# Return to Play in Amateur Soccer Players Undergoing Hip Arthroscopy: Short- to Mid-Term Follow-Up

Victor Ortiz-Declet, M.D., Leslie C. Yuen, B.A., Garrett R. Schwarzman, M.D., Austin W. Chen, M.D., Itay Perets, M.D., and Benjamin G. Domb, M.D.

Purpose: To describe patient-reported outcomes (PROs) and return to play at any level in amateur soccer players undergoing hip arthroscopy for femoroacetabular impingement syndrome at short- to mid-term follow-up. Methods: Data were prospectively collected and retrospectively reviewed for patients who underwent hip arthroscopy between March 2009 and June 2014. Patients who participated in amateur soccer within 1 year prior to surgery and intended to return to their sport after hip arthroscopy for femoroacetabular impingement syndrome were considered for inclusion in our study. Patients were excluded if they had a preoperative Tönnis osteoarthritis grade of 2 or greater, previous ipsilateral hip conditions or hip surgical procedures, or Workers' Compensation status. The patients from the initial group who had preoperative and minimum 2-year postoperative measures for the modified Harris Hip Score, Non-Arthritic Hip Score, Hip Outcome Score–Sports Specific Subscale, and visual analog scale for pain were included in our final group. In addition to PROs, data regarding the patients' return to soccer, surgical complications, and secondary surgical procedures were collected. **Results:** A total of 41 patients were eligible for inclusion in our study, of whom 34 (82.9%) had a mean followup period of 47.4 months. Five patients were not eligible because they did not intend to return to soccer. There were 15 male hips (44.1%) and 19 female hips (55.9%). The mean age at surgery was 20.8  $\pm$  7.4 years. All PROs and the visual analog scale score improved significantly from preoperatively to latest follow-up. Of the 34 patients, 27 (79.4%) returned to soccer. Of the patients who returned to soccer, 19 (70.4%) were competing at the same level or a higher level compared with their highest level within 1 year of surgery. Regardless of competitive level, 21 patients (77.8%) reported that their

From American Hip Institute (B.G.D.), Des Plaines; University of Illinois at Chicago (G.R.S., B.G.D.), Chicago, Illinois; Kayal Orthopaedics (V.O-D.), Franklin Lakes, New Jersey; Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth (L.C.Y.), Hanover, New Hampshire; Boulder Center for Orthopedics (A.W.C.), Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.; and Hadassah Hebrew University Hospital (I.P.), Jerusa-lem, Israel.

The authors report the following potential conflicts of interest or sources of funding: B.G.D reports grants and other from American Orthopedic Foundation, during the conduct of the study; personal fees from Adventist Hinsdale Hospital, personal fees and non-financial support from Amplitude, grants, personal fees and non-financial support from Arthrex, personal fees and nonfinancial support from DJO Global, grants from Kaufman Foundation, grants, personal fees and non-financial support from Medacta, grants, personal fees, non-financial support and other from Pacira Pharmaceuticals, grants, personal fees, non-financial support and other from Stryker, grants from Breg, personal fees from Orthomerica, grants, personal fees, nonfinancial support and other from Mako Surgical Corp, grants and nonfinancial support from Medwest Associates, grants from ATI Physical Therapy, grants, personal fees and non-financial support from St. Alexius Medical Center, grants from Ossur, outside the submitted work; In addition, Dr. Domb has a patent 8920497 - Method and instrumentation for acetabular labrum reconstruction with royalties paid to Arthrex, a patent 8708941 - Adjustable multi-component hip orthosis with royalties paid to Orthomerica and DJO Global, and a patent 9737292 - Knotless suture anchors and methods of tissue repair with royalties paid to Arthrex and Dr. Domb is the Medical Director of Hip Preservation at St. Alexius Medical Center, a board member for the American Hip Institute Research Foundation, AANA Learning Center Committee, the Journal of Hip Preservation Surgery, the Journal of Arthroscopy; has HAD ownership interests in the American Hip Institute, Hinsdale

Orthopedic Associates, Hinsdale Orthopedic Imaging, SCD#3, North Shore Surgical Suites, and Munster Specialty Surgery Center. V.O.-D. reports nonfinancial support from Abbvie, grants and non-financial support from Arthrex, non-financial support from Bioventus LLC, non-financial support from Ferring Pharmaceuticals, non-financial support from Horizon Pharma, non-financial support from Johnson and Johnson, non-financial support from Medacta USA, non-financial support from SeaPearl, non-financial support from Smith & Nephew, non-financial support from Stryker Corporation, nonfinancial support from Tornier, non-financial support from Vericel Corporation, non-financial support from Vertical Pharmaceuticals, outside the submitted work. A.W.C reports grants, personal fees and non-financial support from Arthrex, non-financial support from Smith & Nephew, non-financial support from Ceterix, non-financial support from DePuy Synthes Sales, nonfinancial support from Desert Mountain Medical, non-financial support from Horizon Pharma, non-financial support from Medacta USA, non-financial support from Medtronic Xomed, non-financial support from Orthogenrx, nonfinancial support from Stryker, non-financial support from Tornier, grants from DJO Global, non-financial support from Gemini Mountain Medical, outside the submitted work. Full ICMJE author disclosure forms are available for this article online, as supplementary material.

Received January 14, 2018; accepted August 9, 2019.

