Article:
Doyle, J., Rombach, I., Court, H. et al. (8 more authors) (2025) Graft choice for child and adolescent medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction: a systematic review. Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery. ISSN 2542-6001

https://doi.org/10.4103/jajs.jajs_34_24

Graft choice for Child and Adolescent Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction: a Systematic Review

Doyle J, Rombach I, Court H, Fowler K, Keiller H, Latham H, Sathyanathan K**, Solanke F, Falzon L, Nicolaou N*, Hind D.**

Investigation performed at the University of Sheffield.
Sheffield Centre for Health And Related Research (SCHARR)
School of Medicine and Population Health
University of Sheffield
Regent Court
30 Regent Street
Sheffield, UK
S1 4DA

Corresponding Author:

Nicolas Nicolaou
Consultant Orthopaedic Surgeon
*Sheffield Children's Hospital
Western Bank
Sheffield S10 2TH
Nicolas.nicolaou3@nhs.net
0000-0003-4872-7180

Jdoyle6@sheffield.ac.uk
i.rombach@sheffield.ac.uk
hjcourt1@sheffield.ac.uk
kfowler3@sheffield.ac.uk
hkeiller1@sheffield.ac.uk
hlatham1@sheffield.ac.uk
ksathyanathan1@sheffield.ac.uk
fsolanke1@sheffield.ac.uk
louise.falzon@sheffield.ac.uk
d.hind@sheffield.ac.uk

Registration: CRD42023464274.

Levels of evidence: CEBM Levels 3-4.

Keywords: Medial patellofemoral ligament, patella instability, patella dislocation, graft choice.

Funding: No funding received

Conflicts of Interest: No conflicts

Graft choice for Child and Adolescent Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction: a Systematic Review

Abstract

Background: Medial patellofemoral ligament (MPFL) reconstruction is a common procedure for child and adolescent patellofemoral instability. Graft choice remains debated, with hamstring autograft being most frequent. This systematic review aimed to assess the safety and clinical effectiveness of isolated MPFL reconstruction in children and adolescents based on graft choice, to guide clinical decision-making.

Methods: MEDLINE and EMBASE were searched from 1946 to June 21, 2023 for randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, case-control studies and case series of patients ≤18 years old undergoing MPFL reconstruction. Risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane tool for RCTs and Joanna Briggs Institute checklists for observational studies. Random-effects meta-analysis was planned where possible.

Results: Twenty-six studies (19 case series, 6 cohort studies, 1 case-control study) with 844 procedures were included. No RCTs were identified. Case series had a mean JBI critical appraisal score of 7.6/10, while cohort studies scored 8.5/11. Re-dislocation rates ranged

from 4-10% across graft types (gracilis 7%, semitendinosus 10%, quadriceps 8%, augmented tape 6%, mixed 9%). Median post-operative Kujala scores ranged from 88.6-92.2.

Discussion: Short-term data suggests isolated MPFL reconstruction has good outcomes regardless of graft choice. However, evidence was limited by lack of RCTs, short follow-up, and under-reporting of risk factors. Most studies provided Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine Level 3-4 (case series) evidence. Better comparative studies are needed with risk stratification to allow comparison of techniques for this procedure.

Levels of evidence: CEBM Levels 3-4.

Keywords: Medial patellofemoral ligament, patella instability, patella dislocation, graft choice.

Funding: No funding received

BACKGROUND

The many risk factors that predispose to recurrent patella instability have led to an evolving spectrum of operative choices. Factors such as coronal malalignment,[1] trochlea dysplasia, periarticular extensor mechanism malalignment,[2] patella height and tibial/femoral torsion all play a role in surgical decision making. This is before the role of the medial constraints are even considered, yet Medial Patellofemoral Ligament (MPFL) reconstruction remains the commonest procedure for child and adolescent patellofemoral instability.[3]

Management in children and adolescents poses challenges similar to those in adult populations but with distinct differences. Young age is a well described risk factor for recurrent instability.[4] Trochleoplasty and tibial tubercle osteotomies in the child with residual growth risk growth disturbance. The technique of MPFL reconstruction needs to be considered in view of open growth plates to prevent growth disturbance.[5] Rehabilitation after knee surgery in children is more difficult to carry out and takes greater time in order to minimise risks and failure rates in comparison to adults.[6] Contemporary operative techniques often translate more slowly into paediatric practice due to these concerns and procedures that are largely abandoned in adult patient populations often persist in the care of the younger age group.[7]

Isolated MPFL reconstruction can be considered a good option with satisfactory reported outcomes,[8,9] although longer follow up may suggest high failure rates[10] in a quarter of treated cases. In children it remains an important surgical technique and identifying the best way to perform this procedure is therefore essential.

Graft choice in improving outcomes is debated extensively[11] for anterior cruciate ligament surgery but less so in patellofemoral instability surgery. Here the technique of reconstruction is often considered, but the procedure of choice is often chosen based on technique as opposed to the graft itself. Hamstring autograft tendon reconstruction remains the most frequent choice,[12] although use of allograft and quadriceps tendon are options that can also be considered. The use of synthetic grafts has a paucity of published data in adults and at present the role in children is not well described,[13] although hybrid techniques do exist.[14,15]

The aim of this review is to systematically review clinical studies assessing the safety and clinical effectiveness of isolated MPFL reconstruction for children and adolescents based on the choice of graft.

