Use of Intraarticular Hyaluronic Acid in the Management of Knee Osteoarthritis in Clinical Practice
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Introduction

Knee osteoarthritis (KOA) is a chronic disorder characterized by joint pain, increasing physical disability, and progressive cartilage degeneration, which can lead to total knee arthroplasty (TKA). Despite extensive research, the complex pathophysiology of KOA remains incompletely understood. As a result, no established disease-modifying treatment exists today, and the management of KOA still relies on a combination of nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic modalities (1) primarily intended to relieve the symptoms of pain and loss of knee function. In clinical practice, acetaminophen and nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are generally recommended to relieve pain and improve joint function (2–5). However, due to their vascular and gastrointestinal toxicity (6,7), the risk-benefit ratio of these rapid-acting drugs might not be favorable, particularly for long-course therapies and within the aging population in which KOA is most prevalent (8). Intraarticular (IA) injections of corticosteroids such as triamcinolone hexacetonide and methylprednisolone acetate are also commonly prescribed. As a systemic absorption occurs following IA corticosteroid injection, systemic adverse events (AEs) can be expected and precautions should be observed in patients with concomitant diseases such as hypertension or diabetes mellitus (9–13).
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Injection or oral administration of analgesics and NSAIDs. Thus, IAHA represents an alternative to analgesics and NSAIDs in patients with comorbidities, as well as a secondary option in case of inadequate response to first-line pharmacologic KOA treatments (14). Registered as medical devices in the US, IAHA preparations are currently approved for the symptomatic treatment of KOA, one of the most commonly affected joints. Despite being widely employed in the daily management of KOA for almost 20 years in the US (about 30 years in Europe and Japan), controversies persist regarding their efficacy and safety, as highlighted by discrepancies in the guidelines related to the use of IAHA in clinical practice (2–5,15), which largely reflect the divergent conclusions drawn by meta-analyses on the topic (16–30).

For this purpose, the European Society for Clinical and Economic Aspects of Osteoporosis and Osteoarthritis (ESCEO) convened an international task force of experts in OA and clinical research methodology. Seven members of this working group (CC, FR, PR, OB, GH-B, AM, and DU) were entrusted with the task of preparing a review on diverse aspects of the use of IAHA in the management of KOA. Current knowledge on the mode of action, efficacy, effectiveness, safety, and cost-effectiveness of this treatment modality was presented and discussed at a 1-day meeting in January 2016 in Geneva (Switzerland).

The objective of this review is to provide specialists and practicing physicians with clear, concise, and reasoned answers to questions they might have on the use of IAHA in the management of KOA.

Efficacy
Efficacy of IAHA on pain and joint function has been evaluated in numerous randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Consequently, 15 meta-analyses/systematic reviews assessing the symptomatic effects of IAHA on KOA have been published to date (16–30). Six of them concluded on a clear efficacy of IAHA (17,20,24,27,29,30), 4 considered it as a marginally efficacious treatment modality (16,19,25,26), and 2 meta-analyses found no significant difference in efficacy between IAHA and IA placebo (18,21) (Table 1).

The reported effect sizes (ES) for pain favored IAHA over IA placebo and ranged from 0.20 (30) to 0.46 (24). Heterogeneity of outcomes between trials was relatively high in several meta-analyses (16,20,24,27). As shown by Bannuru et al., the benefits of IAHA vary over time, with a maximal effect on pain at 8 weeks [ES 0.46 [95% confidence interval [95% CI] 0.28, 0.65]] that is still observable at 24 weeks [ES 0.21 [95% CI 0.10, 0.31]] (24). This time dependency may partly contribute to the differences in pain estimates that have been observed between meta-analyses. Another possible explanation is the inclusion of clinical trials that widely differ in methodological quality. Thus, when the analysis was restricted to high-quality trials, an ES of 0.34 (95% CI 0.02, 0.67) and of 0.20 (95% CI 0.03, 0.37) in favor of IAHA was obtained at 8 and 24 weeks, respectively (24). These results were confirmed by Richette et al., who examined clinical data obtained from IA placebo controlled trials with a low risk of bias only (n = 8) in order to reach the highest level of evidence. Based on an ES of 0.20 (95% CI 0.12, 0.29) for pain at 12 weeks, the authors concluded that IAHA provided a moderate but real effect on pain in patients with KOA (30).

Since the estimates for pain mentioned above were based on the difference between the IA placebo and the IAHA effects, it is worth noting that evidence for a clinically significant response of the IA delivery method itself has recently been demonstrated in a meta-analysis, with an ES of 0.29 (95% credible interval [95% CrI] 0.04, 0.54) in favor of IA placebo compared with oral placebo (29). In the same study, different treatment options of KOA were compared based on their ES versus oral placebo at 3 months. IAHA was found to be the most efficacious intervention with an ES of 0.63 (95% CrI 0.39, 0.88), followed by IA corticosteroids (ES 0.61 [95% CrI 0.32, 0.89]), diclofenac (ES 0.52 [95% CrI 0.34, 0.69]), ibuprofen (ES 0.44 [95% CrI 0.25, 0.63]), naproxen (ES 0.38 [95% CrI 0.27, 0.49]), celecoxib (ES 0.33 [95% CrI 0.25, 0.42]), and IA placebo. With an ES of 0.18 (95% CrI 0.04, 0.33), acetaminophen was considered as not superior to oral placebo in relieving pain (29). In direct comparison, IAHA was shown to be not significantly different from continuous oral NSAID treatment at 4 and 12 weeks regarding pain, function, and stiffness (28), and superior to IA corticosteroids from 8 to 26 weeks regarding pain (23).

