

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Interventional procedure overview of superior capsular augmentation for massive rotator cuff tears

The rotator cuff is a group of muscles and tendons that surround the shoulder joint and help to keep it stable. A tear in a rotator cuff tendon can cause pain, limit arm movement and may lead to arthritis. This procedure involves using a graft to fix the top of the shoulder socket to the top of the upper arm bone when the muscles and tendons are no longer repairable. The aims are to stabilise the shoulder joint, reduce pain and improve shoulder function.

Contents

[Introduction](#)

[Description of the procedure](#)

[Efficacy summary](#)

[Safety summary](#)

[The evidence assessed](#)

[Validity and generalisability of the studies](#)

[Existing assessments of this procedure](#)

[Related NICE guidance](#)

[Additional information considered by IPAC](#)

[References](#)

[Additional relevant papers](#)

[Literature search strategy](#)

Introduction

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) prepared this interventional procedure overview to help members of the interventional procedures advisory committee (IPAC) make recommendations about the safety and efficacy of an interventional procedure. It is based on a rapid review of the medical literature and specialist opinion. It should not be regarded as a definitive assessment of the procedure.

Date prepared

This overview was prepared in November 2017 and updated in March 2018.

Procedure name

- Superior capsular augmentation for massive rotator cuff tears

Specialist societies

- British Elbow and Shoulder Society (subgroup of the British Orthopaedic Association)
- Royal College of Surgeons.

Description of the procedure

Indications and current treatment

Patients with rotator cuff tears may have shoulder pain and weakness accompanied by functional limitation leading to a reduced quality of life. Rotator cuff tears can be caused by an injury or can develop gradually. They can be minor or severe depending on the degree of damage to the tendon. Minor tears to the rotator cuff are very common and may not cause any symptoms at all. Diagnosis is usually by ultrasound or MRI.

Conservative treatment may include physiotherapy, pharmacological treatments (including pain relief and topical or oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) and corticosteroid injections. If the tear is severe or has not responded to other treatments, surgical interventions such as debridement, rotator cuff repair, bridging rotator cuff reconstruction, subacromial smoothing, tendon transfer, or shoulder arthroplasty may be needed.

What the procedure involves

Superior capsular augmentation aims to improve pain symptoms and shoulder function in patients with massive and otherwise irreparable rotator cuff tears. The intention is to reduce superior gleno-humeral translation and restore superior stability with minimal re-tear rates. The optimal repair uses the patient's own rotator cuff muscles and tendons, but if the tear is too large augmentation with other tissue may be needed.

Superior capsular augmentation is done arthroscopically or by open surgery, with the patient either in the lateral decubitus position, or the 'beach-chair' position, and under general anaesthesia. It involves using a fascia lata autograft, an allograft or a regenerative tissue matrix. The arm of the patient is kept in neutral abduction and in neutral rotation. The supraspinatus and infraspinatus are repaired as much as possible and a biceps tenotomy or tendonesis are done on any biceps tear or instability. The superior glenoid and greater tuberosity are debrided to prepare for reconstruction. Using suture anchors, the graft is attached medially to the glenoid superior tubercle and laterally to the greater tuberosity. Side-to-side sutures between the graft and the infraspinatus tendon, as well as between the graft and the residual anterior supraspinatus or subscapularis may also be added to improve force coupling. Post-operative rehabilitation is essential and can be long and difficult.

Efficacy summary

Procedure success

In a prospective case series of 59 patients, the rate of procedure success (defined as final American shoulder and elbow surgeons score [ASES] greater than 50, combined with a 17-point postoperative improvement in the ASES and no need for reverse shoulder arthroplasty or revision superior capsular reconstruction) was 68% (40/59).¹

In a retrospective case series of 86 patients (88 shoulders), the rate of graft failure was 5% (4/88). Three graft failures were seen on MRI in patients reporting dissatisfaction and 1 patient reported dissatisfaction because of pain and lack of function, but the MRI revealed an intact graft (this patient was the only one who had a revision to reverse total shoulder arthroplasty).⁵

Improvement in shoulder function

In a retrospective case series of 23 patients (24 shoulders), the mean (\pm standard deviation [SD]) ASES improved statistically significantly from 23.5 ± 14.4 before the procedure to 92.9 ± 11.3 after a mean follow-up of 34 months ($p < 0.00001$, scale from 0 to 100 points). In the same study, the Japanese orthopaedic

association score (scale from 0 to 100 points) and the University of California, Los Angeles score (scale from 0 to 35 points) also improved statistically significantly from 48.3 ± 13.0 to 92.6 ± 9.0 and from 9.9 ± 4.7 to 32.4 ± 4.3 respectively ($p < 0.00001$). The mean shoulder active range of motion improved statistically significantly for elevation from $84^\circ \pm 52.2^\circ$ to $148^\circ \pm 33.4^\circ$ ($p < 0.001$), for external rotation from $26^\circ \pm 14.1^\circ$ to $40^\circ \pm 17.2^\circ$ ($p < 0.01$) and for internal rotation from L3 to L1 ($p < 0.01$). The shoulder muscle strength improved statistically significantly for abduction and external rotation from grade 5 to 9 on a 10-grade scale and from grade 8 to 10 for internal rotation ($p < 0.001$ for all measures). There was no further change for the range of motion and the muscle strength beyond 2 years after the procedure.²

In the prospective case series of 59 patients, the mean (\pm SD) shoulder active range of motion improved statistically significantly for active forward flexion from $130^\circ \pm 48^\circ$ before the procedure to $158^\circ \pm 32^\circ$ at a mean 18-month follow-up ($p < 0.001$), for active external rotation from $36^\circ \pm 18^\circ$ to $45^\circ \pm 17^\circ$ ($p = 0.008$) and for internal rotation from L3 to L1 ($p < 0.001$). In the same study, the shoulder functional scores also improved statistically significantly after a mean follow-up of 18 months, from 43.6 ± 18.6 to 77.5 ± 22.0 for the ASES and from 35.0 ± 19.9 to 76.3 ± 25.2 for the subjective shoulder value ($p < 0.001$).¹

