medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Title

Does *one* exercise a day make the knee stronger and keep surgery away? A randomized dose-response trial of home-based knee-extensor exercise in patients eligible for knee replacement (the QUADX-1 trial).

Rasmus Skov Husted (RSH)[1,2,3*], Anders Troelsen (AT)[3], Henrik Husted (HH)[3], Birk Grønfeldt (BG)[1,2], Kristian Thorborg (KT)[2,4], Thomas Kallemose (TK)[1], Michael Skovdal Rathleff (MSR)[5,6,7], Thomas Bandholm (TB)[1,2]

[1]Department of Clinical Research, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.
[2]Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation Research – Copenhagen (PMR-C); Department of Physical and Occupational Therapy; Department of Clinical Research; Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.
[3]Clinical Orthopedic Research Hvidovre (CORH), Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.
[4]Sports Orthopaedic Research Center – Copenhagen (SORC-C), Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.
[5]Center for General Practice at Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.
[6]Department of Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark.
[7]Department of Health Science and Technology, Aalborg University, Denmark.

E-mail addresses: AT (a_troelsen@hotmail.com), HH (henrik.husted@regionh.dk), BG (birk.mygind.groenfeldt@regionh.dk), KT (kristian.thorborg@regionh.dk), TK (thomas.kallemose@regionh.dk), MSR (misr@hst.aau.dk), TB (thomas.quaade.bandholm@regionh.dk)

*Primary investigator and corresponding author. Department of Clinical Research (Section 056), Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Kettegaard Allé 30, 2650 Hvidovre, Denmark. Mail: rasmus.skov.husted@regionh.dk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives

To firstly investigate the efficacy of three different dosages of home-based, knee-extensor strength exercise on isometric knee-extensor strength in patients eligible for knee replacement due to severe knee osteoarthritis, and secondly, the influence of exercise on symptoms, physical function and decision on surgery.

Design

Randomized dose-response trial.

Setting

Primary and secondary care.

Participants

One-hundred and forty patients eligible for knee replacement were included. Eligibility for surgery was assessed by an orthopedic surgeon specialized in knee arthroplasty.

Interventions

Patients were randomized to three groups; 2, 4 or 6 home-based knee-extensor exercise-sessions per week (group 2, 4 and 6 respectively) for 12 weeks (N=47/group). Exercise instruction was given by a trained physiotherapist.

Main outcome measures

The primary outcome was isometric knee-extensor strength. Secondary outcomes were Oxford Knee Score, Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, average knee pain last week (0-10 numeric rating scale), 6-minute walk test, stair climbing test, exercise adherence and “need for surgery”. The primary endpoint was after 12 weeks of exercise (before surgery) and the secondary after surgery. Outcome assessors and patients were blinded to allocation.

Results

After 12 weeks of exercise, data were available for 117 patients (N=39/group). Isometric knee-extensor strength increased in all groups but intention-to-treat analysis showed no difference between the three groups in change from baseline to after 12 weeks of exercise in isometric knee-extensor muscle strength: Group 2 vs. 4 (0.009 Nm/kg [95% CI -0.15 to 0.17], P=0.913), group 2 vs. 6 (-0.03 Nm/kg [95% CI -0.18 to 0.13], P=0.725) and group 4 vs. 6 (-0.04 Nm/kg [95% CI -0.20 to 0.13], P=0.668). For the secondary

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

outcomes a significant difference before surgery was found between group 2 and group 6 for Oxford Knee Score (4.2 [95% CI 0.6 to 7.8], P=0.02) and average knee pain last week (NRS 0-10) (-1.1 [95% -2.2 to -0.1], P=0.03) in favour of group 2. No other differences were observed before and after surgery. After the 12-week exercise intervention, 38 (32.5%) patients wanted surgery and 79 (67.5%) postponed surgery. This was independent of exercise dosage.

Conclusion

Knee-extensor strength increased with both 2, 4 and 6 exercise sessions per week but none of the prescribed exercise dosages were superior to the others for the primary outcome isometric knee-extensor strength after 12 weeks. Two home-based knee-extensor exercise sessions a week seems superior to six for patient-reported outcomes, and across exercise dosages, only one in three patients decided to have surgery after the coordinated home-based exercise intervention.

Trial registration

ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT02931058, pre-registered October 10th, 2016. Protocol PubMed (PMID: 29347947).

Key words

Knee osteoarthritis, knee replacement, dose-response relationship, knee-extensor, exercise therapy, coordinated non-surgical and surgical care, decision on surgery.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

What is already known on this topic

Clinical guidelines recommend exercise therapy targeting the knee-extensor muscles in patients eligible for knee replacement before surgery is considered.

Exercise therapy may reduce knee osteoarthritis symptoms and impact the decision on surgery, but the dose-response relationship is not described.

Exercise therapy is typically delivered as supervised programs requiring physical attendance at fixed times and often require self-payment, which may be a barrier for some patients.

What this study adds

Knee-extensor strength increased with 2, 4 and 6 exercise sessions per week, but none of the prescribed exercise dosages were superior to the others after 12 weeks – indicating no dose-response relationship.