Methods

This systematic review was registered with Prospero (CRD42023464274) with the protocol being published - Hind, Nicolaou (2023). Graft choice for Child and Adolescent Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction: protocol for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. The University of Sheffield. Workflow. https://doi.org/10.15131/shef.data.24190260.v1

We searched MEDLINE and EMBASE from 1946 to June 21 2023. We searched trial registers without contacting any of the study authors and followed the 2020 Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) statements.

Randomised controlled trials, cohort comparisons, case-control studies and case series that had patients aged 18 years or younger (the legal definition of Paediatric), having undergone an MPFL reconstruction to address patellar instability, were included. Studies with a mixed age population were included if data specifically regarding the 18 and under population was explicit. The intervention was the use of a graft in order to reconstruct the medial patellofemoral ligament. The different types of grafts that were included were: hamstring tendon (Semitendinosus or Gracilis), Quadriceps tendon, synthetic tape or hamstring/ quadriceps tendon augmented with tape. Grafts could be autografts or allografts. We used non-operative management and other surgical procedures for patellofemoral instability as comparators. Studies were checked to ensure no duplication of the same patients.
The specific outcome measures we assessed were: re-dislocation rates, recurrent instability, need for revision surgery, non-MPFL reoperation and other validated outcome measures.

The validated outcome measures included: International Knee Documentation Committee (IKDC) score, the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS), return to sport, Kujala score, Lysholm score, Tegner score, Visual Analogue Score (VAS), Banff Patellofemoral Instability Instrument (BPII), the Hospital for Special Surgery Paediatric Functional Activity Scale (HSS-FABS) and the Norwich Patella Instability Index. This systematic review focused on studies published in the English Language that have been published in or after the year 2000. The reference lists of eligible citations were also checked for further studies (Appendix 1).

Selection Process

All abstracts obtained were screened against the eligibility criteria by 6 reviewers, blinded to each other's decisions. Once eligible abstracts were obtained, two reviewers went over the full texts in order to check their suitability for inclusion at the analysis stage, once again blinded to each other's decisions (Table 1). Data from eligible studies was extracted from the full texts into a standardised Google sheet, with multiple copies of the data sheet being made to allow blind extraction. Different sheets were combined together in order to produce a complete master sheet, with all queries or disagreements resolved by the six reviewers group and discourse with an experienced reviewer and surgeon.

Data Items

The primary outcome was rates of re-dislocation within our population. Secondary outcomes included ongoing instability, revision surgery, non-MPFL reoperations and other validated outcome measures.

Risk of bias assessment in individual studies

In our complete synthesis risk of bias was assessed and then described. We used the Cochrane assessment tool for randomised controlled trials to assess the risk of bias. For case series and cohort studies, we applied to the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal checklist.[16]

Synthesis

Where multiple studies existed which reported a comparable outcome , their results were presented descriptively using Forest plots to allow visual comparisons of the results. Where outcomes were binary, proportions were presented, and where outcomes were continuous, mean outcomes were presented. Where relevant, data reported as medians and interquartile range or range were converted to means. All results were shown with corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The results of the different studies were not combined into pooled estimates due to the heterogeneity of the studies in terms of study design (randomised and non-randomised studies), age groups included, presence of risk factors (e.g. trochlea dysplasia), type of outcome measures reported and variable length of follow-up.

Reporting Bias Assessment

Due to the surgical and niche nature of the population studied, there would likely be a small number of Randomised Clinical trials and a greater proportion of Single-arm studies. Therefore instead of using the GRADE tool, we used the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine tool, to appreciate the risk of bias across all studies. Additionally, if 10 or more studies on the same intervention reported the same outcome, we produced a funnel plot in order to identify small study effects and determine the risk of publication bias.

Results

Study Selection

1,329 abstracts were obtained with 200 duplicates leaving 1,129 unique abstracts that fit our search criteria (Figure 1). After the primary abstract screening stage, we deemed that 926 of the abstracts would not suit our eligibility criteria and hence were excluded. This left us with 203 full texts to retrieve, with us being successful in retrieving 191 of them in order to assess them at the full-text stage. From these 191 full texts, only 26 fit our eligibility criteria and reported at least one of our specified outcomes. The reasons for exclusion were: ineligible population (99); unspecified or incorrect graft type (31); Undesired or non-specific outcome measures (21); a lack of detail in evaluation (10) and a study published in a language other than English (4).

Study Characteristics

The studies included at full text stage (table 2) were published from 2001[17] and 2023,[10,18,19] and were from 12 different countries. The included publications were from: the USA (7), Germany (4), France (4), UK (3), Japan (2) and 6 other publications each from different countries. The range of ages for included patients were 7-18. The mean follow-up times for the different studies ranged from 6 months[20] to 133.2 months.[21] The different grafts used in the studies were: Gracilis (n=15);[10,18,19,22–33] Semitendinosus (n=3);[17,34,35] Quadriceps (n=3);[10,36,37] Augmented Tape (n=2);[15,21] and mixed Semitendinosus and Gracilis or generic hamstring graft (n=4).[20,38–40] It is of note that the study by Leite *et al* [10] contained discrete data that could be fit into two different graft types (Gracilis and Quadriceps).

Risk of Bias in studies

19/26 studies included were case series (Table 3), where the range of scores for the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal checklist[16] ranged from 5[26]-10[19,40] with a mean score of 7.63. There were two items where all studies met the criteria being 'Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?' and 'Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?'. The worst reported checklist criteria within the studies was 'Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?' which no case series in this study met.

We applied the same checklist to case-control studies, with only one being included at the data extraction stage (Lind *et al*).[32] For this 6/10 items of the checklist were met, with the remaining 4/10 not meeting the criteria.

