

Assessment of the Reporting Quality of RCTs for Hip Arthroscopy in Femoroacetabular Impingement Published from 2008 to 2018

Georgios Paraskevas Chalatsis MD, MSc^{1,2}
Athanasios S. Siouras BSc, MSc²
Ioannis Nikolaos Liampas MD, MSc^{2,3}

¹University Hospital of Larisa, Department of Orthopaedics

²University of Thessaly, Biostatistics and Clinical Bioinformatics

³University Hospital of Larisa, Department of Neurology

Article Information

Article Type:	Review	*Corresponding author:	Citation: Georgios Paraskevas Chalatsis. (2020) Assessment of the Reporting Quality of RCTs for Hip Arthroscopy in Femoroacetabular Impingement Published from 2008 to 2018. Med Healthcare Rep, 2(2);1-6
Journal Type:	Open Access	Georgios Paraskevas Chalatsis, MD, MSc	
Volume:	Issue: 2	University Hospital of Larisa	
Manuscript ID:	MHR-1-108	Department of Orthopaedics	
Publisher:	Science World Publishing	University of Thessaly, Biostatistics and Clinical Bioinformatics	
Received Date:	05 March 2020	Email: ghalatsis@hotmail.com	
Accepted Date:	23 March 2020		
Published Date:	25 March 2020		

Copyright: © 2020, Chalatsis GP, et al., This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 international License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Femoroacetabular impingement syndrome is an important cause of hip pain in young adults. It is characterized by excess contact between the femoral neck and head and the anterior rim of the acetabulum.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to assess the reporting quality of Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) for Hip Arthroscopy effectiveness, in Femoroacetabular Impingement, compared to other therapeutic methods.

Methods: Electronic databases of MEDLINE (Pub Med), Cochrane Library, Science Direct, Google scholar and United States Clinical trials registration from 2008 until today. From 16 scientific papers, 5 were selected as appropriate for the study. For the assessment of the randomized controlled trials the CONSORT Checklist was used assessing the report of the 37 key terms.

Results: One study was not reporting results yet but in the rest of the sections complied with the checklist in 21 out of the 25 items. Two out of five of the trials achieved moderate score (21/37 and 20/37) and two trials achieved high scores (31/37 and 30/37).

Conclusions: Although there are limited RCT's, that compare hip arthroscopy to other treatments for FAI, the results based the CONSORT checklist have been more than adequate indicating moderate to high compliancy.

KEYWORDS

Femoroacetabular, Impingement, Arthroscopy, Hip, Randomized, Trial

INTRODUCTION

Femoroacetabular Impingement (FAI) syndrome is a recently described pathology of the hip and a cause of hip pain in young adults [1]. It is a result of shape and size mismatch between the femoral head-neck and the acetabulum. There are two types of FAI: cam and pincer. Cam type, where the morphology of femoral neck-head junction is thicker and with insufficient concavity and pincer type, where acetabulum extends beyond its normal depth and over-covers the femoral head [2]. Many patients have a combination of these two types of impingement (mixed type). Both types are range of movement related disorders and they are characterized by symptoms, clinical signs and imaging findings [3]. The repetitive compressive and shear forces within the joint can cause damage to the acetabular labrum and cartilage, which is believed that can lead to hip Osteoarthritis (OA) [2,4]. Alpha angle greater than 83 degrees has an odds ratio 9.66 for the development of hip osteoarthritis within 5 years follow up [6].

Hip osteoarthritis is an important factor of reduced quality of life and high healthcare costs [5]. Current concepts for the treatment of FAI are surgical and non-surgical approaches. Conservative treatment involves physiotherapy, hip corticosteroid injections and anti-inflammatory drugs [7]. The surgical approaches are either open or arthroscopic. Regardless of the technique used the recommended surgical intervention includes the correction of bony anomalies through osteoplasty, as well as debridement or repair of chondral, labral, and soft tissue defects [8]. Open approaches consist by either the Safe Surgical Dislocation approach described by Ganz in 2001 [9] and the mini-open anterior approach of the hip described by Hartmann in 2009 [10]. The arthroscopic surgery to treat FAI [11,12] is an increasing trend

