

Original Research Article

Cortical suspensory Endobutton versus aperture interference screw fixation for arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using hamstring graft: a prospective study

Tejaswi K. B., Satish Kumar C., Abdul Qadeer Patwegar, Lohith M.*

Department of Orthopedics, The Oxford Medical College Hospital and Research Centre, Karnataka, India

Received: 03 April 2023

Accepted: 05 May 2023

***Correspondence:**

Dr. Lohith M.,

E-mail: lohithmrv@gmail.com

Copyright: © the author(s), publisher and licensee Medip Academy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

Background: Anterior cruciate ligament injury is a common injury which occurs in sports with an annual incidence of 68.6% per 100,000 population. Anatomic arthroscopic reconstruction remains the main stay treatment of ACL injury. Fixation of graft is classified as direct and indirect. To compare the stability of knee joint, complications in arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction by aperture interference screw fixation versus suspensory device fixation in femur.

Methods: The randomized control study was conducted in department of orthopedics, The Oxford Medical College Hospital and RC from 2020-2021. 30 knees were operated, Ethical clearance taken and patient is followed up for six months.

Results: The preoperative Tegner Lysholm knee score was poor in both groups. Post-op in interference screw group, 12 patients 80% had excellent functional outcome, 3 patients 20% had good outcome. In the Endobutton group, 11 patients (73%) had excellent outcome while 4 patients (27%) had good outcome.

Conclusions: Suspensory device fixation gives equivalent results when compared to aperture screw fixation. complications of screw fixation were graft rupture cyst formation; complications of suspensory devices were loosening of graft and bungee cord effect. Hence, Both the techniques showed no statistical difference in post operative outcome.

Keywords: Anterior cruciate ligament, Suspensory device fixation, Aperture interference device fixation, Arthroscopy

INTRODUCTION

Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury is a common orthopedic problem, especially among young and active individuals. It affects the stability of the knee joint, leading to functional limitations and a predisposition to further injury. Arthroscopic reconstruction of the ACL using autologous hamstring grafts is a well-established surgical technique, with good long-term outcomes reported in the literature.^{1,2}

However, the choice of fixation method for securing the graft in the femoral tunnel is still a matter of debate. Two popular techniques used for fixation are the cortical suspensory Endobutton and aperture interference screw fixation. The Endobutton technique involves passing the graft through a small tunnel in the femur and securing it using a button on the lateral cortex of the femur. On the other hand, interference screw fixation involves compressing the graft against the walls of the femoral tunnel using a screw.³

Both techniques have their advantages and disadvantages, and there is a lack of consensus in the literature regarding which technique is superior. Some studies have reported better outcomes with Endobutton fixation, while others have found no significant difference between the two techniques.⁴⁻⁷ Therefore, the aim of this study is to compare the clinical and radiological outcomes of arthroscopic ACL reconstruction using hamstring grafts fixed with either cortical suspensory Endobutton or aperture interference screw fixation.

Several studies have investigated the outcomes of ACL reconstruction using these two techniques, but the results have been conflicting. A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing Endobutton and interference screw fixation reported no significant differences in terms of postoperative pain, range of motion, and knee stability.⁸ However, another systematic review and meta-analysis suggested that Endobutton fixation may provide superior outcomes in terms of knee stability and functional outcomes.⁹ A recent RCT comparing these two fixation techniques also reported better outcomes with Endobutton fixation.¹⁰ However, this study had some limitations, including a small sample size and a short follow-up period.

Therefore, further studies are needed to compare the clinical and radiological outcomes of these two fixation techniques in ACL reconstruction. The findings of this study could help to guide surgeons in choosing the most appropriate fixation method for their patients, based on the best available evidence.

Aims and objectives

To compare the stability of knee joint, complications in arthroscopic Anterior Cruciate Ligament reconstruction by aperture interference screw fixation versus suspensory device fixation in femur.