Effectiveness
The extent to which IAHA achieves its intended effect in the “real-life” clinical setting cannot be measured in RCTs, since patients in such studies are not representative of those seen in usual practice. Therefore, observational studies of real practice are better suited in evaluating effectiveness of IAHA.

Petrella and Wakeford retrospectively assessed the effectiveness of IA crosslinked HA (hylan) using the Southwestern Ontario database, a Canadian real-world cohort (31). For this purpose, they identified 1,263 patients with OA in 1 or both knees that received 2 consecutive series of IA hylan injections and no other prescribed OA medications. They compared them to a cohort of 3,318 demographically matched KOA patients who were never treated with IAHA. All patients were evaluated fully between 2006 and 2012. Results showed that in the group of patients who received repeated treatments of IA hylan, pain at rest and pain after a 6-minute walk decreased by mean ± SD 3.7 ± 1.8 points and 5.6 ± 1.7 points on a 10-point visual analog scale, respectively. In parallel, the distance walked in a 6-minute walk test increased on average by 115 meters in this patient group. These improvements in pain and physical function were
Table 1. Meta-analyses evaluating intraarticular hyaluronic acid in the symptomatic treatment of knee osteoarthritis*

| Reference               | Comparator | Main outcome                        | ES (95% CI)         | General outcome           |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Lo et al, 2003 (16)     | IA placebo | Pain change from BL at M1–4          | SMD = 0.32 (0.17, 0.47) | Intermediate              |
| Wang et al, 2004 (17)   | IA placebo | Pain on movement                     | MPD = 7.9 (4.1, 11.7) | Positive                  |
| Arrich et al, 2005 (18) | IA placebo | Pain on movement at W2–6             | WMD = 3.8 (−1.4, 9.1) | Negative (no clinical difference) |
|                         |            | Pain on movement at W10–14           | WMD = 4.3 (0.9, 7.6) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain on movement at W22–30           | WMD = 7.1 (2.4, 11.8) |                           |
| Modawal et al, 2005 (19)| IA placebo | Pain change at W5–7                  | MD = 17.6 (7.5, 28.0) | Intermediate              |
|                         |            | Pain change at W8–12                 | MD = 18.1 (6.3, 29.9) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change at W15–22                | MD = 4.4 (−15.3, 24.1) |                           |
| Bellamy et al, 2006 (20)| IA placebo | Pain/function at W5–7                | WMD/SMD variable for different HA products | Positive |
| Medina et al, 2006 (21) | IA placebo | Pain/function at W3–13               | WMD/SMD variable for different HA products | Negative (no statistical difference) |
| Reichenbach et al, 2007 (22)| IA hylan | Pain at end of followup              | SMD = −0.27 (−0.55, 0.01) | HA > hylan |
| Bannuru et al, 2009 (23) | IA CS      | Pain change from BL at W2            | SMD$^g$ = −0.39 (−0.65, −0.12) | Positive (HA > CS from W8 onward) |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W4            | SMD$^g$ = −0.01 (−0.23, 0.21) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W8            | SMD$^g$ = 0.22 (−0.05, 0.49) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W12           | SMD$^g$ = 0.35 (0.03, 0.66) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W26           | SMD$^g$ = 0.39 (0.18, 0.59) |                           |
| Bannuru et al, 2011 (24)| IA placebo | Pain change from BL at W4            | SMD$^g$ = 0.31 (0.17, 0.45) | Positive                  |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W8            | SMD$^g$ = 0.46 (0.28, 0.65) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W12           | SMD$^g$ = 0.25 (0.15, 0.36) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W16           | SMD$^g$ = 0.20 (0.11, 0.30) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W24           | SMD$^g$ = 0.21 (0.10, 0.31) |                           |
| Colen et al, 2012 (25)  | IA placebo | Pain change from BL at M3            | vs. IA placebo:      | Intermediate              |
|                         |            | vs. IA placebo:                      | WMD = 10.2 (4.4, 16.0) |                           |
|                         |            | vs hylan                             | SMD = 0.07 (−0.10, 0.24) |                           |
|                         |            |                                       | $I^2 = 72\%$         |                           |
| Rutjes et al, 2012 (26)| Sham or no intervention IA placebo | Pain at end of followup              | SMD: 0.37 (0.28, 0.46) | Intermediate              |
| Miller and Block, 2013 (27) | IA placebo | Pain at W4–13                        | SMD = 0.43 (0.26, 0.60) | Positive                  |
|                         |            | Pain at W14–26                       | SMD = 0.38 (0.21, 0.55) |                           |
|                         |            | Function at W4–13                    | SMD = 0.34 (0.16, 0.51) |                           |
|                         |            | Function at W14–26                   | SMD = 0.32 (0.18, 0.45) |                           |
| Bannuru et al, 2014 (28)| NSAIDs    | Pain change from BL at W4            | SMD$^g$ = −0.01 (−0.18, 0.15) | Positive (HA = NSAIDs) |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at W12           | SMD$^g$ = 0.05 (−0.17, 0.28) |                           |
|                         |            | Pain change from BL at end of followup| SMD$^g$ = 0.07 (−0.10, 0.24) |                           |

(continued)
Seven meta-analyses of RCTs comparing IAHA to IA placebo considering the patient situation in terms of individual and research on the effectiveness of IAHA suggests promoting pragmatic trials were also adapted in the assessment of long-term outcomes.

