

Part II: Biomechanical Assessment for a Footprint-Restoring Arthroscopic Transosseous-Equivalent Rotator Cuff Repair Technique Compared to a Double- Row Repair Technique

Maxwell C. Park, M.D., James E. Tibone, M.D., Neal S. ElAttrache, M.D.,
Christopher S. Ahmad, M.D., BongJae Jun MS, Thay Q. Lee, PhD.

We hypothesized that a “transosseous-equivalent” repair will demonstrate improved tensile strength and gap formation between tendon and tuberosity when compared to a double-row technique. In six fresh-frozen human shoulders, a “transosseous-equivalent” rotator cuff repair was performed: a suture limb from each of two medial anchors was bridged over the tendon, and fixed laterally with an interference screw. In six contralateral match-paired specimens a double-row repair was performed. For all repairs, a materials testing machine was used to cyclically load each repair from 10 N to 180 N for 30 cycles; each repair underwent tensile testing to measure failure loads at a deformation rate of 1 mm/min. Gap formation between tendon edge and insertion was measured using a video digitizing system. The mean ultimate load to failure was significantly greater for the “transosseous-equivalent” technique (443.0 ± 87.8 N) compared to the double-row techniques: 299.2 ± 52.5 N ($p=0.043$). Gap formation during cyclic loading was not significantly greater for the “transosseous-equivalent” and double-row techniques: 3.74 ± 1.51 mm, and 3.79 ± 0.68 mm, respectively ($p=0.95$). Stiffness for all cycles was not statistically different between the two constructs ($p>0.40$). The “transosseous-equivalent” rotator cuff repair technique improves ultimate failure loads when compared to a double-row technique. Gap formation is similar for both techniques. A “transosseous-equivalent” repair helps restore footprint dimensions, and provides a stronger repair than the double-row technique which may help optimize healing biology.