Two in three patients eligible for knee replacement decided to postpone knee replacement surgery after 12 weeks of home-based exercise with *one* simple exercise.

This study successfully employed a model of coordinated care where the patients' decision on surgical treatment was re-evaluated based on symptom changes following simple home-based exercise therapy. These findings suggest using a model of coordinated non-surgical and surgical care to improve the decision on surgery for patients eligible for knee replacement.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Recent findings show that exercise therapy in patients with knee OA can reduce symptoms before potential surgery and postpone surgery in 50% or more of cases.[1–4] In line with this, guidelines from knee OA societies recommend that exercise therapy is tried out before surgery is considered in patients eligible for knee replacement.[5–10] Because the indication for knee replacement is not clear-cut, identifying the right patients to operate at the right time is difficult[11,12] – making the coordination of non-surgical and surgical care crucial in selecting the right candidates for knee replacement.[13–16] Any changes in symptoms after exercise therapy may play an important role in the shared decision-making process on the decision for surgery.[17–20]

Exercise programs for patients with knee OA like 'Good Life with osteoArthritis in Denmark' (GLA:D) - now successfully implemented worldwide[21] - and 'Better management of patients with OsteoArthritis' (BOA) support the effectiveness of exercise therapy and education for this patient population and deliver optimized care.[22–25] These exercise programs are supervised, require physical attendance at fixed times and often require self-payment; factors which can be barriers for some patients and hinder participation and long-term adherence, creating inequality for the care accessible.[26–29] An important element in exercise programs for patients with knee OA is knee-extensor strength[30], as decreased knee-extensor strength is associated with an increased risk of developing knee OA,[31] risk of knee pain and decline in function.[32] Our recent meta-regression analysis suggest no dose-response relationship between prescribed knee-extensor exercise and change in outcomes after knee-extensor exercise in patients scheduled for knee replacement – indicating that small exercise dosages might be equally effective to larger.[33] Based on these results, we investigated the dose-response relationship of *one* home-based exercise targeting the knee-extensor muscles, using a very simple and low-cost exercise option. Compared to supervised exercise programs, this solution does not require physical attendance at fixed times and is free of charge – providing patients with an alternative treatment option.

The QUADX-1 trial was designed within a model of coordinated care where the patients' decision on surgical treatment was re-evaluated based on symptom changes following home-based exercise therapy. The re-evaluation was a shared decision-making process between the patient and an orthopedic surgeon.

We asked the following questions:

1) Is there a dose-response relationship between knee-extensor exercise and change in isometric knee-extensor strength in patients eligible for knee replacement?

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2) Do different dosages of simple knee-extensor exercise change symptoms and decision on surgery in patients eligible for knee replacement?

The purpose was mainly to investigate the efficacy of three different dosages of home-based, knee-extensor strength exercise on isometric knee-extensor strength in patients eligible for KR due to severe knee OA, and secondly, the influence of exercise on symptoms, physical function and decision on surgery. The primary hypothesis was that an exercise dosage of four knee-extensor strength sessions per week would elicit the greatest change in isometric knee-extensor strength pre-operatively compared to two or six sessions per week.

Methods

Trial design

This is the primary trial report for the Quadriceps Exercise Before Total Knee Arthroplasty Trial (The QUADX-1 Trial).[34] The trial is a three-arm parallel-group randomized dose-response trial with three intervention groups and no control group. The three intervention groups all performed *one* home-based knee-extensor exercise for 12 weeks with dosages of 2, 4, or 6 sessions per week, respectively. Outcomes were assessed at 1) baseline, 2) after 12 weeks of exercise (primary endpoint), 3) acutely after surgery and 4) three months after surgery. The trial was double blinded with blinding of all outcome assessors and all participants in relation to the intervention in the other groups and the trial hypothesis. Between October 2016 and January 2019 patients eligible for KR at the Orthopedic Department at Copenhagen University Hospital, Hvidovre were invited to participate. We pre-registered the trial on clinicaltrials.gov on 10th October, 2016 (NCT02931058) before enrollment of the first patient, and published the full trial protocol - including protocol amendments - open access on 18th January, 2018.[34] Approvals from the Ethics Committee of the Capital Region, Denmark (H-16025136) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (2012-58-0004) were obtained before the first patient was enrolled. This trial is reported according to recommendations in the CONSORT checklist.[35]

Trial amendments

Due to an oversight, the second research question and purpose were not pre-registered. Hence, we consider them secondary and exploratory. All other trial amendments are reported in the trial protocol.[34]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Participants

