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There is a dearth of reliable and valid instrumentation that measures disability following injury and/or surgery of the knee joint that is responsive to clinically significant changes over time.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether performance-based or patient-reported measures of function are more effective in estimating disability in individuals with an anterior-cruciate-ligament (ACL)-deficient knee. Subjective rating of knee function was used as the criterion measure for disability, and selected performance-based and patient-reported measures were used as estimation variables. Twenty-nine individuals with an ACL-deficient knee participated in this investigation. Step-wise regression analysis revealed that the Cincinnati Knee Scale, Lysholm Knee Scale, and hop index were the most effective estimates of disability. The results demonstrate that patient-reported measures are more related to the patient's level of disability in individuals with an ACL-deficient knee. More research is necessary to substantiate these findings.
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METHODS

Subjects

Twenty-nine physically active individuals with an ACL-deficient knee (15 males, 14 females) participated in this investigation (X ± SD, 28.7 ± 1.7 years, range = 18–50 years). Subjects were screened at the initial examination to determine inclusion in the study. The clinical diagnosis of ACL deficiency was made by an orthopaedic surgeon who used the following criteria: 1) presence of posi-
tive Lachman and pivot shift, 2) excessive anterior laxity using the KT-1000 (MEDmetric Corp., San Diego, CA) and the criteria presented by Daniel et al (9), and 3) magnetic resonance imaging. At some designated point during the rehabilitation program, all subjects completed a series of tests which included selected patient-reported and performance-based measures of function.

Patients were tested at an average of 41.7 ± 11.7 months postinjury (range = 2–228 months) and spent an average of 2.4 ± .33 months in postinjury rehabilitation. The postinjury rehabilitation protocol for ACL deficiency emphasized hamstring strengthening with functional progression. Prior to participation, all patients reviewed and signed a consent form approved by the Human Subjects Committee. Twenty-four subjects (83%) indicated that they had significantly decreased their level of sports activity as a result of the injury, although Tegner activity ratings indicated that the sample remained physically active postinjury (levels 0–3 activities of daily living, N = 12; levels 4–6 recreational sports, N = 13; levels 7–10 competitive sports, N = 4) (30). Most injuries were sports-related, with 12 (41%) occurring as a result of a downhill skiing accident, five (17%) from football, and five (17%) from basketball. Nine (31%) subjects underwent arthroscopic exploratory surgery; five (17%) had partial medial meniscectomies; and two had grade III medial collateral ligament tears, with one of these tears being repaired.

Research Design

We estimated patient disability using a regression equation model. Our dependent variable was disability and was measured utilizing a visual analog scale. The independent (estimation) variables are the collective or sum of both the patient-reported and performance-based measures. The patient-reported measures are the Lysholm Knee Scale and the Cincinnati Knee Scale. The performance-based measures are the quadriceps index, hop index, static balance index, and proprioception index.

Disability Measure

Subjective rating of knee function
Each patient was asked to numerically rate their level of knee function on a visual analog scale from 0 to 100, with 100 being their level of knee function prior to injury and 0 being complete loss of function due to their knee injury. The use of a visual analog scale in orthopaedic research has been shown to be a valid and reliable assessment of function in patients with knee injuries (11,12,18). The subjective rating identifies the patient’s impression of how their knee functions and is used as the dependent variable for our regression model.

Patient-Reported Measures

The patient-reported knee scoring systems used in this study were the Lysholm and a modified version of the Cincinnati Knee Scales. Both scales were self-administered with standardized instructions provided. The cumulative score (X ± SD) for each scale provided a measure of disability and indicates the functional outcome for the involved limb comparing the status of the limb prior to injury or surgery with the current status of the limb. Higher mean scores indicate a lower level of disability.

Lysholm Knee Scale

The Lysholm is a popular knee scale used following knee injury and/or surgery. The scale consisted of eight items related to common symptoms and functional limitations experienced by individuals who sustain a knee ligament injury. The items within the scale are associated predominantly with activities of daily living (Figure 1). Validity and reliability has been reported in the literature (7,14,30).

Cincinnati Knee Scale

The modified version of the Cincinnati Knee Scale consisted of a three-part questionnaire that measures the patient’s
level of activity, as well as symptoms and functional limitations associated with both activities of daily living and sports (Figure 2). Criterion-referenced validity is also well reported for this scale, although test/retest reliability has not yet been reported in the literature (7,14,24,25).