The Cohort studies (Table 4) that were included there was a range of 5/11[10] to 11/11[28,37] of items met within the checklist. The mean number of items that the studies met was 8.5/11. There were 4 items that were met across all studies (item 3,8,9,11). Item 6 'Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?' was the least well reported with only two studies[28,37] meeting the requirements of this item.

Results of individual studies

36/497 (7%) Knees operated on within the Gracilis graft group had a re-dislocation post-reconstruction occur within their follow-up period (Figure 2). Within the Semitendinous graft group 1/10 (10%) knees had a post-operation dislocation and in the quadricep graft group 4/51 (8%) had a re-dislocation. For the augmented tape graft group 2/33 (6%) of knees also experienced a re-dislocation. Within the final graft group, the mixed gracilis and

semitendinosus or generic hamstring group, 5/57 (9%) observed a re-dislocation post reconstructive surgery. 15 of 26 studies were focussed on the skeletally immature of which 14 reported re-dislocation rates with a median of 5% (SD 4.38) and a range from 0-26%. 2 of 26 included only skeletally mature patients with a median re-dislocation rate of 3.45% (SD-1.62)Range - 0%-7%.The remaining studies consisted of mixed populations or unstated skeletal maturity.

When comparing gracilis autograft re-dislocation rate to allograft, 17 studies reported on autograft redislocation rates with a median of 4% (SD-4.34), range 0%-26%, compared to 2 studies of allograft with a median of 14% (SD-1.98) and range- 9%-19%.

The Mean Kujala scores (Figure 3), within the Gracilis graft group, ranged from 80.3[10]-97.9[24] with a median of 89.63.[31] Alongside these 11 mean Kujala scores there were two median Kujala scores reported of 84[25] and 91.4,[29] these were not included in the median of mean Gracilis group Kujala scores. For the Semitendinosus group the Mean Kujala score ranged from 88.57[34] to 95.4,[35] with a median of 90.8.[17] There was a range of 86.2[10]-94[36] for mean Kujala scores within the quadriceps graft group, and a median mean of 90.1. In addition, there was a separate median reported in the quadriceps group of 89.[37] There was only one mean Kujala score reported for the augmented tape group of 93.6.[21] In the 'mixed gracilis and semitendinosus or generic hamstring' graft choice there was a mean Kujala score range of 89[20]-95.3[39] with a median mean of 92.2. There was once again a separate individual median Kujala score of 91.12[38] within this final group.

Tegner and Lysholm scores were reported for a smaller number of studies (Figure 6 and 7).

Ongoing instability was analysed for each of the different groups (Figure 4). Within the Gracilis group 14/271 knees (5%) experienced post-op ongoing instability, at a minimum follow-up time of 24 months[19,25,26] There was no ongoing instability data within any of the semitendinosus graft group studies. 5/16 knees (31%) within the quadriceps graft choice group experienced ongoing instability, all patients coming from one study by Abouelsoud *et al.*[26] Within the augmented tape group and the mixed gracilis and semitendinosus or generic hamstring group there were 2/33 (6%) and 11/103(11%) cases of ongoing instability respectively.

Revision surgeries (Figure 5) were reported in 27/403 (7%) knees within the Gracilis graft group. None of the knees operated on within the semitendinosus group and the quadriceps graft group required revision surgery. For the augmented tape group 2/33 knees (6%) required revision surgery, and 14/143 (10%) knees needed revision in the mixed gracilis and semitendinosus or generic hamstring group.

Only 3 of the 26 studies included information on participants with ligamentous laxity, 2 including patients with laxity and one excluding them. No studies included scoring of laxity.

Discussion

This systematic review was conducted in order to assess the suitability of different graft choices in paediatric MPFL reconstruction and identifies outcomes to be relatively consistent

across them for the selected outcome measures, although it lacked the data for a statistical analysis and therefore only acts as an indication of efficacy.

Twenty-six studies were included within this analysis, from an original 1,129 individual articles. The pooled rates of post-operative re-dislocation was 4% (6-10%) across the different graft groups, with occurrence most likely in the Semitendinosus group and least likely in the augmented tape group. This confirms the successful role of isolated MPFL reconstruction in treatment of patellofemoral dislocation. Other outcome measures, such as ongoing instability and validated outcome measures also did not differ across the different graft groups.

Follow up was relatively short term in the majority of studies with a wide range. One of the concerns of isolated MPFL reconstruction in the paediatric cohort is the presence of untreated anatomical risk factors increasing the risk of later dislocation, these factors playing a role in recurrence of instability with many studies not stratifying these risk factors. This is a recurring theme within the adult literature.[41 Well-established prognostic data was underreported across our included studies. Body Mass Index (BMI) and the Tibial Tuberosity to Trochlear Groove distance (TT-TG) distance are known factors in patella instability and therefore should be considered.[42,43] BMI was only reported in 5/26 included studies, with TT-TG distances only reported in 15/26. The TT-TG should be considered a composite figure, not a decision making tool that allows understanding of periarticular rotational malalignment that is a complex measurement. The presence of ligamentous laxity was also not documented in the majority of studies. Revision surgery is also a difficult variable to

standardise and indications differ and some cases may be missed that have functional problems post-surgery. The same is true for the reporting of ongoing instability.

The published data on graft groups is heavily weighted to populations treated with a gracilis graft, with the other graft groups under-represented. 31% of quadricep graft treated knees experiencing ongoing instability, this could be due to the fact that all the data for this group for this outcome measure came from one study containing only 16 patients as opposed to a poorer clinical outcome.[36] A greater number of patients in the non gracilis graft groups would be needed for a more accurate representation, and therefore a more reliable analysis. The potential concerns of hamstring allograft seen with ACL reconstruction[44] may affect also the efficacy of MPFL reconstruction.