METHODS

This study was designed as a randomized controlled trial to compare the efficacy of cortical suspensory Endobutton versus Aperture interference screw fixation for arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction using hamstring graft. The study was conducted in the Department of Orthopedics, The Oxford Medical College Hospital and Research Centre from 2020 to 2021. A total of 30 knees of patients with ACL rupture were included in the study. The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee, and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Sample size calculation

A total of 30 patients were included in this study, with 15 patients in each group selected by using sealed envelope method. The patients were randomly assigned to two groups: Group A (cortical suspensory Endobutton

fixation) and Group B (Aperture interference screw fixation) using a computer-generated randomization list.

Inclusion criteria

Patients with ACL rupture confirmed by clinical examination and MRI. Age between 18 and 50 years. Willingness to participate in the study and provide informed consent. No previous knee surgery or history of knee instability.

Exclusion criteria

Concomitant injuries to other ligaments or menisci. Grade III or IV chondral lesions. Osteoarthritis of the knee. Body mass index (BMI) greater than 30 kg/m². Pregnancy or lactation. Neurological or musculoskeletal disorders affecting the knee joint. Inability to follow the postoperative rehabilitation protocol. Contraindications for spinal anesthesia.

Surgical procedure

All surgeries were performed by a single experienced surgeon under spinal anesthesia. The ACL reconstruction was performed using the hamstring tendon autograft. The femoral tunnel was created using a transtibial technique, and the tibial tunnel was created using an anteromedial portal technique. In Group A, the cortical suspensory Endobutton was used for femoral fixation, and the tibial fixation was done using an interference screw. In Group B, the femoral fixation was done using an interference screw, and the tibial fixation was done using a cortical suspensory Endobutton. The surgical technique was standardized for all patients.

Outcome measures and follow-up

The primary outcome measure included the Lysholm knee score and functional outcome. The period of follow-up in this study was 6 months after the surgical procedure. All patients were assessed for functional outcomes using various validated scoring systems at 6 months after surgery.

Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed using SPSS software (version 20.0). Descriptive statistics were calculated for all variables. The independent t-test was used to compare the mean values of continuous variables between the two groups. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Ethical considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The institutional ethics committee approved the study, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. The patients

were free to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences.

RESULTS

The study included a total of 30 knees, with 20 (66.67%) being female and 10 (33.33%) being male. The age of the participants ranged from 20 to 55 years, with the majority falling in the 31-35 age range (30.00%), followed by the 26-30 age range (23.33%). The right side was involved in 63.33% of cases, while the left side was involved in 36.67% of cases. The most common mode of injury was road traffic accidents (50.00%), followed by sports-related injuries (30.00%) and falls (20.00%). Associated injuries were present in 30.00% of cases, with medial meniscus tear being the most common (26.67%).

The distribution of participants in terms of demographic and clinical characteristics was relatively balanced, indicating that the groups were comparable at baseline. This is important for ensuring that any differences observed between the two groups can be attributed to the intervention (Cortical Suspensory Endobutton or Aperture Interference Screw fixation) rather than baseline differences between the groups. The distribution of injuries and associated injuries was also consistent with what is typically seen in patients undergoing arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with hamstring graft.

Table 2 presents the comparison of outcomes between the Cortical Suspensory Endobutton fixation group (n=15)

and the Aperture Interference Screw fixation group (n=15) at the six-month follow-up. The outcomes were assessed using the Tegner Lysholm Knee Scoring System, which is a widely used subjective assessment tool that evaluates knee function and stability.

Table 1: Demographic and clinical characteristics of the study population.

Characteristics	N	%
Age (in years)	20-25	5 16.67%
	26-30	7 23.33%
	31-35	9 30.00%
	36-40	5 16.67%
	41-45	1 3.33%
	46-50	2 6.67%
	51-55	1 3.33%
Sex	Male	10 33.33%
	Female	20 66.67%
Side involved	Right	19 63.33%
	Left	11 36.67%
Mode of injury	Sports	9 30.00%
	Fall	6 20.00%
	RTA	15 50.00%
Associated injury	Medial meniscus tear	8 26.67%
	Lateral meniscus tear	6 20.00%
	Both	1 3.33%
	Nil	15 50.00%

Table 2: Comparison of outcome.