In the retrospective case series of 86 patients, the mean ASES score (\pm SD) improved statistically significantly from 52.22 ± 19.29 before the procedure to 81.56 ± 10.21 at 1 year ($p = 0.005$). The improvement was also statistically significant for the 36 patients with a 2-year follow-up (change in mean ASES score from 49.5 to 85.3, $p < 0.05$). In the same study, the mean range of motion for forward flexion statistically significantly increased for forward flexion from 121° to 160° and for abduction from 103° to 159° at 1 year ($p < 0.05$ for both outcomes). The improvement was still statistically significant at 2 years in the group of 36 patients with a 2-year follow-up. Shoulder strength improved statistically significantly from 4.8 lb for forward flexion, 4.1 lb for abduction and 7.7 lb for external rotation to 9.8 lb, 9.2 lb and 12.3 lb respectively at 1 year ($p < 0.05$ for the improvement within group). The 3 measurements were statistically significantly different between surgical and nonsurgical extremity before the procedure and at 6 months ($p < 0.05$), but not at 1 year.⁵

Improvement in pain symptoms

In the prospective case series of 59 patients, the mean (\pm SD) visual analogue scale (VAS) score (score ranges from 1 to 10 from best to worst) improved statistically significantly from 5.8 ± 2.2 before the procedure to 1.7 ± 2.1 at a mean 18-month follow-up ($p < 0.001$).¹

In the retrospective case series of 86 patients, the mean VAS score (\pm SD) improved statistically significantly from 4.03 ± 2.55 before the procedure to $1.51 \pm$

1.21 at 1 year ($p=0.005$). The improvement was also statistically significant for the 36 patients with a 2-year follow-up (change in mean VAS score from 4.26 to 1.24, $p<0.05$).⁵

Patient satisfaction

In the prospective case series of 59 patients, 73% (43/59) of patients were satisfied with the procedure.¹

In the retrospective case series of 86 patients, 90% of patients were satisfied with the procedure.⁵

Return to normal activities

In the prospective case series of 59 patients, 69% (41/59) of patients returned to normal activity.¹

Re-tear rate

In the retrospective case series of 23 patients, 83% (20/24) of shoulders had no graft tears or no re-tears of the repaired rotator cuff tendon during the mean follow-up of 34 months, 12.5% (3/24) of shoulders with severe fatty degeneration of the infraspinatus tendon had re-tears of the repaired infraspinatus tendon at 3 months after surgery and 1 patient whose surgery was a revision procedure, had a postoperative graft tear 3 months after surgery.²

Secondary procedures

In the prospective case series of 59 patients, 19% (11/59) of patients had revision procedures: 12% (7/59) had a reverse shoulder arthroplasty, 3% (2/59) had a revision superior capsular reconstruction, 2% (1/59) had a debridement and placement of an antibiotic spacer and 2% (1/59) had an open subpectoral tenodesis.¹

In the retrospective case series of 86 patients, 1 patient had a reverse total shoulder arthroplasty after the procedure.⁵

Safety summary

Detachment of the allograft

Detachment of the allograft from the glenoid was reported 8 months after the procedure in a single case report. The graft was reattached with new suture anchors and additional side-to-side anastomosis between the posterior portion of the graft and the infraspinatus tendon was done using multiple sutures.³

Infection

An infection was reported in 1 patient after the procedure in a case series of 59 patients; it needed debridement and placement of an antibiotic spacer.¹

A mild infection was reported in 3% (2/70) of patients after the procedure in a case series of 70 patients (72 shoulders). It was treated with antibiotics and arthroscopic debridement without removal of the reconstructed superior capsule.⁴

Pain

Persistent biceps pain after a proximal tenodesis was reported in 1 patient after the procedure in the case series of 59 patients; it was treated with an open subpectoral tenodesis.¹

Contracture of the shoulder

A severe contracture of the shoulder was reported in 3% (2/70) of patients after the procedure in the case series of 70 patients. It was treated with arthroscopic capsular release in the inferior glenohumeral joint.⁴

Suture anchor pull-out

Pull-out of the suture anchor was reported in 6% (4/70) of patients after the procedure in the case series of 70 patients. There were no consequences on the procedure clinical outcomes.⁴

Fall

A fall was reported in 3% (2/59) of patients after the procedure in the case series of 59 patients (no further details provided).¹

Anecdotal and theoretical adverse events

As well as safety outcomes reported in the literature, specialist advisers are asked about anecdotal adverse events (events which they have heard about) and about theoretical adverse events (events which they think might possibly occur, even if they have never happened). For this procedure, the specialist advisers did not list any anecdotal adverse events. They considered that the following were theoretical adverse events: compartment syndrome from prolonged procedure, failure of the graft used to perform capsular reconstruction and swelling.

The evidence assessed

Rapid review of literature

The medical literature was searched to identify studies and reviews relevant to superior capsular augmentation for massive rotator cuff tears. The following databases were searched, covering the period from their start to 27 March 2018: MEDLINE, PREMEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library and other databases.

Trial registries and the Internet were also searched. No language restriction was applied to the searches (see appendix C for details of search strategy). Relevant published studies identified during consultation or resolution that are published after this date may also be considered for inclusion.

The following selection criteria (table 1) were applied to the abstracts identified by the literature search. Where selection criteria could not be determined from the abstracts the full paper was retrieved.

