

Kevin Conn

Comprising primary hips and knees with pre-op and 6 month post-op PROMs data:

	Procedures From: To:	23/03/2009 23/12/2020
	Produced on:	18/07/2021
Contents		
Usage by Hospital	2	
Primary Total Hip Replacement	3	
Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement	15	
Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement	27	
Methodology	39	
Disclaimer	40	

This analysis is based on data collected by the NJR, and PROMs data collected by NHS Digital. PROMs data has been collected from providers of NHS-funded care in England since April 2009. PROMs scores are included in this analysis where complete paired pre-operative and 6-month post-operative scores are available, and have been linked to consented and traceable NJR primary hip and knee procedures.

This report is made available to Kevin Conn , who is free to share this report as required.

Kevin Conn

PROMs records by Hospital

Hospital	Bicondylar Knees	Unicondylar Knees	Total Hips
Basingstoke and North Hampshire Hospital	113 (229)	39 (137)	223 (475)
BMI Hampshire Clinic	14 (60)	12 (40)	33 (204)
Royal Hampshire County Hospital	0 (1)	0 (4)	0 (4)
Total	127 (290)	51 (181)	256 (683)

Table includes all procedures for which paired pre-operative and 6-month post-operative scores are available for any of the PROMs collected (Oxford Score, EQ-5D, EQ-VAS).

Figures in brackets correspond to the total number of procedures for which the consultant was responsible in that hospital over the same time period.

Primary Total Hip Replacement

Patient Details

	Consultant THR with paired PROMs	All other THR in NJR with paired PROMs
Total Procedures	256	324,431
Total Patients	230	300,665
Demographics		
Mean age	70.9	69.2
< 50	3.5%	4.2%
50 – 59	10.5%	12.4%
60 – 69	26.2%	30.7%
70 – 79	39.5%	37.2%
≥ 80	20.3%	15.5%
Median BMI	27	28
% BMI information available	55.5%	76.5%
Underweight (BMI < 18.5)	2.1%	0.7%
Normal (18.5 ≤ BMI < 25)	26.8%	19.2%
Overweight (25 ≤ BMI < 30)	43.0%	40.5%
Obese I (30 ≤ BMI < 35)	19.7%	26.7%
Obese II (35 ≤ BMI < 40)	7.0%	9.9%
Obese III (BMI ≥ 40)	1.4%	3.0%
% Male	42.6%	40.1%
ASA Grades		
P1 - Fit and healthy	6.6%	13.1%
P2 - Mild disease not incapacitating	89.8%	71.3%
P3 - Incapacitating systemic disease	3.5%	15.3%
P4 / P5	0.0%	0.3%
Indications		
Osteoarthritis	99.61%	96.29%
Rheumatoid Arthritis	0.00%	1.29%
Avascular Necrosis	0.00%	1.85%
Fractured Neck of Femur	0.00%	0.10%
CDH/DDH	0.00%	1.44%
Other	0.39%	1.10%

Total of indications may exceed total number of procedures, since more than one indication can be listed per case.

Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

PROMs Analysis





Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

Oxford Hip Score



Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

EQ-5D Index



Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

EQ-VAS



Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

PROMs Analysis

Oxford Hip Score (0 - 48)	Kevin Conn	All other THR	
Paired Records	254	314,111	
PreOp score	20.4 (19.4 - 21.4)	17.9 (17.9 - 17.9)	
6 month score	42.3 (41.2 - 43.4) 39.5 (39.5 - 39.6)		
Health gain	21.9 (20.7 - 23.1) 21.6 (21.6 - 21.7)		
Health gain (adjusted)	22.6 (21.6 - 23.5) 21.6 (21.6 - 21.7)		
Difference in adjusted gain *	-0.1 to 1.9		
% Score Improved	98.4% 97.3%		
% Adjusted gain > 0	98.4% 98.0%		
p value % adjusted gain > 0		1	