Three recent retrospective studies examined the time from diagnosis of KOA to TKA and whether this time would be influenced by the use of IAHA (35–37). Large populations of insured subjects were screened and about 250,000 TKAs were analyzed and the biologic plausibility of the reported events were usually mild transient local reactions such as pain at the injection site and swelling, as shown in a review by Pagnano and Westrich (40), the frequency of acute local reactions, predominantly reported after avian high-MW crosslinked HA injections (hylan) (42). As shown in a review by Pagnano and Westrich (40), the frequency of acute local reactions, predominantly reported after avian high-MW crosslinked HA injections (hylan) (42).

As the evidence for efficacy of IAHA on knee pain and function is currently established, the ESCEO task force suggests promoting pragmatic trials in order to focus clinical research on the effectiveness of IAHA in real-life conditions, considering the patient situation in terms of individual and disease characteristics, medical history, and comorbidities.

### Safety

Seven meta-analyses of RCTs comparing IAHA to IA placebo evaluated the safety of the intervention (17,18,20,21,26,27,29).

As shown in a review by Pagnano and Westrich (40), the safety of IAHA appears to remain unchanged with multiple courses of treatment, while there might be an increase in AEs after the first hylan injection(s). Leopold et al reported that patients receiving multiple cycles of IA hylan exhibited more than an 8-fold increase in the frequency of acute local reactions compared with patients receiving only 1 course (41). In addition to the AEs mentioned above, postmarketing device surveillance highlighted the occurrence of rare cases of localized inflammatory reactions such as pseudosepsis/severe acute inflammatory reactions, predominantly reported after avian high-MW crosslinked HA injections (hylan) (42). In comparison with other pharmacologic interventions for the treatment of KOA, IAHA therapy was shown to exhibit fewer systemic AEs than acetaminophen or oral NSAIDs, but more local reactions (43). These events were reported to be

| Reference                  | Comparator                        | Main outcome                  | ES (95% CI)                             | General outcome |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|
| Bannuru et al, 2015 (29)   | Other options                     | Pain change from BL at M3    | vs IA placebo:                         | Positive       |
|                            |                                   |                              | SMD\(\delta\) = 0.34 (0.26, 0.42)†    |                |
|                            |                                   |                              | vs oral placebo:                       |                |
|                            |                                   |                              | SMD\(\delta\) = 0.63 (0.39, 0.88)†    |                |
|                            |                                   | Function change from BL at M3| vs IA placebo:                         |                |
|                            |                                   |                              | SMD\(\delta\) = 0.30 (0.20, 0.40)†    |                |
|                            |                                   |                              | vs oral placebo:                       |                |
|                            |                                   |                              | SMD\(\delta\) = 0.45 (0.08, 0.84)†    |                |
| Richette et al, 2015 (30)  | IA placebo                        | Pain at W12                  | vs oral placebo:                       | Positive       |
|                            |                                   |                              | SMD = 0.20 (0.12, 0.29)                |                |
|                            |                                   | Function at W12              | vs IA placebo:                         |                |
|                            |                                   |                              | SMD = 0.12 (0.02, 0.22)                |                |

* Positive effect sizes (ES) favor intraarticular hyaluronic acid, negative ES favor comparator. 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; IA = intraarticular; BL = baseline; M = month; SMD = standardized mean difference; MPD = mean percent difference; W = week; WMD = weighted mean difference; MD = mean difference; HA = hyaluronic acid; hylan = hylan G-F 20; CS = corticosteroid; SMD\(\delta\) = standardized mean difference adjusted for small sample size (Hedges’ g); NSAIDs = nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs.

† 95% credible interval.
similar between different IA therapies, i.e., HA and corticosteroids. Withdrawals due to AEs were more common among patients receiving acetaminophen or NSAIDs than IA therapies (29). As a result, after almost 30 years of use, IAHA is usually recognized as a safe treatment modality for KOA.

**Current guidelines**

As shown in the previous sections dealing with the efficacy, effectiveness, and safety of IAHA, there is increasing evidence that the risk-benefit balance is favorable to the use of IAHA in the management of KOA (24,26,27,29,30,44). However, while IAHA was initially clearly recommended by national and international professional societies, such as the Osteoarthritis Research Society International (OARSI) (49), the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) (2), and the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) (46), some clinicians, researchers, and decision makers feel that current guidelines are conflicting and less favorable than 10 years ago (47,48). Nevertheless, there is relative general agreement on the place of IAHA in the management of KOA across organizations (Table 2). Apart from the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, which refutes the use of IAHA based on insufficient clinical efficacy compared with IA saline (15), and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, which does not assess the modality at all (5), the use of IAHA is recommended as second-line treatment of KOA (Table 2).

Based on the available evidence and guidelines, the ESCEO recommends using IAHA in patients remaining symptomatic despite continuous or intermittent treatment with conventional pharmacologic treatment modalities, i.e., acetaminophen, symptomatic slow-acting drugs, and NSAIDs, as well as in patients with comorbidities precluding the use of NSAIDs. This positioning is clearly highlighted in the ESCEO treatment algorithm for the management of KOA and may help the prescribing physician prioritize interventions (14,49). The ACR guidelines move in the same direction and present IAHA as an alternative to unsatisfactory initial pharmacologic therapy (46). Furthermore, they emphasize its particular interest for patients ages >75 years, who are not recommended to take oral NSAIDs (4,14). EULAR considers the use of IAHA for pain relief and functional improvement based on level 1B evidence (2).