and is performed at a growing rate worldwide the last decade [13]. Initially, open surgery was the most frequently used method to treat FAI, but since many case series published positive outcomes from hip arthroscopy for FAI [14,15], hip arthroscopy is used more often. Hip arthroscopy proves to be safer, with less complications and a shorter recovery time than open surgery [16]. Until few years ago there was minimum evidence from Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs) that compare hip arthroscopy with other interventions [17]. RCTs can help clinicians to clear out whether arthroscopic surgery of the hip has a beneficial effect on patient's symptoms or can prevent osteoarthritis. However, randomized trials can yield bias if they lack methodological thoroughness. The purpose of this study is to assess the reporting quality of RCTs for Hip Arthroscopy effectiveness in Femoroacetabular Impingement comparing to other treatments.

METHODS

A search was made of English-language randomized controlled trials published in MEDLINE (Pub Med), Cochrane Library, Science Direct, Google scholar and United States Clinical trials registration from 2008 until today. To ensure the inclusion of all relevant trials, there was a terminology search to electronic databases defined by the following terms: ("femoroacetabular" OR "femoro-acetabular" OR "femoro acetabular") AND (impingement OR "impingement syndrome") AND (arthroscopy OR arthroscopic) AND (randomised OR random) AND (controlled OR control) AND (trial OR trials).

Eligibility criteria for including, clinical trials in the study, were phase III clinical trials that compare hip arthroscopy surgery to any other possible treatment for femoroacetabular impingement. This included physiotherapy, anti-inflammatory drugs, hip injections, open surgery and/or navigated surgery. Studies should compare patient of FAI with no previous surgery of the hip and not established osteoarthritis of the hip. Studies eligible for assessment were not limited to blinding of the participants and to follow up of the patients.

The assessment of the randomized controlled trials conducted with the help of the CONSORT Checklist. The CONSORT Checklist is a worldwide used assessment tool that helps to improve the reporting quality of RCTs. The latest version described by Schulz et al [18], in 2010, updates the reporting guidelines based on the latest methodological evidence and accumulating experience. It includes a checklist of 25 items categorized in 6 sections: "Title and Abstract", "Introduction", "Methods", "Results", "Discussion" and finally "Other information". 12 items are divided into a and b parts, giving a total

of 37 points to score per paper. All items were investigated in terms of whether they were reported and not whether they were actually carried out during the trial. An item was characterised with a "yes" if it was clearly reported and with a "no" if it is partially reported or not reported at all.

Data were analysed using Microsoft Excel. The total quality of the reporting score on the CONSORT checklist was calculated as a proportion of the "yes" rated applicable items with a possible range of 0 to 37 points. For every negative answer the word "no" was applied.

RESULTS

From the Medline (Pubmed) search, 16 articles were listed. From them, only 4 of them were suitable for this study (19-22) (6 studies were only describing the protocol, 2 were feasibility studies, 3 were review studies and 1 was not comparing arthroscopic surgery for FAI, but conservative treatments). One of the four eligible for inclusion studies [21] was not published with results (although this was not highlighted in the title of the study) but finally was picked off for assessment, to the point that it was concluded, because of lack of any other completed clinical trials. One more study, eligible for inclusion, was found from clinical trials registration and Google scholar [23]. No other completed clinical trials were found that could be included in the analysis in the study. Additional search from 2005, when the first arthroscopic treatment for FAI was reported [12], did not provide more clinical trials than the initial search (Figure 1). The causes may be attributed to the recently described pathophysiology of femoroacetabular impingement and the even more recent development of hip arthroscopy for FAI. This specificity makes the development of this study, the first that assess the quality of the clinical trials for FAI with the CONSORT statement.

From the eligible trials two were examining the effectiveness of hip arthroscopy, compared to conservative treatment (drugs, hip injections, physiotherapy) [19,23], one compared to physical therapy alone [22], one compared hip arthroscopy with arthroscopic lavage of the hip alone [21] and the final one compared the classic hip arthroscopy with the computer navigated procedure [20].

