Poster 73

MRI Prediction of Five-Strand Hamstring Autograft Size for ACL Reconstruction

Ben M. Ose, MPH²; Jack M. Ayres, MD^{1,2}; Tucker Morey, BS²; Liz Brown, MD¹; Damon Mar, PhD¹; Bryan G. Vopat, MD¹; Ian Goodman, MD^{1,3}; Jeffrey Randall, MD¹

¹ University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS ² Prisma Health Orthopedics/University of South Carolina School of Medicine Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Columbia, SC ³ Tulsa Bone & Joint Associates, Owasso, OK



Disclosures

- Bryan Vopat reports a relationship with The University of Kansas Medical Center that includes: Altior: Stock or stock Options; American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society: Board or committee member; Artelon: Paid consultant; Carbon 22: Stock or stock Options; Spinal Simplicity: Stock or stock Options
- Jeffery Randall reports a relationship with The University of Kansas Medical Center that includes: Johnson & Johnson: Stock or stock Options; Stryker: Stock or stock Options



Background

ACL Autografts

- Options generally utilize bone-patellar tendon-bone, quadriceps tendons, or hamstring tendons grafts
- Studies have shown an association between graft diameter and rate of graft failure ¹
- Use of a five-strand hamstring autograft with two strands of gracilis tendon and three strands of semitendinosus tendon is one approach to increase graft diameter
- Pre-operative MRI has shown to be predictive of graft
 diameter for other hamstring and bone-patellar tendon-bone
 Figure 1. Lavey et al autograft options ^{5,6}



Figure 1. Lavey et al.² illustration of final 5-strand graft



Determine if pre-operative MRI measurements of the crosssectional area (CSA) of the semitendinosus and gracilis tendons accurately predicts the intra-operative graft diameter of a fivestrand hamstring autograft for ACL reconstruction.



Methods

Study Design

- A retrospective chart review was performed
- Included patients: Patients who had undergone ACL reconstruction with a five-strand hamstring autograft by a single surgeon between September 2018 and September 2021
- Excluded patients: allograft or an autograft with a technique/graft selection other than a five-strand hamstring autograft technique
- Variables: diagnosis, procedure, graft diameter as determined by the sterile graft sizer used intraoperatively, height, weight, BMI, age, and gender
- All pre-operative knee MRI's were reviewed



Methods

Pre-operative MRI Measurements

- Pre-operative knee MRI's were reviewed by two or three reviewers
- CSAst and CSAgr were measured on the axial image at the level for which the femoral condyle was the widest, per the technique described by Wernecke et al.³ and Grawe et al. (Included image) ⁴



Key Findings

_	Graft Diameter									
	8.0mm		8.5mm		9.0mm		9.5mm		≥10.0mm	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
n	1	4	1	6	3	4	5	5	13	3
age	18.00	42.75	37.00	28.33	16.33	38.75	35.20	25.40	21.23	44.00
Height (in)	69.00	67.50	76.00	66.67	70.17	64.88	70.20	66.95	71.85	68.67
Weight (lb)	140.00	176.75	280.00	152.33	172.67	133.50	208.40	188.00	198.15	177.67
BMI	20.67	27.20	34.08	66.67	24.50	22.32	29.67	29.40	26.82	26.59
CSA Semi-T (mm^2)	11.33	12.45	14.73	12.45	15.30	13.69	16.69	16.40	13.38	11.72
CSA Gracilis (mm^2)	8.31	7.15	8.07	8.45	8.77	8.64	8.92	10.07	8.01	8.93

Demographics

- Graft diameter from 8.0 mm to 11.0 mm
- Patients ranged in age from 15 to 59 years and BMI ranged from 20.01 to 41.05
- MRI measurements of cross-sectional area (mm²) of the semitendinosus and gracilis tendons ranged from 9.71-21.50 and 5.80-12.94, respectively.



Key Findings

Reliability analysis

- Within-Rater reliabilities for both CSAst and CSAgr were excellent for raters 2 and 3.
- Between-Rater reliability was excellent for CSAst and good for CSAgr.

 Table 1: Summary of rater reliability ICC analyses. Between-Rater reliability was assessed from within-rater averages.