OARSI guidelines for the nonsurgical management of KOA probably raise the most considerable amount of misunderstanding. However, as clearly stated in the main part of the article, an “uncertain” classification was “...not intended to be a negative recommendation or preclude use of that therapy. Rather it indicates a role for physician-patient interaction in determining whether this treatment may have merit in the context of its risk: benefit profile and the individual characteristics, co-morbidities, and preferences of the patient” (3). In other words, OARSI privileges the use of IAHA for specific clinical phenotypes, which should be defined by the prescribing physician.

Finally, as recently highlighted by Altman et al (50), clinical practice guidelines, and a fortiori recommendations for the use of IAHA in the management of KOA, are not intended to create uniformity and suppress treating physicians’ self-analysis of the patient situation; they are designed to provide the best evidence-based information available to help physicians in making a treatment decision.

**Mode of action**

In the US, from a purely regulatory point of view, the symptomatic effects of most of the IAHA preparations are considered to primarily result from the unique properties of HA in solution; when injected intraarticularly, exogenous HA is able to compensate for the drop in HA concentration and chain length that has been observed during the progression of OA, thus restoring the elastic and viscous properties of the synovial fluid, which are responsible for its resistance to compression and its lubricating effect, respectively (51,52). However, these direct mechanical effects of exogenous HA cannot account for its long-term benefits observed in clinical trials (24), as it is cleared from the joint within a few days, depending on the IAHA preparation. Over the past 30 years, several possible pharmacologic mechanisms of action explaining how the clinical effects of IAHA could persist for several months have been proposed. A recent review of the preclinical basic science literature performed by Altman et al (53) highlighted the major role of HA binding to cluster 44 receptors in this complex mechanism, as numerous of its mediated effects (e.g., inhibition of

| Organization (issue date) | Recommendation |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| AAOS (2013)              | Recommends not using it (recommendation 9 based on lack of evidence for efficacy, and not on potential harm) (15). |
| ACR (2012)               | Does not recommend it in the initial management of the disease. Conditionally recommends it in patients with no satisfactory response to prior recommended treatments (4). |
| ESCEO (2014)             | Recommends it in patients who are severely symptomatic or still symptomatic despite the use of NSAIDs, or in case of contraindications to NSAIDs (step 2) (14). |
| EULAR (2003)             | Recommends it for pain reduction and functional improvement (2). |
| NICE (2014)              | Recommends not offering it (5). |
| OARSI (2014)             | Recommends it only after physician-patient interaction for determining whether it can have merit in the context of their individual characteristics, comorbidities, and preferences (based on an uncertain appropriateness) (3). |

* AAOS = American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons; ACR = American College of Rheumatology; NSAIDs = nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; ESCEO = European Society for Clinical and Economic Aspects of Osteoporosis and Osteoarthritis; EULAR = European League Against Rheumatism; NICE = National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; OARSI = Osteoarthritis Research Society International.
interleukin (IL)-1β, IL-6, and matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) expression, and reduction in prostaglandin E2 synthesis) contribute to the chondroprotection, proteoglycan/glycosaminoglycan synthesis, antiinflammatory, and subchondral effects as observed in vitro. Alternative pathways involving HA binding to intercellular adhesion molecule 1 and modulation of transient receptor potential vanilloid channel 1 activity have also been described. In addition, the toll-like receptor (TLR) signaling pathway has been suggested to contribute to the antiinflammatory and anti-catabolic (inhibition of inflammation-induced activation of MMPs) effects of IAHA in joint tissues. Indeed, there is evidence that HA fragments that are highly expressed in the OA joint can transduce inflammatory signals through TLR2, TLR4, or both. When exogenous HA is injected in the joint, the proportion of these fragments is reduced, thus modulating TLR-mediated innate immune responses.

The ESCEO group is not convinced that one mode of action is sufficient to explain the therapeutic trajectory of IAHA and privilege the hypothesis that several mechanisms overlap and interact to relieve OA pain. Furthermore, in vitro results obtained on chondrocytes may not be the same as what happens clinically (i.e., in an anaerobic medium).

**Systematically repeated treatment**

Is it useful and acceptable to propose to re-inject patients with a low level of pain? This very relevant issue in daily clinical practice has been addressed in the AMELIA (Osteoarthritis Modifying Effects of Long-Term Intra-Articular Adant) study (44), a long-term, randomized, placebo-controlled trial carried out in 306 patients with symptomatic KOA who received 4 consecutive cycles (5 weekly IA injections) of either noncrosslinked HA of biorefermentative origin or placebo. Followup visits were conducted at 6 months after the first and second cycles and at 12 months after the third and fourth cycles, resulting in a total study duration of 40 months. At the end of the study, the responder rate according to the Outcome Measures in Rheumatology/OARSI response criteria (57) was significantly higher in the IAHA group than in the control group (80.5% versus 65.8%; P < 0.05). No increase in AEs occurred with repeated cycles of IAHA. Between-group differences were significant from 1 year onward (P < 0.05).

**Molecular weight**

There are more than 80 marketed IAHA preparations worldwide. They differ in many characteristics, including origin.

