

# Autologous chondrocyte transplantation /implantation versus existing treatments

<b>Submission date</b> 18/05/2001	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 18/05/2001	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 16/03/2016	<b>Condition category</b> Musculoskeletal Diseases	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data <input type="checkbox"/> Record updated in last year

## Plain English summary of protocol

### Background and study aims

Defects in the cartilage covering the bones of the knee (chondral defects) do not heal by themselves. A technique to treat cartilage defects called autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI) was developed in Sweden and has been used on many patients in the UK and US. The ACI treatment involves two operations. At the first operation a small sample of healthy cartilage is taken from the knee to a laboratory for the cells to be grown for 3-5 weeks, and at the second operation the cells are injected into the knee defect. This treatment appears to have been successful in treating many patients but has not yet been tested in a formal study. The aim of this study is to compare ACI with conventional treatments for patients who have had a failed primary treatment for chondral defects in the knee.

### Who can participate?

Patients who are still getting symptoms from the defect in their knee cartilage despite having surgical treatment for it in the past.

### What does the study involve?

Participants receive a full knee assessment and complete questionnaires about their knee function and how it affects their quality of life. Participants are randomly allocated into one of two groups. One group has the ACI treatment and the other group receive the most appropriate alternative treatment agreed with their surgeon. Both groups receive the standard physiotherapy and rehabilitation programme that is best for the treatment they received, and attend a follow-up appointment 2 or 3 months after surgery and again at 6 months and at 1 year after surgery. On each occasion participants complete questionnaires and their knee function is assessed. Because we want to compare the long-term outcome of the treatments participants are asked to return to the clinic 3, 5 and 10 years later. We also contact participants by post, phone or e-mail on one occasion each year for 10 years so we can check on their progress.

### What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

We hope that whichever treatment participants have will help them. However, this cannot be guaranteed. The information we get from this study may help us to recommend the best course

of action for patients in the future. For participants treated with ACI, in addition to the normal risks of knee surgery there is a small risk that they may experience an allergic reaction to a substance used in the cell transplantation. However, this reaction is very rare.

Where is the study run from?

The Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic and District Hospital, NHS Trust (UK)

When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for?

December 2004 to December 2021

Who is funding the study?

Medical Research Council (UK)

Who is the main contact?

Prof James Richardson

james.richardson@nhs.net

## Contact information

**Type(s)**

Scientific

**Contact name**

Prof James Richardson

**Contact details**

Institute of Orthopaedics

The Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic and District Hospital, NHS Trust

Oswestry

United Kingdom

SY10 7AG

+44 (0)1691 404386

james.richardson@nhs.net

## Additional identifiers

**Protocol serial number**

G0200055

## Study information

**Scientific Title**

Autologous Chondrocyte Transplantation/Implantation Versus Existing treatments: a randomised controlled trial

**Acronym**

ACTIVE

**Study objectives**

To compare autologous chondrocyte implantation with 'conventional' treatments for patients who have had a failed primary treatment for chondral defect(s) in the knee.

**Ethics approval required**

Old ethics approval format

**Ethics approval(s)**

NRES Committee West Midlands, July 2004, ref:04/Q2604/10

**Study design**

Randomised controlled trial

**Primary study design**

Interventional

**Study type(s)**

Treatment

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

Orthopaedics

**Interventions**

Arm 1: Autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI)

Arm 2: One 'conventional' treatment chosen by surgeon/ patient from following list:  
Debridement; Abrasion; Drilling; Microfracture; Mosaicplasty.

Arm 1 (ACI) is further randomised to receive a patch made from either:

- a) Periosteum or
- b) Collagen membrane

**Intervention Type**

Procedure/Surgery

**Primary outcome(s)**

Time to cessation of benefit: as defined when 2/3 assessment criteria show no improvement compared to preoperative assessment levels at least 12 months after surgery:

1. Independently assessed Lysholm Knee score
2. Patient self-assessed Lysholm Knee questionnaire
3. Independent assessor's judgement based on impact on quality of life, physical examination and functional observation

**Key secondary outcome(s)**

Not provided at time of registration

**Completion date**

31/12/2021

**Eligibility**

## **Key inclusion criteria**

Current inclusion criteria as of 09/11/2012:

1. Symptomatic chondral defect(s) on the medical or lateral femoral condyle, trochlea or patella suitable for either ACT or one of the existing conventional treatments (debridement, abrasion, drilling, microfracture, mosaicplasty)
2. Surgical treatment for the same defect carried out at least 12 months previously, that has not relieved symptoms
3. Not more than two defects, not kissing and total area not greater than 12cm<sup>2</sup>
4. Likely to comply with appropriate physiotherapy

Previous inclusion criteria until 09/11/2012:

1. Symptomatic chondral defect(s) on the medical or lateral femoral condyle or trochlea suitable for either ACT or one of the existing conventional treatments (debridement, abrasion, drilling, microfracture, mosaicplasty)
2. Surgical treatment for the same defect carried out at least 12 months previously, that has not relieved symptoms
3. Not more than two defects, not kissing and total area not greater than 12cm<sup>2</sup>
4. Likely to comply with appropriate physiotherapy

## **Participant type(s)**

Patient

## **Healthy volunteers allowed**

No

## **Age group**

Not Specified

## **Sex**

Not Specified

## **Key exclusion criteria**

1. Concurrent meniscectomy/osteotomy or untreated malalignment of patella
2. Generalised osteoarthritis, inflammatory condition or history of mesenchymal tumors
3. Patient in different clinical trial involving the knee, currently or in last 6 months

## **Date of first enrolment**

22/12/2004

## **Date of final enrolment**

09/11/2012

## **Locations**

### **Countries of recruitment**

United Kingdom

England

Norway

**Study participating centre**

The Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic and District Hospital, NHS Trust

Oswestry

United Kingdom

SY10 7AG

## Sponsor information

**Organisation**

Keele University (UK)

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/00340yn33>

## Funder(s)

**Funder type**

Research council

**Funder Name**

Medical Research Council (UK)

**Alternative Name(s)**

Medical Research Council (United Kingdom), UK Medical Research Council, MRC

**Funding Body Type**

Government organisation

**Funding Body Subtype**

National government

**Location**

United Kingdom

## Results and Publications

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="#">Participant information sheet</a>	Participant information sheet	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes
<a href="#">Study website</a>	Study website	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes