

## Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury Management Modalities

Ahmed Mohammed Adel Shafik<sup>1</sup>, Abdel Salam Mohammed Hefny<sup>1</sup>, Ahmed Abdel Aziz Ahmed<sup>2</sup>, Mohamed Saeed ElAttar<sup>1</sup>, Mohamed Mostafa Sayed Abouzeid Gad<sup>3</sup>, Mohammed Gamal Hegazi<sup>4</sup>

1 Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Egypt

2 Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, Egypt

3 Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Sheikh Khalifa Medical City Ajman

4 Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Ministry of Health, Egypt

Corresponding author: Ahmed Mohammed Adel Shafik

E-mail: [ahm.shafik111@gmail.com](mailto:ahm.shafik111@gmail.com), [a.mohamed23@medicine.zu.edu.eg](mailto:a.mohamed23@medicine.zu.edu.eg)

Conflict of interest: None declared

Funding: No funding sources

### Abstract

**Sports medicine physicians have a keen clinical and research interest in the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL). The biomechanical, biologic, and clinical data researchers generate, help drive injury management and prevention practices globally. The current concepts in ACL injury and surgery are being shaped by technological advances, expansion in basic science research, resurging interest in ACL preservation, and expanding efforts regarding injury prevention. As new methods are being developed in this field, the primary goal of safely improving patient outcomes will be a unifying principle. With this review, we provide an overview of topics currently in controversy or debate, and we identify paradigm shifts in the understanding, and management, of ACL tears.**

**Keywords: anterior cruciate ligament, injury management, reconstruction, rehabilitation**

**Tob Regul Sci.™ 2023;9(1): 1055-1073**

**DOI: [doi.org/10.18001/TRS.9.1.72](https://doi.org/10.18001/TRS.9.1.72)**

### Introduction:

The anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) is considered the primary passive restraint to anterior translation of the tibia on the femur, and it provides rotational stability to the knee in both the frontal and transverse planes.<sup>1,2,3</sup> ACL tears account for up to 64% of athletic knee injuries in cutting and pivoting sports, and these injuries result in 120,000–200,000 ACL reconstructions (ACLRs) performed annually in the United States alone, with a cost of around 1.7 billion US

dollars annually.<sup>4,5,6,7</sup> Injuries to the ACL often result in joint effusion, altered knee kinematics and gait, muscle weakness, and reduced functional performance, and they are associated with long term clinical sequelae such as meniscal tears, chondral lesions, and development of early onset posttraumatic osteoarthritis (OA).<sup>8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16</sup> The ACL is among the most heavily studied anatomic structures in the human body, resulting in a plethora of biomechanical, biologic, and clinical data, driving paradigm shifts in nearly every facet of ACL injury management and prevention. In the following sections, we provide a brief overview of where ACL injury management has been, the driving forces for where it is today, and where it is going.

### Anterior Cruciate Ligament Anatomy, Biomechanics, and Injury Mechanisms

The ACL is comprised of two bundles which are named for their relative insertion sites on the tibia: anteromedial (AM) and posterolateral (PL). Along the lateral wall of the intercondylar notch, two prominent osseous ridges mark the borders of the femoral ACL insertion site: the lateral intercondylar ridge demarcates the anterior border of the ACL, while the lateral bifurcate ridge, running perpendicular to the lateral intercondylar ridge, separates the femoral attachment sites of the two bundles.<sup>14,17</sup> The AM bundle is nearly isometric, with a tendency toward slightly more tension during flexion than in extension.<sup>4</sup> Due to this quality, the AM bundle is considered the center of ACL rotation.<sup>18</sup> The PL bundle is lax in flexion and becomes taught during the end range of extension (from 15° of flexion to 0°).<sup>4</sup> This relationship allows the AM bundle to provide both rotational and translational (sagittal plane) stability, whereas the PL bundle provides more rotational stability.<sup>4</sup>

In 2013, Iriuchishima et al. described that the ACL has a smaller cross-sectional area at its midsubstance in comparison to its tibial and femoral attachments.<sup>19,20</sup> Further, the ACL has a band-like shape along its length, fanning out like a trumpet at its tibial insertion site, and crescent-like shape at the femur.<sup>21,22,23</sup>

There are three main ACL injury mechanisms: direct contact, indirect contact, and noncontact.<sup>24,25,26</sup> Direct contact injuries are sustained when a person or object strikes the knee directly. Indirect contact injuries occur when a person or object strikes a part of the body other than the knee itself, causing excessive forces to be transferred through the knee (such as a direct blow the thigh, translating the femur posterior in respect to the tibia), resulting in ACL failure. Noncontact injuries are sustained when a deceleration or change in direction (pivot) force are applied to the knee but often encompass an ill-timed neuromuscular firing of structures around the knee, causing translation of the tibia on the femur, which results in ACL failure.<sup>24,25,26</sup> Noncontact mechanisms account for 60%–70% of ACL injuries. The neuromuscular and biomechanical factors which play into this mechanism will be discussed later during the injury prevention section.<sup>24,25,27,28,29,30</sup>

### Treatment Options and Techniques

### Nonoperative, repair, and reconstruction

Nonoperative management of ACL tears is poorly tolerated by both young active adults and in the skeletally immature. This often leads to recurrent instability and the development of chondral and meniscal injuries.<sup>4,14,15,16</sup> A 2016 Cochrane review looked at randomized control trial outcomes of adult patients undergoing nonoperative management of ACL ruptures in the form of structured rehabilitation alone versus ACLR followed by structured rehabilitation. One study identified by reviewers found no difference between surgery and conservative treatment in patient-reported knee scores at 2 and 5 years. However, 39% of the participants randomized to the nonoperative treatment group underwent either ACLR for continued knee instability or meniscus repair within 2 years of their ACL rupture, while 51% did so within 5 years.<sup>31</sup>

ACL repair was the first reported surgical treatment in the management of ACL tears, first described by Robson in the early 1900s, and it is performed by re-approximating the ruptured ends of the native ACL with the use of suture or suture anchors.<sup>1,32</sup> Conversely, ACLR is characterized by debriding the torn end of the native ACL, and a new ligament is reconstructed using grafts such as hamstring tendon (HT), bone-patellar tendon-bone (BPTB), or quadriceps tendon (QT) to reconstitute the anatomy and function of the native ACL.<sup>1</sup> This tissue can be harvested from the patient (autograft) or from a cadaver (allograft).