In particular, although data is limited on Quadriceps grafts, outcomes appear as effective as hamstring grafts in the limited period of follow up and warrants further investigation based on low re-dislocation rates and the efficacy seen in adult MPFL reconstruction.[45–50]

Strengths and limitations

One key strength of this systematic review was the highly sensitive search strategy employed in order to retrieve potentially relevant articles. We were able to screen 1,129 individual articles, allowing us to find 26 full-text studies that were eligible and therefore included in data extraction with two reviewers performing a critical appraisal of each article. This is in comparison to a recent review by Migliorini *et al*[51]which was only able to identify

730 unique entries, due to their less sensitive search strategy and exclusion of allografts and less specific analysis of factors related to failure of the procedure. Our search allowed us to include 334 more procedures in our review (844 vs 510).

Throughout our screening process, we also ensured the reliable inclusion of studies through multiple blinded reviewers being used. Six reviewers screened at the abstract stage, all blinded to each other's results. Any undecided decisions were brought up as a group and then settled, with input from an experienced reviewer and paediatric knee surgeon and then at the full-text stage 203 articles were split into pairs who assessed their eligibility, once again blind of each other.

In terms of weaknesses, our statistical synthesis was limited due to a lack of robust studies and therefore limited high quality evidence. The use of the GRADE tool was avoided in favour of the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine tool due to the lack of randomised studies and could be considered a deviation from normal systematic review methods, but a process we felt appropriate based on the number of case series. A number of clinical outcome scores used are not validated for patients under the age of 16 years such as the Kujala, Tegner and Lysolm but in the absence of core outcomes for Paediatric knee surgery their use by many within the study of the paediatric age bracket is understandable.

We did not consider other surgical variants such as graft fixation techniques and non-anatomical vs anatomical reconstruction, both factors may alter outcomes.[52] Graft harvesting methods may differ in complications, a factor assessed in systematic reviews for

ACL reconstruction[53,54] but not for MPFL. The contemporary reconstruction of other structures such as the medial quadriceps tendon femoral ligament (MQTFL) and medial patellotibial ligament (MPTL) were also not compared, but it is important to note that isolated and combined reconstruction of these medial structures are increasing and may affect future methods of treatment and the evidence base increases.[55–59]

Clinicians using any of these graft types can be confident that current evidence does not suggest one graft type is superior. As the practice of surgery for recurrent dislocation within the paediatric population continues to be dominated by isolated MPFL reconstruction it suggests that better comparative studies of graft choice that takes in to account risk factors such as body weight, skeletal age, coronal and sagittal malalignment, ligamentous laxity and trochlea dysplasia are needed. The TT-TG measurement, considered by many a composite and complicated figure is still a measure of interest despite controversies on what it represents.

Conclusions

The data pooled across the studies suggests that isolated MPFL reconstruction had good outcomes for all graft types. Heterogeneity in both the participant groups, assessment of risk factors, outcome reporting and methodology limits analysis of the published evidence of graft choice for MPFL reconstruction in children and adolescents. Further studies with careful risk stratification and core outcomes are needed to identify if there is a benefit to one particular type of procedure.

Legends for figures and tables

Figure 1: Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) Flowchart showing the identification, selection, eligibility and inclusion of studies.

Figure 2: Forest plot of re-dislocation rates.

Figure 3: Forest plot of Kujala scores.

Figure 4: Forest plot of ongoing instability rates.

Figure 5: Forest plot of revision surgery.

Figure 6: Forest plot of Lysolm scores.

Figure 7: Forest plot of Tegner scores.

Table 1: Search Strategy

Table 2- Study Characteristics

Table 3- Identified case series

Table 4- Cohort studies

1. Bachman DR, Phillips D, Veerkamp MW, et al. MPFL Reconstruction and Implant-Mediated Guided Growth in Skeletally Immature Patients With Patellar Instability and Genu Valgum. *Am J Sports Med* 2024; 52: 698–704.
2. Danielsen O, Poulsen TA, Eysturoy NH, et al. Trochlea dysplasia, increased TT-TG distance and patella alta are risk factors for developing first-time and recurrent patella dislocation: a systematic review. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2023; 31: 3806–3846.
3. Drapeau-Zgoralski V, Swift B, Caines A, et al. Lateral Patellar Instability. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2023; 105: 397–409.
4. Huntington LS, Webster KE, Devitt BM, et al. Factors Associated With an Increased Risk of Recurrence After a First-Time Patellar Dislocation: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med* 2020; 48: 2552–2562.
5. Sochacki KR, Shea KG, Varshneya K, et al. Relationship of the Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Origin on the Distal Femur to the Distal Femoral Physis: A Systematic Review. *Am J Sports Med* 2021; 49: 261–266.

6. Hurley ET, Sherman SL, Chahla J, et al. A modified Delphi consensus statement on patellar instability: part II. *Bone Joint J* 2023; 105-B: 1265–1270.

7. Trivellas M, Arshi A, Beck JJ. Roux-Goldthwait and Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction for Patella Realignment in the Skeletally Immature Patient. *Arthrosc Tech* 2019; 8: e1479–e1483.

8. Wilkens OE, Hannink G, van de Groes SAW. Recurrent patellofemoral instability rates after MPFL reconstruction techniques are in the range of instability rates after other soft tissue realignment techniques. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2020; 28: 1919–1931.

9. Shamrock AG, Day MA, Duchman KR, et al. Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction in Skeletally Immature Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2019; 7: 2325967119855023.

