NHS
Cheshire and Merseyside

Clinical Commissioning Policy

Dupuytren's Contracture release in adults

Category 2 Intervention - Only routinely commissioned when specific criteria are met -

Ref:	CMICB_Clin016
Version:	2
Purpose	This document is part of a suite of policies that the Integrated Care Board (ICB) uses to drive its commissioning of healthcare. Each policy in that suite is a separate public document in its own right but will be applied with reference to other policies in that suite.
Supersedes:	Previous Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) Policy
Author (inc Job Title):	
Ratified by: (Name of responsible Committee)	ICB Board (April 2023)
Cross reference to other Policies/Guidance	
Date Ratified:	*V2 not ratified*
Date Published and where (Intranet or Website):	October 2025 (Website)
Review date:	October 2028
Target audience:	All Cheshire & Merseyside ICB Staff and Provider organisations

This policy can only be considered valid when viewed via the ICB website or ICB staff intranet. If this document is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the version number on your copy matches that of the one published.

Document control:		
Date:	**Version Number:**	**Section and Description of Change**
April 2023	1	Policy ratified by Cheshire & Merseyside ICB
October 2025	2	Removed references to Collagenase treatment as this is no longer available in UK

1. Introduction

1.1 This policy relates to the commissioning of interventions which optimise clinical effectiveness and represent value for money.

1.2 This document is part of a suite of policies which the Integrated Care Board (ICB) uses to drive its commissioning of healthcare. Each policy is a separate public document in its own right but should be considered alongside all the other policies in the suite as well as the core principles outlined in Appendix 1.

1.3 At the time of publication, the evidence presented per procedure/treatment was the most current available.

1.4 This policy is based on NHS England's Evidence-Based Interventions (EBI) recommendations see link to programme below - accurate at the point of publication https://www.aomrc.org.uk/ebi/clinicians/dupuytrens-contracture-release-in-adults/.

2. Purpose

2.1 This policy aims to ensure a common set of criteria for treatments and procedures across the region. This is intended to reduce variation of access to NHS services in different areas and allow fair and equitable treatment for all patients.

3. Summary of intervention

3.1 Dupuytren's contracture is caused by fibrous bands in the palm of the hand which draw the finger(s) (and sometimes the thumb) into the palm and prevent them from straightening fully. If not treated the finger(s) may bend so far into the palm that they cannot be straightened. All treatments aim to straighten the finger(s) to restore and retain hand function for the rest of the patient's life. However none cure the condition which can recur after any intervention so that further interventions are required.

3.2 Splinting and radiotherapy have not been shown be effective treatments of established Dupuytren's contractures.

3.3 Several treatments are available: needle fasciotomy, fasciectomy and dermofasciectomy. None is entirely satisfactory with some having slower recovery periods, higher complication rates or higher reoperation rates (for recurrence) than others. The need for, and choice of, intervention should be made on an individual basis and should be a shared decision between the patient and a practitioner with expertise in the various treatments of Dupuytren's contractures.

3.4 No-one knows which interventions are best for restoring and maintaining hand function throughout the rest of the patient's life, and which are the cheapest and most cost-effective in the long term. Ongoing and planned National Institute for Health Research studies aim to address these questions.

4. Policy statement

4.1 Treatment for Dupuytren's contracture is not routinely commissioned for cases where there is no contracture and in patients with a mild (less than 20°) contractures or one which is not progressing and does not impair function.

4.2 The following interventions (needle fasciotomy, fasciectomy and dermofasciectomy) are routinely commissioned for:

4.2.1 finger contractures causing loss of finger extension of 30° or more at the metacarpophalangeal joint or 20° at the proximal interphalangeal joint

OR

4.2.2 severe thumb contractures which interfere with function.

5. Exclusions

5.1 None

6. Rationale

6.1 Contractures left untreated usually progress and often fail to straighten fully with any treatment if allowed to progress too far. Complications causing loss, rather than improvement, in hand function occur more commonly after larger interventions, but larger interventions carry a lower risk of need for further surgery.

