Anatomy of the anterior cruciate ligament double bundle structure: a macroscopic evaluation

H. Steckel1,2, J. S. Starman1, M. H. Baums2, H. M. Klinger2, W. Schultz2, F. H. Fu1

1Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, 2Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

Corresponding author: Hanno Steckel, Robert-Koch-Str. 40, 37075 Gröttingen, Germany. Tel: +49 551 392782, Fax: +49 551 395562, E-mail: hanno.steckel@gmail.com

Accepted for publication 24 May 2006

Introduction: Traditional anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) surgery has demonstrated good results, but there is still a subset of unsatisfactory outcomes. Trends in reconstruction technique have changed from bone–patella–tendon–bone to hamstring refixation, and the next step appears to be the double bundle concept. Methods: We examined six fresh-frozen cadaver knees to evaluate the double bundle structure, dynamic motion characteristics and the relationship of knee flexion and relative position of the femoral insertion sites of the ACL. Results: In all knees, we identified an anteromedial (AM) and posterolateral (PL) bundle. The motion pattern demonstrated that the AM and PL bundles are oriented near parallel with the knee extended, and twist around each other as the knee is flexed. The visualization of the femoral footprint anatomy differs with knee flexion.

Discussion: The double bundle model facilitates restoration of the original footprint anatomy and biomechanics more easily than the concept of the ACL as a one-bundle structure and the use of the o’clock position. It is essential to be aware of the degree of knee flexion when drilling the femoral tunnels. Perspective: Anatomic ACL reconstruction is a concept, not a technique, and allows a more refined surgical approach to ACL reconstruction including revision cases and partial ACL tears.

Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) tear is a common injury in orthopedic sports medicine (Brown et al., 1999). Conservative treatment does not restore the normal ACL anatomy, and results in the development of early osteoarthritis due to anterior–posterior (AP) and rotational instability. Therefore, surgical reconstruction is the preferred choice in management. Current techniques in ACL surgery have been associated with satisfactory long-term results in the majority of patients; however, there remains a subset, up to 30% of patients and more, with unsatisfactory outcomes. Specifically, patients report difficulties relating to rotational instability and return to previous level of activity (Gerich et al., 1997; Bach et al., 1998; Brandsson et al., 2000; Anderson et al., 2001b; Goldblatt et al., 2005). Techniques in ACL reconstruction have progressed over time. The most widely accepted graft choice has changed from bone–patella–tendon–bone to hamstring, which is associated with less donor site morbidity (Sanchis-Alfonso et al., 1999; Eriksson et al., 2001; Kartus et al., 2001). The next step in refining surgical technique in ACL reconstruction appears to be the double bundle technique (DBT), which aims at restoring the original anatomy and footprints of the ACL by reconstructing the anteromedial (AM) and posterolateral (PL) bundle of the ACL (Muneta et al., 1999; Hará et al., 2000; Yasuda et al., 2004; Cha et al., 2005). This is in contrast to the single bundle technique (SBT), which attempts to restore the fibers of the AM bundle. The presence of a double bundle anatomy in the ACL is still controversial. While some authors describe the ACL as one continuous structure (Odensten & Gillquist, 1985), others describe two bundles (Girgis et al., 1975; Arnoczky, 1983) or even three bundles (Amis & Dawkins, 1991; Hollis et al., 1991). Restoration of native ACL anatomy and normal knee kinematics is the basic goal in all ACL reconstruction techniques. In radiostereometric studies (RSA), Brandsson et al. (2002) pointed out that knee kinematics following ACL rupture become abnormal as demonstrated by changes in joint loads, and that ACL reconstruction fails to restore normal kinematics. Therefore, there has been a trend in SBT from a more vertical reconstruction to a position closer to the oblique femoral attachment of the ACL, in order to restore a more normal knee rotational stability (Loh et al., 2003; Scopp et al., 2004). In addition to this, Musahl et al. (2005) demonstrated that a femoral tunnel position within the anatomical footprint results in knee kinematics close to the intact knee rather than a graft.
placed at a position for best graft isometry. Thus, it seems reasonable to reconstruct the ACL footprint anatomy by placing two bundles, one closer to the vertical position and one closer to the horizontal position, in order to achieve both AP and rotational stability.