10. Leite CBG, Hinckel BB, Ribeiro GF, et al. Medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction in skeletally immature patients without correction of bony risk factors leads to acceptable outcomes but higher failure rates. *J ISAKOS* 2023; 8: 189–196.

11. Cruz AI, Beck JJ, Ellington MD, et al. Failure Rates of Autograft and Allograft ACL Reconstruction in Patients 19 Years of Age and Younger: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JB JS Open Access*; 5. Epub ahead of print 2020. DOI: 10.2106/JBJS.OA.20.00106.

12. VandenBerg CD, Sarkisova N, Lee Pace J, et al. Current practice trends in the surgical management of patellofemoral instability: a survey of the Paediatric Research in Sports Medicine (PRiSM) Society. *J Child Orthop* 2021; 15: 571–576.

13. Deo H, Mohamed R, Ahmed G. Medium-term outcome of medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction using synthetic graft. *Knee* 2023; 44: 220–226.

14. Nomura E, Inoue M. Hybrid medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction using the semitendinous tendon for recurrent patellar dislocation: minimum 3 years' follow-up. *Arthroscopy* 2006; 22: 787–93.

15. Hobson TE, Tomasevich KM, Quinlan NJ, et al. Tape Augmentation Does Not Affect Mid-Term Outcomes of Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction in Skeletally Mature Adolescent Patients. *Arthrosc Sports Med Rehabil* 2022; 4: e359–e370.

16. Joanna Briggs Institute. Checklist for Case Series. *The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical appraisal tools for use in JBI Systematic Reviews* 2019; 3–3.

17. Drez D, Edwards TB, Williams CS. Results of medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction in the treatment of patellar dislocation. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery* 2001; 17: 298–306.

18. Rueth M-J, Koehl P, Schuh A, et al. Return to sports and short-term follow-up of 101 cases of medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction using gracilis tendon autograft in children and adolescents. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2022; 143: 447–452.

19. Husen M, Milbrandt TA, Shah V, et al. Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction Using Allografts in Skeletally Immature Patients. *Am J Sports Med* 2023; 51: 1513–1524.

20. Reddy G, Hayer P, UlIslam S, et al. Outcomes of allograft medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction in children and adolescents with hypermobility. *Int J Appl Basic Med Res* 2022; 12: 161.

21. Nomura E, Inoue M, Kobayashi S. Long-term Follow-up and Knee Osteoarthritis Change after Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction for Recurrent Patellar Dislocation. *Am J Sports Med* 2007; 35: 1851–1858.

22. Redler LH, Spang RC, Tepolt F, et al. Combined Reconstruction of the Medial Patellofemoral Ligament (MPFL) and Medial Quadriceps Tendon - Femoral Ligament (MQTFL) for Patellar Instability in Children and Adolescents: Surgical Technique and Outcomes. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2017; 5: 2325967117S0038.

23. Wegmann H, Würnschimmel C, Kraus T, et al. Medial patellofemoral ligament (MPFL) reconstruction in combination with a modified grammont technique leads to favorable mid-term results in adolescents with recurrent patellofemoral dislocations. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 2018; 26: 705–709.

24. Schlumberger M, Schuster P, Hofmann S, et al. Midterm Results After Isolated Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction as First-Line Surgical Treatment in Skeletally Immature Patients Irrespective of Patellar Height and Trochlear Dysplasia. *Am J Sports Med* 2021; 49: 3859–3866.

25. Bremond N, Prima R, Rabattu P-Y, et al. Isolated MPFL reconstruction with soft tissue femoral fixation technique in 54 skeletally immature patients: Clinical outcomes at 2 years follow-up. A French multicenter retrospective study. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research* 2022; 103530.

26. Hohn E, Pandya NK. Does the Utilization of Allograft Tissue in Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction in Pediatric and Adolescent Patients Restore Patellar Stability? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2017; 475: 1563–1569.

27. Machado SAF, Pinto RAP, Antunes AJAM, et al. Patellofemoral instability in skeletally immature patients. *Porto Biomed J* 2017; 2: 120–123.

28. Zampieri A, Girardin C, Hocquet B, et al. Patellar dislocation recurrence after pediatric MPFL reconstruction: Bone tunnels and soft tissues versus suture anchors and interference screw. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research* 2022; 103515.

29. Roger J, Viste A, Cievet-Bonfils M, et al. Axial patellar engagement index and patellar tilt after medial patello-femoral ligament reconstruction in children and adolescents. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research* 2019; 105: 133–138.

30. Matuszewski Ł, Tramś M, Ciszewski A, et al. Medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction in children. *Medicine* 2018; 97: e13605.

31. Pemmaraju G, Bassett J, Abbas R, et al. Outcomes of combined tibial tuberosity transfer and medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction for recurrent patellar instability. *Acta Orthop Belg* 2016; 82: 365–371.

32. Lind M, Enderlein D, Nielsen T, et al. Clinical outcome after reconstruction of the medial patellofemoral ligament in paediatric patients with recurrent patella instability. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 2016; 24: 666–671.

33. Kumar N, Bastrom TP, Dennis MM, et al. Adolescent Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction: A Comparison of the Use of Autograft Versus Allograft Hamstring. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2018; 6: 232596711877427.

34. Sadigursky D, Garcia LC, Armede M, et al. Medial patellofemoral ligament and medial patellotibial ligament reconstruction in children: preliminary results. *Revista Brasileira de Ortopedia (English Edition)* 2017; 52: 417–422.