Table 1 Inclusion criteria for identification of relevant studies

Characteristic	Criteria
Publication type	Clinical studies were included. Emphasis was placed on identifying good quality studies. Abstracts were excluded where no clinical outcomes were reported, or where the paper was a review, editorial, or a laboratory or animal study. Conference abstracts were also excluded because of the difficulty of appraising study methodology, unless they reported specific adverse events that were not available in the published literature.
Patient	Patients with massive rotator cuff tears.
Intervention/test	Superior capsular augmentation.
Outcome	Articles were retrieved if the abstract contained information relevant to the safety and/or efficacy.
Language	Non-English-language articles were excluded unless they were thought to add substantively to the English-language evidence base.

List of studies included in the IP overview

This IP overview is based on 239 patients from 4 case series^{1,2,4, 5} and 1 case report³.

Other studies that were considered to be relevant to the procedure but were not included in the main extraction table (table 2) have been listed in appendix A.

Table 2 Summary of key efficacy and safety findings on superior capsular augmentation for massive rotator cuff tears

Study 1 Denard P J (2018)

Details

Study type	Prospective case series
Country	US (4 centres)
Recruitment period	2014–16
Study population and number	n=59 patients with irreparable massive rotator cuff tears
Age and sex	Mean 62 years; 66% (39/59) male
Patient selection criteria	<u>Inclusion criteria</u> : arthroscopic SCR done with a dermal allograft. <u>Exclusion criteria</u> : revision SCR, an irreparable subscapularis tear, active infection, or neurologic pathology limiting shoulder function.
Technique	Arthroscopic superior capsular reconstruction with dermal allograft. The decision to do SCR was made intraoperatively based on the inability to achieve a complete repair following mobilisation. Graft thickness was 1 mm in 5 patients, 2 mm in 2 patients, and 3 mm in all other patients. Postoperatively, patients were immobilised in a sling for 6 weeks without dedicated physical therapy. At 6 weeks postoperatively, the sling was discontinued, and passive forward flexion and passive external rotation were allowed. At 3 to 4 months postoperatively, active forward flexion and passive internal rotation were allowed and strengthening was initiated. Return to full activity was allowed at 6 to 12 months, including all sports activities without restriction.
Follow-up	Minimum 1 year (mean 18 months)
Conflict of interest/source of funding	The authors reported the following potential conflicts of interest or sources of funding: PJD receives support from Arthrex; PCB receives support from Arthrex; CRA receives support from Arthrex; JMT receives support from Arthrex, DePuy, and Mitek; SSB receives support from Arthrex and Wolters-Kluwer.

Analysis

Follow-up issues:

- Sixty-seven patients met the study criteria. No patient declined to participate in the study. Eight patients were lost to follow-up, leaving 88% (59/67) of patients available for the analysis.
- 59% (35/59) of patients had radiographs at 2 weeks postoperatively, and 75% (44/59) had radiographs at 1 year postoperatively.
- Only 20 patients had postoperative MRIs to evaluate graft healing.

Study design issues:

- Range of motion and functional outcome according to visual analogue scale (VAS) pain, American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons (ASES) score, and subjective shoulder value (SSV) score were assessed preoperatively and at final follow-up. Radiographs were used to evaluate the acromiohumeral interval (AHI).
- For final analysis, postoperative functional scores and range of motion were excluded in patients who were converted to reverse shoulder arthroplasty.
- At final follow-up patient satisfaction (yes or no), return to normal activities (yes or no), and any complications or revision surgery were recorded.
- All MRIs and radiographs were reviewed by a single author.

Study population issues: 42% (25/59) of patients had had a range of 1 to 3 previous rotator cuff repairs.

Other issues Radiographs were not fluoroscopically controlled, which limited the evaluation of the AHI.

Key efficacy and safety findings

Efficacy				Safety																
Number of patients analysed: 59																				
Shoulder range of motion																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative status (mean±SD)</th><th>Postoperative status (mean±SD)</th><th>p value</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Active forward flexion</td><td>130°± 48°</td><td>158°±32°</td><td><0.001</td></tr> <tr> <td>Active external rotation</td><td>36°±18°</td><td>45°±17°</td><td>0.008</td></tr> <tr> <td>Internal rotation, spinal level</td><td>L3</td><td>L1</td><td><0.001</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Preoperative status (mean±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value	Active forward flexion	130°± 48°	158°±32°	<0.001	Active external rotation	36°±18°	45°±17°	0.008	Internal rotation, spinal level	L3	L1	<0.001	
	Preoperative status (mean±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value																	
Active forward flexion	130°± 48°	158°±32°	<0.001																	
Active external rotation	36°±18°	45°±17°	0.008																	
Internal rotation, spinal level	L3	L1	<0.001																	
Pain																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative status (mean±SD)</th><th>Postoperative status (mean±SD)</th><th>p value</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>VAS pain</td><td>5.8 ± 2.2</td><td>1.7± 2.1</td><td><0.001</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Preoperative status (mean±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value	VAS pain	5.8 ± 2.2	1.7± 2.1	<0.001									
	Preoperative status (mean±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value																	
VAS pain	5.8 ± 2.2	1.7± 2.1	<0.001																	
Shoulder functional scores																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative status (mean±SD)</th><th>Postoperative status (mean±SD)</th><th>p value</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ASES</td><td>43.6±18.6</td><td>77.5±22.0</td><td><0.001</td></tr> <tr> <td>SSV</td><td>35.0±19.9</td><td>76.3±25.2</td><td><0.001</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Preoperative status (mean±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value	ASES	43.6±18.6	77.5±22.0	<0.001	SSV	35.0±19.9	76.3±25.2	<0.001					
	Preoperative status (mean±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value																	
ASES	43.6±18.6	77.5±22.0	<0.001																	
SSV	35.0±19.9	76.3±25.2	<0.001																	
AHI																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative status (mean ±SD)</th><th>Postoperative status (mean±SD)</th><th>p value</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AHI</td><td>6.6±3.0 mm</td><td>6.7±3.0 mm</td><td>0.889</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Preoperative status (mean ±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value	AHI	6.6±3.0 mm	6.7±3.0 mm	0.889									
	Preoperative status (mean ±SD)	Postoperative status (mean±SD)	p value																	
AHI	6.6±3.0 mm	6.7±3.0 mm	0.889																	
Patient satisfaction: 73% (43/59)																				
% return to normal activities: 69% (41/59)																				
Complete healing of the graft (based on MRI): 45% (9/20) of the grafts																				
Secondary procedures: 19% (11/59)																				
12% (7/59) had a reverse shoulder arthroplasty, 3% (2/59) had a revision SCR, 2% (1/59) had a debridement and placement of an antibiotic spacer and 2% (1/59) had an open subpectoral tenodesis.																				
Successful procedure: 68% (40/59)																				
The outcome was categorised as successful if the final ASES score was >50 based on a previous study combined with a 17-point postoperative improvement in the ASES to meet a minimal clinically important difference for rotator cuff tears and if the patient did not need reverse shoulder arthroplasty or revision SCR.																				
Abbreviations used: AHI, acromiohumeral interval; ASES, American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons; SCR, superior capsular reconstruction; SD, standard deviation; SSV, subjective shoulder value; VAS, visual analogue scale.																				