EQ-5D Index (-0.59 - 1.00)	Kevin Conn	All other THR	
Paired Records	224	289,501	
PreOp score	0.460 (0.418 - 0.502)	0.352 (0.351 - 0.353)	
6 month score	0.849 (0.818 - 0.881) 0.795 (0.794 - 0.796		
Health gain	0.390 (0.345 - 0.434)	0.443 (0.441 - 0.444)	
Health gain (adjusted)	0.445 (0.416 - 0.474)	0.443 (0.442 - 0.443)	
Difference in adjusted gain *	-0.026 to 0.032		
% Score Improved	89.3%	89.7%	
% Adjusted gain > 0	96.4%	95.1%	
p value % adjusted gain > 0	0.44		

EQ-VAS (0 - 100)	Kevin Conn	All other THR	
Paired Records	208	278,872	
PreOp score	70.7 (67.8 - 73.7)	64.6 (64.6 - 64.7)	
6 month score	80.7 (78.2 - 83.1)	77.0 (76.9 - 77.1)	
Health gain	9.9 (6.8 - 13.1)	12.4 (12.3 - 12.4)	
Health gain (adjusted)	12.0 (9.8 - 14.2) 12.3 (12.3 - 12.4)		
Difference in adjusted gain *	-2.5 to 1.8		
% Score Improved	69.7%	66.6%	
% Adjusted gain > 0	83.2% 82.2%		
p value % adjusted gain > 0	0.79		

Adjusted scores correspond to the NHS Digital version 3 casemix-adjustment model. See methodology page for details. Figures in brackets correspond to 95% confidence intervals. * 95% confidence interval for the mean adjusted gain for the consultant, minus the national average adjusted gain.

PROMs Report for: Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

PROMs Analysis



Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

Oxford Hip Score



Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

EQ-5D Index



Kevin Conn

Primary Total Hip Replacement

EQ-VAS



Kevin Conn

Responses are not case-mix adjusted





Primary Total Hip Replacement

Success and Satisfaction

Succes	Kevin Conn			All other THR
Success	Number	Observed %	Expected %	Observed %
Much better	229	90.5%	87.5%	87.1%
A little better	18	7.1%	8.2%	8.4%
About the same	4	1.6%	2.2%	2.2%
A little worse	0	0.0%	1.2%	1.3%
Much worse	2	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Total	253	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Answer to 6-months general health question:

"Overall, how are your problems now, compared to before your operation?"

Satisfaction	Kevin Conn			All other THR
Sausiaction	Number	Observed %	Expected %	Observed %
Excellent	121	47.8%	43.1%	42.6%
Very Good	89	35.2%	34.2%	34.2%
Good	33	13.0%	15.9%	16.1%
Fair	6	2.4%	5.3%	5.4%
Poor	4	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%
Total	253	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Answer to 6-months general health question:

"How would you describe the results of your operation?"

Expected scores are calculated from the responses for all primary total hip replacement, adjusted for age, sex, pre-operative Oxford hip score, and pre-operative EQ-5D score.

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

Patient Details

	Consultant TKR with paired PROMs	All other TKR in NJR with paired PROMs
Total Procedures	127	339,334
Total Patients	116	308,604
Demographics		
Mean age	72.5	70.4
< 50	0.8%	1.2%
50 – 59	4.7%	10.2%
60 – 69	26.8%	32.9%
70 – 79	47.2%	40.4%
≥ 80	20.5%	15.3%
Median BMI	29	30
% BMI information available	63.8%	76.3%
Underweight (BMI < 18.5)	0.0%	0.2%
Normal (18.5 ≤ BMI < 25)	13.6%	9.3%
Overweight (25 ≤ BMI < 30)	44.4%	34.4%
Obese I (30 ≤ BMI < 35)	27.2%	33.2%
Obese II (35 ≤ BMI < 40)	7.4%	16.6%
Obese III (BMI ≥ 40)	7.4%	6.4%
% Male	44.1%	43.3%
ASA Grades		
P1 - Fit and healthy	6.3%	8.3%
P2 - Mild disease not incapacitating	91.3%	74.6%
P3 - Incapacitating systemic disease	2.4%	16.8%
P4 / P5	0.0%	0.3%
Indications		
Osteoarthritis	100.00%	97.83%
Rheumatoid Arthritis	0.00%	1.18%
Other Inflammatory Arthropathy	0.00%	0.66%
Previous Trauma	0.00%	0.52%
Avascular Necrosis	0.00%	0.30%
Other	0.00%	0.28%