35. Kumahashi N, Kuwata S, Tadenuma T, et al. A “sandwich” method of reconstruction of the medial patellofemoral ligament using a titanium interference screw for patellar instability in skeletally immature patients. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2012; 132: 1077–1083.

36. Abouelsoud MM, Abdelhady A, Elshazly O. Anatomic physeal-sparing technique for medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction in skeletally immature patients with

ligamentous laxity. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery & Traumatology* 2015; 25: 921–926.

37. Nelitz M, Dreyhaupt J, Williams SRM. Anatomic reconstruction of the medial patellofemoral ligament in children and adolescents using a pedicled quadriceps tendon graft shows favourable results at a minimum of 2-year follow-up. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*. Epub ahead of print 10 June 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s00167-017-4597-4.

38. Alm L, Krause M, Mull C, et al. Modified adductor sling technique: A surgical therapy for patellar instability in skeletally immature patients. *Knee* 2017; 24: 1282–1288.

39. Pesenti S, Ollivier M, Escudier J-C, et al. Medial patellofemoral ligament reconstruction in children: do osseous abnormalities matter? *Int Orthop* 2018; 42: 1357–1362.

40. Hannah A, Pigott T, Ali F, et al. Functional outcomes of paediatric medial patellofemoral ligament (MPFL) reconstruction surgery with or without patella distalisation and medialisation for recurrent patella instability. *Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery* 2021; 8: 177–183.

41. Cregar WM, Huddleston HP, Wong SE, et al. Inconsistencies in Reporting Risk Factors for Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction Failure: A Systematic Review. *Am J Sports Med* 2022; 50: 867–877.

42. Marin EL, Bifulco SS, Fast A. Obesity. A risk factor for knee dislocation. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 1990; 69: 132–4.

43. Vairo GL, Moya-Angeler J, Siorta MA, et al. Tibial Tubercle-Trochlear Groove Distance Is a Reliable and Accurate Indicator of Patellofemoral Instability. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2019; 477: 1450–1458.

44. Zhao D, Pan J-K, Lin F-Z, et al. Risk Factors for Revision or Rerupture After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med* 2023; 51: 3053–3075.

45. Fink C, Veselko M, Herbort M, et al. MPFL reconstruction using a quadriceps tendon graft. *Knee* 2014; 21: 1175–1179.

46. Peter G, Hoser C, Runer A, et al. Medial patellofemoral ligament (MPFL) reconstruction using quadriceps tendon autograft provides good clinical, functional and patient-reported outcome measurements (PROM): a 2-year prospective study. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 2019; 27: 2426–2432.

47. Goyal D. Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction. *Am J Sports Med* 2013; 41: 1022–1029.

48. Migliorini F, Trivellas A, Eschweiler J, et al. Pedicled Strip of Quadriceps Tendon Graft for Primary Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction in Recurrent Patellofemoral Instability: A Systematic Review. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery* 2021; 37: 1992–1999.

49. Olotu O, Siddiqui A, Peterson D, et al. The Superficial “Swing-Down” Quadriceps Tendon Autograft Is a Viable Option for Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction: A Systematic Review. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery* 2021; 37: 3187–3197.

50. Kay J, Memon M, Ayeni OR, et al. Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction Techniques and Outcomes: a Scoping Review. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med* 2021; 14: 321–327.

51. Migliorini F, Maffulli N, Bell A, et al. Outcomes, Return to Sport, and Failures of MPFL Reconstruction Using Autografts in Children and Adolescents with Recurrent Patellofemoral Instability: A Systematic Review. *Children* 2022; 9: 1892.

52. Shah JN, Howard JS, Flanigan DC, et al. A Systematic Review of Complications and Failures Associated With Medial Patellofemoral Ligament Reconstruction for Recurrent Patellar Dislocation. *Am J Sports Med* 2012; 40: 1916–1923.

53. Lee GH, McCulloch P, Cole BJ, et al. The Incidence of Acute Patellar Tendon Harvest Complications for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery* 2008; 24: 162–166.

54. Hardy A, Casabianca L, Andrieu K, et al. Complications following harvesting of patellar tendon or hamstring tendon grafts for anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Systematic review of literature. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research* 2017; 103: S245–S248.

55. Yang Y, Zhang Q. Reconstruction of the medial patellofemoral ligament and reinforcement of the medial patellotibial ligament is an effective treatment for patellofemoral instability with patella alta. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2019; 27: 2599–2607.

56. Aicale R, Maffulli N. Combined medial patellofemoral and medial patellotibial reconstruction for patellar instability: a PRISMA systematic review. *J Orthop Surg Res* 2020; 15: 529.

57. Spang RC, Tepolt FA, Paschos NK, et al. Combined Reconstruction of the Medial Patellofemoral Ligament (MPFL) and Medial Quadriceps Tendon-Femoral Ligament (MQTFL) for Patellar Instability in Children and Adolescents: Surgical Technique and Outcomes. *J Pediatr Orthop* 2019; 39: e54–e61.

58. Baskar D, Stavinoha TJ, Sanchez M, et al. Quantifying the Relationship Between the Medial Quadriceps Tendon-Femoral Ligament and Patellar Borders: A Pediatric Cadaveric Study. *Am J Sports Med* 2022; 50: 2433–2438.

59. Hinckel BB, Dean RS, Ahlgren CD, et al. Combined Medial Patellofemoral Ligament, Medial Quadriceps Tendon-Femoral Ligament, and Medial Patellotibial Ligament Reconstruction for Patellar Instability: A Technical Note. *Arthrosc Tech* 2023; 12: e329–e335.

