

Incidence and Predictors of Second Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury After Primary Reconstruction and Return to Sport

Mark V. Paterno, PhD, ATC, PT, SCS

Division of Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, Division of Sports Medicine, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, OH

An estimated 200 000 anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries occur annually in the United States,^{1,2} with as many as 90% of patients electing to undergo ACL reconstruction (ACLR).³ Despite the high prevalence of surgery after ACL injury, outcomes vary widely in the literature. Recent evidence suggests that more than 50% of athletes are unable to return to their preinjury level of function after ACLR⁴ and between 50% and 100% develop knee osteoarthritis within 5 to 10 years of surgery.^{5,6} Considering the high rate of poor outcomes after primary ACLR, we must be very concerned that a large proportion of athletes who have undergone ACLR ultimately suffer a second ACL injury. Future directions in the management of ACL injury after ACLR must focus on prevention. Prior success using an injury-prevention model^{7,8} to decrease the rate of primary ACL injury may have important applications in this population.

INCIDENCE OF SECOND ACL INJURY

To prevent ACL injury after ACLR, we must first determine the incidence and magnitude of the problem and then identify the factors predisposing these athletes to increased risk.^{7,8} The incidence of a second ACL injury after ACLR and return to sport (RTS) is not trivial. Over the past decade, a growing body of literature has highlighted a higher rate of ACL injury after ACLR than once assumed. Early reports focused on incidence proportion or crude incidence. Wright et al⁹ described the crude incidence of subsequent ACL injury in a subset of data from the Multicenter Orthopaedic Outcome Network (MOON) database in 2007. One in 17 patients (6%) sustained a second ACL injury within 2 years of ACLR; half of these experienced graft failure, and the remainder incurred a contralateral ACL injury. More recently, in a series of publications reporting outcomes at 5,¹⁰ 10,¹¹ and 15¹² years after ACLR in a common cohort of patients, the authors noted second ACL injury rates, including ipsilateral and contralateral tears, of 12%, 27%, and 31%, respectively. In a systematic review of 5-year outcomes after ACLR, Wright et al¹³ reported a 17.2% second-injury rate, with a greater percentage sustaining a contralateral injury (11.8%) than an ipsilateral graft failure (5.8%). These results highlight the wide variability in reported second ACL injury rates after ACLR, ranging from 6% to 31%. This variation complicates our

ability to clearly identify the magnitude of the problem in this population.

The potential mechanism underlying this variation in reported second injury rates is likely multifactorial. Heterogeneous samples with respect to variables such as age, surgical procedure, and postinjury activity level may all contribute. In an attempt to control for varying activity rates after patients returned to sport, colleagues and I published 2 articles^{14,15} that described the incidence rate normalized to athlete-exposure in pivoting and cutting sports. In these studies, incidence rate provided a more accurate representation of ACL injury proportional to the amount of time the athlete was at risk. This work highlighted the second-injury incidence density at 1 year¹⁴ and 2 years¹⁵ after ACLR and RTS in a young, active population. An athlete between the ages of 10 and 25 years who returned to a pivoting or cutting sport after ACLR was 15 times more likely to sustain an ACL injury in the first 12 months than a previously uninjured athlete.¹⁴ Further, the same population was 5 times more likely to suffer a second ACL injury in the first 24 months after RTS compared with an uninjured cohort.¹⁵ Collectively, these data highlight the large risk of another ACL injury in the early stages of RTS after ACLR. In fact, of the patients who incurred a second ACL injury, 30.4% experienced it in fewer than 20 athlete-exposures after RTS, and more than 52% experienced it in fewer than 72 athlete-exposures.¹⁵ These alarming data highlight the fact that our current system of care is failing in a large segment of this patient population, further validating the magnitude of the problem.

IDENTIFICATION OF RISK FACTORS

Discovering potential risk factors is the next critical step to decreasing the incidence of second ACL injury in this population. Researchers have begun to report factors related to ipsilateral graft failure, contralateral ACL injury, and second injury (both ipsilateral and contralateral). With respect to graft failure, younger age has consistently been identified as a risk factor.^{16–21} Two articles^{17,18} based on the MOON data demonstrated that younger patients were at higher risk for graft failure. Adolescents experienced the highest rate of second injury,¹⁸ as the odds of graft failure declined 0.09 for every year increase in age.¹⁷ Similarly,

population database reports from the Kaiser Permanente Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Registry,^{20,21} Swedish National Anterior Cruciate Ligament Registry,¹⁶ and smaller cohort samples^{19,22} also identified younger patients as being at higher risk for graft failure. A second risk factor for ipsilateral ACL reinjury is graft type: specifically the use of allograft tissue. According to MOON data, allograft tissue was 5.2 to 5.6 times more likely to fail than autograft tissue.^{17,23} Similarly, information from the Kaiser Permanente Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Registry suggested higher graft-failure rates with allograft tissue.^{20,21} The combination of allograft tissue and a younger population appeared to increase the likelihood of failure.^{20,23} Beyond age and graft type, factors such as surgical technique,¹⁶ body mass index,²⁰ and posterior tibial slope²⁴ may increase the risk of subsequent ACL injury, but current evidence is limited.