### Reconstruction types: Nonanatomic, anatomic, single- and double-bundle techniques

Traditional ACLRs are considered nonanatomic, placing the graft outside of the native insertion of the ACL. Vertically oriented grafts, often observed in nonanatomic reconstructions, have demonstrated the ability to reconstitute stability in the sagittal plane (anterior-posterior) but fail to provide adequate rotational stability.<sup>4</sup> Further, nonanatomic tunnel placement can alter the forces experienced by the graft and is one of the main reasons grafts fail (continued instability or re-rupture) after ACLR.<sup>14,33,34</sup>

The current trend is toward anatomic ACLR in an attempt to restore the native ACL footprint on both the tibial and femoral sides of the knee to recreate the native functional kinematics.<sup>4</sup> A “one-size fits all” approach to ACLR is not recommended as variation in anatomy, injury pattern, and demands between individuals should influence the surgeon's decision-making. In general, decisions in ACLR types should be guided by the following principles:

1. Double bundle reconstruction surgery is, in general, considered in patients with a large tibial insertion site (anteroposterior length >14 mm), large intercondylar notch (length and width >14 mm), in the absence of concomitant ligament injuries, absence of advanced arthritic changes (Kellgren Lawrence grade <3), absence of severe bone bruising, and closed physes
2. Single bundle reconstruction, conversely, is indicated for tibial insertion sites less than 14 mm in length, narrow notches (less than 12 mm in width), in the presence of concomitant

ligamentous injuries, severe bone bruising, severe arthritic changes (grade 3 or higher Kellgren Lawrence changes) and in the setting of open physes.<sup>14,35,36,37</sup>

The purpose of the double-bundle graft is to reconstruct both the AM and PL bundles, with the intent of more closely reproducing the native knee anatomy and subsequently kinematics.<sup>17,19,38</sup> Multiple biomechanical studies support this concept.<sup>19,39,40,41</sup> However, other studies present conflicting data and raise concerns. A 2012 Cochrane review assessed both subjective and objective clinical outcome data in double-bundle versus single-bundle ACLR in adults. Although there was limited evidence that double-bundle ACLR has some superior results in objective measurements (i.e., return to preinjury activity level, International Knee Documentation Committee [IKDC] knee examination, KT-1000 scores, and for rotational stability on pivot shift test); insufficient evidence was found to determine relative effectiveness (i.e., subjective knee scores, long term knee pain, complications).<sup>42</sup>

When patients are individually assigned to treatment groups based on the size of the ACL native insertion site and the intercondylar notch width, prospective studies demonstrate no difference in terms of anteroposterior and rotational laxity between single or double-bundle reconstruction techniques.<sup>14,43</sup> A number of studies demonstrate that the biomechanical promise of double-bundle reconstruction fails to translate into clinical significance and may predispose the graft to impingement and excessive tension through the PL bundle during knee extension, resulting early graft rupture or attenuation.<sup>14,19,39,40,41,44</sup> Further, other biomechanical studies demonstrate that anatomic single-bundle grafts tensioned either maximally in extension or submaximally at 20°–30° of flexion most closely reproduce native knee kinematics.<sup>4</sup> As such, double-bundle reconstruction has lost momentum in the United States in favor of anatomic single bundle reconstruction.<sup>45,46,47,48</sup>

### Tunnel drilling

Tunnel drilling is a topic of paradigm shift as growing literature expresses concerns with difficulty in achieving anatomic reconstruction with transtibial drilling of femoral tunnels. As such, transtibial technique is falling more out of practice (decreased from 56.4% in 2007 to 17.6% in 2014) as a growing number of surgeons perform an outside-in technique or use guides placed through the AM portal (increased from 41.3% in 2007 to 65.1% in 2014).<sup>49</sup> Outcome data including fewer persistently positive Lachman and pivot shift tests, lower KT-1000 scores, and higher Lysholm scores in the transtibial groups further support this paradigm shift.<sup>4,49,50</sup>

### Fixation types

At this time, there is no clear consensus on superiority of aperture, suspensory cortical, or button graft fixation or screw (metal/biologic) versus button graft fixation. There are multiple types of screw types available for the use in aperture fixation, broadly falling under metal versus biologic/bioabsorbable screws. Biologic screws can be associated with tunnel widening, a complication infrequently observed in metallic screw fixation. However, biologic screws allow for

advanced imaging of the knee postoperatively without metal artifact. From 2007 to 2014, Tibor et al. report a decrease in use of first-generation bioabsorbable screws for graft fixation and a shift toward biocomposite fixation when performing interference screw fixation.<sup>49</sup> When securing soft tissue grafts, recent studies favor suspensory fixation which fosters better junctional bone-tendon healing as well as stronger zero time fixation.<sup>4</sup> These basic science studies have translated into a 12%–13% yearly increase (from 2007 to 2014) in the use of femoral-sided suspensory fixation for soft tissue grafts.<sup>49</sup>

### Graft Type

The selection of a graft type should be based on patient-specific factors (i.e., patient age, skeletal maturity, and activity level) and supported by evidence in the current literature.<sup>4,6</sup> There are tradeoffs between autograft and allograft and within subsets of these two categories (i.e., HT, QT, and BPTB). The surgeon must be conscientious of donor side and site morbidity when taking autografts, as well as biomechanical properties of different graft types as they apply toward the demands of the patient, regardless of the graft type (HT, QT, and BPTB).

When considering autograft versus allograft, Wasserstein et al. demonstrate a 2.6-fold higher rate of failure when using allograft versus autograft in patients <25 years of age, concluding that autograft remains the graft of choice in young athletes aiming to return to high-level athletic activities.<sup>4,51</sup> Again, this highlights that use of allograft is not recommended in treating the young or high-demand patient.