Total of indications may exceed total number of procedures, since more than one indication can be listed per case.

Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

PROMs Analysis



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

Oxford Knee Score



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-5D Index



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-VAS



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

PROMs Analysis

Oxford Knee Score (0 - 48)	Kevin Conn	All other TKR	
Paired Records	124	326,634	
PreOp score	22.7 (21.3 - 24.0)	19.0 (19.0 - 19.0)	
6 month score	37.9 (36.2 - 39.5) 35.4 (35.4 - 35.4)		
Health gain	15.2 (13.5 - 16.9) 16.4 (16.4 - 16.4)		
Health gain (adjusted)	16.3 (14.7 - 17.8) 16.4 (16.3 - 16.4)		
Difference in adjusted gain *	-1.6 to 1.4		
% Score Improved	93.5%	93.9%	
% Adjusted gain > 0	96.8% 95.2%		
p value % adjusted gain > 0	0.53		

EQ-5D Index (-0.59 - 1.00)	Kevin Conn	All other TKR	
Paired Records	110 302,953		
PreOp score	0.519 (0.461 - 0.577)	0.414 (0.413 - 0.415)	
6 month score	0.807 (0.760 - 0.854) 0.737 (0.736 - 0.73		
Health gain	0.288 (0.226 - 0.349) 0.323 (0.322 - 0.324)		
Health gain (adjusted)	0.328 (0.286 - 0.370)	0.322 (0.321 - 0.322)	
Difference in adjusted gain *	-0.036 to 0.049		
% Score Improved	82.7%	81.4%	
% Adjusted gain > 0	96.4%	92.4%	
p value % adjusted gain > 0	0.15		

EQ-VAS (0 - 100)	Kevin Conn	All other TKR	
Paired Records	108	290,690	
PreOp score	73.9 (70.1 - 77.7)	67.9 (67.8 - 67.9)	
6 month score	77.6 (74.1 - 81.0)	74.0 (73.9 - 74.1)	
Health gain	3.6 (0.0 - 7.7)	6.1 (6.1 - 6.2)	
Health gain (adjusted)	5.2 (2.2 - 8.3) 6.2 (6.1 - 6.2)		
Difference in adjusted gain *	-4.0 to 2.1		
% Score Improved	52.8%	56.4%	
% Adjusted gain > 0	73.1% 71.7%		
p value % adjusted gain > 0	0.83		

Adjusted scores correspond to the NHS Digital version 3 casemix-adjustment model. See methodology page for details. Figures in brackets correspond to 95% confidence intervals. * 95% confidence interval for the mean adjusted gain for the consultant, minus the national average adjusted gain.

Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

PROMs Analysis



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

Oxford Knee Score



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-5D Index



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-VAS



Kevin Conn

Responses are not case-mix adjusted

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement



Kevin Conn

Primary Bicondylar Knee Replacement

Success and Satisfaction

Success	Kevin Conn			All other TKR
Success	Number	Observed %	Expected %	Observed %
Much better	98	77.8%	76.1%	73.8%
A little better	19	15.1%	14.8%	16.0%
About the same	5	4.0%	4.0%	4.5%
A little worse	3	2.4%	3.0%	3.4%
Much worse	1	0.8%	2.0%	2.3%
Total	126	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Answer to 6-months general health question:

"Overall, how are your problems now, compared to before your operation?"