Patients potentially eligible for trial participation were recruited at the surgical outpatient clinic. The patients were referred from their general practitioner for surgical evaluation by an orthopedic surgeon specialized in KR surgery. The patients were told that if they agreed to participate, they would complete the home-based exercise intervention and afterwards their need for surgery would be re-evaluated. The inclusion criteria were: eligible for KR due to knee OA (assessed by an orthopedic surgeon), radiographically verified knee OA with Kellgren-Lawrence classification ≥ 2, average knee pain ≥ 3 (Numeric Rating Scale (NRS)) in the last week, eligible for home-based knee-extensor exercise, age ≥ 45 years, resident in one of three municipalities involved in the trial (Copenhagen, Hvidovre or Broendby) and able to speak and understand Danish. The exclusion criteria were: exercise therapy being contra-indicated, neurological disorder, diagnosed systemic decease (American Society of Anesthesiologists' physical status classification score ≥ 4),[36] terminal illness, severe bone deformity demanding use of non-standard implants, or a greater weekly alcohol consumption than the national recommendation.[37]

Interventions

Detailed intervention descriptions and all related intervention material can be found in the open access trial protocol[34] – including a link to an instructional video (http://bit.ly/2EV7NrF). Following baseline assessment, the patients were referred to a physiotherapist in their local municipal rehabilitation setting. Here the patients were instructed how to perform a single knee-extensor exercise at home. The knee-extensor exercise was performed sitting on a chair with an exercise band wrapped around the ankle and fixed behind a door for resistance (Figure 1). Patients were provided with a personal exercise band for exercising at home and a brochure with instructional notes and illustrations. The patients were randomized to one of three weekly exercise dosages: two, four or six sessions per week for twelve weeks. For all groups training comprised just the single knee-extensor strength exercise. Patients were instructed to perform the exercise in three sets of twelve repetitions at a load corresponding to twelve repetition maximum (RM) in each set with each repetition lasting eight seconds (concentric phase 3 s, isometric phase 1 s, eccentric phase 4 s) (Table 1). The rationale for prescribing *one* home-based exercise was that it is a simple and low-cost alternative to supervised exercise therapy programs. Further, it is pragmatic and time-saving, and therefore has the potential to facilitate adherence and mastery of the exercise while stressing the knee joint minimally.[38–40] A BandCizer© sensor was attached to the exercise band to objectively assess exercise adherence.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. The home-based knee-extensor exercise. The exercise band is fixed behind a door with an anchor. BandCizer© sensor technology was used to objectively assess exercise adherence.

Table 1. Prescribed knee-extensor exercise dosages.

Dosage groups	Group 2 2 sessions/week	Group 4 4 sessions/week	Group 6 6 sessions/week
Total weeks	12	12	12
Total sessions	24	48	72
Total sets	72	144	216
Total repetitions	864	1728	2592
Total time-under-tension (s)	6912	13824	20736

Outcome assessments and outcomes

Outcomes were assessed at four endpoints; at baseline (t_0), after twelve weeks of home-based exercise/before surgery (t_1), at hospital discharge (1-8 days after surgery) (t_2) and three months after surgery (t_3). Outcomes at endpoints t_2 and t_3 were only collected for patients that underwent surgery. The primary endpoint was after the exercise period (t_1) and the secondary endpoints were just before hospital discharge (t_2) and three months after surgery (t_3). After the 12-week exercise period, at endpoint t_1, each patient's decision on surgery was re-evaluated in a shared decision-making process between the patient and orthopedic surgeon (i.e. continue with exercise therapy or schedule KR surgery). Outcome assessments were performed blinded by the primary investigator and a research assistant dedicated to the trial. Both were trained according to the trial outcome assessment protocol to ensure standardized assessments throughout the trial. Following outcome assessments, the data were entered in the browser-based research database Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap 7.1.1) by blinded trial personnel. To ensure data validity, blinded double-data entry was used.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Primary outcome

The primary outcome was change in isometric knee-extensor strength from baseline to after the exercise period (t_0-t_1). Isometric knee-extensor strength was measured using a computerized strength chair (Good Strength Chair, Metitur Oy, Jyvaskyla, Finland), which is valid and reliable in the KR population.[41] Five measurements of maximal isometric knee-extensor strength at 60° knee flexion were completed, separated by 60-s pauses. The patients were instructed to extend their knee as forcefully as possible with a gradual increase in force over a 5-s period while receiving strong standardized verbal encouragement. Isometric knee-extensor strength is expressed as the maximal voluntary torque per kilogram body mass (Nm/kg). The highest obtained value was used for analysis. Isometric knee-extensor strength was chosen as the primary outcome, as it is relevant to have an outcome closely related to the exposure when investigating a dose-response relationship, while also being an outcome that can mediate other health effects.[42–44]

Secondary outcomes

The secondary outcomes were change in isometric knee-extensor strength after surgery (t_0-t_2 and t_0-t_3), change in performance-based function comprising six-minute walk test (6MWT), stair climb test (SCT), current knee pain and average knee pain during the last week (0-10 NRS), self-reported disability; Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) and Oxford Knee Score (OKS), "need for surgery" and objectively measured exercise adherence (t_0-t_1, t_0-t_2 and t_0-t_3). Other outcomes were registration of adverse events and harms.

The "need for surgery" outcome was an assessment of the patients' self-perceived need for surgery. After the 12-week exercise period at outcome assessment t_1 the patients were asked by the outcome assessor: *"Based on your knee symptoms in the last week would you say that you need knee surgery?"* Three answer options were possible: 1) *Yes, I believe I need surgery*, 2) *I do not know* or 3) *No, I do not believe I need surgery*.