Address correspondence to Benjamin G. Domb, M.D., American Hip Institute, 999 E Touhy Ave, Ste 450, Des Plaines, IL 60016, U.S.A. E-mail: DrDomb@americanhipinstitute.org

© 2019 by the Arthroscopy Association of North America 0749-8063/171221/\$36.00 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arthro.2019.08.027

# **ARTICLE IN PRESS**

athletic ability was the same as or higher than it was within 1 year of surgery. **Conclusions:** Hip arthroscopy was associated with significant improvements in PROs for amateur soccer players. There was a high level of return to soccer and a high proportion of patients whose competitive level was similar or improved. As such, hip arthroscopy is a good option for soccer players, in the absence of underlying osteoarthritis, presenting with hip pathology. **Level of Evidence:** Level IV, case series.

C occer is the most popular sport in the world, with  $\bigcirc$  over 265 million competitors playing the game.<sup>1</sup> In the United States, soccer ranks as the fourth most popular sport, with 30% of houses in the country having 1 or more soccer players.<sup>2</sup> Given the immense popularity and participation in the game, an evaluation of common injuries and return to play after treatment is essential. A large number of athletes at different levels of competition present with hip pain and functional disability related to femoroacetabular impingement (FAI) syndrome.<sup>3-5</sup> A recent radiographic study by Gerhardt et al.<sup>6</sup> of elite soccer players suggested that cam morphology was present in 68% of male players and 50% of female players whereas pincer deformities were present in 26.7% of male players and 10% of female players.

Hip arthroscopy has become an extremely common intervention for numerous hip pathologic conditions in athletes.<sup>7</sup> FAI is most commonly diagnosed in athletes participating in sports such as soccer that require repeated changes in direction causing high rotational loads across the hip joint.<sup>5,8</sup> Cam-type deformity has a high prevalence among athletes participating in high-impact activities, especially during adolescence.<sup>9-12</sup> The objectives of surgery are to reduce hip pain, improve hip function, allow athletes to return to their sporting activities, and decelerate the degenerative changes within the hip joint.<sup>5,13</sup>

Studies among elite athletes have shown positive outcomes both at initial follow-up and at 10-year follow-up in terms of return to play and level of play after hip arthroscopy.<sup>14</sup> Regarding recreational athletes, studies have shown that professional players are able to return more quickly than they are but with similar patient-reported outcomes (PROs).<sup>15</sup>

Given the increasing incidence of hip arthroscopy for a wide range of pathologic conditions, as well as the over 265 million soccer players worldwide, it is worthwhile to investigate outcomes in soccer players undergoing hip arthroscopy. The purpose of this study was to describe PROs and return to play at any level in amateur soccer players undergoing hip arthroscopy for FAI syndrome at short- to mid-term follow-up. Our hypothesis was that hip arthroscopy would be an effective treatment for soccer players and that the postoperative level of play would be the same as or better than the preoperative level.

## Methods

# **Patient Selection Criteria**

Data were prospectively collected and retrospectively reviewed for all patients who underwent hip arthroscopy for FAI syndrome performed by the senior author (B.G.D.) between March 2009 and June 2014. Patients were excluded from our study if they had a preoperative Tönnis osteoarthritis grade of 2 or greater, previous ipsilateral hip conditions or hip surgical procedures, or Workers' Compensation status. Patients of any age who participated in amateur soccer within 1 year prior to surgery and intended to return to their sport after surgery were considered for inclusion in our study. If patients indicated their intention not to return to play soccer when responding to the preoperative questionnaire (Appendix 1, available at www.arthroscopyjournal.org), they were excluded. The patients from the initial group who had preoperative and minimum 2-year postoperative measures for the modified Harris Hip Score (mHHS), Non-Arthritic Hip Score (NAHS), Hip Outcome Score-Sports Specific Subscale (HOS-SSS), and visual analog scale (VAS) for pain were included in our final case series. This study was approved by the institutional review board.

#### Indications for Surgery

All surgical candidates underwent a detailed medical history, physical examination, and radiographic analysis. Gait, range of motion, strength, points of tenderness, signs of impingement, and any mechanical symptoms (snapping, catching, and locking) were noted during a clinic visit. A series of radiographs (standing and supine anteroposterior pelvis, false-profile, modified Dunn, and crosstable lateral views) were used to evaluate patients for cam or pincer morphology, acetabular version, dysplasia, and Tönnis osteoarthritis grade. Labral tears and intra-articular injuries were assessed using magnetic resonance arthrography. We recommended surgery if patients had hip pain due to labral tears and FAI interfering with the activities of daily living for at least 3 months and did not improve with rest, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, physical therapy or cortisone injections.

#### **Surgical Technique**

All surgical procedures were performed by a single surgeon (B.G.D.) at a tertiary hip preservation center.

The patient was positioned supine on a traction table with a well-padded perineal post. After adequate subluxation was obtained, the standard anterolateral and midanterior portals were created, the joint was accessed, and a capsulotomy was performed with an arthroscopic knife. A diagnostic arthroscopy was then performed to evaluate the ligamentum teres (LT), intraarticular cartilage, and labrum using the Domb classification system; LT using the Villar classification system; intra-articular cartilage using the acetabular labrum articular disruption (ALAD) and Outerbridge classification systems; and labrum using the Seldes classification system. On the basis of preoperative imaging and fluoroscopic guidance, an acetabuloplasty was performed to address pincer impingement and a femoroplasty was performed to address femoral cam deformities. LT tears were treated with debridement, and full-thickness chondral defects of the femoral head and acetabulum were treated with microfracture. Patients with an iliopsoas impingement lesion or painful internal snapping were treated with iliopsoas fractional lengthening. Labral tears were repaired or selectively debrided when the labrum was salvageable. When the labrum was irreparable, a reconstruction was performed using a semitendinosus allograft. On the basis of the patient's Beighton score and acetabular coverage, the capsule was either released, repaired, or plicated. If indicated, the peritrochanteric space was accessed through the posterolateral and accessory distal lateral portals to address trochanteric or gluteus medius pathologic conditions.