Performance-Based Measures

*Proprioception* Proprioception was measured using a proprioception testing device that measured the subject’s threshold to detect passive motion (Figure 3) (8,19). The proprioception testing device moved the knee at a slow, constant angular velocity (0.5°/sec). A rotational transducer interfaced with a digital microprocessor counter provided angular displacement values to the nearest tenth of a degree. Test-retest reliability for the proprioception testing device has been established with an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) = 0.92 (8,19).

Testing order was randomized and counterbalanced relative to the ACL-deficient and normal limb, starting position, and direction of movement. The subjects were seated in a neutral angle of lumbar flexion (75°), with the popliteal fossa situated 4–6 cm from the edge of the seat to prevent any cutaneous stimula-
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SYMPTOMS

Directions: Using the key (at right), check the appropriate boxes on the scales below which indicate the highest level you can reach without having symptoms.

Key: Description
10 Normal knee, no limitations
8 Able to do moderate activities with running, turning, or jumping; symptoms with strenuous activities
6 Able to do light activities with no running, turning, or jumping; symptoms with moderate activities
4 Able to do activities of daily living; symptoms with light activities
2 Moderate symptoms (frequent, limiting) with activities of daily living
0 Severe symptoms (constant) with activities of daily living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pain</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swelling (actual fluid in knee; obvious puffiness)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial giving way (no fall to the ground)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full giving way (knee collapses and you fall to the ground)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Following my last visit to the doctor, I am | □ Making good progress | □ Slowly progressing |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| □ Staying the same | □ Having worse symptoms | □ Does not apply |

On a scale of 1 to 100, I would rate my knee as ___

Would you be willing to undergo this procedure again? □ Yes □ No

FIGURE 2. Continued from previous page.

Static balance index A commercially available instrumented unstable balance testing device (K.A.T. 2000, Breg Inc., San Marcos, CA) was used for measuring balance proficiency. The balance system consisted of a circular platform with varying degrees of stability centered by a small pivot. The platform is instrumented with a two-axis electrolytic tilt sensor (Accustar II, Lucas Sensing Systems, Phoenix, AZ) fixed at the anterior edge of the circular platform. The objective of the balance test is to maintain a level platform relative to the X and Y axis for the duration of the test. The static balance score is the summed coordinate position of all data acquired for the duration of the test.

The testing protocol consisted of having the individual stand barefoot on the platform. The subjects were randomly tested with one foot on the platform in order to compare the ACL-deficient and normal limbs. The bladder pressures were adjusted according to body weight based on the normalization algorithm in order to standardize the level of difficulty for each individual. Each subject was tested at a 0.5 difficulty level. The knees were slightly bent (~20° of flexion), arms were folded across the chest, and the subject's eyes were fixated on a point 3 m from the wall straight ahead. The individuals were not permitted to view their feet. The subject was instructed to maintain a level base of support for the duration of the test. A 1-minute practice session was provided in order to familiarize oneself with the apparatus. Testing was initiated when the subject establishes equilibrium about the origin, as denoted by an audible beep, followed by the examiner starting the 20-second test. Each subject completed three trials, and the average was recorded. The static balance index was recorded as the quotient between the ACL-deficient and normal limb. The lower the score, the lower the proficiency in static balance. We have determined test/retest reliability to be ICC = 0.84.

One-leg hop index The one-leg hop test is a standardized functional performance test widely used by sports medicine practitioners (3,4,8,14,17,23,29). Function of the knee is emulated in this test by the ability of the subject to propel the body forward and land on the same limb. The test protocol was consistent with the protocol by Barber et al and Noyes et al (3,4,23). With hands placed behind the back, each subject jumped for distance, taking off and landing on the same limb. This method measured the horizontal distance in cm, three trials were performed for each limb, and the best score for each limb was recorded. The criterion measure was recorded as the quotient between the ACL-deficient and normal limb and is referred to as the hop index. The test has demonstrated validity and test/retest reliability (3,4,6,23).

Quadriceps isometric strength index Quadriceps strength was assessed isometrically using a dynamometer (Cybex II dynamometer, Lumex, Inc., Ronkonkoma, NY). The knee was tested at 60° of flexion, eliminating any sagittal shear force placed on the ACL-deficient knee. Subjects performed three maximal isometric contractions against the force pad, and the best of the three trials was recorded as the criterion measure. Strength was measured as peak force generation (N) and compared bilat-
Generally. The measure was recorded as the quotient between ACL-deficient and normal limb and will be referred to as the quadriceps isometric strength index.

