Wright Medical Technology's CONSERVE® Plus Resurfacing System

In comparing the relative clinical effectiveness of hip resurfacing (RS) to total hip replacement (THR), the Assessment Report indicates that a systematic review of the literature was performed, and only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with more than 100 patients, systematic reviews and meta-analyses were considered. The report lists that three randomized controlled trials and three systematic reviews were included to compare the relative clinical effectiveness of RS and THR. The Assessment Report concluded that "Evidence on the relative benefits of RS vs.THR or of different types of THR was largely lacking."

If RCTs with less than 100 patients and cohort studies were included, it is possible that the results would be different. For example, both Lavigne et al [1] and Vendittoli et al [2] conducted RCTs and observed similar functional outcomes in patients that received either a RS or THR device. It should also be noted that the RS patients in the Vendittoli et al study had significantly higher activity levels. The Assessment Report did not include multiple cohort studies of the CONSERVE® Plus RS device (all survival values listed below exceed the current NICE benchmark):

		Survival				
Study Description	**Study**	**3-Yr**	**5-Yr**	**7-Yr**	**8-Yr**	**10-Yr**
CONSERVE® Plus (Ideal patients)	Amstutz et al. [3]				99.7%	99.7%
CONSERVE® Plus (Two-stage bilateral patients)	Amstutz et al. [4]				97.0%	
CONSERVE® Plus (Acetabular only)	Hulst et al. [5]		99.6%			98.3%
CONSERVE® Plus (Osteonecrosis patients)	Amstutz et al. [6]	97.5%	95.7%		93.9%	
CONSERVE® Plus (Non-Osteonecrosis patients)	Amstutz et al. [6]	98.4%	95.4%		93.4%	
CONSERVE® Plus (Male Patients)	Amstutz et al. [7]		96.5%			
CONSERVE® Plus	Langton et al. [8]		99.6%			
CONSERVE® Plus + Corin Cormet	Sayeed et al. [9]			100%		
CONSERVE® Plus (IDE study results)	Amstutz et al. [10]		95.2%			
CONSERVE® Plus (2nd Generation)	Amstutz et al. [11]		98.0%			94.3%

The Assessment Report further reports that "Using the NJR data, we found that 97% of those undergoing THR had remained without a revision by 9 years, whereas only 89% of those undergoing RS had not had a revision by the same stage." It is likely that all RS designs were included in this calculation. It is also likely that the survival value would be higher if recalled RS designs were excluded from the survival calculation.

In summary, Wright Medical Technology feels that sufficient evidence exists that demonstrates the clinical effectiveness of the CONSERVE® Plus RS device and that RS devices can still be considered a possible intervention for end-stage osteoarthritis.

References

[1] M. Lavigne, *et al.,* “The John Charnley Award: The functional outcome of hip resurfacing and large-head THA is the same: a randomized, double-blind study,” *Clin Orthop Relat Res*, vol. 468, pp.326-36, 2010.
[2] P.A. Vendittoli, *et al.,* “A prospective randomized clinical trial comparing metal-on-metal total hip arthroplasty and metal-on-metal total hip resurfacing in patients less than 65 years old,” *Hip Int*, vol. 16 Suppl 4, pp.73-81, 2006.
[3] H. C. Amstutz*, et al.*, "The effect of patient selection and surgical technique on the results of Conserve(R) Plus hip resurfacing--3.5- to 14-year follow-up," *Orthop Clin North Am,* vol. 42, pp. 133-42, vii, Apr 2011.
[4] H. C. Amstutz*, et al.*, "Are There Benefits to One- versus Two-stage Procedures in Bilateral Hip Resurfacing?," *Clin Orthop Relat Res,* vol. 469, pp. 1627-34, Jun 2011.
[5] J. B. Hulst*, et al.*, "Survivorship of Conserve(R) Plus monoblock metal-on-metal hip resurfacing sockets: radiographic midterm results of 580 patients," *Orthop Clin North Am,* vol. 42, pp. 153-9, vii, Apr 2011.
[6] H. C. Amstutz and M. J. Le Duff, "Hip resurfacing results for osteonecrosis are as good as for other etiologies at 2 to 12 years," *Clin Orthop Relat Res,* vol. 468, pp. 375-81, Feb 2010.
[7] H. C. Amstutz*, et al.*, "Sex as a patient selection criterion for metal-on-metal hip resurfacing arthroplasty," *J Arthroplasty,* vol. 26, pp. 198-208, Feb 2011.
[8] D. J. Langton*, et al.*, "Adverse reaction to metal debris following hip resurfacing: the influence of component type, orientation and volumetric wear," *J Bone Joint Surg Br,* vol. 93, pp. 164-71, Feb 2011.
[9] S. A. Sayeed*, et al.*, "Hip Resurfacing in Patients Who Have Osteonecrosis and are 25 Years or Under," *Clin Orthop Relat Res,* vol. 469, pp. 1582-8, Jun 2011.
[10] H. C. Amstutz and M. J. Le Duff, “Eleven Years of Experience With Metal-on-Metal Hybrid Hip Resurfacing: A Review of 1000 Conserve Plus,” *J Arthroplasty,* vol. 23 (6 Suppl 1), pp. 36-43, 2008.
[11] H. C. Amstutz*, et al.*, "Socket Position Determines Hip Resurfacing 10-Year Survivorship," *Clin Orthop Relat Res,* Apr 18 2012.