### Rehabilitation

Patients were instructed to use crutches with toe-touch weight bearing (20 lb) and a low-profile abduction brace (X-Act ROM brace; DJO Global, Vista, CA) for 2 weeks. As early as 1 day postoperatively, patients were to begin physical therapy to restore strength and range of motion. For patients who underwent labral reconstruction, gluteus medius repair, or microfracture, the postoperative treatment plan was adjusted as needed. In general, patients start running 10 to 12 weeks after surgery. Cutting and pivoting are allowed 5 to 6 months after surgery. The return-to-sport phase with full contact is generally 6 to 8 months from surgery.

#### **Outcome Evaluation**

For each patient included in our study, PROs were recorded preoperatively and at a minimum of 2 years postoperatively. Scoring standards collected included the mHHS, NAHS, HOS-SSS, and VAS score for pain at all time points, as well as the International Hip Outcome Tool 12 (iHOT-12) score at latest follow-up; however, preoperative values for the iHOT-12 scale were not available prior to 2012, with the initiation of collection at the center. The PROs were scored from 0 (lowest possible score) to 100 (highest possible score), and the VAS was scored from 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst possible pain). Patient satisfaction was also collected at minimum 2-year follow-up and was scored from 0 (lowest satisfaction) to 10 (highest satisfaction). Statistical analysis of PROs was completed using the scores obtained at latest followup beyond 2 years. In addition to PROs, data were collected regarding the patients' return to soccer. Patients who were still playing soccer at minimum 2-year followup were evaluated based on their competitive and ability levels before and after surgery. Competitive levels were divided into recreational or fitness, high school, college, organized amateur competition, and professional. Patients were asked if they believed that their athletic ability had worsened, improved, or remained the same. Patients who did not continue playing soccer were evaluated based on their reasons for not returning. All postoperative complications, secondary arthroscopies, and conversions to total hip arthroplasty were also identified.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA) was used for all statistical analysis. Data were tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test and for equal variance using the *F* test. Continuous data were compared using the 2-tailed Student test in the setting of parametric data or the Wilcoxon signed rank test in the setting of nonparametric data. The  $\chi^2$  and Fisher exact tests were used to compare categorical data.

## Results

#### **Patient Demographic Characteristics**

After the application of all inclusion and exclusion criteria, 34 patients were included in this study. The average follow-up time was  $47.4 \pm 20.9$  months (range, 24.0-83.4 months). In this case series, there were 15 male hips (44.1%) and 19 female hips (55.9%). The mean age at surgery of patients with labral tears was 20.8  $\pm$  7.4 years, and the mean body mass index was 22.8  $\pm$  4.1. All patient demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1	l.	Patient	Demographic	Characteristics
---------	----	---------	-------------	-----------------

Characteristic	Data
Patients and hips included	
in study, n (%)	
Left hip	18 (52.9)
Right hip	16 (47.1)
Sex, n (%)	
Male	15 (44.1)
Female	19 (55.9)
Age at surgery, mean $\pm$ SD (range), yr	$20.8 \pm 7.4 \ (14.4-47.4)$
BMI, mean $\pm$ SD (range)	$22.8 \pm 4.1 \ (17.0-36.9)$
Follow-up time, mean $\pm$ SD (range), mo	$47.4 \pm 20.9 \ (24.0-83.4)$
Follow-up, %	82.9
ronow-up, %	02.9

BMI, body mass index; SD, standard deviation.