Following the steps of the consort statement assessment, the "Title and Abstract" category in all of the studies concluded the identification as a randomised trial in the title. The structured summary of the trial was following the appropriate sequence in all studies except the one made from the FIRST investigators [21] that is




Figure 1: Flow chart of the selection process

not completed yet and is not reporting results and conclusions (even that the article was published in 2015).

In the “Introduction” category the background and the objectives were examined. The explanation of the rationale and the background, that the study was based on, explained in all studies along with specific objectives and hypotheses.

According to the date the trials were published, the first study that was assessed was published [23] in 2013. “Methods” is the biggest part of the CONSORT Checklist. In this trial, the design was based on a parallel, randomised intervention model. No changes in eligibility criteria was made but the sample size and the duration of the follow up changed. From 2 years, the follow up ended in 6 months and the size of the sample from the starting 140 patients ended up in 10. The eligibility criteria for participants and the places and time where the data collected were reported also. HOS (Hip Outcome Score) was the primary outcome measures and SF-12, LEFS (Lower extremity functional scale), MHHS (modified Harris hip score), NAHS (Non-arthritis hip score) and range of movement were the secondary measures. The sample size was determined with statistical power of 80% and 0.05 alpha error rate to detect a moderate effect size of 0.5 standard deviation. All interventions were explained with detail but there was no explanation about the mechanism and the method used to generate the random allocation sequence and the type of randomization of the patients. The random allocation sequence has been made by two surgeons and during the trial there was no blinding.

In section “Results” from a total of 280 patients at the beginning, only 13 participated and out of them only 10 were analysed. No dates were defining the periods of recruitment and no information about the end of the trial was given. Baseline data and demographics of the participants was presented. The participants in each group were analysed by original assigned groups. The confidence interval was set in 95% and for each group the primary but not all the secondary outcomes were analysed (range of motion wasn’t analysed). Harms and unintended effects were mentioned but no other analysis was performed.

Trial limitations were presented in “Discussion” section, together with the reasons why the trial failed to reach the number of participants that required and of course generalisability was not applicable.

Registration number was not published, although there was a registry in United States clinical trials registry Library. The full protocol of the trial was available but not any sources of funding were mentioned.

The next eligible trial was published in 2015 [21]. As mentioned before this was the fifth trial that participated in the study and can only be assessed for sections that are published. Results will be published in the near future.

In section of “Methods”, the design of the trial was not described but in the trial registry page the term “parallel” can be found. Eligibility criteria mentioned in detail and remained the same during the trial. Dates, settings, and locations where the data collected were also included. The intervention in each group was presented in detail with pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures. Primary outcome measures were using the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) while for the secondary outcome measures HOS, SF-12, iHOT-12 (International Hip Outcome Tool), EuroQol-5D, adverse events, cost and urinary (and sexual) function were measured. The randomisation was made by centralized 24-hour computerized system that allows for automated, internet based allocation patients to the control or intervention group in random block sizes of 4 and 8 prior to intervention. Patients, outcomes assessors and data analysts were blinded. All analyses were made according to intention to treat principle and the statistical was presented in detail.

The category of “Results” cannot be assessed in this trial but some information from the “Discussion” and “Other” topic was available. Some of the trial limitations included the unavailability of the surgeons to be blind. Registration number of the trial was given, together with the access to the full trial protocol and funding sources.

The third trial assessed was published in 2016 [20]. In this trial,

the classic hip arthroscopy for FAI was compared with the navigated method. Description of the trial was included and together there were information about eligibility criteria for the patients, the sample size, the interventions for each group, the similarity between the interventions and pre-specified primary and secondary outcomes. The randomisation type was tailored block based but neither the method used to generate the random allocation nor the mechanism (steps of concealment) was presented. The statistical method and additional analyses was sufficiently described.

In “Results” section the trial didn’t include any follow up information. The primary and secondary outcomes and results for each group were analysed in a 95% confidence interval but no subgroup or adjusted analyses performed. The participant flow was mentioned (despite not in a diagram) with losses and exclusions alongside with baseline data and demographics.