Study 2 Mihata T (2013)

Details

Study type	Retrospective case series
Country	Japan (1 centre)
Recruitment period	2007–09
Study population and number	n=23 consecutive patients (24 shoulders) with symptomatic irreparable rotator cuff tears (11 large [3 to 5 cm], 13 massive [>5cm])
Age and sex	Mean 65 years; 52% (12/23) male
Patient selection criteria	<u>Inclusion criteria</u> : irreparable rotator cuff tear (defined as a torn tendon that cannot reach the original footprint) that was evaluated during shoulder arthroscopy. <u>Exclusion criteria</u> : severe bone deformity such as Hamada classification type V, severe superior migration of the humeral head that does not move by traction of the arm, cervical nerve palsy, axillary nerve palsy, deltoid muscle dysfunction, and infection.
Technique	Arthroscopic superior capsule reconstruction using fascia lata. The use of an abduction pillow was recommended for 4 weeks after the procedure. After the immobilisation period, passive- and active-assisted exercises were started to promote 'scaption' (scapular plane elevation). 8 weeks after surgery, the patients began to do exercises to strengthen the rotator cuff and the scapula stabilisers. Physical therapists assisted all patients.
Follow-up	Mean 34 months (range 24 to 51 months)
Conflict of interest/source of funding	None

Analysis

Follow-up issues:

- From 2007 to 2009, 223 consecutive patients had arthroscopic surgery done by a single surgeon. Twenty-five patients with irreparable rotator cuff tears had arthroscopic superior capsule reconstruction, 24 had partial-thickness tears and 174 with full-thickness tears had arthroscopic rotator cuff repair.
- Among the 25 patients who had arthroscopic superior capsule reconstruction, 2 patients moved away and were lost to follow-up.
- Physical examination, radiography and MRI were done before surgery, at 3, 6 and 12 months after surgery, and yearly thereafter.

Study design issues:

- The objective of the study was to investigate the clinical outcomes and radiographic findings after use of arthroscopic superior capsule reconstruction on irreparable postero-superior rotator cuff tears.

Study population issues:

- One patient had the procedure in both shoulders.
- Mean duration of symptoms before surgery was 21.8 months (3 to 120 months).

Other issues: The patients are likely to be included in the Mihata (2015) abstract also included in table 2.