The use of nonirradiated allograft has been increasing in the older and/or less active population. Nonirradiated allograft reconstruction has been associated with an increased risk of graft failure in young, active patients. However, when used in a middle-aged or recreational athlete, nonirradiated allograft reconstruction has demonstrated acceptable and often equivalent outcomes to autograft, provided that strict rehabilitation parameters are set to allow 8–12 months for graft ligamentization before return to recreational activities.<sup>4,52</sup>

Recent studies comparing BPTB and HT autografts demonstrate an increased risk of failure/revision ACLR, persistently positive pivot shift test, diminished return to preinjury levels of activity, and higher rates of infection associated with HT autograft, while BPTB autografts have a higher incidence of anterior knee pain and pain when kneeling.<sup>4,53,54</sup>

Allograft augmentation of autografts has become a topic of recent investigation. One recent study assessed the clinical and cost-effectiveness of hamstring autograft alone versus a hybrid of hamstring autograft with semitendinosus allograft augmentation in patients under 18 years of age. Jacobs et al. reported an 11.9% failure rate in those receiving the hybrid HT autograft with allograft augmentation versus 28.3% failure rate in those receiving HT autograft alone. This reduced revision rate also translated into an incremental cost savings of US\$2765.<sup>55</sup>

### Quadriceps autograft

Regarding graft choice, BPTB and hamstring autografts have long been considered the main graft choices for young, active patients. The advantages of the patella tendon graft include a strong stiff graft, secure fixation, potential for bone-to-bone ingrowth, and low failure rates. However, BPTB autografts can be associated with significant donor-site morbidity.<sup>56,57</sup> HT grafts have demonstrated equivalent functional outcomes and less donor-site morbidity than BPTB but with increased laxity and higher failure rates.<sup>56</sup> Because of this tradeoff, surgeons have continued to search for alternative graft options, leading to the increased popularity of QT autografts.<sup>56,58</sup> In clinical studies, QT grafts have demonstrated good strength, low donor-site morbidity, and reliable long term outcomes.<sup>56,59</sup> Historically, QT grafts have been used for ACL revision surgery but never gained general acceptance for primary ACLR. However, QT graft harvest and fixation techniques have been simplified using a minimally invasive approach and this makes it an increasingly attractive option for primary reconstruction.<sup>60</sup>

Fischer et al. explain that since the quadriceps is an ACL antagonist, slightly impaired function of this muscle may protect the ACL graft against the quadriceps anteriorly directed force, whereas decreased hamstring strength combined with high relative quadriceps strength may increase risk for ACL rupture.<sup>61</sup> Further, biomechanical studies demonstrate that the residual strength of the QT after graft harvest is higher than that of the intact patellar tendon, which suggests that extensor mechanism strength is compromised less by QT graft harvest than by BPTB.<sup>57</sup>

A number of clinical studies have found good outcomes and support the selection of QT as an option for graft choice. Systematic reviews conclude that QT autograft ACLR yields good outcomes and stability comparable to BPTB and HT grafts regarding postoperative Lachman's test, pivot-shift test, IKDC scores, and Lysholm scores, with minimal donor-site morbidity.<sup>56,57</sup> No differences in residual laxity or patient-reported outcomes have been described between BPTB and QT in primary ACLR, while QT autograft is associated with better outcomes regarding extensor mechanism strength with equal or better functional outcomes than HT graft, without affecting morbidity.<sup>58</sup> Patients who underwent primary ACLR with QT autograft demonstrate significantly higher hamstring-to-quadriceps ratio than HT grafts within 1 year after surgery, which may be protective during the first several months of ACL graft maturation.<sup>61</sup> A recent systematic review concludes that the use of QT for ACLR is safe, reproducible, and versatile.<sup>58</sup>

### Resurgence of Primary Anterior Cruciate Ligament Repair

Historically, poor outcomes have been associated with primary ACL repair. Results reported by Feagin and Curl and Cabaud et al. led to the generalized preference of ACLR over repair.<sup>4,62,63,64,65,66</sup> However, a number of limitations affect the generalizability of these early results as follows.

1. Repair was attempted on all types of ACL tears
2. Many had concomitant ligamentous injuries
3. The inherent morbidity associated with open approaches and prolonged postoperative immobilization led to significant motion loss and patellofemoral issues.<sup>67,68</sup>

Recently, there has been an increasing interest in ACL preservation as an option to perhaps better restore native ACL anatomy, biomechanics, and neurosensory function.<sup>65,69</sup> The reason for this paradigm shift is due to advancements in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) quality, regenerative medicine and tissue engineering capabilities, arthroscopic techniques and instrumentation, as well as a better appreciation of the importance of early mobilization in rehabilitation.<sup>1,67,68,70</sup>

Primary repair aims to preserve the native ACL's inherent healing capacity, proprioceptive function, and knee kinematics.<sup>67,68,69,71,72,73,74</sup> Histological analysis demonstrates that the proximal one-third of the ACL has an intrinsic healing response similar to the medial collateral ligament and that the proximal and distal remnants of a torn ACL are mechanoreceptor rich.<sup>75</sup> Primary ACL repair can now be performed arthroscopically with the use of newer devices, which allows the remnant to be tensioned directly, while advanced approaches to rehabilitation with a focus on early motion help mitigate the high rates of stiffness and debilitating patellofemoral pain seen in prior series.<sup>65,76</sup>

Achtlich et al. compared clinical and radiographic outcomes between primary ACL repair and reconstruction at a minimum 2-year followup.<sup>70</sup> They reported a 15% failure rate in the repair group versus 0% in the reconstruction group and confirmed ACL presence on MRI in 100% of reconstruction cases versus 86% of repairs at a mean followup of 28 months. However, they concluded that primary repair was a reasonable option in a select patient population and could restore stability and yield good functional outcomes comparable to that of reconstruction, a conclusion echoed by Taylor et al. in their 2015 systematic review.<sup>70,77</sup>