7. Underpinning evidence

7.1 British Society for Surgery of the Hand (2016) Duputren's disease patient leaflet.

7.2 CKS Dupuytren's disease. https://cks.nice.org.uk/dupuytrens-disease

7.3 Crean SM, Gerber RA, Le Graverand MP, Boyd DM, Cappelleri JC. The efficacy and safety of fasciectomy and fasciotomy for Dupuytren's contracture in European patients: a structured review of published studies. J Hand Surg Eur 2011;36(5):396-407.

7.4 Krefter C, Marks M, Hensler S, Herren DB, Calcagni M. Complications after treating dupuytren's A systematic literature review. Hand surgery & rehabilitation. 2017, 36: 322-9.

7.5 NICE Interventional procedures guidance (2004). Needle fasciotomy for Dupuytren's contracture. [IPG43]

7.6 Rodrigues JN, Becker GW, Ball C, Zhang W, Giele H, Hobby J, et al. Surgery for Dupuytren's contracture of the fingers. Cochrane Database Syst 2015(12):CD010143.

7.7 van Rijssen AL, Gerbrandy FS, Ter Linden H, Klip H, Werker PM. A comparison of the direct outcomes of percutaneous needle fasciotomy and limited fasciectomy for Dupuytren's disease: A 6-week follow-up study. J Hand Surg 2006, 31: 717-25.

7.8 van Rijssen AL, ter Linden H, Werker Five-year results of a randomized clinical trial on treatment in Dupuytren's disease: Percutaneous needle fasciotomy versus limited fasciectomy. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2012, 129: 469-77.

8. Force

8.1 This policy remains in force until it is superseded by a revised policy or by mandatory NICE guidance or other national directive relating to this intervention, or to alternative treatments for the same condition.

9. Coding

SQL code

```
WHEN left(der.Spell_Dominant_Procedure,4) IN ('T521','T522','T525','T526','T541','T561')
AND (ISNULL(APCS.Age_At_Start_of_Spell_SUS,APCS.Der_Age_at_CDS_Activity_Date)
between 19 AND 120) AND left(der.Spell_Primary_Diagnosis,4)='M720'
AND APCS.Admission_Method not like ('2%')
THEN 'N_dupuytr'
```

Global cancer exclusion

```
APC
WHERE 1=1
-- Cancer Diagnosis Exclusion
AND (apcs.der_diagnosis_all not like '%C[0-9][0-9]%'
AND apcs.der_diagnosis_all not like '%D0%'
AND apcs.der_diagnosis_all not like '%D3[789]%'
AND apcs.der_diagnosis_all not like '%D4[012345678]%'
OR apcs.der_diagnosis_all IS NULL)
```

10. Monitoring And Review

10.1 This policy may be subject to continued monitoring using a mix of the following approaches:

- Prior approval process
- Post activity monitoring through routine data
- Post activity monitoring through case note audits

10.2 This policy will be kept under regular review, to ensure that it reflects developments in the evidence base regarding effectiveness and value.

11. Quality and Equality Analysis

11.1 Quality and Equality Impact Analyses have been undertaken for this policy at the time of its review.

Appendix - Core Objectives and Principles

Objectives

The main objective for having healthcare commissioning policies is to ensure that:

- Patients receive appropriate health treatments
- Treatments with no or a very limited evidence base are not used; and
- Treatments with minimal health gain are restricted.

Principles

This policy aims to ensure a common set of criteria for treatments and procedures across the region. This is intended to reduce variation of access to NHS services in different areas and allow fair and equitable treatment for all patients.