The aim of this study is to describe the relationship of flexion degree and the relative position of the AM and PL insertion sites, as the visualization of the femoral attachment sites of both bundles changes with different degrees of knee flexion and does not seem to receive enough consideration. To provide information for graft choice and landmarks for tunnel placement, we demonstrate the double bundle structure, the femoral and tibial attachment sites, the length and width of the AM and PL bundles and the tensioning pattern of each bundle.

**Material and methods**

We obtained six fresh-frozen cadaver knees (two females, four males), aged from 24 to 40 years, with an average age of 30 years. The specimens obtained had approximately 200 mm of femur and tibia. There were three left and three right knees. Skin, muscles, patella, patella tendon and the joint capsule were removed; however, the passive stabilizing structures of the joint, including the ACL, PCL, medial and lateral meniscus and the collateral ligaments, were left intact. A preparation of the ACL was completed in order to identify and separate the AM and PL bundle. Next, flexion-extension and rotation motion was assessed before and after removal of the PCL and the medial femoral condyle with a testing machine, in order to visualize the motion patterns of the two bundles. Following completion of this step, we marked the femoral and tibial attachment area with a pen. After removal of the AM and PL bundle, the center of the femoral insertion site of each bundle was also marked. We assessed the angle formed between a horizontal line and a line connecting the center of the femoral insertion of each bundle at 0°, 30°, 60°, 90°, 120° and 150° of knee flexion. Individual bundle length and width were measured using a standard micrometer. We defined the length of each bundle as the distance between the central points of the femoral and tibial attachments. Width was measured at the midpoint of each bundle. The cross-sectional area of each bundle was defined by transecting each bundle at its midpoint. Next, the cross-sectional area, the AM and PL insertion sites on the femoral and tibial attachments were measured using digital photographs. Finally, digital photographs were also taken of the femoral insertion site at each of the defined knee flexion angles to assess the angle created by the lines connecting AM insertion, PL insertion and the horizontal plane. For statistical analysis, we reported the ranges and the mean of our measurements.

**Results**

In all six knees, we were able to identify an ACL with an AM and PL bundle, which we divided surgically for better distinction. The femoral insertion site of the whole ACL was semilunar at the posterior part of the inner surface of the lateral condyle with an attachment length of 13–25 mm and a width of 6–13 mm. The AM bundle originated from the anterior–proximal aspect and the PL bundle from the posterior–distal aspect of the femoral attachment with the leg in extension. The cross-sectional area increased from the femur to the tibia. The tibial insertion site of the whole ACL was located anterior and lateral to the medial tibial spine with a width between 9 and 14 mm and an AP length of 17–25 mm. The AM bundle insertion was located at the anteromedial and the PL bundle insertion at the posterolateral aspect of the tibial attachment (Figs 1 and 2). In each knee, we observed a close approximation of the PL bundle to the posterior root of the lateral meniscus, including some common attachment fibers (Fig. 3). The range and means of the AM bundle measurements are shown in Tables 1a and 1b and in Fig. 4(a). Data concerning the PL bundle are demonstrated in Tables 2a and 2b and in Fig. 4(b).
Motion pattern observation of the AM and PL bundle, obtained using our testing machine before and after removal of the PCL and the medial femoral condyle, showed tightening of the AM bundle as the knee was flexed toward 90°, and a tightening of the PL bundle as the knee was extended and when internal rotation was applied at 90° flexion. While AM and PL appeared parallel in the sagittal plane with the knee at full extension, the two bundles twisted around each other with increasing degrees of knee flexion (Fig. 5a, b). The measurements of the angle between the line connecting the centers of the AM and PL insertion and a horizontal line are demonstrated in Table 3.

**Discussion**

Our macroscopic evaluation showed that the double bundle structure can be well distinguished in the ACL, as described by Girgis et al. (1975) and Arnoczky (1983). However, this study reveals the importance of the correlation of knee flexion and femoral insertion site position. It is important to remember that the anatomical description is given with the knee in full extension (Fig. 5a), while surgery is completed with the knee in flexion (Fig. 5b). With the knee in normal position for arthroscopy, flexion degrees between 70° and 100° are reached. In this position, the PL bundle is visualized anterior–distal
to the AM bundle. Bending the knee toward $120^\circ$–$150^\circ$, a more horizontal position of the bundles' insertion sites is reached. The description of the femoral insertion site using the o’clock position is only helpful in the frontal plane (Sommer et al., 2000), but does not account for the three-dimensional nature of the femoral attachment, especially when the double bundle concept is applied. Furthermore, the intercondylar notch measurements and descriptions differ significantly among different authors (Souryal et al., 1988; Shelbourne et al., 1997; Teitz et al., 1997; Anderson et al., 2001a, b).