---

### Table 3. Pharmacoeconomic studies evaluating the cost-effectiveness of IAHA in the symptomatic treatment of knee osteoarthritis

| Reference          | Source of data | Country | Duration | Product vs. comparator | Cost-effectiveness | ICER          |
|--------------------|----------------|---------|----------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Waddell et al, 2001 (65) | Cohort†        | US      | 3 years  | Synvisc + AC vs. AC    | NA                 | Dominant      |
| Torrance et al, 2002 (66) | RCT (74)       | Canada  | 12 months| Synvisc + AC vs. AC    | NA                 | $10,000 Canadian per QALY Dominant |
| Kahan et al, 2003 (67)      | RCT (67)       | France  | 9 months | Synvisc vs. CC         | €829 for 32% improvement in Lequesne index | Dominant      |
| Yen et al, 2004 (68)       | Cohort†        | Taiwan  | 6 months | Artz vs. naproxen      | $1,538 US per QALY | Dominant      |
| Mazieres et al, 2007 (69)  | Cohort (69)    | France  | 6 months | Suplasyn vs. CC (BL)   | €528 for 27% improvement in Lequesne index | Dominant      |
| Turajane et al, 2007 (70)  | Retrospective (75) | Thailand | 2 years | Hylan + AC vs. AC      | NA                 | NA            |
| Chou et al, 2009 (71)      | Cohort (71)    | Taiwan  | 6 months | Synvisc vs. CC (BL)    | $299,456 NT per QALY | NA            |
| Miller and Block, 2014 (72) | Cohort (76)    | US      | 2 years  | Registered IAHA vs. CC† | $12,800 US per QALY | < $23,400 US per QALY Dominant |
| Hatoum et al, 2014 (73)    | RCTs (77,78)   | US      | 12 months| Euflexxa vs. CC (BL)   | $21,281 US per QALY | NA            |
| Hatoum et al, 2014 (73)    | RCTs (74,77,78)| US      | 12 months| Euflexxa vs. AC        | $8,816 US per QALY | $42,000 US per QALY Dominant |

* ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; AC = appropriate care (e.g., nonpharmacologic therapy, nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs [NSAIDs], analgesics, corticosteroids, total knee arthroplasty); NA = not available; RCT = randomized controlled trial; QALY = quality-adjusted life year; CC = conventional care (i.e., nonpharmacologic therapy, NSAIDs, analgesics); BL = baseline.

† Hypothetical.

‡ $1 NT = $0.0315 US (2008 exchange).
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(animal versus biofermentation), mean MW (500–6,000 kDa) and MW distribution, molecular structure (linear, crosslinked, and a mix of both), method of crosslinking, concentration (0.8–30 mg/ml), volume of injection (0.5–6.0 ml), and posology. Some of the preparations include different concentrations of additives, such as mannitol, sorbitol, or chondroitin sulfate. While each of these parameters may theoretically have an impact on the effect of the IAHA treatment, research has mostly focused on the potential differences resulting from the size of HA. For this purpose, the exogenous HA available for IA injections are divided into 3 MW categories: low (500–730 kDa), intermediate (800–2,000 kDa), and high (2,000–6,000 kDa), including crosslinked formulations of HA (58). The rationale for an influence of the MW results from research on the mode of action of IAHA. Indeed, as summarized in the review by Altman et al (53), basic preclinical science showed that higher MW HAs may provide superior chondroprotective, proteoglycan/glycosaminoglycan synthesis, antiinflammatory, mechanical, and analgesic effects. Whether these differences observed in vitro translate into clinical evidence is not clearly established yet.

Two meta-analyses comparing different IAHA preparations have been published to date (Table 1). The first one compared hylan with lower-MW IAHA and found no clinically relevant benefits in terms of efficacy of either type of preparation. However, the risks for local AEs (RR 1.91 [95% CI 1.04, 3.49]; I² = 28%) and postinjection flares (RR 2.04 [95% CI 1.18, 3.53]; I² = 0%) were observed to be twice as high with hylan than with low- or intermediate-MW HA (22). In addition, a higher number of pseudoposesis cases were reported with hylan than with other IAHA preparations, whose risk might increase with subsequent courses (40). In the second meta-analysis, comparing different commercially available IAHA products, the authors were not able to conclude that one brand had a better efficacy than another due to the heterogeneity of the studies and outcomes (25).

In addition, most head-to-head RCTs performed to date have found noninferiority with respect to symptomatic efficacy between the various HA preparations evaluated (59–64). To our knowledge, only 1 RCT was able to demonstrate a statistically significant difference between 2 IAHA preparations varying in MW regarding symptomatic efficacy. Indeed, this study conducted in 400 patients with KOA showed that an intermediate-MW HA provided statistically superior pain relief at 6 months than a low-MW HA. Secondary end points confirmed the primary finding (58).

Based on the above, the ESCEO task force considers that there is currently no clinical evidence supporting an advantage in efficacy of one product over another. Furthermore, if certain intrinsic properties (e.g., MW) of particular IAHA preparations provide beneficial results in comparison with other IAHA products, characteristics related to the patient are likely to prevail.

Efficiency

Only 9 pharmacoeconomic studies evaluating the cost-effectiveness of IAHA have been published to date (Table 3) (65–73). Most of them were conducted in patients with KOA who received IA injections of hylan (65–67,71).

Although pharmacoeconomic data are overall in favor of IAHA, only a few evaluations included sensitivity analyses or were performed based on RCTs. Furthermore, some costs were not included, such as those associated with potential AEs. Therefore, the ESCEO task force recommends investigating more in the identification, measurement, and comparison of the costs, risks, and benefits of IAHA in the management of KOA.