Relatively fewer authors have addressed the risk factors related to sustaining a contralateral ACL injury after ACLR and RTS. Younger age^{20,25} and female sex²⁰ increased the likelihood of contralateral ACL injury. Younger age and return to a pivoting or cutting sport increased the chance of an ipsilateral graft tear or contralateral ACL injury.^{10,19,26} Collectively, the reported risk factors for subsequent ACL injury to either extremity after ACLR and RTS have centered on demographic and surgical factors. With respect to preventing future ACL injury, these demographic data are helpful for identifying at-risk individuals, but they may not represent modifiable factors. Although surgical decision making related to graft type can be altered, a gap in the literature persists regarding other potentially modifiable risk factors to prevent second ACL injury.

To my knowledge, only 1 group has identified biomechanical and neuromuscular risk factors for second ACL injury after ACLR and RTS. Paterno et al²⁷ assessed biomechanical and neuromuscular variables in a cohort of young athletes who returned to pivoting and cutting sports. These data were used to prospectively identify, through multivariate logistic regression, 4 variables that predicted second ACL injury to either the ipsilateral or contralateral knee after ACLR and RTS with high sensitivity (0.92) and specificity (0.88). These predictive variables consisted of 3 biomechanical variables assessed during a drop-vertical-jump maneuver (increased hip internal-rotation moment during the initial 10% of stance phase in the uninvolved limb, increased peak knee valgus during landing on the involved limb, and side-to-side asymmetries in sagittal-plane knee moment at initial contact with the uninvolved limb having a relatively smaller net knee-extensor moment than the involved limb) and altered postural stability. Interestingly, hip-rotation moment at the onset of stance from a drop vertical jump alone predicted second ACL injury with a sensitivity of 0.77 and a specificity of 0.81. This work represents important foundational, preliminary data highlighting potentially modifiable risk factors after ACLR. However, it is not without limitations. Future authors need to more specifically determine independent risk factors for both ipsilateral graft failure and contralateral ACL injury, as these factors may be unique. Once these factors are more clearly identified in the literature, we will progress toward an injury-prevention model.

CONCLUSIONS

The current system of care for patients after ACLR is failing. Outcomes in this population could be improved through an injury-prevention model. The magnitude of the problem is clear, as a high incidence of second ACL injury, particularly in young, active patients, is well documented. In addition, a contralateral ACL injury appears to be more common than graft failure in young, active patients. Preliminary work has elucidated risk factors related to second injury rates, which are likely multifactorial. Future researchers must focus on identifying more specific modifiable risk factors, for which prevention strategies can be developed, as well as nonmodifiable risk factors, such as genetic predisposition,²⁸ related to second ACL injury. As with preventing primary ACL injuries, once risk factors are identified,²⁹⁻³¹ efforts must focus on developing and validating interventions for preventing second ACL injuries.

REFERENCES

1. Prodromos C, Joyce B, Shi K. A meta-analysis of stability of autografts compared to allografts after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2007;15(7):851-856.
2. Frank CB, Jackson DW. The science of reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1997;79(10):1556-1576.
3. Linko E, Harilainen A, Malmivaara A, Seitsalo S. Surgical versus conservative interventions for anterior cruciate ligament ruptures in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2005;18(2):CD001356.
4. Ardem CL, Taylor NF, Feller JA, Webster KE. Return-to-sport outcomes at 2 to 7 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery. *Am J Sports Med.* 2012;40(1):41-48.
5. Oiestad BE, Holm I, Aune AK, et al. Knee function and prevalence of knee osteoarthritis after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a prospective study with 10 to 15 years of follow-up. *Am J Sports Med.* 2010;38(11):2201-2210.
6. Oiestad BE, Holm I, Engebretsen L, Risberg MA. The association between radiographic knee osteoarthritis and knee symptoms, function and quality of life 10-15 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Br J Sports Med.* 2011;45(7):583-538.
7. Bahr R, Krosshaug T. Understanding injury mechanisms: a key component of preventing injuries in sport. *Br J Sports Med.* 2005;39(6):324-329.
8. van Mechelen W, Hlobil H, Kemper HC. Incidence, severity, aetiology and prevention of sports injuries: a review of concepts. *Sports Med.* 1992;14(2):82-99.
9. Wright RW, Dunn WR, Amendola A, et al. Risk of tearing the intact anterior cruciate ligament in the contralateral knee and rupturing the anterior cruciate ligament graft during the first 2 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a prospective MOON cohort study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2007;35(7):1131-1134.
10. Salmon L, Russell V, Musgrove T, Pinczewski L, Refshauge K. Incidence and risk factors for graft rupture and contralateral rupture after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy.* 2005;21(8):948-957.
11. Pinczewski LA, Lyman J, Salmon LJ, Russell VJ, Roe J, Linklater J. A 10-year comparison of anterior cruciate ligament reconstructions with hamstring tendon and patellar tendon autograft: a controlled, prospective trial. *Am J Sports Med.* 2007;35(4):564-574.
12. Leys T, Salmon L, Waller A, Linklater J, Pinczewski L. Clinical results and risk factors for reinjury 15 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a prospective study of hamstring and patellar tendon grafts. *Am J Sports Med.* 2012;40(3):595-605.