# ARTICLE IN PRESS

#### V. ORTIZ-DECLET ET AL.

Table 2. Intraoperative Findings

Seldes tear type       0       0       0       0         I       12 $(35.3)$ II       13 $(38.2)$ I and II       9 $(26.5)$ 9 $(26.5)$ ALAD classification       9 $(26.5)$ 1       9 $(26.5)$ 1       9 $(26.5)$ 1       9 $(26.5)$ 2       14 $(41.2)$ 3       2 $(5.9)$ 4       0 $(0)$ 0       0       0         Outerbridge classification       Acetabular       0 $(0)$ 0       0       0 $0$ 9 $(26.5)$ 1       9 $(26.5)$ 2       14 $(41.2)$ 3       2 $(5.9)$ 4       0 $(0)$ 0       0         Femoral head       0       0       31 $(91.2)$ 1 $0$ $(0)$ 2 $(5.9)$ 4       1 $(2.9)$ 1 $(2.9)$ 1 $(2.9)$ $(2.9)$ $(2.9)$ $(2.9)$ $(2.9)$ $(2.9)$ $(2.5)$ $(2.5)$ $(2.5)$ $(2.5)$	Finding	n (%)
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} 0 & 0 & (0) \\ I & 12 & (35.3) \\ II & 13 & (38.2) \\ I and II & 9 & (26.5) \\ ALAD classification \\ 0 & 9 & (26.5) \\ 1 & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2 & 14 & (41.2) \\ 3 & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & 0 & (0) \\ Outerbridge classification \\ Acetabular \\ 0 & 9 & (26.5) \\ 1 & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2 & 14 & (41.2) \\ 3 & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & 0 & (0) \\ \hline Femoral head \\ 0 & 31 & (91.2) \\ 1 & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & 0 & (0) \\ 3 & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & 0 & (0) \\ 3 & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & 1 & (2.9) \\ IT percentile class (Domb classification) \\ 0: 0\% & 19 & (55.9) \\ 4 & 1 & (2.9) \\ IT percentile class (Domb classification) \\ 0: 0\% & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: >0\% & to <50\% & 2 & (5.9) \\ 1: >0\% & to <50\% & 2 & (5.9) \\ Villar classification of LT \\ 0: no tear & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: complete rupture & 2 & (5.9) \\ 2: partial tear & 10 & (29.4) \\ 3: degenerated tear & 3 & (8.8) \\ \end{array}$	Seldes tear type	
I12 (35.3)II13 (38.2)I and II9 (26.5)ALAD classification909 (26.5)19 (26.5)214 (41.2)32 (5.9)40 (0)Outerbridge classification $(44.1.2)$ Acetabular9 (26.5)19 (26.5)214 (41.2)32 (5.9)40 (0)Femoral head0031 (91.2)10 (0)20 (0)32 (5.9)41 (2.9)LT percentile class (Domb classification)00: 0%19 (55.9)1: >0% to <50%	0	0 (0)
II       13 (38.2)         I and II       9 (26.5)         ALAD classification       9 (26.5)         0       9 (26.5)         1       9 (26.5)         2       14 (41.2)         3       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         Outerbridge classification       Acctabular         0       9 (26.5)         1       9 (26.5)         2       14 (41.2)         3       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         Femoral head       0 (0)         5       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         2       0 (0)         3       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         2       0 (0)         3       2 (5.9)         4       1 (2.9)         LT percentile class (Domb classification)       0 (0)         0:       0%       19 (55.9)         1: >0% to <50%	Ι	12 (35.3)
I and II9 (26.5)ALAD classification9 (26.5)09 (26.5)19 (26.5)214 (41.2)32 (5.9)40 (0)Outerbridge classification $Acetabular$ 09 (26.5)19 (26.5)214 (41.2)32 (5.9)40 (0)Femoral head0031 (91.2)10 (0)20 (0)32 (5.9)41 (2.9)LT percentile class (Domb classification)0 (0)0:0%19 (55.9)1:>0% to <50%	П	13 (38.2)
ALAD classification       9 (26.5)         1       9 (26.5)         2       14 (41.2)         3       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         Outerbridge classification       Acetabular         0       9 (26.5)         1       9 (26.5)         2       14 (41.2)         3       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         Femoral head       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         Femoral head       0 (0)         2       0 (0)         3       2 (5.9)         4       1 (91.2)         1       0 (0)         2       0 (0)         3       2 (5.9)         4       1 (2.9)         LT percentile class (Domb classification)       0 (0)         2: 50% to <100%	I and II	9 (26.5)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	ALAD classification	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0	9 (26.5)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	9 (26.5)
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} 3 & & & & & & & & \\ 4 & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & & & & & & & \\ 0 & & & &$	2	14 (41.2)
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 4 & & & & 0 & (0) \\ Outerbridge classification \\ Acetabular \\ 0 & & & 9 & (26.5) \\ 1 & & & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2 & & & 14 & (41.2) \\ 3 & & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ \hline Femoral head & & & & \\ 0 & & & & & 31 & (91.2) \\ 1 & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 3 & & & & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & & & & & 1 & (2.9) \\ LT percentile class (Domb classification) & & & & \\ 0 & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & 0 & (5.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & 0 & (5.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 3 & & & & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ LT percentile class (Domb classification) & & & & \\ 0 & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & 0 & (26.5) \\ 2 & & & & & & 0 & (100\% & & & 4 & (11.8) \\ 3 & & & & & & 100\% & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ \hline Villar classification of LT & & & & \\ 0 & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 2 & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1 & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 2 & & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 2 & & & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 2 & & & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 2 & & & & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 2 & & & & & & & & & & & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 2 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	3	2 (5.9)
Outerbridge classification         Acetabular         0       9 (26.5)         1       9 (26.5)         2       14 (41.2)         3       2 (5.9)         4       0 (0)         Femoral head       0         0       31 (91.2)         1       0 (0)         2       0 (0)         3       2 (5.9)         4       1 (2.9)         LT percentile class (Domb classification)       0         0:       0%       19 (55.9)         1: >0% to <50%	4	0 (0)
Acetabular09 (26.5)19 (26.5)214 (41.2)32 (5.9)40 (0)Femoral head0031 (91.2)10 (0)20 (0)32 (5.9)41 (2.9)LT percentile class (Domb classification)00:0%19 (55.9)1: >0% to <50%	Outerbridge classification	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Acetabular	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0	9 (26.5)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	9 (26.5)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2	14 (41.2)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3	2 (5.9)
Femoral head031 (91.2)10 (0)20 (0)32 (5.9)41 (2.9)LT percentile class (Domb classification)0: 0%0: 0%19 (55.9)1: >0% to <50%	4	0 (0)
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & 31 & (91.2) \\ 1 & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & 0 & (0) \\ 3 & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & 1 & (2.9) \\ \text{LT percentile class (Domb classification)} \\ 0: 0\% & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: >0\% & to <50\% & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2: 50\% & to <100\% & 4 & (11.8) \\ 3: 100\% & 2 & (5.9) \\ \text{Villar classification of LT} \\ 0: no tear & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: complete rupture & 2 & (5.9) \\ 1: complete rupture & 2 & (5.9) \\ 2: partial tear & 10 & (29.4) \\ 3: degenerated tear & 3 & (8.8) \\ \end{array}$	Femoral head	
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 2 & & & & 0 & (0) \\ 3 & & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & & & & 1 & (2.9) \\ \text{LT percentile class (Domb classification)} & & & \\ 0: & 0\% & & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: & >0\% & to <50\% & & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2: & 50\% & to <100\% & & 4 & (11.8) \\ 3: & 100\% & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ \text{Villar classification of LT} & & & \\ 0: & no & tear & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: & complete rupture & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 1: & complete rupture & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 2: & partial & tear & & & 10 & (29.4) \\ 3: & degenerated & tear & & & & 3 & (8.8) \\ \end{array}$	0	31 (91.2)
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 2 & 0 & (0) \\ 3 & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & 1 & (2.9) \\ \text{LT percentile class (Domb classification)} \\ 0: 0\% & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: >0\% & to <50\% & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2: 50\% & to <100\% & 4 & (11.8) \\ 3: 100\% & 2 & (5.9) \\ \text{Villar classification of LT} \\ 0: no tear & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: complete rupture & 2 & (5.9) \\ 1: complete rupture & 2 & (5.9) \\ 2: partial tear & 10 & (29.4) \\ 3: degenerated tear & 3 & (8.8) \\ \end{array}$	1	0 (0)
$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 3 & & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 4 & & & 1 & (2.9) \\ \text{LT percentile class (Domb classification)} & & & \\ 0: 0\% & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: >0\% & to <50\% & & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2: 50\% & to <100\% & & 4 & (11.8) \\ 3: 100\% & & 2 & (5.9) \\ \text{Villar classification of LT} & & \\ 0: & no tear & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: & complete rupture & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 1: & complete rupture & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 2: & partial tear & & 10 & (29.4) \\ 3: & degenerated tear & & 3 & (8.8) \\ \end{array}$	2	0 (0)
$\begin{array}{cccc} 4 & & 1 & (2.9) \\ \text{LT percentile class (Domb classification)} & & & \\ 0: 0\% & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: >0\% & to <50\% & & 9 & (26.5) \\ 2: 50\% & to <100\% & & 4 & (11.8) \\ 3: 100\% & & 2 & (5.9) \\ \text{Villar classification of LT} & & \\ 0: & no tear & & 19 & (55.9) \\ 1: & complete rupture & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 1: & complete rupture & & 2 & (5.9) \\ 2: & partial tear & & 10 & (29.4) \\ 3: & degenerated tear & & 3 & (8.8) \\ \end{array}$	3	2 (5.9)
LT percentile class (Domb classification) 0: 0% 19 (55.9) 1: >0% to <50% 9 (26.5) 2: 50% to <100% 4 (11.8) 3: 100% 2 (5.9) Villar classification of LT 0: no tear 19 (55.9) 1: complete rupture 2 (5.9) 2: partial tear 10 (29.4) 3: degenerated tear 3 (8.8)	4	1 (2.9)
0: 0%       19 (55.9)         1: >0% to <50%	LT percentile class (Domb classification)	
1: >0% to <50%	0: 0%	19 (55.9)
2: 50% to <100%	1: >0% to <50%	9 (26.5)
3: 100%       2 (5.9)         Villar classification of LT       0: no tear         0: no tear       19 (55.9)         1: complete rupture       2 (5.9)         2: partial tear       10 (29.4)         3: degenerated tear       3 (8.8)	2: 50% to <100%	4 (11.8)
Villar classification of LT0: no tear19 (55.9)1: complete rupture2 (5.9)2: partial tear10 (29.4)3: degenerated tear3 (8.8)	3: 100%	2 (5.9)
0: no tear       19 (55.9)         1: complete rupture       2 (5.9)         2: partial tear       10 (29.4)         3: degenerated tear       3 (8.8)	Villar classification of LT	
1: complete rupture       2 (5.9)         2: partial tear       10 (29.4)         3: degenerated tear       3 (8.8)	0: no tear	19 (55.9)
2: partial tear       10 (29.4)         3: degenerated tear       3 (8.8)	1: complete rupture	2 (5.9)
3: degenerated tear 3 (8.8)	2: partial tear	10 (29.4)
	3: degenerated tear	3 (8.8)