Exercise therapy adherence was objectively quantified using a sensor attached to the exercise band (BandCizer© sensor technology). The sensor collects and stores data on date, time, number of sets, number of repetitions and time-under-tension (TUT). The sensor technology has been reported to be valid and reliable for musculoskeletal conditions.[45–47] In the present trial patients were defined as adherent if >75% of the prescribed exercise sessions were completed.

For detailed information on the secondary outcomes please see the protocol paper.[34]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Sample size

For the planned three-group one-way ANOVA analysis, a sample size of 126 patients (42 per group) was required to obtain a power of 80%. The a priori sample size calculation was based on a normal mean difference with a two-sided significance level of 0.05, a minimal clinical important difference of 0.15 Nm/kg (15%) and a common standard deviation of 0.22 Nm/kg in isometric knee-extensor strength.[48] To allow for a dropout rate of 10%, a total of 140 patients were included in the intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis.

Randomization, sequence generation, allocation concealment mechanisms and implementation

The patients were randomly assigned to one of the three exercise groups (two, four or six sessions per week) by a 1:1:1 allocation ratio. The random allocation sequence was computer-generated by a statistician otherwise not involved in the trial in any way. One hundred and forty sequentially numbered sealed opaque envelopes were generated. When a patient had been included in the trial (signed written informed consent and completed baseline assessment) a research assistant independent of the trial opened an envelope and informed the patient's municipality of the exercise group allocation. The random allocation sequence was stored on a secure password locked server only accessible by the research assistant independent of the trial.

Blinding

All outcome assessors and the data analysts were blinded to the exercise group allocation. At outcome assessments the assessors started by informing the patients not to mention their exercise dosage. For analysis the data was coded in such a way that group allocation was concealed blinding the data assessors and analysts to the patients' allocation. The physiotherapists and patients were not blinded to the allocation due to the nature of the intervention, however the patients were blinded to the other exercise dosages and the study hypothesis.

Statistical methods

The primary intention-to-treat analysis tested the hypothesis that an exercise dosage of four knee-extensor strength sessions per week would elicit a greater change in isometric knee-extensor strength pre-operatively compared to two or six sessions per week. For all outcomes, between group contrasts were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

compared using repeated measures of variance (one-way ANOVA). Normality assumptions of the model residuals were checked to ensure that the underlying assumptions of the statistical model were met. Results are presented firstly as absolute changes (e.g. Nm/kg) and secondly, as relative changes (%) from baseline. Mean scores with ±SD, between group contrasts (change scores) with 95% CI and p-values for each outcome at each time-point across all three groups are reported. Descriptive statistics are presented as mean with ±SD. Normal distribution of data was checked by q-q plots and histograms. As supplementary analyses, simple regression models were performed using the pooled exercise adherence data across all three groups. The dependent variables were the primary and secondary outcomes and the independent variable was exercise adherence quantified in two ways: 1) as total number of completed exercise sessions and 2) as total time-under-tension (TUT) per patient. All analyses followed the ITT principle and to create full datasets, missing data were imputed using multiple imputation (100 imputation sets). Multiple imputation models were based on age, gender, group allocation and all previous scores in relevant outcomes. Missing data at the different time-points are presented in appendix 1. All analyses were performed blinded by the principal investigator and a statistician, and followed the pre-specified analysis plan.[34] Analyses were performed in SAS Enterprise Guide version 7.1.

Patient and public involvement

The trial outcome assessment procedures were piloted in seven patients before initiating the trial. Here the patients could provide feedback on the procedures. This was done to refine and standardize the trial outcome-assessment protocol. As an embedded part of the trial, participating patients (unpublished), and orthopedic surgeons and physiotherapists[49] were interviewed about their perceived facilitators and barriers related to the trial. No other contributions from patients or the public were used for the trial design, research question, outcomes, recruitment or conduct of the trial.

Results

Participant flow, Recruitment and Baseline data

Between 25th October 2016 and 8th January 2019, 898 patients potentially eligible for KR were assessed for eligibility. One-hundred and forty patients were included and randomized to an exercise dosage of 2 sessions/week, 4 sessions/week or 6 sessions/week (Figure 2, flow chart). Assessments at the primary endpoint (after 12 weeks of exercise [t_1]) was completed for 117 patients with 39 in each group. At the two secondary endpoints, 32 patients were available for assessment. Assessments were completed for 17

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

patients acutely after surgery (t_2) and for 25 patients three months after surgery (t_3). Reasons for drop-out and missing data for each group are provided in figure 2. For the intention-to-treat analyses, 140 patients were included in the primary analysis (t_0-t_1) and 32 patients were included in the secondary analyses (t_0-t_2 and t_0-t_3). Baseline characteristics are provided in table 2 for the whole sample and for each group separately. The baseline characteristics were comparable between groups (no statistical hypothesis testing was undertaken as suggested by the CONSORT group).[35] Separate baseline characteristics for the patients lost to follow-up and the remaining patients are provided in appendix 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Flow chart of each assessment time-point of the trial according to the CONSORT guidelines.[35] ITT = intention-to-treat analysis. Dotted lines indicate assessment time-points after surgery. *6 patients (N=2/group) wanted surgery but had competing co-morbidities disqualifying them as candidates for surgery (Appendix 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Baseline characteristics (t_0).