Key efficacy and safety findings

Efficacy							Safety																																																				
Number of patients analysed: 23 patients (24 shoulders)							There were no surgical complications or complications with the harvest site.																																																				
Shoulder functional scores (n=24 shoulders)																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th colspan="2">ASES score</th><th colspan="2">JOA score</th><th colspan="2">UCLA score</th><th></th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mean</td><td>23.5</td><td>92.9</td><td>48.3</td><td>92.6</td><td>9.9</td><td>32.4</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>SD</td><td>14.4</td><td>11.3</td><td>13.0</td><td>9.0</td><td>4.7</td><td>4.3</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>									ASES score		JOA score		UCLA score				Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up		Mean	23.5	92.9	48.3	92.6	9.9	32.4		SD	14.4	11.3	13.0	9.0	4.7	4.3																					
	ASES score		JOA score		UCLA score																																																						
	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up																																																					
Mean	23.5	92.9	48.3	92.6	9.9	32.4																																																					
SD	14.4	11.3	13.0	9.0	4.7	4.3																																																					
All scores improved statistically significantly from the preoperative to the final assessment (p<0.00001). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASES and JOA scores: scale of 0 (minimum) to 100 points (maximum); UCLA score: scale of 0 to 35 points. 																																																											
Shoulder range of motion (n=24 shoulders)																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th colspan="2">Active elevation (°)</th><th colspan="2">Active external rotation (°)</th><th colspan="2">Active internal rotation (°)</th><th></th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mean</td><td>84</td><td>148</td><td>26</td><td>40</td><td>L3</td><td>L1</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>SD</td><td>52.2</td><td>33.4</td><td>14.1</td><td>17.2</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>									Active elevation (°)		Active external rotation (°)		Active internal rotation (°)				Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up		Mean	84	148	26	40	L3	L1		SD	52.2	33.4	14.1	17.2	-	-																					
	Active elevation (°)		Active external rotation (°)		Active internal rotation (°)																																																						
	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up																																																					
Mean	84	148	26	40	L3	L1																																																					
SD	52.2	33.4	14.1	17.2	-	-																																																					
The shoulder active range of motion improved statistically significantly at the final follow-up for elevation (p <0.001), for external rotation (p < 0.01) and by 2 vertebral bodies for internal rotation (p < 0.01). There was no further change beyond 2 years after the procedure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal rotation decreased in 3 patients after surgery. 																																																											
Shoulder muscle strength (n=24 shoulders)																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th colspan="2">Abduction (Grade)</th><th colspan="2">External Rotation (Grade)</th><th colspan="2">Internal Rotation (Grade)</th><th></th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th></th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>MMT</th><th>10 scale</th><th>MMT</th><th>10 scale</th><th>MMT</th><th>10 scale</th><th>MMT</th><th>10 scale</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mean</td><td>3+</td><td>5</td><td>5-</td><td>9</td><td>3+</td><td>5</td><td>5-</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>									Abduction (Grade)		External Rotation (Grade)		Internal Rotation (Grade)				Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up			MMT	10 scale	MMT	10 scale	MMT	10 scale	MMT	10 scale	Mean	3+	5	5-	9	3+	5	5-	9																		
	Abduction (Grade)		External Rotation (Grade)		Internal Rotation (Grade)																																																						
	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up	Preoperative	At final follow-up																																																					
	MMT	10 scale	MMT	10 scale	MMT	10 scale	MMT	10 scale																																																			
Mean	3+	5	5-	9	3+	5	5-	9																																																			
MMT is on a scale of 0 to 5; 10 scale is converted MMT grade to a scale of 0 to 10, where MMT 5 =10, MMT 5- = 9, MMT 4+ = 8, MMT 4 = 7, MMT 4- = 6, MMT 3+ = 5, MMT 3 = 4, MMT 3- = 3, MMT 2 = 2, MMT 1 = 1, and MMT 0 = 0.																																																											
The shoulder muscle strength improved statistically significantly from the preoperative assessment to the final assessment (p <0 .001 for abduction, external and internal rotation). There was no further change beyond 2 years after the procedure.																																																											
Acromiohumeral distance (radiographic evaluation, n=24 shoulders)																																																											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th colspan="2">AHD (mm)</th><th></th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>Preoperative</th><th>At final follow-up</th><th>p</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mean</td><td>4.6</td><td>8.7</td><td>0.00001</td></tr> <tr> <td>SD</td><td>2.2</td><td>2.6</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>									AHD (mm)				Preoperative	At final follow-up	p	Mean	4.6	8.7	0.00001	SD	2.2	2.6																																					
	AHD (mm)																																																										
	Preoperative	At final follow-up	p																																																								
Mean	4.6	8.7	0.00001																																																								
SD	2.2	2.6																																																									
The AHD in 58% (14/24) of shoulders was 5 mm or less before surgery. At final follow-up, the AHD was more than 5 mm in 92% (22/24) of shoulders.																																																											
MRI findings																																																											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 83% (20/24) of shoulders had no graft tears or no re-tears of the repaired rotator cuff tendon during the follow-up. 																																																											

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12.5% (3/24) of shoulders with severe fatty degeneration of the infraspinatus tendon had re-tears of the repaired infraspinatus tendon at 3 months after surgery. 1 patient whose surgery was a revision procedure, had a postoperative graft tear 3 months after surgery. 	
---	--

Abbreviations used: AHD, acromiohumeral distance; ASES, American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons; JOA, Japanese Orthopaedic Association; MMT, manual muscle testing; SD, standard deviation; UCLA, University of California, Los Angeles.

Study 3 Zerr J (2017)

Details

Study type	Case report
Country	US
Recruitment period	Not reported
Study population and number	n= 1 patient with massive rotator cuff tear
Age and sex	55.5 years; male
Patient selection criteria	Not reported
Technique	Superior capsular reconstruction using a dermal patch allograft along with revision rotator cuff repair of the subscapularis
Follow-up	8 months
Conflict of interest/source of funding	None

Analysis

Study population issues: The patient had previously had rotator cuff repair and a revision of rotator cuff repair.

Key efficacy and safety findings

Efficacy					Safety
Number of patients analysed: 1					Detachment of the allograft from the glenoid
Examination findings					After returning to work about 6 months after the procedure, the patient noticed some mild shoulder pain and limitation in motion. Symptoms gradually progressed and a shoulder magnetic resonance (MR) arthrogram was done 8 months after the procedure. Detachment of the allograft from the glenoid and anterior aspect of the rotator cuff was seen on the MR arthrogram. Repeat shoulder arthroscopy confirmed the partial detachment of the superior capsule graft from the posterior glenoid, although it remained fixed on the humeral side.
	pre-SCR	post-SCR	post-SCR when graft had failed	7 weeks post-SCR revision	
Forward elevation	70°	130°	100°	100°	
Abduction	60°	95°	80°	80°	
External rotation	55°	40°	50°	40°	
Strength	4/5	4/5	4/5	-	

Abbreviations used: SCR, superior capsular reconstruction.

Study 4 Mihata T (2015) [conference abstract only]

Details

Study type	Case series
Country	Japan
Recruitment period	2007–13
Study population and number	n=70 consecutive patients (72 shoulders) with irreparable rotator cuff tears
Age and sex	Mean 65.5 years; gender not stated
Patient selection criteria	Patients with irreparable rotator cuff tears for whom conservative treatment had failed.
Technique	Arthroscopic superior capsule reconstruction using fascia lata.
Follow-up	Mean 30.5 months (range 12 to 76 months)
Conflict of interest/source of funding	Not reported

Analysis

Follow-up issues:

- Physical examination, radiography and MRI were done before surgery, at 3, 6 and 12 months after surgery, and yearly thereafter.

Study design issues:

- The objective of the study was to investigate the clinical outcomes and radiographic findings after use of arthroscopic superior capsule reconstruction on irreparable postero-superior rotator cuff tears.