**Data Analysis**

All measures were reported as index scores based on a percentage scale of 100. This procedure indicates that the measures for the ACL-deficient limb were compared with some standard. For the patient-reported measures, the current status of the ACL-deficient limb was compared with the status of the limb prior to the injury. For example, the index for the Cincinnati Knee Scale is 63. This indicates that the ACL-deficient limb is currently functioning 37% less than prior to the injury. The indices for the performance-based tests were calculated by comparing the scores for the ACL-deficient limb with the healthy limb. Therefore, the index is defined as the quotient of the ACL-deficient limb divided by the healthy limb. Index scores for the dependent and independent variables are listed in Table 1.

Data were initially analyzed using Pearson product moment correlation coefficients to screen for multicollinearity among independent variables (Table 2) (28). If any two independent variables demonstrated a correlation of $r \geq .70$, one of the variables would be eliminated from the model. Step-wise regression analysis using a forward selection procedure was used to identify significant estimates of disability. Our default criteria was set at an $F_{to-enter} = 2.00$ and an $F_{to-remove} = 1.5$. Alpha was set at 0.05. All data were reduced and analyzed using Statview® 4.02 statistical software for Macintosh (Abacus Concepts, Inc., Berkeley, CA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective rating</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Knee Scale</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysholm Knee Scale</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static balance index</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hop index</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadriceps strength</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprioception index</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TABLE 1. Index scores for the independent and dependent variables.*

![FIGURE 2. Continued from previous page.](image)

![FIGURE 3. Proprioceptive testing device: rotational transducer (a), motor (b), moving arm (c), stationary arm (d), control panel (e), digital microprocessor (f), hand-held disengage switch (g), pneumatic compression sleeve (h), pneumatic compression device (i). Threshold to detection of passive motion (TTDPM) is assessed by measuring the angular displacement (degrees) until the subject senses knee joint motion. (From Lephart SM, Kocher MS, Fu FH, Borsa PA, Harner CD: Proprioception following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. J Sports Rehabil 1:186–196, 1992, reprinted with permission).](image)
JOSPT - Assessing disability with knee ligament injuries (1,15,17,22,24,27,31). The models use clinical measures of pathology (i.e., X-rays, magnetic resonance imaging) and impairment (i.e., laxity, range of motion), as well as patient-reported and performance-based measures of function to determine the clinical outcome. Recent advances in outcome-based assessment has indicated a need to report results from the patient's perspective (13,14,16). Our rationale for using the subjective rating of knee function as our criterion measure reflects this need.

When determining the success or failure of a clinical outcome, it is important for both the patient-reported and performance-based measures to strongly correlate with the level of disability that the patient is experiencing (14,16). A common problem that the clinician experiences is obtaining data on symptoms and functional limitations that may be difficult to discriminate, such as neuromuscular inhibition due to pain, residual swelling, weakness from atrophy and deafferentation, as well as apprehension due to feelings of giving way. In order for any clinical measure to be valid, it must possess sensitivity and specificity to the physical impairment (13). Research has demonstrated low sensitivity of certain performance-based measures due to the inability to discriminate among symptoms and functional limitations that may significantly affect functional performance (23). Conversely, patient-reported measures have been reported to accurately reflect the level of patient disability (7,14).

Our results demonstrate that the patient-reported measures were collectively the better estimates of disability. According to step 1 of our regression analysis, the adjusted \( R^2 = .56 \). The only measure included in this step was the Cincinnati Knee Scale. This finding indicates that 56% of the variability can be accounted for by the Cincinnati Knee Scale. In step 2 of our step-wise regression analysis, the adjusted \( R^2 \) improved to \( .58 \) when the Lysholm Knee Scale is included into the model. This finding indicates that only an additional 2% of the variability could be explained when the Lysholm is combined with the Cincinnati. When the hop index was included into the regression model at step 3, the adjusted \( R^2 \) improved slightly again to \( .60 \). Therefore, only an additional 2% of the variability can be accounted for by the inclusion of a performance-based measure. These findings indicate that the Cincinnati is the best estimate, and that the addition of the Lysholm and hop index does not significantly improve our ability to estimate disability.

