



**Dorset
Clinical Commissioning Group**

NHS Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group

Hip Arthroscopy

Criteria Based Access Protocol



Supporting people in Dorset to lead healthier lives

POLICY TRAIL AND VERSION CONTROL SHEET:

Protocol Reference: Version: 2

Document Status: Current			
Developed by: Review, Design and Delivery			
Policy Number:		101	
Date of Policy:		May 2015	
Next Review Date:		May 2018	
Name of Originator/Author:		Emma Moggeridge	
Sponsor:		Cindy Shaw-Fletcher	
Approving Committee or Group:			
Date Approved:		May 2015	
Version	Date	Comments	By Whom

Target Audience	All staff and Members within NHS Dorset Clinical Commissioning and relevant referring and receiving clinicians.	
Distribution		
Intranet	Clinical Commissioning Group Website	Email to Staff
✓	✓	✓

NHS DORSET CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP

HIP ARTHROSCOPY

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	3
2	Definitions	3
3	Access Criteria.....	4
4	Exclusions.....	5
5	NICE Guidance.....	5
6	Governance.....	6
7	Cases for Individual Consideration.....	6
8	Audit.....	6
9	Equality Impact Assessment.....	7

NHS DORSET CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP

HIP ARTHROSCOPY

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This paper sets out the clinical criteria based protocol for hip arthroscopy in the adult population of NHS Dorset CCG. It will state the definitions; the access criteria for surgery; the case of clinical need and where the patient meets the treatment criteria.

2. Definitions

Hip arthroscopy

- 2.1 Hip arthroscopy is an innovative technique which allows for the inspection of the interior of the hip. The instrument used is a type of endoscope which is a tube shaped instrument inserted into a cavity in the body to investigate and treat disorders. It is flexible and equipped with lenses and a light source. It is a technically challenging procedure which should only be carried out in specialist units by teams with specific training in the techniques.

Sepsis of the hip joint

- 2.2. A septic joint required immediate action and is an orthopaedic emergency when in a native (i.e. non-replaced) joint. It can cause irreversible cartilage damage very quickly and can be fatal if pus under pressure is left in situ for any significant length of time.
- 2.3 The long term ramifications of a septic joint if not dealt with expeditiously are subsequent joint replacement or potentially death in the severe cases of fulminant septicaemia (normally seen in the elderly or immune-compromised).

Loose bodies

- 2.4. Loose bodies in the hip joint can present spontaneously (such as in conditions like synovial chondromatosis) or as part of traumatic insult. A significant number of dislocated hips are reduced closed but as they are relocated “drag in to the joint” a piece of fractured bone (normally the socket rim). The result is a very painful problem which causes locking, giving way, an inability to weight bear and ultimately cartilage destruction due to the attrition effect of the loose body grinding away at the joint surface.

Excision/repair of Radiological Proven Labral Tears in the Absence of OA or Femoro-Acetabular Impingement Syndrome (FAI)

- 2.5. This is effectively a cartilage tear of the hip similar to meniscal tears of the knee. Such tears of the hip can be caused by differing aetiologies.
- 2.6 There are a group of tears that can be caused as part of a degenerative process (arthritis). This is an area which requires further evaluation and longitudinal studies to evaluate treatment options.
- 2.7 Some labral tears are acute and sustained as part of a single injurious process. Patient who axially load the hip and then are subjected to a twisting movement can experience such tears. These tears are painful from the outset, do not develop insidiously and do not resolve. Patients

can experience locking and giving way. The joint can lock at any time and bring the individual to ground.

- 2.8 If a simple labral tear is suspected, at the clinician's discretion, an MRI hip arthrogram is recommended.

Hip Impingement Syndrome (Femoro-Acetabular Impingement (FAI))

- 2.9 Hip Impingement (FAI) is a result of abnormality in the femoral head, acetabulum or both. Impingement may be caused by the jamming of an abnormally shaped femoral head into the acetabulum during forceful motion (especially flexion), or as a result of contact between the acetabular rim and the femoral head-neck junction. Its precise relationship with osteoarthritis of the hip is unclear but it may lead to the development of osteoarthritis.
- 2.10 The diagnosis of FAI is made from characteristic findings (Macfarlane, Haddad 2010) increasing duration and intensity of groin pain, initially intermittent on exercise, becoming constant and intense, with stiffness, clicking or popping sensation and reduced flexion and internal rotation.
- 2.11 Two mechanisms have been identified; cam impingement (most common in young athletic males) and pincer impingement (most common in middle-aged women). FAI is also associated with articular (chondral) damage, labral tearing and progressive OA of the hip.

