

Oxford Hip Score (OHS)

Measures pain & function in relation to daily activities

Phases

Pre-op
Post-acute
Active living



ICF

Body function
Activity¹



Time

5-10 mins^{1,2}



Administration

Print and online versions



Quality



Validity

THA: Excellent correlation with WOMAC global ($r_s = 0.84$), pain ($r_s = 0.85$) & function ($r_s = 0.82$) subscales^{3,4} yet content validity is questioned for a present-day THA population.⁵

THA: Spearman's $r_s = 0.50-0.80$ with SF12 subscales⁶ & SF-12 physical functioning subscore ($r_s = -0.67$).⁴

Hip OA: Strong correlation with SF-36 pain ($r_s = 0.72$), physical function ($r_s = 0.71$) & social function ($r_s = 0.58$) subscores.⁷



Reliability

THA: "Some good evidence in favor" of internal consistency and reproducibility.⁸ THA: Internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha was 0.85-0.86 (pre-op),^{7,9} 0.90 (3-mos post-op) & 0.92 (12-mos post-op respectively).⁹



Responsiveness

THA: Large SRM = 2.1 pre to 6-mos post-op¹⁰; Hip OA: "good evidence in favor" of responsiveness,⁸ Large ES = 1.98 after hyaluronic acid injections.⁷



Floor/ceiling effects

THA/Hip OA: No floor/ceiling effects reported,^{7,11} 1-yr post-op, ceiling effects reported for pain and function subscores⁴



Feasibility

Quick to complete & score, routinely used in joint replacement clinical registries, however, requires free registration to use.



Instructions

Ask patient to respond to questions based on a 4-wk recall period. See 'Relevant Links' for detailed instructions.

Scoring: Score responses from 0 (worse) to 4 (best) for total score 0 to 48. Pain & function subscores can also be calculated. Note: In 2007, a new scoring system of 0 (worst) to 48 (best) was developed; previously it was 12 (best) to 60 (worst)- interpret and report scores accordingly.³



Interpretation

Direction: Higher score = better^{1,3}

MDC₉₀: THA: 5 points¹²; Hip OA: 6.1 points⁷

MCID: THA: 8 points¹²

Normative/Reference values: Pre- & post-THA reference-based values available by age and gender.¹³

Cut points/thresholds: Based on single Canadian surgeon's caseload, patients with OHS >34 points were deemed non-surgical.¹⁴

PASS: THA: At 3-mo, 1-yr, and 2-yr intervals, PASS thresholds = 34 (CI 31–36), 40 (CI 36–44), & 39 (CI 35–42) points.¹⁵ At 12-mos & 2-yrs post-op PASS thresholds = 30.6 (95% CI 29.0-32.2) & 30.5 (95% CI 29.3-31.8).¹⁶ THA: Treatment failure (TF) values at 12-mos & 2-yrs were 25.5 (95% CI 22.9-27.7) & 27.0 (95% CI 25.2-28.8).¹⁶



Other

Key messages: Recommended. Quick and easy to administer and score. Acceptable psychometric properties although content validity questioned for THA. Commonly used in THA registries. A license is required (free for clinical purposes) but can be accessed online from Orthopaedic Scores.

Translations: Available in multiple languages.¹⁷



Relevant Links

[Summary & instructions \(Oxford University\)](#)

[Licencing \(Oxford University\)](#)

[List of available languages \(Oxford University\)](#)¹⁷

[Online fillable PDF \(Orthopaedicscores.com\)](#)

[Summary & instructions \(Physiopedia\)](#)

[Summary & instructions \(Shirley Ryan AbilityLab\)](#)



References

1. Shirley Ryan Abilitylab. Oxford Hip Scale. December 4 2013. Accessed September 18, 2023. <https://www.sralab.org/rehabilitation-measures/oxford-hip-scale>
2. Weick JW, Bullard J, et al. Measures of hip function and symptoms. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2020; 72(Suppl 10):200-18.PMID: PMID: [33091262](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33091262/)
3. Physiopedia contributors. Oxford Hip Score. September 8 2022. Accessed 14 October 2023. https://www.physio-pedia.com/Oxford_Hip_Score
4. Garbuz DS, Xu M, et al. Patients' outcome after total hip arthroplasty: a comparison between the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities index and the Oxford 12-item hip score. J Arthroplasty. 2006;21(7):998-1004. PMID: [17027542](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17027542/)
5. Holmenlund C, Overgaard S, et al. Evaluation of the Oxford Hip Score: Does it still have content validity? Interviews of total hip arthroplasty patients. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2021;19(1):237. <https://hql.o.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12955-021-01869-8>
6. Paulsen A, Odgaard A, et al. Translation, cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Danish version of the Oxford hip score: Assessed against generic and disease-specific questionnaires. Bone Joint Res. 2012;1(9):225-33. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3626210/>
7. Martinelli N, Longo UG, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation and validation with reliability, validity, and responsiveness of the Italian version of the Oxford Hip Score in patients with hip osteoarthritis. Qual Life Res. 2011;20(6):923-9. PMID: [21136297](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21136297/)
8. Harris K, Dawson J, et al. Systematic review of measurement properties of patient-reported outcome measures used in patients undergoing hip and knee arthroplasty. Patient Relat Outcome Meas. 2016;7:101-8. <https://www.dovepress.com/systematic-review-of-measurement-properties-of-patient-reported-outcom-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-PROM>
9. Fitzpatrick R, Morris R, et al. The value of short and simple measures to assess outcomes for patients of total hip replacement surgery. Qual Health Care. 2000;9(3):146-50. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1743526/>
10. Kang S. Assessing responsiveness of the EQ-5D-3L, the Oxford Hip Score, and the Oxford Knee Score in the NHS patient-reported outcome measures. J Orthop Surg Res. 2021;16(1):18. <https://josr-online.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13018-020-02126-2>
11. Lim CR, Harris K, et al. Floor and ceiling effects in the OHS: an analysis of the NHS PROMs data set. BMJ Open. 2015;5(7):e007765. <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/7/e007765.long>
12. Beard, D.J., Harris, K, et al. Meaningful changes for the Oxford hip and knee scores after joint replacement surgery. J Clin Epidemiol. 2015;68(1):73-9. [https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0895-4356\(14\)00341-2](https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0895-4356(14)00341-2)
13. Hamilton DF, Giesinger JM, et al. Making the Oxford Hip and Knee Scores meaningful at the patient level through normative scoring and registry data. Bone Joint Res. 2015;4(8):137-44. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4561372/>
14. Neufeld ME, Masri BA. Can the Oxford Knee and Hip Score identify patients who do not require total knee or hip arthroplasty? Bone Joint J. 2019;101-B(Supple B):23-30. PMID: [31146569](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31146569/)
15. Galea VP, Ingelsrud LH, et al. Patient-acceptable symptom state for the Oxford Hip Score and Forgotten Joint Score at 3 months, 1 year, and 2 years following total hip arthroplasty: a registry-based study of 597 cases. Acta Orthop. 2020 Aug;91(4):372-377. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8023959/>
16. Harris LK, Troelsen A, et al. Interpretation threshold values for the Oxford Hip Score in patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty: Advancing their clinical use. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2023;105(10):797-804. PMID: [36947604](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36947604/)
17. Oxford University Innovation. The Oxford Hip Score (OHS). April 2021. Accessed November 8 2023. https://innovation.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/OHS_language-list_April-2021-1.pdf