Figure 1: Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) Flowchart showing the identification, selection, eligibility and inclusion of studies



Study	Year	Redislocation	Total	Proportion (95% CI)
Hamstring Autograft				
Alm et al	2017	4	30	0.1 [0.0, 0.3]
Bremond et al	2022	5	54	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]
Drez et al	2001	1	5	0.2 [0.0, 0.6]
Hobson et al	2022	2	33	0.1 [0.0, 0.1]
Kumahashi et al	2012	0	5	0.0
Kumar et al (autograft group)	2018	6	23	0.3 [0.1, 0.4]
Leite et al (gracilis group)	2023	5	29	0.2 [0.0, 0.3]
Lind et al	2016	4	24	0.2 [0.0, 0.3]
Machado et al	2017	1	35	0.0 [0.0, 0.1]
Matuszewski et al	2018	0	25	0.0
Pemmaraju et al	2016	0	8	0.0
Pesenti et al	2018	1	27	0.0 [0.0, 0.1]
Roger et al	2019	0	20	0.0
Rueth et al	2022	1	101	0.0 [0.0, 0.0]
Schlumberger et al	2021	3	54	0.1 [0.0, 0.1]
Wegmann et al	2018	0	7	0.0
Zampieri et al	2022	2	57	0.0 [0.0, 0.1]
Quadriceps Graft				
Abouelsoud et al	2015	0	16	0.0
Leite et al (quad group)	2023	2	29	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]
Nelitz et al	2018	0	25	0.0
Hamstring Allograft				
Hohn et al	2016	2	26	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]
Husen et al	2023	13	79	0.2 [0.1, 0.2]



Study	Year	N	Kujala score Mean (95% CI)
Hamstring Autograft			
Alm et al	2017	30	88.1 [84.3, 91.9]
Bremond et al	2022	54	84.0 [82.1, 85.9]
Drez et al	2001	5	90.8 [80.7, 100.9]
Kumahashi et al	2012	5	95.4 [92.6, 98.2]
Kumar et al (autograft group)	2018	23	97.4 [95.2, 99.6]
Leite et al (gracilis group)	2023	29	80.3 [74.0, 86.6]
Lind et al	2016	24	81.0 [74.6, 87.4]
Machado et al	2017	35	84.0 [81.0, 87.0]
Matuszewski et al	2018	25	94.3 [92.6, 96.1]
Nomura et al	2007	12	93.8 [89.5, 98.1]
Pemmaraju et al	2016	8	89.6 [83.5, 95.7]
Pesenti et al	2018	27	95.3 [92.9, 97.7]
Roger et al	2019	20	91.4 [89.7, 93.2]
Sadigurski et al	2017	7	88.6 [84.8, 92.3]
Schlumberger et al	2021	54	97.9 [96.0, 99.8]
Wegmann et al	2018	7	94.0 [87.3, 100.7]
Quadriceps Graft			
Abouelsoud et al	2015	16	94.0 [92.7, 95.3]
Leite et al (quad group)	2023	29	86.2 [83.0, 89.4]
Nelitz et al	2018	25	88.9 [86.6, 91.2]
Hamstring Allograft			
Husen et al	2023	79	96.5 [94.9, 98.1]
Spang et al	2017	27	85.9 [80.7, 91.1]



Study	Year	Ongoing instability	Total	Proportion (95% CI)
Hamstring Autograft				
Bremond et al	2022	2	54	0.0 [0.0, 0.1]
Hobson et al	2022	2	33	0.1 [0.0, 0.1]
Lind et al	2016	5	24	0.2 [0.0, 0.4]
Machado et al	2017	3	35	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]
Pemmaraju et al	2016	1	8	0.1 [0.0, 0.4]
Pesenti et al	2018	4	27	0.1 [0.0, 0.3]
Schlumberger et al	2021	1	54	0.0 [0.0, 0.1]
Quadriceps Graft				
Abouelsoud et al	2015	5	16	0.3 [0.1, 0.5]
Hamstring Allograft				
Hohn et al	2016	2	26	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]
Husen et al	2023	1	79	0.0 [0.0, 0.0]
Reddy et al	2022	7	76	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]



Study	Year	Revision surgery	Total	Proportion (95% CI)
Hamstring Autograft				
Drez et al	2001	0	5	0.0
Hannah et al	2021	5	40	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]
Hobson et al	2022	2	33	0.1 [0.0, 0.1]
Kumahashi et al	2012	0	5	0.0
Lind et al	2016	5	24	0.2 [0.0, 0.4]
Pemmaraju et al	2016	1	8	0.1 [0.0, 0.4]
Roger et al	2019	0	20	0.0
Rueth et al	2022	1	101	0.0 [0.0, 0.0]
Schlumberger et al	2021	3	54	0.1 [0.0, 0.1]
Wegmann et al	2018	0	7	0.0
Zampieri et al	2022	3	57	0.1 [0.0, 0.1]
Quadriceps Graft				
Abouelsoud et al	2015	0	16	0.0
Nelitz et al	2018	0	25	0.0
Hamstring Allograft				
Hohn et al	2016	1	26	0.0 [0.0, 0.1]
Husen et al	2023	11	79	0.1 [0.1, 0.2]
Reddy et al	2022	9	76	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]
Spang et al	2017	2	27	0.1 [0.0, 0.2]