Study population issues:

- 2 patients had the procedure in both shoulders.

Other issues: Some of the patients included in this study are also likely to be included in the Mihata (2013) paper also included in table 2.

Key efficacy and safety findings

Efficacy	Safety
<p>Number of patients analysed: 70 patients (72 shoulders)</p> <p>Efficacy findings from conference abstracts are not normally considered adequate to support decisions on efficacy and are not generally selected for presentation in the overview.</p>	<p>Mild infection: 3% (2/70) It was treated with antibiotics and arthroscopic debridement without removal of the reconstructed superior capsule.</p> <p>Suture anchor pull-out: 6% (4/70) There were no consequences on the procedure clinical outcomes.</p> <p>Severe contracture of the shoulder: 3% (2/70) It was treated with arthroscopic capsular release in the inferior glenohumeral joint.</p> <p>There were no complications with the harvest site.</p>

Study 5 Pennington W T (2018)

Details

Study type	Retrospective case series
Country	USA
Recruitment period	2015-16
Study population and number	n= 86 consecutive patients (88 shoulders) with massive rotator cuff tears
Age and sex	Mean 59 years; 69% (59/86) male
Patient selection criteria	All patients who had superior capsular reconstruction during the time period of this study.
Technique	Arthroscopic superior capsular reconstruction using an acellular dermal allograft
Follow-up	Minimum 12 months (range 16 to 28 months)
Conflict of interest/source of funding	W.T.P. receives board membership fees from Midwest Orthopedic Specialty Hospital, The Surgery Center at Associated Surgical Medical Specialists, The Orthopedic Institute of Wisconsin, OSM Consulting; is a paid consultant for Arthrex; and is on clinical faculty and has been paid to do educational talks and labs by Arthrex.

Analysis

Follow-up issues: It was not clear from the paper if 27% (23/86) or 44% (38/86) of patients had a 2-year follow-up.

Study design issues:

- Outcome analysis was done via an internet-based outcome-tracking system to evaluate visual analogue scale (VAS) and American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons (ASES) scores. Radiographic analysis of anteroposterior radiographs analysed acromiohumeral interval and superior capsular distance. Digital dynamometric strength and functional range of motion assessments were also obtained.
- The acromiohumeral distance and superior capsular distance measurements were determined by a research assistant under the supervision of the lead author.
- MRI scans were only obtained for patients who were dissatisfied or who sustained trauma.

Study population issues:

- 41% of patients had 1 or more previous surgical attempts to treat their rotator cuff pathology.
- 78% of patients presented as pseudoparalytic, defined as the inability to abduct or having forward flexion of less than 90 with normal passive range of shoulder motion and the absence of neurologic impairment.