Satisfaction	Kevin Conn			All other TKR
	Number	Observed %	Expected %	Observed %
Excellent	37	29.1%	27.8%	25.8%
Very Good	44	34.6%	36.1%	35.8%
Good	36	28.3%	23.1%	24.2%
Fair	7	5.5%	10.1%	10.9%
Poor	3	2.4%	2.9%	3.3%
Total	127	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Answer to 6-months general health question:

"How would you describe the results of your operation?"

Expected scores are calculated from the responses for all primary bicondylar knee replacement, adjusted for age, sex, pre-operative Oxford knee score, and pre-operative EQ-5D score.

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

Patient Details

	Consultant UKR with paired PROMs	All other UKR in NJR with paired PROMs
Total Procedures	51	13,331
Total Patients	51	12,798
Demographics		
Mean age	68.5	65.7
< 50	0.0%	3.9%
50 – 59	13.7%	23.3%
60 – 69	39.2%	36.2%
70 – 79	43.1%	29.5%
≥ 80	3.9%	7.1%
Median BMI	27	30
% BMI information available	82.4%	82.6%
Underweight (BMI < 18.5)	2.4%	0.2%
Normal (18.5 ≤ BMI < 25)	16.7%	10.9%
Overweight (25 ≤ BMI < 30)	40.5%	38.4%
Obese I (30 ≤ BMI < 35)	14.3%	33.6%
Obese II (35 ≤ BMI < 40)	19.0%	12.9%
Obese III (BMI ≥ 40)	7.1%	4.1%
% Male	52.9%	53.5%
ASA Grades		
P1 - Fit and healthy	7.8%	14.5%
P2 - Mild disease not incapacitating	90.2%	74.9%
P3 - Incapacitating systemic disease	2.0%	10.5%
P4 / P5	0.0%	0.1%
Indications		
Osteoarthritis	100.00%	98.98%
Rheumatoid Arthritis	0.00%	0.03%
Other Inflammatory Arthropathy	0.00%	0.04%
Previous Trauma	0.00%	0.23%
Avascular Necrosis	0.00%	0.89%
Other	0.00%	0.29%

Total of indications may exceed total number of procedures, since more than one indication can be listed per case.

Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

PROMs Analysis



Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

Oxford Knee Score



Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-5D Index



Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-VAS



Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

PROMs Analysis

Oxford Knee Score (0 - 48)	Kevin Conn	All other Uni Knees	
Paired Records	51	12,934	
PreOp score	23.2 (21.1 - 25.3)	21.3 (21.2 - 21.4)	
6 month score	39.5 (37.1 - 42.0) 38.5 (38.3 - 38.6)		
Health gain	16.4 (13.7 - 19.0) 17.2 (17.0 - 17.3)		
Health gain (adjusted)	18.1 (15.9 - 20.3) 18.2 (18.0 - 18.3)		
Difference in adjusted gain *	-2.3 to 2.1		
% Score Improved	100.0% 94.9%		
% Adjusted gain > 0	98.0% 96.4%		
p value % adjusted gain > 0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	

EQ-5D Index (-0.59 - 1.00)	Kevin Conn	All other Uni Knees		
Paired Records	47	12,219		
PreOp score	0.535 (0.451 - 0.619)	0.474 (0.469 - 0.479)		
6 month score	0.802 (0.735 - 0.868) 0.792 (0.788 - 0.797)			
Health gain	0.267 (0.177 - 0.357)	0.318 (0.313 - 0.324)		
Health gain (adjusted)	0.335 (0.275 - 0.396)	0.353 (0.350 - 0.357)		
Difference in adjusted gain *	-0.079 to 0.043			
% Score Improved	83.0%	83.8%		
% Adjusted gain > 0	93.6%	94.5%		
p value % adjusted gain > 0	0.74			

