

Clinical Commissioning Policy

CMICB_Clin101

Pinnaplasty for prominent ear

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

Contents

1. Policy statement	2
2. Exclusions	2
3. Core Eligibility Criteria	2
4. Rationale behind the policy statement.....	3
5. Summary of evidence review and references.....	3
6. Advice and Guidance.....	4
7. Monitoring and Review	6
8. Quality and Equality Analysis	6
9. Clinical Coding.....	6
Document Control.....	7

Last Reviewed: May 2025

This policy statement will be reviewed 5 years from the date of the last review unless new evidence or technology is available sooner.

1. Policy statement

1.1 Children and adolescents with prominent ears will only be offered pinnaplasty if they meet the following criteria:

1.2.1 The patient is aged 7 years to 18 years inclusive:

AND

- The prominent ear, upper 3rd mastoid – helical distance is ≥ 21.5 mm

AND

- During the clinical assessment, a consultant surgeon can verify that the child is suffering from significant psychological distress due to their prominent ears (in cases of bullying/teasing at school, provision of documented evidence from the head teacher (or equivalent) will complement this assessment)

AND

- The child and parent understand the risks, likely outcome and are motivated to proceed with surgery.

OR

- If there are functional reasons for the procedure, such as the need to keep a hearing aid in place or ears folding over when asleep causing pain, all other cases of Pinnaplasty will not be commissioned.

2. Exclusions

2.1 None.

3. Core Eligibility Criteria

3.1 There are several circumstances where a patient may meet a 'core eligibility criterion' which means they are eligible to be referred for this procedure or treatment, regardless of whether they meet the policy statement criteria, or the procedure or treatment is not routinely commissioned.

3.2 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, dehiscent surgical wounds, necrotising fasciitis.
- For patients expressing gender incongruence, further information can be also be found in the current ICB gender incongruence policy and within the [NHS England gender services programme](https://www.england.nhs.uk/commissioning/spec-services/npc-crg/gender-dysphoria-clinical-programme/) - <https://www.england.nhs.uk/commissioning/spec-services/npc-crg/gender-dysphoria-clinical-programme/>

4. Rationale behind the policy statement

- 4.1 The criteria within the policy statement were based on the findings of a rapid review (see below) and in conjunction with surgical opinion at Alder hey Hospital.
- 4.2 The policy criteria are slightly more restrictive than Royal College of Surgeons' (RCS) guidance. Whilst RCS specify a lower age limit of 5 years, the policy statement specifies a minimum age of 7 years. This was based on local surgical opinion which raised concerns about the additional surgical risks in very young children.
- 4.3 Surgical opinion also modified the definition of "prominent" ear (i.e. mastoid – helical distance >21.5 mm) as this was felt to be more clinically appropriate.

5. Summary of evidence review and references

- 5.1 A rapid review on the clinical effectiveness of pinnaplasty, written by a consultant paediatric plastic surgeon and Consultant in public health, concluded there is moderate quality evidence that some children with prominent ears experience substantial psychological distress due to their ears and in around half of these, clinical anxiety and/or depression may result.
- 5.2 Explicit signs of bullying and teasing may be an indicator of psychological and emotional distress in some although there will be a small cohort of others who suffer the same degree of distress yet these children "suffer in silence".
- 5.3 Further, there is strong evidence that pinnaplasty (in children who are experiencing psychological distress as a result of their prominent ears) results in significant improvements in their wellbeing and health-related quality-of-life. Self-confidence and self-esteem are improved resulting in enhanced social and leisure activities. Post-operative satisfaction with the surgical procedure is extremely high.
- 5.4 The detailed review is available at the end of this document.

6. Advice and Guidance

6.1 Aim and Objectives

- 6.1.1 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.
- 6.1.2 This policy relates to the commissioning of interventions which optimise clinical effectiveness and represent value for money.
- 6.1.3 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.
- 6.1.4 At the time of publication, the evidence presented per procedure/treatment was the most current available.
- 6.1.5 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.
- 6.1.6 Owing to the nature of clinical commissioning policies, it is necessary to refer to the biological sex of patients on occasion. When the terms 'men' and 'women' are used in this document (unless otherwise specified), this refers to biological sex. It is acknowledged that this may not necessarily be the gender to which individual patients identify.

6.2 Core Principles

- 6.2.1 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.

6.3 Individual Funding Requests (Clinical Exceptionality Funding)

- 6.3.1 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.
- 6.3.2 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 available on the C&M ICB website: <https://www.cheshireandmerseyside.nhs.uk/your-health/individual-funding-requests-ifr/>

6.4 Cosmetic Surgery

- 6.4.1 Cosmetic surgery is often carried out to change a person's appearance to achieve what a person perceives to be a more desirable look.
- 6.4.2 Cosmetic surgery/treatments are regarded as procedures of low clinical priority and therefore not routinely commissioned by the ICB Commissioner.
- 6.4.3 A summary of Cosmetic Surgery is provided by NHS Choices. Weblink: [Cosmetic procedures - NHS](#)

6.5 Diagnostic Procedures

- 6.5.1 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.
- 6.5.2 Where a General Practitioner/Optometrlist/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/Optometrlist/Dentist, in order for them to make a decision on future treatment.

6.6 Clinical Trials

- 6.6.1 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.

7. Monitoring and Review

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 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.
- 7.3 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
- 7.4 This policy will be kept under regular review, to ensure that it reflects developments in the evidence base regarding effectiveness and value.

8. Quality and Equality Analysis

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

9. Clinical Coding

- 9.1 **Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS)**

D03.3 Pinnaplasty: *Includes: Correction of prominent ear*

Document Control

Ref:	CMICB_Clin101 - Pinnaplasty for prominent ear
Version:	Version 0.4, May 2025
Supersedes:	Previous Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) Policies
Author (inc Job Title):	Consultant in Public Health, NHS Midlands and Lancashire
Ratified by: (Name of responsible Committee)	ICB Board
Cross reference to other Policies/Guidance	N/A
Date Ratified:	May 2025
Date Published and where (Intranet or Website):	June 2025 (Website)
Review date:	June 2030
Target audience:	All Cheshire & Merseyside ICB staff and provider organisations

Version History
Version 0.2 – September 2020 Criteria made more specific
Version 0.3 – July 2024 Re-formatting
Version 0.4 – May 2025 – This policy was part of a public engagement exercise, there was no feedback received.