## Biomechanical Comparison of WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Stitch and Krackow Stitch

## Objective

The purpose of testing was to compare biomechanical characteristics of a new WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ stitch to a traditional Krackow stitch. This testing specifically evaluated ultimate failure load, a key bench metric associated with clinical success of a suture method. ${ }^{1}$

## Test Groups

The Krackow stitch is a running locking stitch that has long been the gold standard for creating secure soft tissue suture constructs. ${ }^{2}$ However, it can be time consuming and requires the surgeon to stitch up one side of the tissue then back down the other to complete a stitch series. The new WhipLock ${ }^{\top \mathrm{M}}$ stitch, enabled by EasyWhip®, achieves the same locking mechanism of the Krackow, but it requires 50\% fewer needle holes through the tissue, as depicted in Figure 1.


Figure 1: Illustration of the number of needle holes required for a Krackow stitch (left) versus a WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ stitch (right).

## Methods

Quadriceps tendons were dissected from human cadaver specimens and standardized to the same size ( $70 \times 12 \times 8.5$ $\mathrm{mm})$. Tendons were divided into two test groups of 8 , for a total sample size of 16 . WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ samples were stitched with EasyWhip®, a novel two-part needle. Krackow samples were stitched with a conventional FiberWire $®$ curved needle (Arthrex). Graft constructs were prepared by two fellowshiptrained orthopedic surgeons then underwent biomechanical testing.
Testing was performed on an MTS Bionix with a 5 kN load cell. Samples were preconditioned to normalize viscoelastic effects. Thereafter, the samples were loaded to $50-200 \mathrm{~N}$ for 500 cycles at 1 Hz and then were ramped to failure at 20 $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{min}$. Ultimate failure load was recorded for each sample and compared across groups.

## Results ${ }^{3}$

Ultimate failure load results are summarized in Figure 2. Average ultimate failure load for WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ and Krackow were 343.2 N and 369.1 N respectively. WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ samples did not have significantly different ultimate failure loads than the Krackow counterparts ( $p=0.072$ ). It was also noted that all 16 samples across the groups failed by suture breakage, shown in Figure 3, as opposed to tendon damage.


Figure 2: Ultimate failure load ( N ) results for WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ and Krackow on cadaveric quadriceps tendon. ${ }^{5}$


Figure 3: Representative images of WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ (left) and Krackow (right) samples after reaching failure due to suture breakage. ${ }^{5}$

## Discussion

The WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ had comparable ultimate failure load and failure mode compared to the Krackow. The data showed no significant difference between the ultimate failure load ( N ) for the WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ and Krackow, suggesting that the two methods are biomechanically equivalent.
A key benefit of the WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ over a Krackow is that it requires fewer needle holes and provides evenly distributed circumferential load. Fewer needle holes cause less disruption in soft tissue longitudinal fibers ${ }^{4}$ while evenly distributed circumferential load increases the resistance to gapping and improves mechanical strength. ${ }^{5}$

## Conclusion

The EasyWhip® WhipLock ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ is a promising new stitch method that produces a biomechanically equivalent ultimate load to a Krackow, while resulting in less tissue damage from fewer needle holes based on bench testing of ex-vivo tissue. Correlation to clinical results in humans is unknown.
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