		JCC	95% CI	p value	
Deter 4*	CSAst	NA		ΝΔ	
Rater 1"	COASI				
	CSAgr	NA	NA	NA	
Rater 2	CSAst	0.93	0.88-0.96	<0.001**	
	CSAgr	0.87	0.79-0.92	<0.001**	
		-	-		
Rater 3	CSAst	0.90	0.84-0.94	<0.001**	
	CSAgr	0.83	0.74-0.89	<0.001**	
Between-Rater	CSAst	0.86	0.77-0.93	<0.001**	
	CSAgr	0.60	0.44-0.73	<0.001**	
ICC: Inter Class Correlation, CI: Confidence Interval, CSAst: Semitendinosus Cross					

ICC: Inter Class Correlation, CI: Confidence Interval, CSAst: Semitendinosus Cross Sectional Area, CSAgr: Gracilis Cross Sectional Area. * Rater 1 only completed a single set of CSAst and CSAgr measures. ** Indicates significance at p<0.001.

HE UNIVERSITY OF

Key Findings

- An initial multiple linear regression model was created using CSAst, CSAgr, gender, age at the time of surgery, height, weight, and BMI (Adjusted R2 = 0.62, p<0.001).
- CSAst was the only significant predictor of graft diameter.
- VIF analysis showed moderate collinearity for both CSAst and CSAgr, and high collinearity for height, weight, and BMI.

	predicting final graft diameter.							
			Coefficient	p value	VIF			
		Intercept	2.018					
	Model 1	CSAst	0.128	0.040*	4.858			
		CSAgr	0.154	0.088	4.240			
		Gender, Male	0.021	0.930	2.508			
		Age	-0.007	0.270	1.416			
•	Height		0.060	0.630	25.475			
		Weight	-0.004	0.845	160.817			
		BMI	0.014	0.925	110.513			
				-	-			
	Model 2	Intercept	5.324					
		CSAst	0.124	0.028*	3.902			
		CSAgr	0.183	0.038*	3.902			
	CSAst: Semitendinosus Cross Sectional Area, CSAgr: Gracilis Cross Sectional Area, BMI: Body Mass Index, VIF: Variance Inflation Factor, * Indicates significance at p<0.05.							

Table 3: Summary of multiple linear regression models for



The second multiple linear regression model was created using CSAst and CSAgr (Adjusted R2 = 0.61, p<0.001). Both CSAst and CSAgr were significant predictors of graft diameter. The resulting equation for determining the graft diameter based on CSAst and CSAgr is as follows:

[Graft Diameter (mm)] = 5.324 + 0.124 * [CSAst (mm²)] + 0.183 * [CSAgr (mm²)]



The CSA of the semitendinosus (CSAst) and gracilis (CSAgr) tendons on preoperative MRI may be used to accurately predict the graft diameter of a five-strand hamstring autograft for ACL reconstruction.



Prior studies have discussed the use of the five strand technique as a "bailout" option for an unexpected small tendon, but with adequate methods of predicting tendon size preoperatively this could be avoided. Among the patients included in this study, the fivestrand technique was a planned procedure and achieved the literature recommended minimum of an 8.0 mm diameter graft.

Adequate graft diameter is a critical factor in the success of ACL reconstruction surgery with strong associations to graft failure rates and overall patient outcomes. Better preparative planning can help to avoid negative outcomes.



References

- 1. Magnussen RA, Lawrence JT, West RL, et al. Graft size and patient age are predictors of early revision after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with hamstring autograft. Arthroscopy. 2012;28(4):526-531.
- 2. Lavery KP, Rasmussen JF, Dhawan A. Five-strand hamstring autograft for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Arthrosc Tech. 2014;3(4):e423-426.
- 3. Wernecke G, Harris IA, Houang MT, et al. Using magnetic resonance imaging to predict adequate graft diameters for autologous hamstring double-bundle anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Arthroscopy. 2011;27(8):1055-1059.
- Grawe BM, Williams PN, Burge A, et al. Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction With Autologous Hamstring: Can Preoperative Magnetic Resonance Imaging Accurately Predict Graft Diameter? Orthop J Sports Med. 2016;4(5):2325967116646360.
- An VVG, Scholes C, Mhaskar VA, Parker DA, Fritsch BA. Regression modelling combining MRI measurements and patient anthropometry for patient screening and prediction of graft diameter in hamstring autograft arthroscopic ACL reconstruction. Asia Pac J Sports Med Arthrosc Rehabil Technol. 2017;8:24-31. Epub 20170227. doi: 10.1016/j.asmart.2017.02.001. PubMed PMID: 29264276; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5721915.
- Chang CB, Seong SC, Kim TK. Preoperative magnetic resonance assessment of patellar tendon dimensions for graft selection in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Am J Sports Med. 2009;37(2):376-82. Epub 20081125. doi: 10.1177/0363546508324971. PubMed PMID: 19036719.