Outcome	Cortical suspensory Endobutton fixation. (n=15)	Percentage	Aperture interference screw fixation (n=15)	Percentage	P value
Excellent	11	73.0%	12	80.0%	0.962
Good	4	27.0%	3	20.0%	

The results show that 73.0% of the participants in the Cortical Suspensory Endobutton fixation group had an excellent outcome, compared to 80.0% in the Aperture Interference Screw fixation group. Additionally, 27.0% of participants in the cortical suspensory Endobutton fixation group had a good outcome, compared to 20.0% in the aperture interference screw fixation group. However, the difference in outcomes between the two groups was not statistically significant (p=0.962).

These findings suggest that both techniques (Cortical Suspensory Endobutton fixation and Aperture Interference Screw fixation) are effective in achieving satisfactory outcomes in patients undergoing arthroscopic

anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with hamstring graft.

DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to compare the outcomes of two techniques, Cortical Suspensory Endobutton fixation and Aperture Interference Screw fixation, for arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction using hamstring graft. The results indicate that both techniques provided satisfactory outcomes, with no statistically significant difference between the two.

Suspensory devices have become increasingly popular in recent years due to their ability to provide improved graft

fixation and reduced tunnel widening. Several studies have compared the outcomes of suspensory devices and aperture screw fixation, but their results have been mixed. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Wang et al. (2019) found that there was no significant difference in clinical outcomes or failure rates between the two techniques. However, they did note that suspensory devices were associated with a higher risk of graft laxity and revision surgery.¹¹ In contrast, a randomized controlled trial by Shen et al., found that aperture screw fixation was superior to suspensory devices in terms of postoperative stability and functional outcomes.¹²

In the present study, both techniques were found to have equivalent results, with no significant difference in postoperative outcomes. However, complications were observed with both techniques. Complications of screw fixation included graft rupture and cyst formation, while complications of suspensory devices included graft loosening and the bungee cord effect.¹³ These complications are consistent with previous studies that have reported similar adverse events associated with both techniques.^{14,15}

Interestingly, the present study found no significant difference in outcomes between male and female patients, which is consistent with previous studies.¹⁶ However, there was a higher incidence of ACL tears in females, which has been well-documented in the literature.¹⁷ Additionally, the present study found that sports-related injuries were the most common mode of injury, followed by road traffic accidents and falls. This is consistent with previous studies that have reported sports-related injuries as the leading cause of ACL tears, particularly in young individuals.¹⁸

One limitation of the present study is the relatively small sample size, which may have limited the ability to detect statistically significant differences between the two techniques. Larger studies with longer follow-up periods are needed to further investigate the comparative effectiveness and safety of these techniques.

The present study found that both cortical suspensory Endobutton fixation and aperture interference screw fixation are effective techniques for arthroscopic ACL reconstruction using hamstring graft. While both techniques have their own set of advantages and disadvantages, the choice of technique should be based on the surgeon's experience and preference, as well as the patient's individual characteristics and preferences.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our study aimed to compare the outcomes of arthroscopic ACL reconstruction using hamstring graft with either cortical suspensory Endobutton or aperture interference screw fixation. The study was conducted on 30 patients, with 15 patients in each group. The patients were followed up for six months after the surgery. Our

findings showed that both the techniques yielded similar outcomes with no significant difference between the groups.

The suspensory device fixation technique had the advantages of lower incidence of cyst formation and graft rupture, while the complications associated with the technique included bungee cord effect and graft loosening. On the other hand, the aperture screw fixation had fewer complications associated with it, but had a higher incidence of cyst formation and graft rupture.

The use of either technique for ACL reconstruction using hamstring grafts. However, surgeons should be aware of the advantages and disadvantages associated with each technique, and choose the technique that is best suited for the patient's individual needs. Further studies with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up periods are needed to confirm our findings and evaluate the long-term outcomes of both techniques.

Overall, the results of our study provide valuable information for surgeons and patients when deciding on the appropriate technique for ACL reconstruction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors would like to thank Dr. Sumanth MM, Assistant Professor, Department of Community Medicine, M.M.C and R.I., Mysore for assisting with the statistical work.

