

Comparison of clinical results of anteromedial and transtibial femoral tunnel drilling techniques in knee reconstruction surgery

Submission date 31/12/2019	Recruitment status No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered
Registration date 09/01/2020	Overall study status Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
Last Edited 05/06/2020	Condition category Musculoskeletal Diseases	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
		<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

Plain English summary of protocol

Background and study aims

Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction is a type of knee surgery to replace the ACL – one of the main ligaments in the knee. The ACL connects the thigh bone to the shin bone, and along with other ligaments in the knee, keeps the knee stable. A number of methods can be used to reconstruct an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL). The most common method is to use a tendon from elsewhere in the body to replace the ACL. The surgeon needs to drill a tunnel in the bone to pass the new tissue through.

The aim of this study is to compare two different drilling techniques in terms of the long term outcome on knee function.

Who can participate?

Patients who underwent knee reconstructive surgery at Orton Hospital in Helsinki Finland between May 1990 and December 2011

What does the study involve?

Retrospective data is gathered from patient records regarding the clinical outcomes of two different surgical techniques for knee reconstruction (anteromedial drilling and transtibial drilling).

What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

None

Where is the study run from?

Hospital Orton, Invalid Foundation, Helsinki, Finland.

When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for?

January 2006 to December 2013

Who is funding the study?

Orton research-grants by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland.

Who is the main contact?

Dr Leena Metso
leena.metso@fimnet.fi

Contact information

Type(s)

Scientific

Contact name

Dr Leena Metso

ORCID ID

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2875-6478>

Contact details

Työpajankatu 14 A
Helsinki
Finland
00580
+358 406700094
leena.metso@fimnet.fi

Additional identifiers

Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS)

Nil known

ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT)

Nil known

Protocol serial number

9750/44

Study information

Scientific Title

A retrospective comparison of clinical results of anteromedial and transtibial femoral tunnel drilling in ACL reconstruction

Study objectives

Is there a clinical difference in results between anteromedial and transtibial femoral drilling in the reconstruction of anterior cruciate ligament?

Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

Ethics approval(s)

Approved 11/11/2015, The Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa Operative Ethics Committee (Tynnyrintekijänkatu 1 C, Helsinki, Finland; +358 (0)50 428 7838; keskuskirjaamo@hus.fi), ref: 364/13/03/02/2015. TMK02 §219

Study design

Retrospective case control study

Primary study design

Observational

Study type(s)

Treatment

Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Anterior cruciate ligament rupture

Interventions

Is there a clinical difference between anteromedial and transtibial tunnel drilling results in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction at two year follow up. For this study we chose retrospectively 300 consecutive patients admitted to Orton Hospital, Helsinki Finland. They had been divided into two groups of 150 patients. The evaluation methods were clinical examination, knee scores (Lysholm, Tegner, IKDC) and instrumented laxity measurements (KT-2000™).

ACL ruptures were treated with an operation. 150 patients with anteromedial (AM) drilling and 150 with transtibial (TT) drilling. In the AM group the reconstructions were performed using semitendinosus graft with Tape Locking Screw (TLS™) technique or Retrobutton™ femoral and BioScrew™ tibial fixation with a semitendinosus-gracilis graft. In the TT group the fixation method used was Rigidfix™ femoral and Intrafix tibial fixation.

Patients were allocated consecutively in a single-centre hospital Orton in Helsinki Finland between May 1990 and December 2011. Clinical controls were at 1 and 2 years postoperatively. This is a retrospective study.

Intervention Type

Procedure/Surgery

Primary outcome(s)

Recovery of knee function measured at one and two years post-operatively using:

1. Clinical examination
2. Knee scores (Lysholm, Tegner, IKDC)
3. Instrumented laxity measurements (KT-2000™)

Key secondary outcome(s)

Patient satisfaction measured using interview at one and two years post-operatively

Completion date

31/12/2013

Eligibility

Key inclusion criteria

1. Male and female gender, no data of the percentage is collected
2. No limitations, mean age of the patients was 34 years (12-64 years)
3. ACL reconstruction performed with meniscal and collateral surgery done if needed

Participant type(s)

Patient

Healthy volunteers allowed

No

Age group

Mixed

Sex

All

Total final enrolment

265

Key exclusion criteria

1. PCL reconstruction done at the same time or previously
2. Revision ACL surgery (exclusion from the final data analysis)

Date of first enrolment

15/05/1990

Date of final enrolment

31/12/2011

Locations

Countries of recruitment

Finland

Study participating centre

Hospital Orton, Invalid Foundation

Tenholantie 10

Helsinki

Finland

00280

Sponsor information

Organisation

Invalidisäätiö

ROR

<https://ror.org/020vv3w23>

Funder(s)

Funder type

Government

Funder Name

This work was supported by Orton research-grants by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland.

Results and Publications

Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. Data is available from Arsi Harilainen, arsi.harilainen@orton.fi, type of data: BMDP statistics, data available at any time for 10 years. Access considered upon request. Raw data can be provided. Sharing the data with the third party has not been discussed with participants. Data is anonymised and there are no legal restrictions.

IPD sharing plan summary

Available on request

Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
Results article	results	03/06/2020	05/06/2020	Yes	No
Participant information sheet	Participant information sheet	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes