samuelsson K, Ayeni OR. Press-fit fixation in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction yields low graft failure and revision rates: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2021; **29**: 1750-1759 [PMID: [32785757](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00167-020-06173-4](#)]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**  
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-3991568

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**Help Desk:** <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