The trial had limitations that the writers included in the “conclusion” topic. All participants were male, the range of movement assessment was computer simulated, the surgeries performed by a single surgeon, in supine position and there was no assessment of the clinical value of the interventions. There was an interpretation consistent between harms and benefits but no discussion made about generalisability. The registration number and the protocol of the trial was not provided. While the sources of funding were mentioned.

The fourth trial [22] was between patients who treated with hip arthroscopy or physiotherapy. The writer describes in the part of “methods” the design of the trial, the eligibility criteria for participants and the data collection settings. The intervention in each group was described in detail in the study protocol and the same apply for the outcomes of the trial (primary and secondary). The primary outcome was measured with the HOS scale, while the secondary outcomes with the GRC and the iHOT-33. The sample size was determined based on power 80% and the randomization was performed electronically by an independent person in blocks of 2 or 4. The mechanism of the random allocation was mentioned and blinded were the assessors. Statistical methods for the comparison of groups outcomes along with additional sensitivity analyses were also reported.

The participant flow was described with a diagram (including losses and exclusions) and baseline data was presented. During the trial, many patients decided to change group from physical therapy to surgery. The analysis of the outcomes was made in both the original randomization and based on the type of the final intervention. Harms and unintended effects were also presented.

The limitations of the trial were mentioned and they were the high rate of crossover, no masking of the therapists, the one sight that the trial took place and a single surgeon, the low final number of the physical therapy group and that the sample was consisted only by military population. These were the reasons why the writer admitted that no generalizability could be applied. The full trial protocol could be accessed through the trials registration number but the role of the founders wasn’t specified.

The final trial [19] was a multi-centric (23 centres), assessor-blinded randomised trial that was published in 2018. During the trial design, no changes to methods and outcomes measures took place. The eligibility criteria along with way the sample size determined was presented. The statistical methods for the analysis of the outcomes in both groups were described thoroughly. Unfortunately, the mechanism and the type of randomisation were not available and the same applies for the person or persons who generated the random allocation.

In this big multi-centre trial, in the “results” section all the criteria of the checklist were met. The participant flow (with a diagram), the way the recruitment of the patients took place, the baseline data and analysis of the results were all published in the study. The limitations of the trial were also described. The participants and the treating clinicians were not blinded to treatment allocation, there was no control group and there was a delay in the time the surgery, in many patients, took place. The last one resulted in the follow up examination (12 months after randomization) some patients not to have enough time to recover from the surgery. During the discussion parameters that should have been added to the trial were reported

so that it could be generalised. The interpretation of the results was consistent with the trials hypothesis. The trial registry number was published and the full trial protocol could be reached through that. The sources of funding were reported but there was no role for the

founders in the trial.

The results of the CONSORT Checklist for the trials are concluded on the Table 1. and the Chart 1.

Table 1: CONSORT Checklist for each RCT

Item No	Klaus <i>et al</i> (2013)	FIRST Team (2015)	Houcke <i>et al</i> (2016)	Mansell <i>et al</i> (2018)	Griffin <i>et al</i> (2018)	Proportion
1a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
1b	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4/5(80%)
2a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
2b	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
3a	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	4/5(80%)
3b	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	2/5(40%)
4a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
4b	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	4/5(80%)
5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	4/5(80%)
6a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
6b	No	No	No	Yes	No	1/5(20%)
7a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
7b	No	No	No	No	Yes	1/5(20%)
8a	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3/5(60%)
8b	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	3/5(60%)
9	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2/5(40%)
10	No	No	No	Yes	No	1/5(20%)
11a	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3/5(60%)
11b	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	3/5(60%)
12a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
12b	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
13a	No	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	3/4(75%)
13b	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	4/4(100%)
14a	No	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	2/4(50%)
14b	No	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	3/4(75%)
15	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	4/4(100%)
16	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	4/4(100%)
17a	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	4/4(100%)
17b	No	N/A	No	No	Yes	1/4(25%)
18	No	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	2/4(50%)
19	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	3/4(75%)
20	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/5(100%)
21	No	N/A	No	No	Yes	1/4(25%)
22	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	2/4(50%)
23	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3/4(75%)
24	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	4/5(80%)
25	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	3/5(60%)
Total	20/37	21/25	21/37	31/37	30/37	