Characteristics Mean (SD)	All patients N = 140	Group 2 N = 47	Group 4 N = 47	Group 6 N = 46
Gender (f/m)	76/64	22/25	29/18	25/21
Age (years)	66.7 (9.9)	67.5 (9.7)	66.8 (10.0)	65.8 (10.0)
Weight (kg)	91.9 (19.9)	92.1 (17.0)	94.2 (21.8)	89.8 (20.3)
Height (cm)	169.2 (8.3)	168.7 (7.0)	170.1 (7.7)	169.1 (9.9)
Municipality (Cph/Hvi/Bro)	74/44/22	22/16/9	23/16/8	29/12/5
Kellgren and Lawrence score (2/3/4)*	20/61/57	5/20/21	9/19/18	6/22/18
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	2.2 (2.2)	2.1 (2.4)	2.1 (2.2)	2.4 (2.1)
Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)	5.8 (1.6)	5.7 (1.6)	5.8 (1.6)	5.8 (1.4)
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	1.27 (0.52)	1.31 (0.57)	1.22 (0.49)	1.28 (0.51)
KOOS Symptoms (0-100)	55.0 (18.8)	58.9 (19.4)	53.4 (16.7)	52.9 (19.6)
KOOS Pain (0-100)	49.7 (16.4)	51.7 (16.5)	48.2 (16.7)	49.6 (15.5)
KOOS ADL (0-100)	55.3 (17.5)	57.7 (17.0)	51.7 (17.5)	56.3 (17.3)
KOOS Sport (0-100)	21.0 (20.8)	24.5 (23.6)	16.8 (16.7)	21.3 (20.1)
KOOS QoL (0-100)	32.7 (16.3)	35.4 (16.3)	31.2 (16.1)	31.1 (15.9)
OKS (0-48)	24.8 (7.6)	26.2 (7.3)	23.2 (8.0)	24.9 (7.0)
6MWT (m)	402.3 (105.3)	416.5 (94.1)	387.7 (112.2)	402.1 (102.8)
SCT up (secs)	9.4 (5.1)	8.7 (5.1)	10.3 (5.4)	9.0 (4.6)
SCT down (secs)	10.4 (6.7)	8.9 (5.3)	11.9 (7.9)	10.4 (6.4)

Abbreviations: Cph = Copenhagen, Hvi = Hvidovre, Bro = Broendby, NRS = Numeric Rating Scale, KOOS = Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test. * = missing data on two patients.

Numbers analyzed, Outcomes and estimation and Ancillary analyses

The outcome scores for the primary and secondary outcomes at the primary endpoint (t_1) are presented in table 3. Due to the large proportion of patients who postponed surgery after the exercise intervention, only 32 patients were available for the post-operative intention-to-treat analyses at the secondary endpoints; acutely after surgery (t_2) and three months after surgery (t_3). Separate baseline characteristics of the 32 patients who had surgery is presented in appendix 4. No between group differences for any outcomes were observed for the assessments at these endpoints (Appendix 5 and 6).

Assessment after exercise (primary endpoint (t_1))

Primary outcome – Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg): The intention-to-treat analysis showed no difference between the three groups in change between baseline and following 12 weeks of exercise (primary endpoint (t_0-t_1)) in *isometric knee-extensor muscle strength*: group 2 vs. 4; 0.009 Nm/kg (0.1%) [95% CI -0.15 to 0.17], P=0.913, group 2 vs. 6; -0.03 Nm/kg (-2.6%) [95% CI -0.18 to 0.13], P=0.725 and group 4 vs. 6; -0.04 Nm/kg (-2.7%) [95% CI -0.20 to 0.13], P=0.668 (Figure 3). Within group changes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

between baseline and following 12 weeks of exercise showed an increase in *isometric knee-extensor muscle strength* for the whole sample and all three groups separately, though not statistically significant for group 4: whole sample; 0.13 Nm/kg (10.2%) [95% CI 0.07 to 0.19], P=<0.0001, group 2; 0.12 Nm/kg (9.2%) [95% 0.02 to 0.22], P=0.021, group 4; 0.11 Nm/kg (9.0%) [95% -0.01 to 0.23], P=0.064 and group 6; 0.15 Nm/kg (11.7%) [95% CI 0.04 to 0.25], P=0.007 (Table 3).