Study	Year	N	Lysholm score Mean (95% CI)
Hamstring Autograft			
Alm et al	2017	30	85.9 [81.8, 90.0]
Kumahashi et al	2012	5	96.0 [94.1, 97.9]
Sadigurski et al	2017	7	87.7 [83.5, 91.9]
Schlumberger et al	2021	54	95.9 [93.9, 97.9]
Hamstring Allograft			
Husen et al	2023	79	96.5 [95.0, 98.0]
Spang et al	2017	27	84.3 [79.2, 89.4]



Study	Year	N	Tegner score Mean (95% CI)
Hamstring Autograft			
Alm et al	2017	30	6.0 [5.5, 6.6]
Bremond et al	2022	54	4.9 [4.6, 5.2]
Drez et al	2001	5	7.6 [6.1, 9.1]
Machado et al	2017	35	6.0 [5.3, 6.7]
Schlumberger et al	2021	54	6.3 [5.9, 6.7]
Wegmann et al	2018	7	5.0 [3.7, 6.3]
Quadriceps Graft			
Abouelsoud et al	2015	16	5.2 [4.8, 5.7]
Nelitz et al	2018	25	5.1 [4.6, 5.6]



Table 1: Search Strategy

1	Joint Instability/ (23454)
2	Patella/ (10932)
3	Patellofemoral Joint/ (1976)
4	2 or 3 (12337)
5	1 and 4 (1339)
6	((Patella or Patellofemoral) adj2 (alta or instability or Dislocat*)).tw. (1685)
7	Trochlear dysplasia.tw. (592)
8	Medial patellofemoral ligament.tw. (1211)
9	mpfl.tw. (925)
10	or/5-9 (3297)
11	exp Orthopedic Procedures/ (359030)
12	reconstruction.tw. (247711)
13	(Medial adj2 (reefing augmentation or plication or imbrication)).tw. (90)
14	Quadricepsplasty.tw. (150)
15	Proximal realignment.tw. (63)
16	or/11-15 (575569)
17	10 and 16 (1865)
18	limit 17 to "all child (0 to 18 years)" (600)
19	(child* or adolesc* or teen* or juvenile* or infant* or pediatric* or paediatric* or skeletal* immatur*).tw. (2380612)
20	17 and 19 (293)
21	18 or 20 (716)

Table 2- Study Characteristics

Study	Levels of evidence	age range	Follow up (months)	Population	Procedures	Graft	Country	Year published
Rueth *et al*	IV	13-16	32	101	101	Gracilis	Germany	2022
Spang *et al*	IV	10-18	24	25	27	Gracilis	USA	2017
Husen *et al*	IV	8-17	24	69	79	Gracilis	USA	2023
Wegmann *et al*	IV	14-17	50	6	7	Gracilis	Austria	2017
Schlumberger *et al*	IV	11-15	48	49	54	Gracilis	Germany	2021
Bremond *et al*	IV	12-18	24	54	54	Gracilis	France	2022
Hohn *et al*	IV	14-18	24	22	25	Gracilis	USA	2016
Machado *et al*	IV	14-17	44	35	35	Gracilis	Portugal	2017
Zampieri *et al*	III	12-15	30	57	57	Gracilis	France	2022
Roger *et al*	IV	8-17	43	18	20	Gracilis	France	2018
Matuszewski *et al*	III	13-17	24	22	22	Gracilis	Poland	2018
Pemmaraju *et al*	IV	16-18	31	8	8	Gracilis	UK	2016
Lind *et al*	III	8-16	39	20	24	Gracilis	Denmark	2016
Leite *et al*	III	10-17	60	29	29	Gracilis and Quadriceps	USA	2023
Kumar *et al* (autograft group)	III	13-17	49.2	23	23	Gracilis	USA	2018
Sadigurski *et al*	IV	9-13	12	7	7	Semitendinosus	Brazil	2017
Kumahashi *et al*	IV	11-15	27.8	5	5	Semitendinosus	Japan	2012
Drez *et al*	IV	14-18	27.1	5	5	Semitendinosus	USA	2001

Abouelsoud *et al*	IV	8-15	29.25	16	16	Quadriceps	Egypt	2015
Nelitz *et al*	III	9-14	24	25	25	Quadriceps	Germany	2017
Nomura *et al*	IV	8-17	133.2	11	11	Augmented tape	Japan	2007
Hobson *et al*	IV	12-18	58.8	29	33	Augmented tape	USA	2022
Alm *et al*	IV	11-17	25.6	28	30	Gracilis + Semitendinosus	Germany	2017
Pesenti *et al*	IV	11-16	41.1	25	27	Gracilis + Semitendinosus	France	2018
Reddy *et al*	III	7-16	6	57	76	Hamstring	UK	2022
Hannah *et al*	IV	10-16	6	33	40	Hamstring	UK	2021

Table 3- Identified case series

Author	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Total
Rueth	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	7
Hobson	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
Spang	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
Husen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10
Pesenti	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	7
Wegmann	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	8
Alm	Y	Y	Y	U	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	7
Hohn	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	U	Y	N	U	5
Schlumberger	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
Bremond	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	9
Machado	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
Sadigurskl	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	Y	Y	U	Y	7
Roger	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	Y	N	U	6
Pemmaraju	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	U	N	7
Abouelsoud	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	N	Y	Y	Y	U	7
Kumahashi	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	7
Nomura	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	6
Drez	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	7
Hannah	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10
Total	17	19	19	9	6	16	18	18	9	14	N/A

Table 4- Cohort studies

Author	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10	Item 11	Total
Leite	N	N	Y	N	N	U	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	5
Kumar	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10
Neilitz	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11
Zampieri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11
Matuszewski	N	Y	Y	U	N	U	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	6
Reddy	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	8
Total	4	5	6	4	3	2	5	6	6	4	6	N/A