Chart 1: Percentage of compliance for each item regarding all the RCTs

CONCLUSIONS

The CONSORT checklist does not actually assess the quality of the methodology of a RCT, but rather assess the reporting of key items that are crucial in determining the validity and quality of the RCT. The CONSORT checklist was developed as a guideline, not as an actual scale for assessing methodology of an RCT. A well-designed and well-reported RCT should meet all of the criteria of the CONSORT statement. With adequate reporting, readers will understand what was actually done, rather than assume what was done.

There is no evidence that the failure to mention methodological details equates to the lack of methodological knowledge or skills: a method of a trial that is not reported does not mean actually that it has not been performed. The reporting of methodological aspects of RCTs does not necessarily reflect the conduct of the trial. The responsibility for reporting lies not only with the authors. Peer reviewers and editors are at fault for not insisting on complete description of the studies as dictated by the CONSORT statement.

In the present study, we assessed the quality of reporting of randomized controlled trials that compared the Hip Arthroscopy with other therapeutic methods for the treatment of Femoroacetabular Impingement published from 2008 to 2018. During our search, we discovered that there are limited RCT's that compare the hip arthroscopy with other therapies for FAI. This is a result of the recently described pathology of femoroacetabular impingement and the even more recent development of hip arthroscopy for FAI.

All RCT's reported satisfactorily on many important items (i.e. structure of the RCT, scientific background, eligibility criteria, outcome measures, sample size calculation, statistical methods used to compare groups, participant flow, baseline data, intention-to-treat analysis and precision of measurement and limitations of the studies), making it easy for any reader to determine the quality and validity of results without needing to make various assumptions.

Compliance was poorest for items relating to randomization (60%), implementation of randomization (40%), allocation concealment mechanism (20%) and generalisability (25%). Good randomization protocols aim to produce treatment groups that are comparable and have an equal distribution of both known and unknown confounders. Achieving patient randomization suitable for a clinical trial is a complex issue. The fact that items related to the previous topics were poorly adhered to, highlights the need for further education regarding this aspect of trial design.

Two out of five of the studies achieved moderate score (21/37 and 20/37), two studies achieved high scores (31/37 and 30/37) and the study that was not yet completed 21 out of 25 items, suggesting that many journals have adopted the CONSORT checklist and have improved levels of compliance in their trial reports. There is good evidence in the literature that the adoption of CONSORT statement improves the quality of both the conduct and reporting of trials in journals that have taken the decision to make it a requirement for submission acceptance. Researchers also need to design research with full understanding of the CONSORT reporting guidelines and full consideration of items whose reporting quality is low.