Secondary outcomes: The intention-to-treat analyses showed a significant difference in change between baseline and following 12 weeks of exercise between group 2 and 6 in favour of group 2 for *Oxford Knee Score*: 4.2 OKS points (15.2%) [95% CI 0.6 to 7.8], P=0.021 (Figure 4) and *average knee pain last week* (NRS 0-10): -1.1 NRS points (-19.5%) [95% -2.2 to -0.1], P=0.030 (Table 3). No between group differences were observed for any other group comparisons or secondary outcomes at the primary endpoint after 12 weeks exercise. Within group changes showed a positive change for the whole sample, and all three groups separately, for all secondary outcomes at the primary endpoint. Larger changes were observed in group 2 compared to group 4 and 6, and in group 4 compared to group 6. For the outcome "*need for surgery*"; 37 patients answered "*Yes, I believe I need surgery*", 25 "*I do not know*" and 55 "*No, I do not believe I need surgery*". For the distribution of answers between the three groups, see table 3.

Table 3. Mean change in all outcomes between baseline and following 12 weeks home-based exercise (t_0-t_1). Intention-to-treat analysis, N = 140. One-way ANOVA based on imputed data.

	Mean change (95% CI) from baseline within groups (effect = time)			Mean change (95% CI) from baseline between groups (effect = time*group)			
	Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change		Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change
Primary outcome							
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)							
All patients	0.13 (0.07 to 0.19)	<0.0001	10.2%				
Group 2	0.12 (0.02 to 0.22)	0.021	9.2%	Group 2 vs. 4	0.009 (-0.15 to 0.17)	0.913	0.1%
Group 4	0.11 (-0.007 to 0.23)	0.064	9.0%	Group 2 vs. 6	-0.03 (-0.18 to 0.13)	0.725	-2.6%
Group 6	0.15 (0.04 to 0.25)	0.007	11.7%	Group 4 vs. 6	-0.04 (-0.20 to 0.13)	0.668	-2.7%
Secondary outcomes							
KOOS Symptoms							
All patients	9.1 (5.6 to 12.6)	<0.0001	16.5%				
Group 2	12.9 (6.2 to 19.6)	0.0001	21.9%	Group 2 vs. 4	4.9 (-3.6 to 13.4)	0.257	4.9%
Group 4	8.0 (2.6 to 13.4)	0.003	17.0%	Group 2 vs. 6	6.4 (-2.2 to 14.9)	0.144	9.6%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Group 6	6.5 (0.5 to 12.5)	0.032	12.3%	Group 4 vs. 6	1.7 (-6.9 to 10.3)	0.698	4.8%
KOOS Pain							
All patients	9.9 (6.7 to 13.2)	<0.0001	19.9%				
Group 2	13.7 (7.5 to 19.8)	<0.0001	26.5%	Group 2 vs. 4	3.8 (-3.9 to 11.5)	0.331	6.4%
Group 4	9.7 (4.7 to 14.8)	<0.0001	20.1%	Group 2 vs. 6	6.9 (-1.3 to 15.0)	0.098	12.8%
Group 6	6.8 (1.4 to 12.2)	0.014	13.7%	Group 4 vs. 6	2.8 (-5.2 to 10.7)	0.492	6.4%
KOOS ADL							
All patients	9.2 (5.9 to 12.4)	<0.0001	16.6%				
Group 2	11.6 (6.0 to 17.2)	<0.0001	20.1%	Group 2 vs. 4	2.1 (-5.8 to 10.0)	0.603	1.7%
Group 4	9.5 (3.9 to 14.9)	<0.0001	18.4%	Group 2 vs. 6	4.6 (-3.5 to 12.7)	0.259	7.8%
Group 6	6.9 (1.3 to 12.7)	0.015	12.3%	Group 4 vs. 6	2.5 (-5.5 to 10.4)	0.541	6.1%
KOOS Sport							
All patients	8.4 (4.3 to 12.6)	<0.001	40.0%				
Group 2	10.7 (2.0 to 19.5)	0.015	43.7%	Group 2 vs. 4	3.8 (-6.3 to 13.9)	0.453	2.6%
Group 4	6.9 (0.5 to 13.5)	0.036	41.1%	Group 2 vs. 6	3.3 (-7.0 to 13.6)	0.530	8.5%
Group 6	7.5 (1.3 to 13.6)	0.016	35.2%	Group 4 vs. 6	-0.3 (-10.7 to 10.1)	0.955	-5.9%
KOOS QoL							
All patients	8.2 (4.6 to 11.8)	<0.0001	25.1%				
Group 2	11.6 (4.9 to 18.2)	<0.0001	32.8%	Group 2 vs. 4	4.2 (-4.7 to 12.9)	0.351	9.4%
Group 4	7.3 (1.6 to 12.9)	0.012	23.4%	Group 2 vs. 6	5.6 (-3.5 to 14.6)	0.226	13.5%
Group 6	6.0 (-0.6 to 12.7)	0.076	19.3%	Group 4 vs. 6	1.8 (-7.7 to 10.1)	0.792	4.1%
OKS							
All patients	4.5 (3.0 to 5.9)	<0.0001	18.1%				
Group 2	6.4 (3.8 to 9.0)	<0.0001	24.4%	Group 2 vs. 4	1.6 (-1.9 to 5.1)	0.366	3.3%
Group 4	4.9 (2.6 to 7.1)	<0.0001	21.1%	Group 2 vs. 6	4.2 (0.6 to 7.8)	0.021	15.2%
Group 6	2.3 (-0.3 to 4.8)	0.080	9.2%	Group 4 vs. 6	2.6 (-0.9 to 6.2)	0.138	11.9%
Current pain							
All patients	-0.3 (-0.8 to 0.1)	0.168	-13.6%				
Group 2	-0.4 (-1.2 to 0.4)	0.327	-19.0%	Group 2 vs. 4	-0.2 (-1.3 to 0.9)	0.700	-14.3%
Group 4	-0.1 (-0.9 to 0.6)	0.709	-4.8%	Group 2 vs. 6	0.1 (-1.0 to 1.2)	0.887	1.8%
Group 6	-0.5 (-1.3 to 0.3)	0.264	-20.8%	Group 4 vs. 6	0.3 (-0.8 to 1.5)	0.563	16.1%
Pain last week							
All patients	-1.2 (-1.6 to -0.8)	<0.0001	-20.7%				
Group 2	-1.8 (-2.6 to -1.1)	<0.0001	- 31.6%	Group 2 vs. 4	-0.7 (-1.7 to 0.3)	0.157	-12.6%
Group 4	-1.1 (-1.8 to -0.4)	0.001	-19.0%	Group 2 vs. 6	-1.1 (-2.2 to -0.1)	0.030	-19.5%
Group 6	-0.7 (-1.4 to 0.04)	0.062	-12.1%	Group 4 vs. 6	-0.4 (-1.5 to 0.6)	0.398	-6.9%
6MWT							
All patients	19.2 (3.0 to 35.4)	0.020	4.8%				
Group 2	33.7 (3.5 to 63.8)	0.028	8.1%	Group 2 vs. 4	24.1 (-16.2 to 64.4)	0.237	5.3%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Group 4	10.9 (-16.6 to 38.6)	0.435	2.8%	Group 2 vs. 6	20.1 (-22.0 to 62.3)	0.345	4.7%
Group 6	13.5 (-15.4 to 42.5)	0.359	3.4%	Group 4 vs. 6	-1.7 (-42.6 to 39.2)	0.933	-0.5%
SCT up							
All patients	-0.9 (-1.6 to -0.2)	0.010	-9.6%				
Group 2	-1.4 (-2.8 to 0.1)	0.065	-16.1%	Group 2 vs. 4	0.03 (-1.8 to 1.8)	0.976	2.5%
Group 4	-1.4 (-2.6 to -0.1)	0.031	-13.6%	Group 2 vs. 6	-1.3 (-3.1 to 0.5)	0.151	-15.5%
Group 6	-0.05 (-1.1 to 0.9)	0.929	-0.6%	Group 4 vs. 6	-1.3 (-3.1 to 0.4)	0.140	-13.0%
SCT down							
All patients	-1.4 (-2.3 to -0.5)	0.001	-13.5%				
Group 2	-1.4 (-2.8 to 0.1)	0.060	-15.7%	Group 2 vs. 4	0.7 (-1.4 to 2.9)	0.501	1.9%
Group 4	-2.1 (-3.9 to -0.2)	0.028	-17.6%	Group 2 vs. 6	-0.5 (-2.7 to 1.6)	0.624	-8.0%
Group 6	-0.8 (-2.1 to 0.5)	0.204	-7.7%	Group 4 vs. 6	-1.3 (-2.9 to 1.4)	0.263	-10.0%