3. Access Criteria

- 3.1 The CCG has commissioned hip arthroscopy as per the criteria based protocol for hip arthroscopy approved in December 2011. Further discussions with clinicians have resulted in the need to revise the protocol approved in December 2011 into this current protocol. Hip arthroscopy will now be commissioned for all patients, who must be fully worked up within the disease pathways as detailed below:

Femoro-Acetabular Impingement (FAI)

- 3.2. The CCG will fund open or arthroscopic hip surgery for the treatment of femoro-acetabular impingement (FAI) ONLY when patients fulfil all of the following criteria:
- Diagnosis of definite femoro-acetabular impingement defined by appropriate investigations, X-rays, MRI and CT scans.
 - An orthopaedic surgeon who specialises in young adult hip surgery has made the diagnosis. This should include discussion of each case with a specialist musculoskeletal radiologist.
 - Severe symptoms typical of FAI with duration of at least six months where diagnosis of FAI has been made as above.
 - Failure to respond to all available conservative treatment options including activity modification, pharmacological intervention and specialist physiotherapy.
 - Compromised function, which requires urgent treatment within a 6-8 months time frame, or where failure to treat early is likely to significantly compromise surgical options at a future date.

- Treatment with more established surgical procedures is not clinically viable.

Sepsis of the hip joint

- 3.3. Hip arthroscopy is supported in the washout of an infected hip joint in patients refractory to medical management, patients with underlying disease or patients who are immunosuppressed.

Loose bodies

- 3.4. Hip arthroscopy is supported for the removal of radiologically proven loose bodies within the hip joint with an associated acute traumatic episode. Arthroscopy is not supported as a diagnostic tool where there is suspicion of loose bodies.

Excision/repair of Radiological Proven Labral Tears in the Absence of OA or Femoro-Acetabular Impingement Syndrome

- 3.5. Hip arthroscopy is supported for the excision of radiological proven labral tears associated with an acute traumatic episode in the absence of OA or FAI syndrome.

4. Exclusions

- 4.1 Hip arthroscopy is not routinely commissioned for any other indications or pathologies other than those outlined above.

- 4.2 In addition, the CCG will not fund hip arthroscopy in patients with femoro-acetabular impingement where any of the following criteria apply:

- Patients with advanced Osteo-Arthritic change on preoperative X-ray (Tonnis grade 2 or more) or severe cartilage injury (Outerbridge grade III or IV).
- Patients with a joint space on plain radiograph of the pelvis that is less than 2mm wide anywhere along the sourcil.
- Patients who are a candidate for hip replacement.
- Any patient with severe hip dysplasia or with a Crowe grading classification of 4.
- Patients with generalised joint laxity especially in diseases connected with hypermobility of the joints, such as Marfan syndrome and Ehlers-Danlos syndrome.
- Patients with osteogenesis imperfecta.

5. NICE Guidance

- 5.1 In considering the use of this procedure in 2007, NICE reported the following concerns:

- Efficacy outcomes have been poorly reported and assessment assessments are mostly qualitative.
- Specialist scores have not been developed to objectively measure outcome. There are a limited number of studies but demonstrating differences in surgical techniques.
- Data on patient selection is unclear (degree of impingement and arthritic degeneration of hips of patients included in the studies were not well defined).

- There was a lack of evidence to show whether the procedure successfully slows progression to osteoarthritis.

5.2 In the updated NICE guidance IPG 203, 213, 408, states the treatment should be restricted to centres experienced in treating this condition and staffed by surgeons adequately trained in techniques addressing FAI. All governance and audit should be undertaken in accordance with these guidelines.

6. Governance

6.1 Clinicians wishing to undertake hip arthroscopy must ensure they meet 5.2 above and:

- Provide a regular audit and review of activity.
- Submit details of all patients undergoing this procedure to the British Hip Society to enable long-term outcomes to be evaluated.

7. Cases for Individual Consideration

7.1 Should a patient not meet the protocol criteria, the Joint Commissioning Policy for Individual Treatment Requests (which is available on the NHS Dorset CCG website or upon request), recognises that there will be occasions when patients who are not considered for funding may have good clinical reasons for being treated as exceptions. In such cases the requesting clinician must provide further information to support the case for being considered as an exception.