An inherent limitation of performance-based measures is that they require physical exertion on the part of the patient and, in some instances, may transmit too much stress on the injured limb. Therefore, performance-based measures may not always be practical for the patient in the early stages of rehabilitation. Barber et al (3) suggest that patients with an ACL-deficient knee should refrain from performance-based functional testing until after the rehabilitation protocol is completed and the patient is asymptomatic with respect to pain, swelling, and episodes of giving way. Examples of performance-based tests that may be too provocative in the early stages of rehabilitation include the one-leg hop, agility, and isokinetic tests for muscular power and work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables in Model</th>
<th>( p ) value</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>&lt;0001</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Lysholm</td>
<td>&lt;0001</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Lysholm, Hop index</td>
<td>&lt;0001</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3. Regression summary for steps 1, 2, and 3.**
A practical alternative to performance-based measures of function are patient-reported measures. Patient-reported measures can be self-administered at any time throughout the rehabilitation program and are not limited by patient apprehension or other physical limitations as a result of the injury. There are many patient-reported measures currently used in clinical and research practice, and utilization is usually based on personal preference rather than proven effectiveness. Due to a lack of generalizability, no knee scoring system has been presently identified as the “gold standard.” For example, the Cincinnati has demonstrated limitations in its generalizability to nonathletic populations, while the Lysholm has been shown to have a ceiling effect when used on physically active individuals (2,7,14,26). In our study, the Cincinnati was the best estimate of disability, followed by the Lysholm. We feel that the Cincinnati was a stronger estimate than the Lysholm due to the high level of physical activity of our patients. In order to overcome these limitations, knee scoring scales should be similar in item content and designed to delineate between symptoms and functional limitations that arise due to activities of daily living or sports activity.

The performance-based measures selected for this study included the one-leg hop for distance, quadriceps isometric strength, proprioceptive sensibility, and balance proficiency. The one-leg hop for distance test is a popular performance-based test used to assess knee function (3,4,8,14,17,23,29). The one-leg hop for distance test is an indicator of the integrated effect of neuromuscular control, strength, and confidence in the limb. Individuals who view their ACL-deficient limb as functionally unstable will be less confident to jump and land on the involved limb. According to Noyes et al (23), a one-leg hop index of less than 85% is considered abnormal and increases the risk of recurrent episodes of instability. The mean one-leg hop index in our study was 84%, indicating that our sample was just below normal and, therefore, at risk for instability. In our study, subject apprehension and lack of confidence in limb performance may have diminished the actual capabilities of our patients and may explain the low correlations with the dependent variable.

Generally, tests of proprioception and balance are not considered provocative and are prescribed in the early stages of rehabilitation (10,14). However, the results of this study indicate low correlations to patient disability. Proprioceptive sensibility is a measure of sensory feedback relative to the individual's conscious perception of joint motion, while balance proficiency integrates both sensory input and motor output for task performance. Research has demonstrated that sensory feedback is diminished in individuals with an ACL-deficient knee (8), while deficits in balance proficiency have not been reported. We postulate that other confounding factors compensated for the deficits in sensory feedback in this study relative to balance or proprioception. One possible compensatory factor may include visual and vestibular input known to contribute to maintaining balance as well as somatosensory inputs from other joints within the kinetic chain (i.e., hip and ankles). Also, subjects may have compensated by shifting their center of gravity during the static balance test by employing different muscle groups unaffected by knee joint sensory deficits to control for balance. This study used only static assessments of balance proficiency, and more dynamic assessments may provide more conclusive results.

The relationship between proprioception and function has been demonstrated by Barrett (5) and Borsa et al (8). Borsa et al (8) reported a strong positive correlation between proprioceptive sensibility and the one-leg hop for distance in ACL-deficient limbs, and Barrett (5) states that limb function relies more on proprioceptive input than strength during activity. However, neither the strength, hop, nor proprioception index significantly estimate disability in our study.

Valid and reliable instrumentation is necessary to measure the level of disability following knee injury from the patient's perspective (14,16). From the results of our study, the most effective estimates of disability were patient-reported measures as opposed to performance-based. We surmise that the patient-reported measures have a higher level of estimation due to the ability of the measures to quantify the tangible symptoms and functional limitations experienced by the patient during both activities of daily living and sports. More substantial research needs to be conducted in order to identify the best models for estimating disability.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future research efforts should focus on conducting prospective studies investigating the efficacy of various models on estimating disability. Significant findings will provide valid models that consistently report functional outcomes with knee injuries.

CONCLUSION

In the reporting process of functional disability for ACL deficiency, we have demonstrated that patient-reported measures provide a more accurate estimate of disability than
performance-based measures of function. The results of this study demonstrate that performance-based measures have limitations in accurately addressing the level of patient disability, while patient-reported measures are clearly more related to the patient's level of disability. More research must be conducted in order to substantiate these findings.
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