"Need for surgery"

	Yes, I believe I need surgery	*I do not know*	*No, I do not believe I need surgery*
All patients (N=117)	37 (31.6%)	25 (21.4%)	55 (47.0%)
Group 2 (N=39)	9 (23.1%)	7 (18.0%)	23 (58.9%)
Group 4 (N=39)	13 (33.3%)	7 (18.0%)	19 (48.7%)
Group 6 (N=39)	15 (38.5%)	11 (28.2%)	13 (33.3%)

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Isometric knee-extensor strength reported as Nm/kg (positive change = improvement); Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) subscale reported on 0-100 scale (positive change = improvement); Oxford Knee Score (OKS) reported on 0-48 scale (positive change = improvement); Pain scores reported on Numeric Raring Scales (NRS 0-10) (negative change = improvement); Six-minute walk test (6MWT) reported in meters (positive change = improvement); Star climb test (SCT) reported in seconds (negative change= improvement); The "need for surgery" outcome was an assessment of the patients self-perceived need for surgery. After the 12-week exercise period at outcome assessment t_1 the patients were asked by the outcome assessor: *"Based on your knee symptoms in the last week would you say that you need knee surgery?"*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Isometric knee-extensor muscle strength (Nm/kg) at baseline (t_0) and after twelve weeks of home-based knee-extensor exercise (t_1) across the three groups. The X represents the mean value and the whiskers the corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



355

356 Figure 4. Oxford Knee Scores at baseline (t_0) and after twelve weeks of home-based knee-extensor exercise (t_1) across
357 the three groups. The X represents the mean value and the whiskers the corresponding 95% confidence intervals.
358 *=change score for group 2 significantly higher than group 6 (P=0.021).