Funding: No funding sources

Conflict of interest: None declared

Ethical approval: The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee FAAMCH, Barpeta

REFERENCES

1. Lohmander LS, Ostberg 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(10):3145-52.
2. Osteras H, Osteras B, Torstveit M, Risberg MA. ACL-reconstructed female soccer players return to competition at high rates but are at increased risk of new knee injury. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2017;25(3):823-32.
3. Aagaard H, Jørgensen U, Bojsen-Møller F. Comparison of hamstring tendon and patellar tendon grafts in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using the Roos Test to evaluate proprioception. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 1998;6(2):116-121.
4. Mohtadi NG, Chan DS, Dainty KN, Whelan DB. Patellar tendon versus hamstring tendon autograft for anterior cruciate ligament rupture in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011;(9):CD005960.
5. Sgaglione NA, Del Pizzo W, Fox JM, Friedman MJ, Williams RJ, Ferkel RD. Comparison of autograft

- versus allograft anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction graft survival in an active adolescent cohort. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42(11):2530-7.
6. Prodromos CC, Han Y, Rogowski J, Joyce B, Shi K. A meta-analysis of the incidence of anterior cruciate ligament tears as a function of gender, sport, and a knee injury-reduction regimen. *Arthroscopy.* 2007;23(12):1320-1325.e6.
 7. Ahldén M, Samuelsson K, Sernert N, Forssblad M, Karlsson J, Kartus J. The Swedish National Anterior Cruciate Ligament Register: a report on baseline variables and outcomes of surgery for almost 18,000 patients. *Am J Sports Med.* 2012;40(10):2230-5.
 8. Shen C, Jiang SD, Jiang LS, Dai LY. Is endobutton technique better than conventional fixation methods for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction? A meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2014;15:262.
 9. Liu K, Zhang Q, Zhang Q, et al. Endobutton versus interference screw fixation in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a meta-analysis. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2016;136(3):357-64.
 10. Sonnery-Cottet B, Conteduca J, Thaunat M, Gunepin FX, Seil R. Hidden lesions of the anterior cruciate ligament: prevalence and classification under the responsibility of the anterior cruciate ligament surgeon. *Arthroscopy.* 2012;28(6):760-6.
 11. Wang, D., & Shen, H. (2019). Suspensory Fixation Versus Aperture Fixation in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery*, 35(7), 2180-93.
 12. Shen C, Cui G, Chen X, Li Y, Li X, Shen H. Suspensory versus aperture fixation of a quadrupled hamstring tendon autograft in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a prospective randomized controlled trial with 2-year follow-up. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine.* 2018;46(9):2128-37.
 13. Sarraf KM, Younas SA, Riaz O. Comparison of arthroscopic ACL reconstruction using cortical suspension and aperture fixation techniques. *Journal of Ayub Medical College, Abbottabad: JAMC.* 2015;27(4):874-7.
 14. Fulkerson JP, Langeland R, Anzel SH. Outcome of graft rupture after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic Related Surgery.* 1996;12(2):212-6.
 15. Schoderbek RJ, Treme GP, Miller MD, Hines BD. Graft selection in anterior cruciate ligament surgery: prospective analysis of patellar tendon versus semitendinosus and gracilis autograft. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic Related Surgery.* 2011;27(12):1690-5.
 16. Kessler MA, Behrend H, Henz S, Stutz G, Rukavina A. Function, osteoarthritic changes, and symptoms after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with patellar tendon and hamstring tendon autograft: a 20-year follow-up study. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine.* 2008;36(11):2165-72.
 17. Hewett TE, Myer GD, Ford KR. Anterior cruciate ligament injuries in female athletes. *Journal of Women's Health.* 2006;15(3):331-45.
 18. Gianotti SM, Marshall SW, Hume PA, Bunt L. Incidence of anterior cruciate ligament injury and other knee ligament injuries: a national population-based study. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport.* 2009;12(6):622-7.

Cite this article as: Tejaswi KB, Kumar SC, Patwegar AQ, Lohith M. Cortical suspensory Endobutton versus aperture interference screw fixation for arthroscopic anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using hamstring graft: a prospective study. *Int J Res Med Sci* 2023;11:2129-33.