Conclusion

This review addresses major aspects related to the use of IAHA in the management of KOA. It emphasizes its good safety profile and its moderate but real efficacy on symptoms, which is in the same range as other pharmacologic treatment modalities (e.g., NSAIDs) used in this indication. The effectiveness of IAHA has also been highlighted based on real-life clinical data and should therefore be helpful to clinicians when making care decisions tailored to individual patient needs.

The ESCEO working group is aware that IAHA is not a panacea for treating a heterogeneous disease such as KOA. However, KOA is known to mostly affect the elderly and individuals with significant comorbidities, thereby constraining the use of several conventional therapeutic options such as acetaminophen, NSAIDs, opioids, duloxetine, or TKA. Therefore, the experts convened by the ESCEO feel that the medical community cannot afford to neglect the use of IAHA, particularly now that systematic repetitive treatment cycles have been shown to yield positive results in terms of both efficacy and safety. Indeed, they consider that IAHA is a reasonable alternative in patients with KOA who have not sufficiently responded to previous pharmacologic treatments, and a key weapon in the therapeutic armamentarium for managing KOA in patients with contraindications to conventional interventions.

The ESCEO task force calls for additional well-conducted clinical trials (RCTs, cohort studies) to define the predictive factors (i.e., patient phenotypes, treatment characteristics) associated with an optimal risk-benefit ratio. Such research may further help in determining candidates that may take most advantage of IAHA.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors were involved in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and all authors approved the final version to be submitted for publication. Dr. Cooper had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study conception and design. Cooper, Bruyère, Reginster.

Acquisition of data. Cooper, Rannou, Richette, Bruyère, Herrero-Beaumont, Migliore, Uebelhart, Reginster.

Analysis and interpretation of data. Cooper, Rannou, Richette, Bruyère, Al-Daghri, Altman, Brandi, Collaud Basset, Herrero-Beaumont, Migliore, Pavelka, Uebelhart, Reginster.

ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE

Author Collaud Basset is an employee of TRB Chemedica International SA.
REFERENCES

1. Zhang W, Moskowitz RW, Nuki G, Abramson S, Altman RD, Arden N, et al. OARSI recommendations for the management of hip and knee osteoarthritis, part I: critical appraisal of existing treatment guidelines and systematic review of current research evidence. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2007;15:981–1000.

2. Jordan KM, Arden NK, Doherty M, Bannwarth B, Bijlsma JW, Dieppe P, et al. EULAR recommendations 2003: an evidence based approach to the management of knee osteoarthritis. Report of a task force of the Standing Committee for International Clinical Studies Including Therapeutic Trials (ESCISIT). Ann Rheum Dis 2003;62:1145–55.

3. McAlindon TE, Bannuru RR, Sullivan MC, Arden NK, Berenbaum F, Biemer-Zeinstram SM, et al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2014;22:363–88.

4. Hochberg MC, Altman RD, April TK, Benkhalifi M, Guyatt G, McGowan J, et al. American College of Rheumatology 2012 recommendations for the use of nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic therapies in osteoarthritis of the hand, hip, and knee. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken) 2012;64:65–74.

5. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Clinical guideline CG177: osteoarthritis: care and management in adults. 2014. URL: http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg177.

6. Bhala N, Emberson J, Merhi A, Abramson S, Arber N, et al., and the Coib and Traditional NSAID ‘Trials’ (CNT) Collaboration. Vascular and upper gastrointestinal effects of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: meta-analyses of individual participant data from randomised trials. Lancet 2013;382:769–79.

7. Roberts E, Delgado Nunes V, Buckner S, Latchem S, Constantini M, Miller P, et al. Paracetamol: not as safe as we thought? A systematic literature review of observational studies. Ann Rheum Dis 2016;75:552–9.

8. Johnson VL, Hunter DJ. The epidemiology of osteoarthritis. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol 2014;28:5–15.

9. Axelrod L. Glucocorticoids. In: Kelley WN, Harris ED Jr, Ruddy S, Sledge CB, editors. Textbook of rheumatology. 4th ed. Philadelphia: WB Saunders; 1993. p. 779–96.

10. Lazarevic MB, Skosee JL, Djordjevic-Denic G, Swedler WI, Zgradic I, Myones BL. Reduction of cortisol levels after single intra-articular and intramuscular steroid injection. Am J Med 1995;99:370–3.

11. Wicki JC, Droz M, Cirafici L, Vallotton MB. Report of a task force of the Standing Committee for International Clinical Studies Including Therapeutic Trials (ESCISIT). Ann Rheum Dis 2003;62:1145–55.

12. Younes M, Ferrer M, Choi HK, Castle JA. Hyaluronic acid injections are associated with delay of total knee replacement surgery in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Ann Intern Med 2015;162:46–54.

13. Richette P, Chevalier X, Eymard F, Henrotin Y, Ornetti P, et al. Hyaluronic acid for the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: an updated meta-analysis of trials with low risk of bias. RMD Open 2015;1:o000071.

14. Petrella RJ, Wakeford C. Pain relief and improved physical function in knee osteoarthritis patients receiving ongoing hyaluronan G-F 20, a high-molecular-weight hyaluronan, versus other treatment options: data from a large real-world longitudinal cohort in Canada. Drug Des Dev Pract 2006;55:669–75.

15. Treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee: evidence-based guideline. 2nd ed. Rosemont (IL): American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons; 2013. URL: www.aaos.org/research/guidelines/TreatmentofOsteoarthritisofTheKneeGuideline.pdf.

16. Lo CH, LaValley M, McAlindon T, Felson DT. Intra-articular hyaluronic acid in treatment of knee osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis. JAMA 2003;290:3115–21.

17. Wang CT, Lin J, Chang CJ, Lin YT, Hou SM. Therapeutic effects of hyaluronic acid on osteoarthritis of the knee: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2004;86A:538–45.

18. Arrich J, Piribauer F, Mad P, Schmid D, Klaushofer K, Mullner M. Intra-articular hyaluronic acid for the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee: a systematic review and meta-analysis. CMAJ 2005;172:1039–43.

19. Modawal A, Ferrer M, Choi HK, Castle JA. Hyaluronic acid injections relieve knee pain. J Fam Pract 2005;54:758–67.

20. Bellamy N, Campbell J, Robinson V, Gee T, Bourne R, Wells G. Viscosupplementation for the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2006;CD005321.

21. Medina JM, Thomas A, Denegar CR. Knee osteoarthritis: should your patient opt for hyaluronic acid injection? J Fam Pract 2006;55:669–75.

22. Reichenbach S, Blank S, Rutjes AW, Shang A, King EA, Dieppe PA, et al. Hylan versus hyaluronic acid for osteoarthritis of the knee: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arthritis Rheum 2007;57:1410–8.

23. Bannuru RR, Natov NS, Obadan IE, Price LL, Schmid CH, McAlindon TE. Therapeutic trajectory of hyaluronic acid versus corticosteroids in the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arthritis Rheum 2009;61:1704–11.

24. Bannuru RR, Natov NS, Dasi UR, Schmid CH, McAlindon TE. Therapeutic trajectory following intra-articular hyaluronic acid injection in knee osteoarthritis: meta-analysis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2011;19:611–9.

25. Colen S, van den Bekerom MP, Mulier M, Haverkamp D. Hyaluronic acid in the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis with emphasis on the efficacy of different products. Biodrugs 2012;26:257–68.

26. Rutjes AW, Jüni P, da Costa BR, Trelle S, Nüesch E, Reichenbach S. Viscosupplementation for osteoarthritis of the knee: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Intern Med 2012;157:180–91.

27. Miller LE, Block JE. US-approved intra-articular hyaluronic acid injections are safe and effective in patients with knee osteoarthritis: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, saline-controlled trials. Clin Med Insights Arthritis Musculoskelet Disord 2013;6:57–63.

28. Bannuru RR, Vaysbrot EE, Sullivan MC, McAlindon TE. Relative efficacy of hyaluronic acid in comparison with NSAIDs for knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2014;43:593–9.

29. Bannuru RR, Schmid CH, Kent DM, Vaysbrot EE, Wong JB, McAlindon TE. Comparative effectiveness of pharmacologic interventions for knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Ann Intern Med 2015;162:46–54.

30. Petrella RJ, Wakeford C. Pain relief and improved physical function in knee osteoarthritis patients receiving ongoing hyaluronan G-F 20, a high-molecular-weight hyaluronan, versus other treatment options: data from a large real-world longitudinal cohort in Canada. Drug Des Devel Ther 2015;9:5633–40.

31. Petrella RJ. Hyaluronic acid for the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: long-term outcomes from a naturalistic primary care experience. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2005;84:278–83.

32. Waddell DD, Bricker DC. Clinical experience with the effectiveness of hylan G-F 20 in 1047 patients with osteoarthritis of the knee. J Knee Surg 2006;19:19–27.

33. Waddell DD, Bricker DC. Clinical experience with the effectiveness of hylan G-F 20 in 1047 patients with osteoarthritis of the knee. J Knee Surg 2006;19:19–27.

34. Klaushofer K, Culmann M, Schmid D, Ricke M, Zipfel M. Intra-articular hyaluronic acid for the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis. JAMA 2003;290:3115–21.