In general, primary ACL repair does not burn bridges in the event of revision; failed repair is treated similar to a primary ACLR. In contrast, failed reconstruction can be fraught with complex obstacles and complications such as tunnel widening, preexisting tunnel malposition, removal or management of interference screws, and the need for bone grafting.<sup>65,76</sup>

It is important to carefully select the correct patients for primary repair. Sherman et al. stressed the importance of assessing ACL tear type and tissue quality, noting that patients with proximal avulsion tears (Sherman Type 1: soft tissue avulsion directly off the femoral footprint with minimal residual ligament on the femur) and excellent tissue quality are the best patient subset to consider for primary repair.<sup>1,65,66</sup>

Overall, primary ACL repair may be considered in the setting of proximal tears with good tissue quality, whereas ACLR remains the preferred technique in nonproximal tears (Sherman Type 3, 4

or midsubstance), those with concomitant ligamentous injuries (limiting early ACL focused rehabilitation), or those with poor tissue quality.<sup>1,66,67,68</sup>

### Internal Bracing

While ACLR, primary ACL repair, or partial bundle reconstruction are treatment options that can be performed in isolation, augmentation of these constructs with an internal brace is an evolving surgical option.<sup>76</sup> Internal bracing represents a promising area in novel ACL research. The goal is to help protect the graft during early rehabilitation and to facilitate safe and efficient return to activity with the potential for reduced re injury risk.<sup>78</sup> Use of collagen coated, ultrahigh molecular weight polyethylene/polyester suture tape as an internal brace has been investigated.<sup>69</sup> Clinical studies demonstrate improved stability and graft protection. Basic science studies have demonstrated that the internal brace functions as a load-sharing device, still allowing the graft to see enough stress to undergo ligamentization.<sup>79</sup>

Concerns remain regarding the safety of exposed intraarticular, collagen-coated, ultrahigh-molecular-weight polyethylene/polyester suture tape. However, in a canine study investigating ACLR with concomitant internal bracing, Cook et al. found that the combined tendon allograft with synthetic suture tape allowed for an effective biologic-synthetic hybrid load-sharing ACL construct, prevented early failure, allowed for direct, four-zone graft-to-bone healing, and functional graft remodeling while avoiding soft tissue reaction and other problems prominently associated with all-synthetic grafts without the development of premature OA.<sup>79</sup>

In clinical studies that look at ACL repair augmented by internal brace, included patients demonstrated functional stability with near-normal knee function, excellent patient satisfaction, and return to previous levels of competition activity in the majority of patients.<sup>80</sup> These findings are promising also helping to support the recent paradigm shift in the treatment of proximal ACL tears as previously discussed.

### Anterolateral Ligament

In 2013, Claes et al. formally described the anterolateral ligament (ALL).<sup>81</sup> This study brought attention back to the extraarticular anterolateral soft tissue structures of the knee. There has been much debate about the function of the ALL and defining the role of surgical reconstruction in the setting of ACL tear.

The ALL is proposed to provide rotational stability to the knee and to a lesser extent anterior tibial translation. Imbert et al. describe more specifically that, in their biomechanical study, an anisometric behavior of the ALL is observed – where the ALL is tight in both extension and in the presence of internal rotation at 20° of flexion, and that the ligament relaxed through continued flexion to 120° and continued to be lax during internal rotation at 90° of flexion.<sup>82</sup> Isolated ACLR can fail to fully restore normal rotational stability, which may contribute to subsequent articular injuries.<sup>83</sup> Biomechanical studies demonstrate that in an ACL-deficient knee, the ALL experiences



significantly increased forces during anterior drawer and Lachman's tests and to a lesser extent during pivot shift. Further, these studies have found 2–3 mm of increased anterior tibial translation after sectioning of the ALL.<sup>84</sup> Because of its potential role in preventing translation and internal rotation near extension, it may be a factor behind a high grade of pivot shift and a failure to restore normal kinematics in some individuals undergoing ACLR only; a majority of biomechanical, clinical, and cadaver studies support this theory.<sup>82,83,84,85,86</sup>

As noted above, there is still some disagreement regarding the role of individual anterolateral structures as well as the management of rotatory laxity in ACL-deficient knees. However, it is known that the anterolateral structures do significantly contribute to rotational knee stability. Surgical treatment should be considered in the setting of ACL injury with a high-grade pivot shift or persistent pivot shift following anatomic reconstruction, in young active patients with profound underlying hyperlaxity, and in the revision setting.<sup>85</sup>

#### Biologic Agents in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Repair/Reconstruction

Growing interest has been placed on investigating biologic agents, both in the realm of ACLR and in the development of minimally invasive options to treat stable partial tears.<sup>87</sup> The main effort of these studies has been focused on two agents: platelet-rich plasma (PRP) and stem cells.

PRP is the most heavily used of the two agents in orthopedics, and its presence in literature reflects that being investigated in 22 of 23 studies included in a recent systematic review.<sup>87,88,89</sup> Overall, there is no consensus on the role and impact of PRP on ACL repair or reconstruction. However, a number of studies suggest that PRP may promote graft maturation over time, but this is still controversial and there are studies which fail to support this finding.<sup>87,90,91</sup> There is no demonstrated benefit toward bone-graft integration or prevention of bony tunnel enlargement.<sup>87,92</sup> Use of PRP in partial tears is still poorly understood and scarcely investigated in humans at this time. Recent canine studies suggest that PRP may reduce pain and improve range of motion and limb function, and it demonstrates evidence of repair with decreased synovitis on histologic examination compared to saline injection.<sup>87,93</sup> One major limiting factor in evaluation of PRP is the significant variability in harvest, preparation, and location of application/injection, as well as inherent variability in patient biology, impacting the composition and biologic activity of the concentrate.<sup>92,94</sup> Not only does the PRP compositions of platelets and leukocytes vary between individuals when using the same system, but it also varies for the same individual when collected at different times.<sup>95</sup> For this reason, some more recent systems attempt to standardize or even allow customization of PRP concentrates by use of flow cytometry.