EQ-VAS (0 - 100)	Kevin Conn	All other Uni Knees		
Paired Records	44	11,944		
PreOp score	70.6 (64.7 - 76.5)	69.4 (69.0 - 69.7)		
6 month score	77.4 (72.3 - 82.5) 77.5 (77.2 - 77.8)			
Health gain	6.8 (0.6 - 13.1)	8.1 (7.7 - 8.5)		
Health gain (adjusted)	6.4 (1.9 - 11.0) 7.6 (7.3 - 7.9)			
Difference in adjusted gain *	-5.8 to 3.4			
% Score Improved	59.1% 60.5%			
% Adjusted gain > 0	72.7% 76.5%			
p value % adjusted gain > 0	0.59			

Adjusted scores correspond to the NHS Digital version 3 casemix-adjustment model. See methodology page for details. Figures in brackets correspond to 95% confidence intervals. * 95% confidence interval for the mean adjusted gain for the consultant, minus the national average adjusted gain.

PROMs Report for: Kevi

Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

PROMs Analysis



Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

Oxford Knee Score



Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-5D Index



Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

EQ-VAS



Kevin Conn

Responses are not case mix adjusted





Kevin Conn

Primary Unicondylar Knee Replacement

Success and Satisfaction

Succes	Kevin Conn			All other UKR
Success	Number	Observed %	Expected %	Observed %
Much better	41	82.0%	75.5%	77.7%
A little better	8	16.0%	15.1%	13.9%
About the same	1	2.0%	4.2%	4.1%
A little worse	0	0.0%	3.1%	2.6%
Much worse	0	0.0%	2.1%	1.7%
Total	50	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Answer to 6-months general health question:

"Overall, how are your problems now, compared to before your operation?"

Satisfaction	Kevin Conn			All other UKR
Salisiaction	Number	Observed %	Expected %	Observed %
Excellent	16	31.4%	27.9%	32.3%
Very Good	21	41.2%	35.9%	36.0%
Good	10	19.6%	23.1%	19.8%
Fair	2	3.9%	10.1%	9.1%
Poor	2	3.9%	3.0%	2.8%
Total	51	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Answer to 6-months general health question:

"How would you describe the results of your operation?"

Expected scores are calculated from the responses for all primary Unicondylar knee replacement, adjusted for age, sex, pre-operative Oxford knee score, and pre-operative EQ-5D score.

Methodology

Adjustment

Adjusted gain in score is taken from the NHS Digital version 3 casemix-adjustment model, which is used in publications of Trust level PROMs scores. Variables considered for inclusion in the adjustment model are taken from the PROMs dataset, HES, and Index of Multiple Deprivation. These include preoperative score, age, sex, ethnicity, deprivation index, comorbitities, symptom period and diagnosis. Details of the adjustment methodology can be found on the NHS Digital website in the document: https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2013/10/proms-meth-prim-revis.pdf

Expected proportions of Success and Satisfaction scores have been calculated using proportional odds logistic regression to adjust for patient age, gender, and pre-operative Oxford score and EQ-5D score.

Disclaimer

Disclaimer

The National Joint Registry (NJR) produces this service using data collected, collated and provided by third parties. As a result of this the NJR takes no responsibility for the accuracy, currency, reliability and correctness of any data used or referred to in this service, nor for the accuracy, currency, reliability and correctness of links or references to other information sources and disclaims all warranties in relation to such data, links and references to the maximum extent permitted by legislation.

The NJR shall have no liability (including but not limited to liability by reason of negligence) for any loss, damage, cost or expense incurred or arising by reason of any person using or relying on the data within this service and whether caused by reason of any error, omission or misrepresentation in the presentation of data or otherwise. Presentations of data are not to be taken as advice. Third parties using or relying on the data in this service do so at their own risk and will be responsible for making their own assessment and should verify all relevant representations, statements and information with their own professional advisers.