ALAD acetabular labrum articular disruption; LT, ligamentum teres.

#### **Intraoperative Findings**

All findings from the diagnostic arthroscopy are documented in Table 2. The Seldes classification system

Procedure	n (%)
Labral treatment	
Repair	27 (79.4)
Debridement	6 (17.6)
Reconstruction	1 (2.9)
Capsular treatment	
Repair or plication	27 (79.4)
Release	7 (20.6)
Acetabuloplasty	27 (79.4)
Femoroplasty	21 (61.8)
Iliopsoas fractional lengthening	21 (61.8)
Ligamentum teres debridement	9 (26.5)
Acetabular chondroplasty	6 (17.6)
Femoral head chondroplasty	2 (5.9)
Synovectomy	3 (8.8)
Removal of loose body	3 (8.8)
Trochanteric bursectomy	1 (2.9)
Gluteus medius or minimus repair	0 (0)
Acetabular microfracture	1 (2.9)
Femoral head microfracture	1 (2.9)

#### Table 4. Patient-Reported Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Preoperative	Minimum 2-yr Follow-Up	P Value
mHHS	$\frac{68.4 \pm 12.0}{68.4 \pm 12.0}$	87.9 + 12.1	< .001
NAHS	$67.5 \pm 15.4$	$89.6 \pm 11.3$	<.001
HOS-SSS	$46.5\pm19.9$	$81.9 \pm 19.8$	<.001
iHOT-12 score		$81.8 \pm 18.1$	
VAS score	$5.4\pm2.3$	$1.6 \pm 1.7$	<.001
Patient satisfaction		$8.3 \pm 1.4$	

NOTE. Data are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation.

