

# The cost-effectiveness of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) for investigation of the knee joint

<b>Submission date</b> 25/04/2003	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered
		<input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 25/04/2003	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 02/09/2009	<b>Condition category</b> Musculoskeletal Diseases	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

**Plain English summary of protocol**  
Not provided at time of registration

## Contact information

**Type(s)**  
Scientific

**Contact name**  
Dr Stirling Bryan

**Contact details**  
Health Services Management Centre  
University of Birmingham  
Park House  
40 Edgbaston Park Road  
Birmingham  
United Kingdom  
B15 2RT  
+44 (0)121 414 4706  
s.bryan@bham.ac.uk

## Additional identifiers

**EudraCT/CTIS number**

**IRAS number**

**ClinicalTrials.gov number**

**Secondary identifying numbers**  
HTA 93/26/16

# Study information

## Scientific Title

### Study objectives

This study considered the role of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) in the diagnosis of knee injuries in a District General Hospital (DGH) setting. The principal objective was to identify whether the use of MRI had a major impact on the clinical management of patients presenting with chronic knee problems, in whom surgery was being considered, whether it reduced overall costs and whether it improved patient outcome.

In addition, the research:

1. Explored the 'diagnostic accuracy' of initial clinical investigation of the knee by an orthopaedic trainee, consultant knee specialist and consultant radiologist
2. Considered the variability and diagnostic accuracy of interpretations of knee MRI investigations between radiologists
3. Measured the strength of preference for the potential diagnostic/therapeutic impact of knee MRI (i.e. the avoidance of surgery)

### Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

### Ethics approval(s)

Not provided at time of registration

### Study design

Single centre, randomised controlled trial

### Primary study design

Interventional

### Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

### Study setting(s)

Hospital

### Study type(s)

Screening

### Participant information sheet

### Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Musculoskeletal injury

### Interventions

The research was based on a single-centre randomised controlled trial conducted at Kent and Canterbury Hospital.

Patients were randomised to:

1. Investigation using an MRI scan (MRI trial arm), or
2. Investigation using arthroscopy (no-MRI trial arm)

Investigation of diagnostic accuracy:

For the investigation of diagnostic accuracy of initial clinical investigation, the sample comprised 114 patients recruited in a separate study conducted at St Thomas Hospital. The sample was drawn from patients presenting at the Accident and emergency Department with an acute knee injury. All study patients received an MRI scan, but initial diagnosis was made without access to the scan or the radiologists report. After 12 months, all clinical notes and MRI scans of study patients were reviewed and a final reference standard diagnosis for each patient was reached. Comparison was made between the diagnosis recorded by each clinician (i.e. orthopaedic trainee, knee specialist and consultant radiologist) and the reference diagnosis.

Investigation of the generalisability of results:

For this substudy, the MRI images from 80 patients (recruited at St Thomas Hospital) were interpreted independently by seven consultant radiologists at DGHs and the St Thomas Hospital MRI radiologist. For each area of the knee, the level of agreement (measured using weighted kappa) between the responses of the eight radiologists and the reference standard diagnosis was assessed.

Investigation of preferences:

The investigation of potential patient preferences for the diagnostic/therapeutic impact of MRI was explored using a discrete choice conjoint measurement research design. Choices involved selecting between two alternative scenarios described using four attributes, and data were collected from 585 undergraduate sports science students and analysed using a random-effects probit model.

## **Intervention Type**

Other

## **Phase**

Not Specified

## **Primary outcome measure**

The study investigated the benefits of knee MRI at two levels:

1. Diagnostic/therapeutic impact (i.e. avoidance of surgery)
2. Patient outcome (using the 36-item Short Form questionnaire [SF-36] and the EuroQoL quality-of-life measurement instruments [EQ-5D]); quality of life was assessed at baseline and at 6 and 12 months

Costs were assessed from the perspectives of the NHS and patients. All analyses were by intention to treat.

## **Secondary outcome measures**

No secondary outcome measures

## **Overall study start date**

01/01/1996

## **Completion date**

31/12/1998

## Eligibility

### Key inclusion criteria

Patients attending with knee problems in whom surgery was being considered were recruited from routine orthopaedic clinics.

### Participant type(s)

Patient

### Age group

Not Specified

### Sex

Both

### Target number of participants

118

### Key exclusion criteria

No exclusion criteria

### Date of first enrolment

01/01/1996

### Date of final enrolment

31/12/1998

## Locations

### Countries of recruitment

England

United Kingdom

### Study participating centre

Health Services Management Centre

Birmingham

United Kingdom

B15 2RT

## Sponsor information

### Organisation

Department of Health (UK)

### Sponsor details

Quarry House  
Quarry Hill  
Leeds  
United Kingdom  
LS2 7UE  
+44 (0)1132 545 843  
Sheila.Greener@doh.gsi.gov.uk

### Sponsor type

Government

### Website

<http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/index.htm>

### ROR

<https://ror.org/03sbpja79>

## Funder(s)

### Funder type

Government

### Funder Name

NIHR Health Technology Assessment Programme - HTA (UK)

## Results and Publications

### Publication and dissemination plan

Not provided at time of registration

### Intention to publish date

### Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

### IPD sharing plan summary

Not provided at time of registration

### Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Other publications</a>	HTA monograph results	01/12/2001		Yes	No

[Results article](#)

01/03/2004

Yes

No