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**1. Introduction and Purpose**  
The Low Priority Procedure (LPP) Policy T8 Male Circumcision is due for review and update as of January 2013. As a result of this, a review has been undertaken to research for any new or updated evidence for this policy on male circumcision. This briefing will identify any new or changed evidence as well as the sources for this evidence.

**2. Background and Methodology**

**3. Current policy**  
The CCG policy T8 Male Circumcision sets out the eligibility criteria for Male Circumcision surgical intervention in the population of Ipswich & East Suffolk and West Suffolk CCGs.  
A full comparison of the current policy and new literature has been undertaken. Through review of the literature and there are not any new updates identified around the approach to male circumcision. The evidence is summarized and identifies any changes that were found.

**4. Summary of Evidence Review**

**NICE:**  
A review of the NICE guidelines for male circumcision identifies no updated guidance. The treatment guidance includes diagnosing and timing for intervention.

**TRIP Cochrane: Database: SIGN (Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network):**  
www.clinicalguidelines.gov

- A literature search using the terms ‘circumcision’ and ‘male circumcision’ was performed. 40 pieces of literature were reviewed for new and updated approaches for male circumcision as well as changes in surgical eligibility. The current policy remains in scope with the current medical approaches for treatment.
Other CCGs

A review of other CCGs for ‘Male Circumcision’ included policy from Oxfordshire, Brent, Central London, Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Harrow, Hillingdon, and Hounslow, Lancashire, Hull, and NHSE. These policies contained largely the same guidance criteria as Suffolk, however there was some additional criteria noted in the majority of these policies around eligibility for recurrent UTIs with an abnormal urinary tract, and inclusion of wording around suspected penile cancer and traumatic foreskin injury.
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