As described in the literature, we found the orientation of the AM and PL bundle to be parallel in the sagittal plane with the knee at full extension, and twisted as the knee was flexed toward $90^\circ$ (Hollis et al., 1991; Duthon et al., 2005; Takashi et al., 2006). This observation is a critical point for surgical considerations, because of the flexed knee position used during standard arthroscopy. In our study, the AM bundle tightened as the knee was flexed toward $90^\circ$, while the PL bundle tightened as the knee was extended. In a cadaveric study, Sakane et al. (1997) reported a higher in situ force in the PL bundle at $0^\circ$ and $15^\circ$, and a higher in situ force in the AM bundle at $90^\circ$ knee flexion, which was confirmed in biomechanical evaluations by Amis and Dawkins (1991) and Gabriel et al. (2004). The forces within the fibers and bundles change throughout flexion and extension (Takai et al., 1993; Zaffagnini et al., 2004). Therefore, tensioning of the AM bundle should be in approximately $90^\circ$ flexion and the PL bundle in a position near full extension.

Consistent with the existing literature, we found the femoral insertion site of the whole ACL to be semilunar at the posterior part of the inner surface of...
the lateral condyle, with the same range of attachment length (Bernard et al., 1997; Giron et al., 2005; Takashi et al., 2006). The AM and PL bundle originated from the anterior–proximal and posterior–distal aspect of the femoral attachment. With respect to the cross-sectional area of the whole ACL, we observed an increase from the femur to the tibia. The AM bundle inserted anteromedial and the PL bundle posterolateral, as previously reported (Girgis et al., 1975; Arnoczky et al., 1983; Amis & Dawkins, 1991; Dienst et al., 2002; Petersen et al., 2002). Our observation of the characteristics of each bundle showed that the AM bundle and the PL bundle measurements were in agreement with the literature (Kennedy et al., 1974; Kummer & Yamamoto, 1988; Amis & Dawkins, 1991). Although there are good literature data concerning the width of the whole ACL, measuring between 7 and 12 mm (Amis & Dawkins, 1991), there is no good literature database concerning the midsubstance width and cross-sectional area of the AM and PL bundle individually. In contrast to Duthon et al. (2005), we found the AM bundle to be thicker than the PL bundle on average. Our measurements of the cross-sectional areas of the AM and PL bundle at their attachment sites were within the data described by Harner et al. (1999) and Takashi et al. (2006). At the femoral attachment, findings differ concerning the AM and PL bundle sizes; however, at the tibial attachment there appears to be agreement that the AM bundle has a greater attachment, area than the PL bundle. As described by Girgis et al. (1975), we found the PL bundle and the posterior root of the lateral meniscus to have some common attachment fibers. As the PL bundle is often obscured by the AM bundle, the posterior root of the lateral meniscus is an important landmark for tibial PL tunnel placement, especially when only the PL bundle is replaced.

As descriptions of the tibial and femoral anatomical footprints differ within the literature, the location of the remaining ACL fibers of each patient should be examined closely at the time of surgery to ensure proper restoration of the normal anatomy. The exact degree of knee flexion should be taken into account for femoral tunnel placement and for describing tunnel positioning.

**Perspectives**

The double bundle model of the ACL is a logical way to understand the three-dimensional ACL anatomy. Keeping the double bundle structure in mind facilitates a closer restoration of the original footprint anatomy, and improved biomechanics over traditional SBT approaches using the o'clock model. Another advantage of the anatomic double bundle concept is that it offers a model for description of different rupture patterns of the AM and PL bundle, which may guide surgical approach in isolated cases where only one bundle is torn. In these situations, it may be possible to preserve an intact bundle, and replace only the torn bundle. Finally, the concept may be applied to revision cases, specifically in patients where a PL bundle can be used to augment an SBT-reconstructed knee with adequate AP but poor rotational stability. Clinical outcomes studies are needed for an objective evaluation of the DBT approach. One important component in studying outcomes from DBT is inclusion of more accurate measurements of rotational stability and three-dimensional knee kinematics. Possible techniques include video motion analysis, computer navigation, RSA and dynamic MRI. In the future, these tools may help to determine the clinical utility of this approach to ACL reconstruction.
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