Much public attention has been placed on the use of stems cells in regenerative medicine. However, their role in management of ACL injuries is highly debated and poorly understood. In DiMatteo's 2016 systematic review, only two studies evaluating the use of stems cells on partial ACL tears met their criteria: one looking at the effects of stem cells alone and the other in concert with PRP.<sup>87,96,97</sup>

In 2014, Silva et al. used MRI to assess the effect of adult noncultivated bone marrow stem cells on tendon-to-bone healing in the femoral tunnel in ACLR. Their findings suggest that adult noncultivated bone marrow stem cells do not appear to accelerate graft-to-bone healing in ACLR.<sup>87,96</sup>

Centeno et al. performed a prospective trial where patients were treated by fluoroscopic-guided intraligamentary injection of PRP, platelet lysate, and bone marrow-derived stem cells. Seven out of 10 patients demonstrated changes consistent with ACL healing on MRI evaluation at 3 months following the procedure.<sup>87,97</sup>

Some studies have begun to evaluate the comparative multilineage potential of mesenchymal stem cells from different tissues. In 2017, Ćuti et al. concluded that in vitro, mesenchymal stem cells derived from muscle tissue had greater innate capacity to enhance bone-tendon integration and graft ligamentization than those derived from the HT itself. They suggest that instead of stripping all the remnant muscle from the harvested HT autograft, that leaving some of the remnant muscle on the tendon may yield better graft maturation and integration.<sup>98</sup> An additional study compared the multilineage potential of stem cells derived from HT versus that from the native ACL. They concluded that stem cells derived from the ACL have a much higher multilineage potential than those from an HT graft and suggested that external stimuli are important for HT graft maturation and restoration of more normal ligamentous properties and function.<sup>99</sup>

Again, results investigating the use of stem cells are subject to a number of the same limitations as PRP regarding variable patient biology as well as heterogeneity of harvesting, preparation, and application techniques.

### Summary

The treatment of ACL injury is a dynamic and evolving field. Strategies change as we gain a better understanding of the native knee kinematics, basic science of ligament healing, improved surgical techniques, better recognition of major causes of ACL surgical failure, injury risk detection, and primary prevention. It is important that we continue to reflect on where we have been and where we are going. Healthy debate is critical to analyze novel concepts and to learn from the success and failure of those who came before us. What is in and out in ACL surgery may change over time, but intellectual curiosity and the drive to safely improve patient outcomes are a unifying principle that remains constant.

### References:

1. Kiapour AM, Murray MM. Basic science of anterior cruciate ligament injury and repair. *Bone Joint Res.* 2014;3:20–31. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Butler DL, Noyes FR, Grood ES. Ligamentous restraints to anterior-posterior drawer in the human knee. A biomechanical study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1980;62:259–70. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

3. Kiapour AM, Wordeman SC, Paterno MV, Quatman CE, Levine JW, Goel VK, et al. Diagnostic value of knee arthrometry in the prediction of anterior cruciate ligament strain during landing. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42:312–9. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Stannard JP, Sherman SL, Cook JL. Soft tissues about the knee. In: Grauer JN, editor. *AAOS Orthopaedic Knowledge Update 12.* Ch. 36. 2017. pp. 1–13. [Google Scholar]
5. Ellman MB, Sherman SL, Forsythe B, LaPrade RF, Cole BJ, Bach BR, Jr, et al. Return to play following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.* 2015;23:283–96. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Duchman KR, Lynch TS, Spindler KP. Graft selection in anterior cruciate ligament surgery: Who gets what and why? *Clin Sports Med.* 2017;36:25–33. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Kim S, Bosque J, Meehan JP, Jamali A, Marder R. Increase in outpatient knee arthroscopy in the United States: A comparison of national surveys of ambulatory surgery, 1996 and 2006. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2011;93:994–1000. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Levine JW, Kiapour AM, Quatman CE, Wordeman SC, Goel VK, Hewett TE, et al. Clinically relevant injury patterns after an anterior cruciate ligament injury provide insight into injury mechanisms. *Am J Sports Med.* 2013;41:385–95. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Chu CR, Beynon BD, Buckwalter JA, Garrett WE, Jr, Katz JN, Rodeo SA, et al. Closing the gap between bench and bedside research for early arthritis therapies (EARTH): Report from the AOSSM/NIH U-13 Post-Joint Injury Osteoarthritis Conference II. *Am J Sports Med.* 2011;39:1569–78. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Lohmander LS, Ostenberg A, Englund M, Roos H. High prevalence of knee osteoarthritis, pain, and functional limitations in female soccer players twelve years after anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2004;50:3145–52. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Nebelung W, Wuschech H. Thirty-five years of followup of anterior cruciate ligament-deficient knees in high-level athletes. *Arthroscopy.* 2005;21:696–702. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
12. von Porat A, Roos EM, Roos H. High prevalence of osteoarthritis 14 years after an anterior cruciate ligament tear in male soccer players: A study of radiographic and patient relevant outcomes. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2004;63:269–73. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
13. Quatman CE, Kiapour A, Myer GD, Ford KR, Demetropoulos CK, Goel VK, et al. Cartilage pressure distributions provide a footprint to define female anterior cruciate ligament injury mechanisms. *Am J Sports Med.* 2011;39:1706–13. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Rahnemai-Azar AA, Sabzevari S, Irarrázaval S, Chao T, Fu FH. Anatomical individualized ACL reconstruction. *Arch Bone Joint Surg.* 2016;4:291–7. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