7.2 The fact that treatment is likely to be effective for a patient is not in itself a basis for exceptional circumstances. In order for funding to be agreed there must be some unusual or unique clinical factor in respect of the patient that suggests that they are:

- Significantly different to the general population of patients with the particular condition; and
- They are likely to gain significantly more benefit from the intervention than might be expected for the average patient with the condition.

8. Audit

8.1 Audit will be conducted on an annual basis collecting:

- Six week post-operative follow up identifying complication rates and increased symptoms;
- Pre and post operative information at one year (not necessarily undertaken face to face but by email or postal) using the dataset defined within the reporting format collected by the British Hip Society.
 - MAHORN (Multicenter Arthroscopy of the Hip Outcomes Research Network) Hip Outcome Tool (MHOT14)
 - EQ 5-D

- Modified Harris Hip Score
 - UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) Activity Score
 - Non arthritic Hip Score
 - HOOS (Hip disability and Osteoarthritis) Score
- Proportion registered with the British Hip Society – standard set at 100% compliance.

9. Equality Impact Assessment

9.1 The Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for this policy has been undertaken Appendix A.

<p>Title of Document: Hip Arthroscopy Criteria Based Protocol</p>
<p>What are the intended outcomes of this work? <i>Include outline of objectives and function aims</i></p> <p>This paper sets out that hip arthroscopy will only routinely be supported in patients with femoro-acetabular impingement. It will go on to describe the surgical management for the treatment of hip impingement syndrome, the case of clinical need and where the patient meets the treatment criteria.</p>
<p>Who will be affected? <i>e.g. staff, patients, service users etc</i></p> <p>The referring clinicians always receive the policy and employees of the PCT's (clinical and non-clinical) regularly explain the policy to referrers.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>
<p>What evidence have you considered?</p>
<p>Disability <i>Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on attitudinal, physical and social barriers.</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Sex <i>Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on men and women (potential to link to carers below).</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Race <i>Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on difference ethnic groups, nationalities, Roma gypsies, Irish travellers, language barriers.</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Age <i>Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) across age ranges on old and younger people. This can include safeguarding, consent and child welfare.</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Gender reassignment (including transgender) <i>Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on transgender and transsexual people. This can include issues such as privacy of data and harassment.</i></p>

N/A
<p>Sexual orientation Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on heterosexual people as well as lesbian, gay and bi-sexual people.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Religion or belief Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on people with different religions, beliefs or no belief.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Pregnancy and maternity Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on working arrangements, part-time working, infant caring responsibilities.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Carers Consider and detail (including the source of any evidence) on part-time working, shift-patterns, general caring responsibilities.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Other identified groups Consider and detail and include the source of any evidence on different socio-economic groups, area inequality, income, resident status (migrants) and other groups experiencing disadvantage and barriers to access.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>What is the overall impact? Consider whether there are different levels of access experienced, needs or experiences, whether there are barriers to engagement, are there regional variations and what is the combined impact?</p> <p>The Policy identifies the clinical circumstances where funding may be considered. Individual policies for certain treatments are reviewed by the relevant Clinical Commissioning Programme to ensure they meet current guidelines and adequate consultation is made.</p>
<p>Addressing the impact on equalities Please give an outline of what broad action you or any other bodies are taking to address any inequalities identified through the evidence.</p>

Name of person who carried out this assessment:

Deputy Director of Specialist and Tertiary Care Commissioning

Date assessment completed:

10.10.12

Name of responsible Director:

Director of Acute and Primary Care Service Improvement

Date assessment was signed:

10.10.12

Equality Impact is the same for all the groups mentioned above when considering the Individual Cases Policy – ie. the impact is neither high nor low.

Action plan template

This part of the template is to help you develop your action plan. You might want to change the categories in the first column to reflect the actions needed for your policy.

Category	Actions	Target date	Person responsible and their Directorate
Involvement and consultation			
Data collection and evidencing			
Analysis of evidence and assessment			
Monitoring, evaluating and reviewing			
Transparency (including publication)			

Please return a copy to Ebi Sosseh Equalities and Human Rights Lead: ebi.sosseh@bp-pct.nhs.uk once completed who will review it and ensure that it is published on NHS Dorset CCG website. A signed hard copy and electronic copy should be kept within your department for audit purposes.