Commissioning decisions by ICB Commissioners are made in accordance with the commissioning principles set out as follows:

- Commissioners require clear evidence of clinical effectiveness before NHS resources are invested in the treatment.
- Commissioners require clear evidence of cost effectiveness before NHS resources are invested in the treatment.
- Commissioners will consider the extent to which the individual or patient group will gain a benefit from the treatment.
- Commissioners will balance the needs of an individual patient against the benefit which could be gained by alternative investment possibilities to meet the needs of the community.
- Commissioners will consider all relevant national standards and consider all proper and authoritative guidance.
- Where a treatment is approved Commissioners will respect patient choice as to where a treatment is delivered, in accordance with the 'NHS Choice' framework.
- Commissioning decisions will give 'due regard' to promote equality and uphold human rights. Decision making will follow robust procedures to ensure that decisions are fair and are made within legislative frameworks.

Core Eligibility Criteria

There are a number of circumstances where a patient may meet a 'core eligibility criterion' which means they are eligible to be referred for the procedures and treatments listed, regardless of whether they meet the criteria; or the procedure or treatment is not routinely commissioned.

These core clinical eligibility criteria are as follows:

- Any patient who needs 'urgent' treatment will always be treated.
- All NICE Technology Appraisals Guidance (TAG), for patients that meet all the eligible criteria listed in a NICE TAG will receive treatment.
- In cancer care (including but not limited to skin, head and neck, breast and sarcoma) any lesion that has features suspicious of malignancy, must be referred to an appropriate specialist for urgent assessment under the 2-week rule.
- NOTE: Funding for all solid and haematological cancers are now the responsibility of NHS England.
- Reconstructive surgery post cancer or trauma including burns.
- Congenital deformities: Operations on congenital anomalies of the face and skull are usually routinely commissioned by the NHS. Some conditions are considered highly specialised and are commissioned in the UK through the National Specialised Commissioning Advisory Group (NSCAG). As the incidence of some cranio-facial congenital anomalies is small and the treatment complex, specialised teams, working in designated centres and subject to national audit, should carry out such procedures.
- Tissue degenerative conditions requiring reconstruction and/or restoring function e.g. leg ulcers, dehisced surgical wounds, necrotising fasciitis.
- For patients wishing to undergo Gender reassignment, this is the responsibility of NHS England and patients should be referred to a Gender Identity Clinic (GIC) as outlined in the Interim NHS England Gender Dysphoria Protocol and Guideline 2013/14.

Cosmetic Surgery

Cosmetic surgery is often carried out to change a person's appearance to achieve what a person perceives to be a more desirable look.

Cosmetic surgery/treatments are regarded as procedures of low clinical priority and therefore not routinely commissioned by the ICB Commissioner.

A summary of Cosmetic Surgery is provided by NHS Choices. Weblink:
http://www.nhs.uk/conditions/Cosmetic-surgery/Pages/Introduction.aspx and
http://www.nhs.uk/Conditions/Cosmetic-surgery/Pages/Procedures.aspx

Diagnostic Procedures

Diagnostic procedures to be performed with the sole purpose of determining whether or not a restricted procedure is feasible should not be carried out unless the eligibility criteria are met, or approval has been given by the ICB or GP (as set out in the approval process of the patients responsible ICB) or as agreed by the IFR Panel as a clinically exceptional case.

Where a General Practitioner/Optometrist/Dentist requests only an opinion the patient should not be placed on a waiting list or treated, but the opinion given and the patient returned to the care of the General Practitioner/Optometrist/Dentist, in order for them to make a decision on future treatment.

Clinical Trials

The ICB will not fund continuation of treatment commenced as part of a clinical trial. This is in line with the Medicines for Human Use (Clinical Trials) Regulations 2004 and the Declaration of Helsinki which stipulates that the responsibility for ensuring a clear exit strategy from a trial, and that those benefiting from treatment will have ongoing access to it, lies with those conducting the trial. This responsibility lies with the trial initiators indefinitely.

Clinical Exceptionality

If any patients are excluded from this policy, for whatever reason, the clinician has the option to make an application for clinical exceptionality. However, the clinician must make a robust case to the Panel to confirm their patient is distinct from all the other patients who might be excluded from the designated policy.

The ICB will consider clinical exceptions to this policy in accordance with the Individual Funding Request (IFR) Governance Framework consisting of: IFR Decision Making Policy; and IFR Management Policy.