15. Ajuied A, Wong F, Smith C, Norris M, Earnshaw P, Back D, et al. Anterior cruciate ligament injury and radiologic progression of knee osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42:2242–52. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Atarod M, Frank CB, Shrive NG. Increased meniscal loading after anterior cruciate ligament transection in vivo: A longitudinal study in sheep. *Knee.* 2015;22:11–7. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Fu FH, Jordan SS. The lateral intercondylar ridge – A key to anatomic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2007;89:2103–4. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
18. Sonnery-Cottet B, Chambat P. Arthroscopic identification of the anterior cruciate ligament posterolateral bundle: The figure-of-four position. *Arthroscopy.* 2007;23:1128.e1–3. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
19. Paschos NK, Howell SM. Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Principles of treatment. *EFORT Open Rev.* 2016;1:398–408. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. Iriuchishima T, Yorifuji H, Aizawa S, Tajika Y, Murakami T, Fu FH, et al. Evaluation of ACL mid-substance cross-sectional area for reconstructed autograft selection. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2014;22:207–13. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. Guenther D, Irrarázaval S, Nishizawa Y, Vernacchia C, Thorhauer E, Musahl V, et al. Variation in the shape of the tibial insertion site of the anterior cruciate ligament: Classification is required. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2015;25:2428–2432. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. Sasaki N, Ishibashi Y, Tsuda E, Yamamoto Y, Maeda S, Mizukami H, et al. The femoral insertion of the anterior cruciate ligament: Discrepancy between macroscopic and histological observations. *Arthroscopy.* 2012;28:1135–46. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. Triantafyllidi E, Paschos NK, Goussia A, Barkoula NM, Exarchos DA, Matikas TE, et al. The shape and the thickness of the anterior cruciate ligament along its length in relation to the posterior cruciate ligament: A cadaveric study. *Arthroscopy.* 2013;29:1963–73. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
24. Lang PJ, Sugimoto D, Micheli LJ. Prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of anterior cruciate ligament injuries in children. *Open Access J Sports Med.* 2017;8:133–41. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
25. Boden BP, Dean GS, Feagin JA, Jr, Garrett WE., Jr Mechanisms of anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Orthopedics.* 2000;23:573–8. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
26. Hewett TE. An introduction to understanding and preventing ACL injury. In: Hewett TE, Schultz SJ, Griffin L, editors. *Understanding and Preventing Non-Contact ACL Injury.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; 2007. pp. xxi–xxviii. [Google Scholar]

27. Arendt E, Dick R. Knee injury patterns among men and women in collegiate basketball and soccer. NCAA data and review of literature. *Am J Sports Med.* 1995;23:694–701. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. Agel J, Arendt EA, Bershadsky B. Anterior cruciate ligament injury in national collegiate athletic association basketball and soccer: A 13-year review. *Am J Sports Med.* 2005;33:524–30. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
29. Myklebust G, Maehlum S, Engebretsen L, Strand T, Solheim E. Registration of cruciate ligament injuries in Norwegian top level team handball. A prospective study covering two seasons. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 1997;7:289–92. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
30. Waldén M, Hägglund M, Magnusson H, Ekstrand J. Anterior cruciate ligament injury in elite football: A prospective three-cohort study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2011;19:11–9. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
31. Monk AP, Davies LJ, Hopewell S, Harris K, Beard DJ, Price AJ, et al. Surgical versus conservative interventions for treating anterior cruciate ligament injuries. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016;4:CD011166. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
32. Robson AW. VI. Ruptured crucial ligaments and their repair by operation. *Ann Surg.* 1903;37:716–8. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
33. Chen JL, Allen CR, Stephens TE, Haas AK, Huston LJ, Wright RW, et al. Differences in mechanisms of failure, intraoperative findings, and surgical characteristics between single- and multiple-revision ACL reconstructions: A MARS cohort study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2013;41:1571–8. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
34. Araujo PH, Asai S, Pinto M, Protta T, Middleton K, Linde-Rosen M, et al. ACL graft position affects in situ graft force following ACL reconstruction. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2015;97:1767–73. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
35. van Eck CF, Lesniak BP, Schreiber VM, Fu FH. Anatomic single- and double-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction flowchart. *Arthroscopy.* 2010;26:258–68. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
36. Shen W, Forsythe B, Ingham SM, Honkamp NJ, Fu FH. Application of the anatomic double-bundle reconstruction concept to revision and augmentation anterior cruciate ligament surgeries. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2008;90(Suppl 4):20–34. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
37. Kopf S, Pombo MW, Szczodry M, Irrgang JJ, Fu FH. Size variability of the human anterior cruciate ligament insertion sites. *Am J Sports Med.* 2011;39:108–13. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
38. Colombet P, Robinson J, Christel P, Franceschi JP, Djian P, Bellier G, et al. Morphology of anterior cruciate ligament attachments for anatomic reconstruction: A cadaveric dissection and radiographic study. *Arthroscopy.* 2006;22:984–92. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
39. Zelle BA, Vidal AF, Brucker PU, Fu FH. Double-bundle reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament: Anatomic and biomechanical rationale. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.* 2007;15:87–96. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

40. Morimoto Y, Ferretti M, Ekdahl M, Smolinski P, Fu FH. Tibiofemoral joint contact area and pressure after single-and double-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy*. 2009;25:62–9. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
41. Yagi M, Wong EK, Kanamori A, Debski RE, Fu FH, Woo SL, et al. Biomechanical analysis of an anatomic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Am J Sports Med*. 2002;30:660–6. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
42. Tiamklang T, Sumanont S, Foocharoen T, Laopaiboon M. Double-bundle versus single-bundle reconstruction for anterior cruciate ligament rupture in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;11:CD008413. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
43. Hussein M, van Eck CF, Cretnik A, Dinevski D, Fu FH. Individualized anterior cruciate ligament surgery: A prospective study comparing anatomic single- and double-bundle reconstruction. *Am J Sports Med*. 2012;40:1781–8. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
44. Markolf KL, Park S, Jackson SR, McAllister DR. Anterior-posterior and rotatory stability of single and double-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstructions. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2009;91:107–18. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
45. Pearle AD, McAllister D, Howell SM. Rationale for strategic graft placement in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: I.D.E.A.L. femoral tunnel position. *Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ)* 2015;44:253–8. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
46. Järvelä T. Double-bundle versus single-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: A prospective, randomized clinical study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2007;15:500–7. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
47. Meredith RB, Vance KJ, Appleby D, Lubowitz JH. Outcome of single-bundle versus double-bundle reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament: A meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med*. 2008;36:1414–21. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
48. Muneta T, Koga H, Mochizuki T, Ju YJ, Hara K, Nimura A, et al. A prospective randomized study of 4-strand semitendinosus tendon anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction comparing single-bundle and double-bundle techniques. *Arthroscopy*. 2007;23:618–28. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
49. Tibor L, Chan PH, Funahashi TT, Wyatt R, Maletis GB, Inacio MC, et al. Surgical technique trends in primary ACL reconstruction from 2007 to 2014. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2016;98:1079–89. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
50. Liu A, Sun M, Ma C, Chen Y, Xue X, Guo P, et al. Clinical outcomes of transtibial versus anteromedial drilling techniques to prepare the femoral tunnel during anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2015 DOI: 10.1007/s00167-015-3672-y [Epub ahead of print] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
51. Wasserstein D, Sheth U, Cabrera A, Spindler KP. A systematic review of failed anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with autograft compared with allograft in young patients. *Sports Health*. 2015;7:207–16. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