35. Ong KL, Anderson AF, Niazi F, Fierlinger AL, Kurtz SM, Altman RD. Hyaluronic acid injections in Medicare knee
osteoarthritis patients are associated with longer time to knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2016;31:1667–73.
37. Altman R, Fredericson M, Bhattacharyya SK, Lissin B, Abbott T, Yadalam S, et al. Association between hyaluronic acid injections and time-to-total knee replacement surgery. J Knee Surg 2015;29:564–70.
38. McAlindon TE, Bannuru RR. Osteoarthritis: is viscosupplementation really so unsafe for knee OA? Nat Rev Rheumatol 2012;8:635–6.
39. Montiel A, Berenbaum F, Hochberg M, Punzi L, Reginster JY. Comment on recent therapeutic guidelines for osteoarthritis. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2015;44:611–7.
40. Pagnano M, Westrich G. Successful nonoperative management of chronic osteoarthritis pain of the knee: safety and efficacy of treatment with intra-articular hyaluronan. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2005;13:751–61.
41. Leopold SS, Warne WJ, Pettis PD, Shott S. Increased frequency of acute local reaction to intra-articular hyaluronan (Synvisc) in patients receiving more than one course of treatment. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2002;84A:1619–23.
42. Chen AL, Desai P, Adler EM, Di Cesare PE. Granulomatous inflammation after hyaluronan G-F 20 viscosupplementation of the knee: a report of six cases. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2002;84A:1142–7.
43. Bellamy N, Campbell J, Robinson V, Gee T, Bourne R, Wells G. Intraarticular corticosteroid for treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2006;CD005328.
44. Navarro-Sarabia F, Coronel P, Collantes E, Navarro FJ, de la Serna AR, Naranjo A, et al. A 40-month multicentre, randomised placebo-controlled study to assess the efficacy and carry-over effect of repeated intra-articular injections of hyaluronic acid in knee osteoarthritis: the AMELIA project. Ann Rheum Dis 2011;70:1957–62.
45. Zhang W, Moskowitz RW, Nuki G, Abramson S, Altman RD, Anderson JJ, et al. OMERACT-OARSI initiative: Efficacy and safety of intra-articular hylan G-F 20 in symptomatic osteoarthritis of the knee (KOA): results of a non-inferiority, prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Arthritis Rheum 2007;56:3610–9.
46. Maheu E, Zaim M, Appelboom T, Jeka S, Trc T, Berenbaum F, et al. Comparative efficacy and safety of two different molecular weight (MW) hyaluronans F60027 and hylan G-F 20 in symptomatic osteoarthritis of the knee (KOA): results of a non-inferiority, prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Clin Exp Rheumatol 2011;29:527–35.
47. Pavelka K, Uebelhart D. Efficacy evaluation of highly purified intra-articular hyaluronic acid (Sinovial) vs hylan G-F 20 in symptomatic osteoarthritis of the knee. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2004;12:389–99.
48. Dreiser RL, Avouac B, Bardin T. A 6 month trial evaluating efficacy of one intraarticular injection of 2 per cent sodium hyaluronate versus hylan G F 20 in the treatment of painful tibiofemoral osteoarthritis [abstract]. Ann Rheum Dis 2015;Suppl 2:376.
49. Waddell D, Reinz A, Parancis C, Coleman PM, Weiss C. Cost implications of introducing an alternative treatment for patients with osteoarthritis of the knee in a managed care setting. Am J Manag Care 2001;7:981–91.
50. Torrance GW, Raynauld JP, Walker V, Goldsmith CH, Bellamy N, Band PA, et al. A prospective, randomized, pragmatic, health outcomes trial evaluating the incorporation of hylan G-F 20 into the treatment paradigm for patients with knee osteoarthritis (Part 2 of 2): economic results. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2002;10:518–27.
51. Kahan A, Lleu PL, Salin L. Prospective randomised study comparing the medicoeconomic benefits of hylan GF-20 vs. conventional treatment in knee osteoarthritis. Joint Bone Spine 2003;70:276–81.
52. Yen ZS, Lai MS, Wang CT, Chen LS, Chen SC, Chen WJ, et al. Cost-effectiveness of treatment strategies for osteoarthritis of the knee in Taiwan. J Rheumatol 2004;31:1797–803.
53. Mazieres B, Bard H, Ligier M, Bru I, d’Orsay GG, Le Pen C. Medicoeconomic evaluation of hyaluronic acid for knee osteoarthritis in everyday practice: the MESSAGE study. Joint Bone Spine 2007;74:453–60.
70. Turajane T. Cost analysis of intra-articular sodium hyaluronate treatment in knee osteoarthritis patients who failed conservative treatment. J Med Assoc Thai 2007;90:1839–44.

71. Chou CW, Lue KH, Lee HS, Lin RC, Lu KH. Hylan G-F 20 has better pain relief and cost-effectiveness than sodium hyaluronate in treating early osteoarthritic knees in Taiwan. J Formos Med Assoc 2009;108:663–72.

72. Miller LE, Block JE. An 8-week knee osteoarthritis treatment program of hyaluronic acid injection, deliberate physical rehabilitation, and patient education is cost effective at 2 years follow-up: the OsteoArthritis Centers of America Experience. Clin Med Insights Arthritis Musculoskelet Disord 2014;7:49–55.

73. Hatoum HT, Fierlinger AL, Lin SJ, Altman RD. Cost-effectiveness analysis of intra-articular injections of a high molecular weight bioengineered hyaluronic acid for the treatment of osteoarthritis knee pain. J Med Econ 2014;17:326–37.

74. Raynauld JP, Torrance GW, Band PA, Goldsmith CH, Tugwell P, Walker V, et al. A prospective, randomized, pragmatic, health outcomes trial evaluating the incorporation of hylan G-F 20 into the treatment paradigm for patients with knee osteoarthritis (part 1 of 2): clinical results. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2002;10:506–17.

75. Turajane T. Outcomes of intra-articular injection of sodium hyaluronate for the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. J Med Assoc Thai 2007;90:1845–52.

76. Miller LE, Block JE. An 8-week multimodal treatment program improves symptoms of knee osteoarthritis: a real-world multicenter experience. Pragmatic Observational Res 2013;4:39–44.

77. Altman RD, Rosen JE, Bloch DA, Hatoum HT, Korner P. A double-blind, randomized, saline-controlled study of the efficacy and safety of Euflexxa for treatment of painful osteoarthritis of the knee, with an open-label safety extension (the FLEXX trial). Semin Arthritis Rheum 2009;39:1–9.

78. Altman RD, Rosen JE, Bloch DA, Hatoum HT. Safety and efficacy of retreatment with a bioengineered hyaluronate for painful osteoarthritis of the knee: results of the open-label extension Study of the FLEXX Trial. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2011;19:1169–75.