13. Wright RW, Magnussen RA, Dunn WR, Spindler KP. Ipsilateral graft and contralateral ACL rupture at five years or more following ACL reconstruction: a systematic review. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2011;93(12):1159–1165.
14. Paterno MV, Rauh MJ, Schmitt LC, Ford KR, Hewett TE. Incidence of contralateral and ipsilateral anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury after primary ACL reconstruction and return to sport. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2012;22(2):116–121.
15. Paterno MV, Rauh MJ, Schmitt LC, Ford KR, Hewett TE. Incidence of second ACL injuries 2 years after primary ACL reconstruction and return to sport. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42(7):1567–1573.
16. Andernord D, Desai N, Bjornsson H, Ylander M, Karlsson J, Samuelsson K. Patient predictors of early revision surgery after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a cohort study of 16,930 patients with 2-year follow-up. *Am J Sports Med.* 2015;43(1):121–127.
17. Kaeding CC, Pedroza AD, Reinke EK, Huston LJ, MOON Consortium, Spindler KP. Risk factors and predictors of subsequent ACL injury in either knee after ACL reconstruction: prospective analysis of 2488 primary ACL reconstructions from the MOON cohort. *Am J Sports Med.* 2015;43(7):1583–1590.
18. Kaeding CC, Aros B, Pedroza A, et al. Allograft versus autograft anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: predictors of failure from a MOON prospective longitudinal cohort. *Sports Health.* 2011;3(1):73–81.
19. Webster KE, Feller JA, Leigh WB, Richmond AK. Younger patients are at increased risk for graft rupture and contralateral injury after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42(3):641–647.
20. Maletis GB, Inacio MC, Funahashi TT. Risk factors associated with revision and contralateral anterior cruciate ligament reconstructions in the Kaiser Permanente ACLR registry. *Am J Sports Med.* 2015;43(3):641–647.
21. Maletis GB, Inacio MC, Desmond JL, Funahashi TT. Reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament: association of graft choice with increased risk of early revision. *Bone Joint J.* 2013;95-B(5):623–628.
22. Kamien PM, Hydrick JM, Replogle WH, Go LT, Barrett GR. Age, graft size, and Tegner activity level as predictors of failure in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with hamstring autograft. *Am J Sports Med.* 2013;41(8):1808–1812.
23. Borchers JR, Pedroza A, Kaeding C. Activity level and graft type as risk factors for anterior cruciate ligament graft failure: a case-control study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2009;37(12):2362–2367.
24. Webb JM, Salmon LJ, Leclerc E, Pinczewski LA, Roe JP. Posterior tibial slope and further anterior cruciate ligament injuries in the anterior cruciate ligament-reconstructed patient. *Am J Sports Med.* 2013;41(12):2800–2804.
25. Andernord D, Desai N, Bjornsson H, Gillen S, Karlsson J, Samuelsson K. Predictors of contralateral anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a cohort study of 9061 patients with 5-year follow-up. *Am J Sports Med.* 2015;43(2):295–302.
26. Ahlden 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):2230–2235.
27. Paterno MV, Schmitt LC, Ford KR, et al. Biomechanical measures during landing and postural stability predict second anterior cruciate ligament injury after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction and return to sport. *Am J Sports Med.* 2010;38(10):1968–1978.
28. Rahim M, Gibbon A, Hobbs H, et al. The association of genes involved in the angiogenesis-associated signaling pathway with risk of anterior cruciate ligament rupture. *J Orthop Res.* 2014;32(12):1612–1618.
29. Hewett TE, Lindenfeld TN, Riccobene JV, Noyes FR. The effect of neuromuscular training on the incidence of knee injury in female athletes: a prospective study. *Am J Sports Med.* 1999;27(6):699–706.
30. Mandelbaum BR, Silvers HJ, Watanabe D, et al. Effectiveness of a neuromuscular and proprioceptive training program in preventing the incidence of ACL injuries in female athletes: two-year follow up. *Am J Sports Med.* 2005;33(7):1003–1010.
31. Myklebust G, Engebretsen L, Braekken IH, Skjoldberg A, Olsen OE, Bahr R. Prevention of anterior cruciate ligament injuries in female team handball players: a prospective intervention study over three seasons. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2003;13(2):71–78.

Address correspondence to Mark V. Paterno, PhD, ATC, PT, SCS, Division of Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, 3333 Burnet Avenue, MLC 10001, Cincinnati, OH 45229. Address e-mail to mark.paterno@cchmc.org.

Copyright of Journal of Athletic Training (Allen Press) is the property of Allen Press Publishing Services Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.