52. Mariscalco MW, Magnussen RA, Mehta D, Hewett TE, Flanigan DC, Kaeding CC, et al. Autograft versus nonirradiated allograft tissue for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: A systematic review. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42:492–9. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
53. Xie X, Liu X, Chen Z, Yu Y, Peng S, Li Q, et al. A meta-analysis of bone-patellar tendon-bone autograft versus four-strand hamstring tendon autograft for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee.* 2015;22:100–10. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
54. Gifstad T, Foss OA, Engebretsen L, Lind M, Forssblad M, Albrektsen G, et al. Lower risk of revision with patellar tendon autografts compared with hamstring autografts: A registry study based on 45,998 primary ACL reconstructions in Scandinavia. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42:2319–28. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
55. Jacobs CA, Burnham JM, Makhni E, Malempati CS, Swart E, Johnson DL, et al. Allograft augmentation of hamstring autograft for younger patients undergoing anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Am J Sports Med.* 2017;45:892–99. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
56. Mulford JS, Hutchinson SE, Hang JR. Outcomes for primary anterior cruciate reconstruction with the quadriceps autograft: A systematic review. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2013;21:1882–8. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
57. Kim SJ, Kumar P, Oh KS. Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Autogenous quadriceps tendon-bone compared with bone-patellar tendon-bone grafts at 2-year followup. *Arthroscopy.* 2009;25:137–44. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
58. Cavaignac E, Coulin B, Tscholl P, Nik Mohd Fatmy N, Duthon V, Menetrey J, et al. Is quadriceps tendon autograft a better choice than hamstring autograft for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction? A comparative study with a mean followup of 3.6 years. *Am J Sports Med.* 2017;45:1326–32. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
59. Akoto R, Hoehner J. Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction with quadriceps tendon autograft and press-fit fixation using an anteromedial portal technique. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2012;13:161. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
60. Fink C, Herbort M, Abermann E, Hoser C. Minimally invasive harvest of a quadriceps tendon graft with or without a bone block. *Arthrosc Tech.* 2014;3:e509–13. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
61. Fischer F, Fink C, Herbst E, Hoser C, Hepperger C, Blank C, et al. Higher hamstring-to-quadriceps isokinetic strength ratio during the first postoperative months in patients with quadriceps tendon compared to hamstring tendon graft following ACL reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2017. doi: 10.1007/s00167-017-4522-x [Epub ahead of print] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
62. Feagin JA, Jr, Curl WW. Isolated tear of the anterior cruciate ligament: 5-year followup study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1996;325:4–9. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

63. Cabaud HE, Feagin JA, Rodkey WG. Acute anterior cruciate ligament injury and augmented repair. Experimental studies. *Am J Sports Med.* 1980;8:395–401. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
64. Cabaud HE, Rodkey WG, Feagin JA. Experimental studies of acute anterior cruciate ligament injury and repair. *Am J Sports Med.* 1979;7:18–22. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
65. DiFelice GS, Villegas C, Taylor S. Anterior cruciate ligament preservation: Early results of a novel arthroscopic technique for suture anchor primary anterior cruciate ligament repair. *Arthroscopy.* 2015;31:2162–71. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
66. Sherman MF, Lieber L, Bonamo JR, Podesta L, Reiter I. The long term followup of primary anterior cruciate ligament repair. Defining a rationale for augmentation. *Am J Sports Med.* 1991;19:243–55. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
67. DiFelice GS, van der List JP. Arthroscopic primary repair of proximal anterior cruciate ligament tears. *Arthrosc Tech.* 2016;5:e1057–61. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
68. van der List JP, DiFelice GS. Primary repair of the anterior cruciate ligament: A paradigm shift. *Surgeon.* 2017;15:161–8. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
69. Nyland J, Mattocks A, Kibbe S, Kalloub A, Greene JW, Caborn DN, et al. Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, rehabilitation, and return to play: 2015 update. *Open Access J Sports Med.* 2016;7:21–32. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
70. Achnich A, Herbst E, Forkel P, Metzloff S, Sprenger F, Imhoff AB, et al. Acute proximal anterior cruciate ligament tears: Outcomes after arthroscopic suture anchor repair versus anatomic single-bundle reconstruction. *Arthroscopy.* 2016;32:2562–9. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
71. Ahn JH, Lee SH, Choi SH, Lim TK. Magnetic resonance imaging evaluation of anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using quadrupled hamstring tendon autografts: Comparison of remnant bundle preservation and standard technique. *Am J Sports Med.* 2010;38:1768–77. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
72. Ahn JH, Lee SH. Risk factors for knee instability after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2016;24:2936–42. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
73. Ahn JH, Lee YS, Lee SH. Creation of an anatomic femoral tunnel with minimal damage to the remnant bundle in remnant-preserving anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using an outside-in technique. *Arthrosc Tech.* 2014;3:e175–9. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
74. Bieri KS, Scholz SM, Kohl S, Aghayev E, Staub LP. Dynamic intraligamentary stabilization versus conventional ACL reconstruction: A matched study on return to work. *Injury.* 2017;48:1243–8. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]