HOS-SSS, Hip Outcome Score—Sports Specific Subscale; iHOT-12, International Hip Outcome Tool 12; mHHS, modified Harris Hip Score; NAHS, Non-Arthritic Hip Score; VAS, visual analog scale.

was used to characterize labral tears. In this patient case series, there were 12 type I tears (35.3%), 13 type II tears (38.2%), and 9 type I and II tears (26.5%). The integrity of the cartilage was assessed using the ALAD and Outerbridge classification systems. A total of 16 hips (47.1%) had defects with an ALAD classification of 2 or greater, 16 hips (47.1%) had acetabular defects with an Outerbridge classification of 2 or greater, and 3 hips (8.8%) had femoral head defects with an Outerbridge classification of 2 or greater. LT tears were evaluated using the Domb and Villar classification systems. Of the hips, 15 (44.1%) had LT tears.

#### **Arthroscopic Procedures**

Labral tears were repaired in 27 hips (79.4%), debrided in 6 (17.6%), and reconstructed in 1 (2.9%). Of the 15 LT tears, 9 (60.0%) were treated with debridement whereas the other 6 (40%) were observed. Acetabuloplasty was performed in 27 hips (79.4%), and femoroplasty was performed in 21

Return to Soccer



**Fig 1.** Return-to-sport statistics for patients who tried to play soccer after surgery.

# ARTICLE IN PRESS RETURN TO SOCCER AFTER HIP ARTHROSCOPY



**Fig 2.** Competitive level of 27 patients who returned to soccer at latest follow-up.

(61.8%). The iliopsoas was fractionally lengthened in 21 cases (61.8%). The capsule was repaired or plicated in 27 hips (79.4%) and released in 7 (20.6%). Table 3 details all of the arthroscopic procedures performed.

#### **Outcomes at Latest Follow-Up**

All PROs and the VAS score improved significantly (P < .001) from preoperatively to latest follow-up and are summarized in Table 4. At latest follow-up, the mean mHHS was 87.9 (vs 68.4 preoperatively), the mean NAHS was 89.6 (vs 67.5 preoperatively), the mean HOS-SSS was 81.9 (vs 46.5 preoperatively), and the mean VAS score was 1.6 (vs 5.4 preoperatively). The mean patient satisfaction rating was 8.3.

At latest follow-up, all 34 patients reported that they tried to return to soccer, of whom 27 (79.4%) were successfully able to do so (Fig 1). Of the patients who returned to soccer, 19 (70.4%) were competing at the same level or a higher level compared with their highest level within 1 year of surgery (Fig 2). Regardless of competitive level, 21 patients (77.8%) reported that their athletic ability was the same as or higher than it was within 1 year of surgery (Fig 3). Of the 34 patients who tried to return to play soccer, 19 (55%) ended up playing at a level of soccer at least as high as that before surgery.

We compared the outcome scores for the patients who were still playing soccer at latest follow-up and those who were not (Table 5). The patients in the return-to-soccer group showed significant improvements from preoperatively to latest follow-up in all PRO scores and the VAS score. The patients who did not return to soccer showed significant improvements from preoperatively to latest follow-up in the mHHS (from 67.9 to 83.6), NAHS (from 63.5 to 84.8), and HOS-SSS (from 38.0 to 71.0). However, the VAS score did not significantly improve (3.6 preoperatively to 2.3 at latest follow-up). The latest HOS-SSS (71.0 vs 85.1) and iHOT-12 score (67.4 vs 86.0) were significantly lower in the group of patients who did not return to soccer. Although no other significant differences were noted between groups, the latest follow-up and delta scores were consistently lower in patients who did not return to soccer.

# Complications, Secondary Arthroscopies, and Conversions to Total Hip Arthroplasty

Of the 34 patients included in our study, 4 underwent secondary arthroscopies at an average of 10.5 months after their initial surgical procedures: 3 because of adhesions and 1 because of a retear of the labrum. One patient reported numbress in the toes as a postoperative complication. No patients required a total hip arthroplasty up to their latest follow-up.

### Discussion

In this case series, all the PROs in the patients who returned to play soccer showed significant improvements and the return-to-play rate was 79.4% at latest follow-up. In the group that was able to return to play, the latest HOS-SSS and iHOT-12 were significantly higher than those in the group of patients who did not return to soccer. These findings are consistent with our hypothesis that a high number of patients with short- to



**Fig 3.** Level of ability of 27 patients who returned to soccer at latest follow-up.

#### 6

# ARTICLE IN PRESS

#### V. ORTIZ-DECLET ET AL.

#### Table 5. Comparison of Patient-Reported Outcomes Between RTS and NRTS Groups

	RTS $(n = 27)$	NRTS $(n = 7)$	P Value
mHHS			
Preoperative	$69.0 \pm 13.5$	$67.9 \pm 11.9$	.854
Latest follow-up	$88.9 \pm 12.5$	$83.6\pm8.5$	.111
<i>P</i> value (preoperative vs. postoperative)	<.001	.036	
Change	$19.9\pm17.5$	$15.7 \pm 15.4$	.862
NAHS			
Preoperative	$69.2 \pm 15.5$	$63.5\pm9.9$	.388
Latest follow-up	$90.8 \pm 11.3$	$84.8\pm9.7$	.085
<i>P</i> value (preoperative vs. postoperative)	<.001	.008	
Change	$21.8\pm16.3$	$21.4\pm14.6$	.889
HOS-SSS			
Preoperative	$48.1\pm20.0$	$38.0 \pm 16.1$	.246
Latest follow-up	$85.1\pm20.2$	$71.0 \pm 12.1$	.018
<i>P</i> value (preoperative vs. postoperative)	<.001	.015	
Change	$37.1\pm27.1$	$33.0 \pm 25.9$	.278
VAS score			
Preoperative	$5.7\pm2.3$	$3.6 \pm 3.2$	.082
Latest follow-up	$1.3 \pm 1.6$	$2.3 \pm 1.7$	.116
<i>P</i> value (preoperative vs. postoperative)	<.001	.402	
Change	$-4.4\pm2.8$	$-1.3 \pm 4.2$	.494
iHOT-12 score	$86.0\pm16.7$	$67.4 \pm 15.8$	.009
Patient satisfaction	$8.6 \pm 1.3$	$7.6\pm1.4$	.088

NOTE. Data are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation.