Key efficacy and safety findings

Efficacy				Safety																																								
Number of patients analysed: 86 patients (88 shoulders)				No safety outcomes reported.																																								
Graft failure: 4.5% (4/88) of shoulders 3 graft failures were seen on MRI in patients reporting dissatisfaction and 1 patient reported dissatisfaction due to pain and lack of function, but the MRI revealed an intact graft (this patient was the only one who had a revision to reverse total shoulder arthroplasty).																																												
Outcome data at 1-year follow-up																																												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Pre-operation</th><th>1 year</th><th>p value</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ASES Score</td><td>52.22 ± 19.29</td><td>81.56 ± 10.21</td><td>0.005</td></tr> <tr> <td>VAS Pain</td><td>4.0306 ± 2.5478</td><td>1.51 ± 1.21</td><td>0.005</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Pre-operation	1 year	p value	ASES Score	52.22 ± 19.29	81.56 ± 10.21	0.005	VAS Pain	4.0306 ± 2.5478	1.51 ± 1.21	0.005																													
	Pre-operation	1 year	p value																																									
ASES Score	52.22 ± 19.29	81.56 ± 10.21	0.005																																									
VAS Pain	4.0306 ± 2.5478	1.51 ± 1.21	0.005																																									
Range of motion (degrees)																																												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Pre-operation</th><th>6 months</th><th>1 year</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Forward flexion</td><td>121 (10-180)</td><td>145 (60-180) p=0.0283</td><td>160 (70-180) p=0.0436</td></tr> <tr> <td>Abduction</td><td>103 (15-180)</td><td>137 (45-175) p=0.0436</td><td>159 (68-180) p=0.00678</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Pre-operation	6 months	1 year	Forward flexion	121 (10-180)	145 (60-180) p=0.0283	160 (70-180) p=0.0436	Abduction	103 (15-180)	137 (45-175) p=0.0436	159 (68-180) p=0.00678																													
	Pre-operation	6 months	1 year																																									
Forward flexion	121 (10-180)	145 (60-180) p=0.0283	160 (70-180) p=0.0436																																									
Abduction	103 (15-180)	137 (45-175) p=0.0436	159 (68-180) p=0.00678																																									
Shoulder strength (pounds)																																												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th colspan="2">Forward flexion</th><th colspan="2">Abduction</th><th colspan="2">External rotation</th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th>Surgical extremity</th><th>Nonsurgical extremity</th><th>Surgical extremity</th><th>Nonsurgical extremity</th><th>Surgical extremity</th><th>Nonsurgical extremity</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pre-operation</td><td>4.8 (0-11.5) p=0.00051</td><td>14.1</td><td>4.1 (0-11.9) p=0.000013</td><td>13.9</td><td>7.7 (0-19.2) p=0.018</td><td>16.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>6 months</td><td>6.2 (0.5-18.0) p=0.016</td><td>13.0</td><td>5.8 (0.5-17.0) p=0.0022</td><td>11.1</td><td>9.3 (3.2-20) p=0.011</td><td>15.2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1 year</td><td>9.8 (3.0-18.1) p=0.44</td><td>11.5</td><td>9.2 (0.5-16.1) p=0.39</td><td>10.1</td><td>12.3 (2.0-20.3) p=0.060</td><td>14.7</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Forward flexion		Abduction		External rotation			Surgical extremity	Nonsurgical extremity	Surgical extremity	Nonsurgical extremity	Surgical extremity	Nonsurgical extremity	Pre-operation	4.8 (0-11.5) p=0.00051	14.1	4.1 (0-11.9) p=0.000013	13.9	7.7 (0-19.2) p=0.018	16.5	6 months	6.2 (0.5-18.0) p=0.016	13.0	5.8 (0.5-17.0) p=0.0022	11.1	9.3 (3.2-20) p=0.011	15.2	1 year	9.8 (3.0-18.1) p=0.44	11.5	9.2 (0.5-16.1) p=0.39	10.1	12.3 (2.0-20.3) p=0.060	14.7						
	Forward flexion		Abduction		External rotation																																							
	Surgical extremity	Nonsurgical extremity	Surgical extremity	Nonsurgical extremity	Surgical extremity	Nonsurgical extremity																																						
Pre-operation	4.8 (0-11.5) p=0.00051	14.1	4.1 (0-11.9) p=0.000013	13.9	7.7 (0-19.2) p=0.018	16.5																																						
6 months	6.2 (0.5-18.0) p=0.016	13.0	5.8 (0.5-17.0) p=0.0022	11.1	9.3 (3.2-20) p=0.011	15.2																																						
1 year	9.8 (3.0-18.1) p=0.44	11.5	9.2 (0.5-16.1) p=0.39	10.1	12.3 (2.0-20.3) p=0.060	14.7																																						
Results of dynamometric strength measurements taken on the surgical extremity and nonsurgical extremity. The p values in the table are for the difference between the surgical and nonsurgical extremity. Statistically significant improvement between pre-operative values and 1-year results for forward flexion, abduction and external rotation (p<0.05)																																												
Radiographic Measurements (mm)																																												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Pre-operation</th><th>1 week</th><th>6 months</th><th>1 year</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Acromiohumeral interval</td><td>7.1</td><td>10.8 (p= 3.22E-07)</td><td>9.0 (p=0.00872)</td><td>9.7 (p=0.0487)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Superior capsular distance</td><td>52.9</td><td>49.2 (p=5.25E-05)</td><td>48.7 (p=0.00932)</td><td>46.2 (p=0.01052)</td></tr> </tbody> </table>						Pre-operation	1 week	6 months	1 year	Acromiohumeral interval	7.1	10.8 (p= 3.22E-07)	9.0 (p=0.00872)	9.7 (p=0.0487)	Superior capsular distance	52.9	49.2 (p=5.25E-05)	48.7 (p=0.00932)	46.2 (p=0.01052)																									
	Pre-operation	1 week	6 months	1 year																																								
Acromiohumeral interval	7.1	10.8 (p= 3.22E-07)	9.0 (p=0.00872)	9.7 (p=0.0487)																																								
Superior capsular distance	52.9	49.2 (p=5.25E-05)	48.7 (p=0.00932)	46.2 (p=0.01052)																																								
Patient satisfaction (on post-op surveys): 90%																																												
Patients with a 2-year follow-up (n=36 patients)																																												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Pre-operation</th><th>2-year follow-up</th><th>p value</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ASES Score (mean)</td><td>49.5</td><td>85.3</td><td><0.05</td></tr> <tr> <td>VAS Pain (mean)</td><td>4.26</td><td>1.24</td><td><0.05</td></tr> <tr> <td>Acromiohumeral interval (mean)</td><td>7.3 mm</td><td>9.9 mm</td><td>0.0492</td></tr> <tr> <td>Superior capsular distance (mean)</td><td>53.4 mm</td><td>45.8 mm</td><td>0.01</td></tr> <tr> <td>Range of motion</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Mean forward flexion</td><td>123°</td><td>162°</td><td>0.041</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mean abduction</td><td>106°</td><td>160°</td><td>0.006</td></tr> <tr> <td>Shoulder strength</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Forward flexion</td><td>4.7 lb</td><td>9.8 lb</td><td>0.46</td></tr> </tbody> </table>						Pre-operation	2-year follow-up	p value	ASES Score (mean)	49.5	85.3	<0.05	VAS Pain (mean)	4.26	1.24	<0.05	Acromiohumeral interval (mean)	7.3 mm	9.9 mm	0.0492	Superior capsular distance (mean)	53.4 mm	45.8 mm	0.01	Range of motion				Mean forward flexion	123°	162°	0.041	Mean abduction	106°	160°	0.006	Shoulder strength				Forward flexion	4.7 lb	9.8 lb	0.46
	Pre-operation	2-year follow-up	p value																																									
ASES Score (mean)	49.5	85.3	<0.05																																									
VAS Pain (mean)	4.26	1.24	<0.05																																									
Acromiohumeral interval (mean)	7.3 mm	9.9 mm	0.0492																																									
Superior capsular distance (mean)	53.4 mm	45.8 mm	0.01																																									
Range of motion																																												
Mean forward flexion	123°	162°	0.041																																									
Mean abduction	106°	160°	0.006																																									
Shoulder strength																																												
Forward flexion	4.7 lb	9.8 lb	0.46																																									

Abduction	4.0 lb	9.4 lb	0.40		
External rotation	7.6 lb	12.6 lb	0.05		

Abbreviations used: ASES, American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons; VAS, visual analogue scale

Validity and generalisability of the studies

- The evidence base was limited to 3 case series of 59, 23 and 86 patients with a maximum follow-up of 2 years, 1 case report³ and 1 abstract⁴ included for the safety data.
- There seems to be a learning curve associated with this procedure.