75. Nguyen DT, Ramwadhoebe TH, van der Hart CP, Blankevoort L, Tak PP, van Dijk CN, et al. Intrinsic healing response of the human anterior cruciate ligament: An histological study of reattached ACL remnants. *J Orthop Res.* 2014;32:296–301. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
76. van der List JP, DiFelice GS. Preservation of the anterior cruciate ligament: A treatment algorithm based on tear location and tissue quality. *Am J Orthop.* 2016;45:E393–405. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
77. Taylor SA, Khair MM, Roberts TR, DiFelice GS. Primary repair of the anterior cruciate ligament: A systematic review. *Arthroscopy.* 2015;31:2233–47. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
78. Smith PA, Bley JA. Allograft anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction utilizing internal brace augmentation. *Arthrosc Tech.* 2016;5:e1143–7. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
79. Cook JL, Smith P, Stannard JP, Pfeiffer F, Kuroki K, Bozynski CC, et al. A canine arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction model for study of synthetic augmentation of tendon allografts. *J Knee Surg.* 2016 doi: 10.1055/s-0036-1597618 [Epub ahead of print] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
80. Henle P, Röder C, Perler G, Heitkemper S, Eggli S. Dynamic intraligamentary stabilization (DIS) for treatment of acute anterior cruciate ligament ruptures: Case series experience of the first three years. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2015;16:27. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
81. Claes S, Vereecke E, Maes M, Victor J, Verdonk P, Bellemans J, et al. Anatomy of the anterolateral ligament of the knee. *J Anat.* 2013;223:321–8. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
82. Imbert P, Lutz C, Daggett M, Niglis L, Freychet B, Dalmay F, et al. Isometric characteristics of the anterolateral ligament of the knee: A cadaveric navigation study. *Arthroscopy.* 2016;32:2017–24. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
83. Ibrahim SA, Shohdy EM, Marwan Y, Ramadan SA, Almisfer AK, Mohammad MW, et al. Anatomic reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament of the knee with or without reconstruction of the anterolateral ligament: A randomized clinical trial. *Am J Sports Med.* 2017;45:1558–66. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
84. Patel RM, Brophy RH. Anterolateral ligament of the knee: Anatomy, function, imaging, and treatment. *Am J Sports Med.* 2017;363546517695802. doi: 10.1177/0363546517695802 [Epub ahead of print]. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
85. Musahl V, Getgood A, Neyret P, Claes S, Burnham JM, Batailler C, et al. Contributions of the anterolateral complex and the anterolateral ligament to rotatory knee stability in the setting of ACL injury: A roundtable discussion. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2017;25:997–1008. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
86. Stentz-Olesen K, Nielsen ET, de Raedt S, Jørgensen PB, Sørensen OG, Kaptein B, et al. Reconstructing the anterolateral ligament does not decrease rotational knee laxity in ACL-

- reconstructed knees. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2017;25:1125–31. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
87. Di Matteo B, Loibl M, Andriolo L, Filardo G, Zellner J, Koch M, et al. Biologic agents for anterior cruciate ligament healing: A systematic review. *World J Orthop.* 2016;7:592–603. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
88. Di Matteo B, Filardo G, Kon E, Marcacci M. Platelet-rich plasma: Evidence for the treatment of patellar and achilles tendinopathy – A systematic review. *Musculoskelet Surg.* 2015;99:1–9. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
89. Filardo G, Kon E, Roffi A, Di Matteo B, Merli ML, Marcacci M, et al. Platelet-rich plasma: Why intraarticular? A systematic review of preclinical studies and clinical evidence on PRP for joint degeneration. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2015;23:2459–74. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
90. Komzák M, Hart R, Šmíd P, Puskeiler M, Jajtner P. The effect of platelet-rich plasma on graft healing in reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament of the knee joint: Prospective study. *Acta Chir Orthop Traumatol Cech.* 2015;82:135–9. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
91. Andriolo L, Di Matteo B, Kon E, Filardo G, Venieri G, Marcacci M. PRP augmentation for ACL reconstruction. *Biomed Res Int.* 2015;2015:371746. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
92. Lubowitz JH. Editorial commentary: Platelet-rich plasma in ACL surgery. *Arthroscopy.* 2015;31:989. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
93. Cook JL, Smith PA, Bozynski CC, Kuroki K, Cook CR, Stoker AM, et al. Multiple injections of leukoreduced platelet rich plasma reduce pain and functional impairment in a canine model of ACL and meniscal deficiency. *J Orthop Res.* 2016;34:607–15. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
94. Kopka M, Bradley JP. The use of biologic agents in athletes with knee injuries. *J Knee Surg.* 2016;29:379–86. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
95. Mazzocca AD, McCarthy MB, Chowaniec DM, Cote MP, Romeo AA, Bradley JP, et al. Platelet-rich plasma differs according to preparation method and human variability. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2012;94:308–16. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
96. Silva A, Sampaio R, Fernandes R, Pinto E. Is there a role for adult non-cultivated bone marrow stem cells in ACL reconstruction? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2014;22:66–71. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
97. Centeno CJ, Pitts J, Al-Sayegh H, Freeman MD. Anterior cruciate ligament tears treated with percutaneous injection of autologous bone marrow nucleated cells: A case series. *J Pain Res.* 2015;8:437–47. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
98. Ćuti T, Antunović M, Marijanović I, Ivković A, Vukasović A, Matić I, et al. Capacity of muscle derived stem cells and pericytes to promote tendon graft integration and ligamentization following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Int Orthop.* 2017;41:1189–98. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

99. Ghebes CA, Kelder C, Schot T, Renard AJ, Pakvis DF, Fernandes H, et al. Anterior cruciate ligament- and hamstring tendon-derived cells: In vitro differential properties of cells involved in ACL reconstruction. *J Tissue Eng Regen Med.* 2017;11:1077–88. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]