In conclusion, although there is a limited number of RCT's regarding hip arthroscopy for FAI, the results based the CONSORT checklist have been more than adequate. During a period of rapid transition in the healthcare delivery system (where cost and effectiveness of every treatment matters more and more) and especially during a period of new therapeutic modalities, higher quality reports are likely to improve RCT interpretation, minimize biased conclusions, and ultimately facilitate decision-making about treatment effectiveness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck M, Kalhor M, Leunig M, Ganz R. Hip morphology influences the pattern of damage to the acetabular cartilage: femoroacetabular impingement as a cause of early osteoarthritis of the hip. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2005;87(7):1012-1018.
- Ganz R, Parvizi J, Beck M, Leunig M, Notzli H, Siebenrock KA. Femoroacetabular impingement: a cause for osteoarthritis of the hip. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2003;417:112-120.
- Griffin DR, Dickenson EJ, Donnell JO, Agricola R, Awan T, et al. The Warwick Agreement on Femoroacetabular Impingement. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50(19).
- Ganz R, Leunig M, Leunig-Ganz K, Harris WH. The etiology of osteoarthritis of the hip: an integrated mechanical concept. *Clinical Orthopaedics & Related Research.* 2008;466(2):264-272.
- Salaffi F, Carotti M, Stancati A, Grassi W. Health-related quality of life in older adults with symptomatic hip and knee osteoarthritis: a comparison with matched healthy controls. *Aging ClinExpRes.* 2005;17(4):255-263.
- Agricola R, Heijboer MP, Bierma-Zeinstra SM, Verhaar JA, Weinans H, et al. CAM impingement causes osteoarthritis of the hip: a nationwide prospective cohort study (CHECK). *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2013;72:918-923.
- Wall PD, Fernandez M, Griffin DR, Foster NE. Non-operative treatment for femoroacetabular impingement: a systematic review of the literature. *PMR.* 2013;5(5):418-426.
- Griffin DR, Dickenson DJ, O'Donnell J, Agricola R, Awan T. The 2016 Warwick Agreement on femoroacetabular impingement. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50:1169-1176.
- Ganz R, Gill TJ, Gautier E, Ganz K, Krugel N, et al. Surgical dislocation of the adult hip a technique with full access to the femoral head and acetabulum without the risk of avascular necrosis. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery.* 2001;83:1119-1124.
- Hartmann A, Gunther KP. Arthroscopically assisted anterior decompression for femoroacetabular impingement: technique and early clinical results. *Archives of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery* 2009;129:1001-1009.
- Murphy S, Tannast M, Kim YJ, Buly R, Millis MB. Debridement of the adult hip for femoroacetabular impingement: indications and preliminary clinical results. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research* 2004;429:178-181.
- Sampson, Thomas G. Arthroscopic treatment of femoroacetabular impingement. *Tech Orthop.* 2005;20(1):56-62.
- Montgomery SR, Ngo SS, Hobson T, Nguyen S, Alluri R, et al. Trends and Demographics in Hip Arthroscopy in the United States. *Arthroscopy.* 2013;29(4):661-665.
- Sansone M, Ahldén M, Jónasson P, Thomeé C, Swärd L, et al. Outcome after hip arthroscopy for femoroacetabular impingement in 289 patients with minimum 2-year follow-up. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2017;27(2):230-235.
- Polesello GC, Lima FR, Guimaraes RP, Riccioli W, Queiroz MC. Arthroscopic treatment of femoroacetabular impingement: minimum five-year follow-up. *Hip International.* 2014;24(4):381.
- Matsuda DK, Carlisle JC, Arthurs SC, Wierks CH, Philippon MJ. Comparative systematic review of the open dislocation, mini-open, and arthroscopic surgeries for femoroacetabular impingement. *Arthroscopy.* 2011;27:252-269.
- Wall PD, Brown JS, Parsons N, Buchbinder R, Costa ML, Griffin D. Surgery for treating hip impingement (femoroacetabular impingement). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2014; 9: CD010796.
- Schulz Kenneth F, Altman Douglas G, Moher David. CONSORT 2010 Statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2010;340:c332.
- Griffin DR, Dickenson EJ, Wall PDH, Achana F, Donovan JL, et al. Hip arthroscopy versus best conservative care for the treatment of femoroacetabular impingent syndrome (UK FASHIoN): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2018;391(10136):2225-2235.
- Houcke VJ, Khanduja V, Nakano N, Krekel P, Pattyn C, Audenaert E. Accuracy of navigated cam resection in femoroacetabular impingement: A randomised controlled trial. *Int J Med Robot.* 2017.
- FIRST Investigators. A multi-centre randomized controlled trial comparing arthroscopic osteochondroplasty and lavage with arthroscopic lavage alone on patient important outcomes

- and quality of life in the treatment of young adult (18-50) femoroacetabular impingement. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2015;16:64.
22. Mansell N, Rhon D, Meyer J, Slevin J, Marchant B. Arthroscopic surgery or physical therapy for patients with femoroacetabular impingement syndrome: A randomized controlled trial with 2-year follow-up. *The American Journal of Sports Medicine.* *Am J Sports Med.* 2018 May;46(6):1306-1314.
23. Klaus, Heather C., "A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Arthroscopic Surgery to Conservative Management of Femoroacetabular Impingement" (2013). Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 1609.