HOS-SSS, Hip Outcome Score–Sports Specific Subscale; iHOT-12, International Hip Outcome Tool 12; mHHS, modified Harris Hip Score; NAHS, Non-Arthritic Hip Score; NRTS, no return to sport; RTS, return to sport; SD, standard deviation; VAS, visual analog scale.

mid-term follow-up after hip arthroscopy would be able to return to play soccer.

A common motivation to undergo hip arthroscopy is to regain the capacity to play sports and improve athletic ability.<sup>16</sup> During recent years, multiple case series have been published about professional players' return to play after arthroscopic hip surgery.<sup>7,14,17-23</sup> Their results have been encouraging. Naal et al.<sup>23</sup> found a 96% rate of return to play (21 of 22) in professional athletes at 3.8 years' follow-up after surgical hip dislocation. Philippon et al.<sup>20</sup> reported that 93% of 45 arthroscopically treated athletes initially returned to professional competition and that 78% were still professionally active 1.6 years after surgery.

To a lesser extent, there are studies that have evaluated the return to sport in professional as well as amateur patients. Malviya et al.<sup>15</sup> followed up 80 athletes (40 professional and 40 recreational; mean age, 35.7 years) who underwent hip arthroscopy for FAI with a mean follow-up period of 1.4 years. They measured the time to return to sport, training time, time in competition, mHHS, and NAHS. Their data suggest that professional athletes may show a quicker return to sport than recreational athletes but the hip scores and rates of return to sport are similar.

In our case series, all PROs and the VAS score improved significantly from preoperatively to latest follow-up. Brunner et al.<sup>24</sup> reported a similar NAHS (86.7) at 2.4 years in 53 patients who participated regularly in sports, of whom 82% returned to sport. Our study's slightly lower return-to-sport percentage

(79.4%) may be explained by the fact that we only analyzed soccer players and soccer involves more cutting and a higher impact than sports such as biking or swimming.

We also compared the PROs for the group that was able to return to play versus the group that was not. The latest HOS-SSS and iHOT-12 score were significantly lower in the group of patients who did not return to soccer. Although no other significant differences were found between groups, the latest follow-up and delta scores were consistently lower in the patients who did not return to soccer. Domb et al.<sup>25</sup> found similar results in their study comparing patients who returned versus those who did not return to sport at 2 years, with significant differences in the HOS-SSS at latest follow-up. Although not statistically significant in both studies, the preoperative HOS-SSS was lower in the patients who did not return to sport.

This study included only amateur-level athletes and, thus, may better represent the patient population that a typical hip arthroscopic surgeon will encounter in his or her practice. Our study showed that 79.4% of the patients returned to play soccer after hip arthroscopy. It has been shown that factors such as self-motivation, aging, pain, encouragement from other persons, and adaptation to physical limitations can largely affect a patient's decision to return to sport after arthroscopic hip surgery.<sup>26</sup>

A consensus statement has previously reported the following<sup>27</sup>: "An athlete's psychological traits may influence decision-making regarding treatment and may substantially impact post-illness and injury and postoperative treatment, rehabilitation, and outcomes. The team physician and the athletic care network need to be aware of these factors and develop effective treatment protocols for identification of and intervention for possible harmful factors. Three prominent psychological factors that have been shown to be important in illness and injury treatment and outcomes are pain perception, optimism/self-efficacy, and depression/ stress."

Furthermore, the motivation to return to sport may differ based on the level at which the athlete competes. Athletes who compete at the professional level may be more inclined to return to sport because of a limited window of opportunity in their careers, in addition to monetary considerations. On the other hand, recreational athletes do not have these same motivations and, therefore, may decide not to return to sport for the sake of prolonging hip longevity.<sup>14,21,25,28</sup> This may help to explain the difference between the return-to-play rate in our study, which included mainly recreational players, and the return-to-play rates reported in previous studies that analyzed only professional players.

#### Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. The levelof-ability data were self-reported and therefore may suffer from reporting bias. Another limitation results from the fact that there are many factors influencing an individual's decision to return to sport after surgery, which makes it difficult to discern whether a patient's hip is the limiting factor in returning to soccer. Along these same lines, there was significant heterogeneity in the patient population and pathologic conditions treated. Furthermore, some limitations stem from the questions on our questionnaire. We did not ask about the specific time at which patients returned to soccer, only whether they had returned by the latest follow-up. We also did not ask patients about the frequency with which they played soccer both before and after surgery. In addition, our data do not clearly reflect whether the patients who did not return to soccer are now playing other sports that require less impact. Finally, this was a retrospective study in which there was no matching group with which to compare our subjects.

#### Conclusions

Hip arthroscopy was associated with significant improvements in PROs for amateur soccer players. There was a high level of return to soccer and a high proportion of patients whose competitive level was similar or improved. As such, hip arthroscopy is a good option for soccer players, in the absence of underlying osteoarthritis, presenting with hip pathology.

