

Two factors that may underpin outstanding outcomes after ACL rehabilitation

H Grindem,¹ M A Risberg,¹ I Eitzen²

Because ACL reconstruction does not automatically lead to successful outcomes and return to play,^{1,2} active rehabilitation is a realistic option that is being adopted by an increasing number of patients.³ In the Delaware-Oslo ACL Cohort Study, we found no differences in 2-year knee function, sports participation or new knee injuries between patients treated with ACL reconstruction followed by progressive preoperative and postoperative active rehabilitation, and patients treated with active rehabilitation alone.⁴ In our 2015 paper, we found that 86–94% of our ACL reconstruction and active rehabilitation group reported 2-year Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) within normative ranges—far superior to the outcomes after standard practice in Norway.⁵

In an accompanying editorial, Dr Häggglund *et al*⁶ asked for the secret to these outstanding outcomes.⁵ We offer two points for consideration.

INTENSE REHABILITATION

First, the superior outcome in our cohort compared to the Swedish KANON³ trial could be explained by differences in the rehabilitation programmes. The KANON trial started in 2002 with a rehabilitation protocol based on evidence available at that time. Two months after injury, the patients performed closed-chain quadriceps exercises only (unknown intensity, volume and progression) and one-legged standing on demanding surfaces.³ The Delaware-Oslo ACL Cohort Study started in 2007. Our patients followed the Norwegian Research Center for Active

Rehabilitation (NAR) programme.⁷ Two months after injury, this programme includes three sets of 6RM full range of motion leg extensions and single-legged hopping. To the best of our knowledge, it is the most progressive preoperative ACL rehabilitation programme published to date—resulting in 73% of our patients passing the preoperative criteria (more than 90% symmetry index for quadriceps strength, hamstrings strength and four single-legged hop tests).⁵ We agree that passing these criteria is not achievable for all patients; however, the preoperative/non-operative potential should not be underestimated as more patients pass the criteria preoperatively than 2 years after surgery.⁴

PATIENT MOTIVATION—CLINICIANS CAN CONTRIBUTE

Second, we argue that patient motivation in the NAR study group is not due to selection bias. ACL rehabilitation is time-consuming as well as mentally and emotionally demanding.⁸ In our experience, the patients do not show up to the clinic already fully motivated—motivation is created and maintained in at least three ways: (1) quality patient education, (2) goal-setting and (3) repeated functional testing (to provide feedback). Thus, a substantial part of our first few consultations is spent counselling the patient. In our opinion, patients must understand why they have problems with muscle strength and neuromuscular function, and why these features should be restored before ACL reconstruction, if they are to realise the importance of rehabilitation.

As with most research, our results introduce new questions to be answered. For now, we believe better rehabilitation results can be achieved by using a structured and highly progressive preoperative and postoperative rehabilitation programme, combined with clear goal-

setting, repeated testing and thorough patient education. Clinicians, and not just those in specialised clinics, should be able to improve outcomes by incorporating these principles in practice.

Competing interests None declared.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; internally peer reviewed.

To cite Grindem H, Risberg MA, Eitzen I. *Br J Sports Med* Published Online First: [please include Day Month Year] doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-095194

Accepted 14 July 2015



► <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094791>

Br J Sports Med 2015;0:1.
doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-095194

REFERENCES

- 1 Ardern CL, Taylor NF, Feller JA, *et al*. Fifty-five per cent return to competitive sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis including aspects of physical functioning and contextual factors. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:1543–52.
- 2 Czuppon S, Racette BA, Klein SE, *et al*. Variables associated with return to sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2014;48:356–64.
- 3 Frobell RB, Roos EM, Roos HP, *et al*. A randomized trial of treatment for acute anterior cruciate ligament tears. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:331–42.
- 4 Grindem H, Eitzen I, Engebretsen L, *et al*. Nonsurgical or surgical treatment of ACL injuries: knee function, sports participation, and knee reinjury: the Delaware-Oslo ACL cohort study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2014;96:1233–41.
- 5 Grindem H, Granan LP, Risberg MA, *et al*. How does a combined preoperative and postoperative rehabilitation programme influence the outcome of ACL reconstruction 2 years after surgery? A comparison between patients in the Delaware-Oslo ACL Cohort and the Norwegian National Knee Ligament Registry. *Br J Sports Med* 2015;49:385–9.
- 6 Häggglund M, Walden M, Thomee R. Should patients reach certain knee function benchmarks before anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction? Does intense ‘prehabilitation’ before anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction influence outcome and return to sports? *Br J Sports Med* Published Online First: 5 Jun 2015. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-094791
- 7 Eitzen I, Moksnes H, Snyder-Mackler L, *et al*. A progressive 5-week exercise therapy program leads to significant improvement in knee function early after anterior cruciate ligament injury. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2010;40:705–21.
- 8 Heijne A, Axelsson K, Werner S, *et al*. Rehabilitation and recovery after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: patients’ experiences. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2008;18:325–35.

¹Norwegian Research Center for Active Rehabilitation, Department of Sports Medicine, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway; ²Norwegian Research Center for Active Rehabilitation, Department of Orthopaedics, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

Correspondence to Dr Hege Grindem, NIMI/NAR, PB 3843 Ullevål Stadion, Oslo 0855, Norway; hege.grindem@nih.no



Two factors that may underpin outstanding outcomes after ACL rehabilitation

H Grindem, M A Risberg and I Eitzen

Br J Sports Med published online August 3, 2015

Updated information and services can be found at:

<http://bjsm.bmj.com/content/early/2015/08/03/bjsports-2015-095194>

These include:

References

This article cites 7 articles, 4 of which you can access for free at:

<http://bjsm.bmj.com/content/early/2015/08/03/bjsports-2015-095194>
#BIBL

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Notes

To request permissions go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions>

To order reprints go to:

<http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to BMJ go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/>