Existing assessments of this procedure

There were no published assessments from other organisations identified at the time of the literature search.

Related NICE guidance

Below is a list of NICE guidance related to this procedure.

Interventional procedures

- Biodegradable subacromial spacer insertion for rotator cuff tears. NICE interventional procedures guidance 558 (2016). Available from <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg558>.
- Shoulder resurfacing arthroplasty. NICE interventional procedures guidance 354 (2010). Available from <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg354>.
- Extracorporeal shockwave lithotripsy for calcific tendonitis (tendinopathy) of the shoulder. NICE interventional procedures guidance 21 (2003). Available from <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg21>.

Additional information considered by IPAC

Specialist advisers' opinions

Specialist advice was sought from consultants who have been nominated or ratified by their Specialist Society or Royal College. The advice received is their individual opinion and is not intended to represent the view of the society. The advice provided by Specialist Advisers, in the form of the completed questionnaires, is normally published in full on the NICE website during public consultation, except in circumstances but not limited to, where comments are considered voluminous, or publication would be unlawful or inappropriate. Two Specialist Advisor Questionnaires for superior capsular augmentation for massive rotator cuff tears were submitted and can be found on the [NICE website](#).

Patient commentators' opinions

NICE's Public Involvement Programme was unable to gather patient commentary for this procedure.

Issues for consideration by IPAC

There was no ongoing trial.

References

1. Denard P J, Brady P C, Adams C R et al. (2018) Preliminary Results of Arthroscopic Superior Capsule Reconstruction with Dermal Allograft. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic and Related Surgery*, Vol 34, No 1: pp 93-99
2. Mihata T, Lee T Q, Watanabe C et al. (2013) Clinical results of arthroscopic superior capsule reconstruction for irreparable rotator cuff tears. *Arthroscopy* 29(3), 459-70
3. Zerr J, McDermott J D, Beckmann N M et al. (2017) Case study: failure of superior capsular reconstruction using dermal allograft. *Skeletal Radiology* 46(11), 1585-1589
4. Mihata T and Lee T Q (2015) Clinical Outcomes of Superior Capsule Reconstruction for Irreparable Rotator Cuff Tears without Osteoarthritis in the Glenohumeral Joint. *Journal of shoulder and elbow surgery* 24(4) e107–e109
5. Pennington W T, Bartz B A, Pauli J M, et al. (2018) Arthroscopic Superior Capsular Reconstruction With Acellular Dermal Allograft for the Treatment of Massive Irreparable Rotator Cuff Tears: Short-Term Clinical Outcomes and the Radiographic Parameter of Superior Capsular Distance. *Arthroscopy* 15, 15 [in press]

Appendix A - Additional relevant papers

The following table outlines the studies that are considered potentially relevant to the IP overview but were not included in the main data extraction table (table 2). It is by no means an exhaustive list of potentially relevant studies.

Article	Number of patients/follow-up	Direction of conclusions	Reasons for non-inclusion in table 2
Roberson T A, and Tokish J M (2017) Superior Capsular Reconstruction for Irreparable Rotator Cuff Tears. Techniques in Shoulder and Elbow Surgery 18(1), 8-14	Single case report	Superior capsular reconstruction does offer great promise to fill a previously unmet need and as such further investigation is warranted to define the nuances of technique and supporting clinical outcomes.	Description of the procedure technique.

Literature search strategy

Databases	Date searched	Version/files
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews – CDSR (Cochrane Library)	27/03/2018	Issue 3 of 12, March 2018
Cochrane Central Database of Controlled Trials – CENTRAL (Cochrane Library)	27/03/2018	Issue 2 of 12, February 2018
HTA database (Cochrane Library)	27/03/2018	Issue 4 of 4, October 2016
MEDLINE (Ovid)	27/03/2018	1946 to Present with Daily Update
MEDLINE In-Process (Ovid) and MEDLINE Epubs ahead of print (Ovid)	27/03/2018	March 23, 2018
EMBASE (Ovid)	27/03/2018	1974 to 2018 Week 13

Trial sources searched

- Clinicaltrials.gov
- ISRCTN
- WHO International Clinical Trials Registry

Websites searched

- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)
- NHS England
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA) - MAUDE database
- Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures – Surgical (ASERNIP – S)
- Australia and New Zealand Horizon Scanning Network (ANZHSN)
- EuroScan
- General internet search

The following search strategy was used to identify papers in MEDLINE. A similar strategy was used to identify papers in other databases.

- 1 Rotator Cuff/
- 2 Shoulder Impingement Syndrome/
- 3 Shoulder Joint/
- 4 Shoulder Pain/
- 5 Acromion/

(shoulder* or rotat* or rotor* or rotar* or cuff* or humer* or abcromi* or subabcromi* or sub-abcromi* or
6 acromion* or arthroscop* or supraspinatus* or infraspinatus* or "teres minor*" or teres-minor* or
subscapularis*).tw.
7 or/1-6
((scar* or tear* or torn* or rip* or ruptur* or absenc* or irrepair* or irreparab* or imping* or fullthick* or
8 full-thick* or non-funct* or nonfunct* or ruptur*) adj4 (lesion* or large* or partial* or massive* or tendon*
or ligament* or muscle*).tw.
9 7 and 8
10 Rotator cuff injuries/
11 (rotat* adj4 cuff* adj4 injur*).tw.
12 or/9-11
13 Reconstructive Surgical Procedures/
14 (superior adj4 capsul*).tw.
15 ((dermis or dermal or tissue* or fascia lata*) adj4 (matri* or scaffold* or autograft* or autotransplant* or
allograft* or graft* or patch*).tw.
16 SCR.tw.
17 or/13-16
18 12 and 17
19 (arthroflex or graftjacket).tw.
20 18 or 19
21 animals/ not humans/
22 20 not 21