## References

- Kunz M. 265 million playing football, https://www.fifa.com/ mm/document/fifafacts/bcoffsurv/emaga\_9384\_10704.pdf. Published 2006. Accessed November 26, 2016.
- ESPN FC. Relegation zone blog, http://www.espnfc.com/ blog/relegation-zone/71/index. Accessed December 7, 2016.
- **3.** Siebenrock KA, Kaschka I, Frauchiger L, Werlen S, Schwab JM. Prevalence of cam-type deformity and hip pain in elite ice hockey players before and after the end of growth. *Am J Sports Med* 2013;41:2308-2313.
- **4.** Hammoud S, Bedi A, Magennis E, Meyers WC, Kelly BT. High incidence of athletic pubalgia symptoms in professional athletes with symptomatic femoroacetabular impingement. *Arthroscopy* 2012;28:1388-1395.
- Casartelli NC, Leunig M, Maffiuletti NA, Bizzini M. Return to sport after hip surgery for femoroacetabular impingement: A systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2015;49:819-824.
- 6. Gerhardt MB, Romero AA, Silvers HJ, Harris DJ, Watanabe D, Mandelbaum BR. The prevalence of radiographic hip abnormalities in elite soccer players. *Am J Sports Med* 2012;40:584-588.
- 7. Philippon MJ, Schenker ML. Arthroscopy for the treatment of femoroacetabular impingement in the athlete. *Clin Sports Med* 2006;25:299-308.
- **8**. Nawabi DH, Bedi A, Tibor LM, Magennis E, Kelly BT. The demographic characteristics of high-level and recreational athletes undergoing hip arthroscopy for femoroacetabular impingement: A sports-specific analysis. *Arthroscopy* 2014;30:398-405.
- **9.** Mosler AB, Crossley KM, Waarsing JH, et al. Ethnic differences in bony hip morphology in a cohort of 445 professional male soccer players. *Am J Sports Med* 2016;44:2967-2974.
- Agricola R, Bessems JHJM, Ginai AZ, et al. The development of cam-type deformity in adolescent and young male soccer players. *Am J Sports Med* 2012;40:1099-1106.
- 11. Siebenrock KA, Ferner F, Noble PC, Santore RF, Werlen S, Mamisch TC. The cam-type deformity of the proximal femur arises in childhood in response to vigorous sporting activity. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2011;469:3229-3240.
- **12.** Tak I, Weir A, Langhout R, et al. The relationship between the frequency of football practice during skeletal growth and the presence of a cam deformity in adult elite football players. *Br J Sports Med* 2015;49:630-634.
- 13. Bedi A, Kelly BT. Femoroacetabular impingement. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2013;95:82-92.
- 14. Byrd JWT, Jones KS. Hip arthroscopy in athletes: 10-Year follow-up. *Am J Sports Med* 2009;37:2140-2143.
- **15.** Malviya A, Paliobeis CP, Villar RN. Do professional athletes perform better than recreational athletes after arthroscopy for femoroacetabular impingement? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2013;471:2477-2483.
- **16.** Mannion AF, Impellizzeri FM, Naal FD, Leunig M. Fulfilment of patient-rated expectations predicts the outcome of surgery for femoroacetabular impingement. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2013;21:44-50.
- Byrd JWT, Jones KS. Arthroscopic management of femoroacetabular impingement in athletes. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39:7S-13S (suppl).
- 18. Nho SJ, Magennis EM, Singh CK, Kelly BT. Outcomes after the arthroscopic treatment of femoroacetabular

#### V. ORTIZ-DECLET ET AL.

impingement in a mixed group of high-level athletes. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39:14S-19S (suppl).

- **19.** Singh PJ, O'Donnell JM. The outcome of hip arthroscopy in Australian Football League players: A review of 27 hips. *Arthroscopy* 2010;26:743-749.
- **20.** Philippon M, Schenker M, Briggs K, Kuppersmith D. Femoroacetabular impingement in 45 professional athletes: Associated pathologies and return to sport following arthroscopic decompression. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2007;15:908-914.
- **21.** Philippon MJ, Weiss DR, Kuppersmith DA, Briggs KK, Hay CJ. Arthroscopic labral repair and treatment of femoroacetabular impingement in professional hockey players. *Am J Sports Med* 2010;38:99-104.
- 22. Bizzini M, Notzli HP, Maffiuletti NA. Femoroacetabular impingement in professional ice hockey players. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35:1955-1959.
- Naal FD, Miozzari HH, Wyss TF, Nötzli HP. Surgical hip dislocation for the treatment of femoroacetabular impingement in high-level athletes. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39:544-550.

- 24. Brunner A, Horisberger M, Herzog RF. Sports and recreation activity of patients with femoroacetabular impingement before and after arthroscopic osteoplasty. *Am J Sports Med* 2009;37:917-922.
- **25.** Domb BG, Dunne KF, Martin TJ, et al. Patient reported outcomes for patients who returned to sport compared with those who did not after hip arthroscopy: Minimum 2-year follow-up. *J Hip Preserv Surg* 2016;3: 124-131.
- **26.** Tjong VK, Cogan CJ, Riederman BD, Terry MA. A qualitative assessment of return to sport after hip arthroscopy for femoroacetabular impingement. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2016;4:2325967116671940.
- 27. Psychological issues related to illness and injury in athletes and the team physician: A consensus statement—2016 update. *Curr Sports Med Rep* 2017;16: 189-201.
- **28.** Guanche CA, Sikka RS. Acetabular labral tears with underlying chondromalacia: A possible association with high-level running. *Arthroscopy* 2005;21:580-585.