359

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Treatment decision after exercise therapy

As a post hoc analysis, the number of patients who underwent surgery and those who postponed surgery were registered. Of the 117 patients with follow-up assessments after 12 weeks of exercise (Figure 2), 79 (67.5%) postponed surgery, 32 (27.4%) underwent KR, and 6 (5.1%) wanted surgery, but the orthopedic surgeon deemed this as contra-indicated due to co-morbidities (Appendix 3) (Table 4).

Table 4. Shared surgical decision after exercise therapy.

	All patients	Group 2	Group 4	Group 6
	N = 117	N = 39	N = 39	N = 39
Postponed surgery, N (%)	79 (67.5%)	30 (76.9%)	25 (64.1%)	24 (61.6%)
Surgery, N (%)	32 (27.4%)	7 (18.0%)	12 (30.8%)	13 (33.3%)
Wanted surgery but surgery was contra indicated*, N (%)	6 (5.1%)	2 (5.1%)	2 (5.1%)	2 (5.1%)

Distribution of treatment decision across the whole sample and the three groups, number and percentage. *Six patients wanted surgery but had co-morbidities disqualifying them as candidates for surgery (Appendix 3).

Table 5. Patients' self-perceived "need for surgery" and surgical decision after exercise therapy.

Shared surgical decision after exercise therapy.	**Question: *"based on your knee symptoms in the last week would you say that you need knee surgery?"***		
	Answer to question		
	"Yes, I believe I need surgery"	*"I do not know"*	*"No, I do not believe I need surgery"*
Postponed surgery, N	3	21	55
Surgery, N	28	4	0
Wanted surgery but surgery was contra indicated*, N	6	0	0

Distribution of treatment decision across the whole sample and answers to the question: *"Based on your knee symptoms in the last week would you say that you need knee surgery?"* *Six patients wanted surgery but had co-morbidities disqualifying them as candidates for surgery (Appendix 3).

Exercise adherence

Data from 95 patients was available for the exercise adherence assessment. Of the 45 patients without available data, 23 did not complete the 12 weeks of exercise (dropped-out and missing data), 8 had less than 6 recorded exercise sessions and 14 had technical problems or lost the BandCizer© sensor. Exercise adherence was quantified as 1) *total number of sessions* and 2) *total time-under-tension (TUT)*. When exercise adherence was quantified as *total number of sessions* both group 2 and 4 completed >75% of the prescribed dosage (84.8% and 81.9%, respectively) (Figure 5). When quantified as *total time-under-tension (TUT)* no groups completed >75% of the prescribed dosage. No between group differences were observed (Table 6).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

377

Table 6. Exercise adherence (t_0-t_1).

Total number of sessions

	Number of prescribed sessions	Number of completed sessions (SD)	Percentage of completed sessions (SD)		Mean percentage difference between groups (95% CI)	P-value
All patients (N=95)	144	107.6 (14.2)	76.9% (33.6%)			
Group 2 (N=32)	24	20.3 (7.3)	84.8% (30.4%)	Group 2 vs. 4	-2.8% (-19.6% to 13.9%)	0.741
Group 4 (N=29)	48	39.3 (18.4)	81.9% (38.4%)	Group 2 vs. 6	18.1% (1.9 % to 34.2%)	0.028
Group 6 (N=34)	72	48.0 (21.6)	66.7% (30.1%)	Group 4 vs. 6	15.3% (-1.3% to 31.8%)	0.069

Time-under-tension (TUT)

	Prescribed TUT in secs	Completed TUT in secs (SD)	Percentage of completed TUT (SD)		Mean percentage difference between groups (95% CI)	P-value
All patients (N=95)	41472	23412.5 (2918.5)	56.5% (31.9%)			
Group 2 (N=32)	6912	4477.3 (2161.9)	64.8% (31.3%)	Group 2 vs. 4	0.3% (-15.5% to 16.2%)	0.965
Group 4 (N=29)	13824	9002.2 (4870.4)	65.1% (35.2%)	Group 2 vs. 6	16.9% (1.7% to 32.1%)	0.030
Group 6 (N=34)	20736	9933.0 (5596.3)	47.9% (26.9%)	Group 4 vs. 6	17.2% (1.6% to 32.8%)	0.031

Objectively quantified exercise adherence using a sensor attached to the exercise band (BandCizer© technology). Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Statistical test: one-Way ANOVA.

378

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Adherence to prescribed exercise dosage across the three groups with exercise quantified as *total number of exercise sessions*. Circles represent the mean number of recorded exercise sessions for each patient. Red circles represent patients prescribed two exercise sessions per week. Black circles represent patients prescribed four exercise sessions per week. Blue circles represent patients prescribed six exercise sessions per week. The red dotted line represents the prescribed exercise dosage in group two (24 sessions). The black dotted line represents the prescribed exercise dosage in group four (48 sessions). The blue dotted line represents the prescribed exercise dosage in group six (72 sessions).

Supplementary analyses

For the supplementary regression analyses the three groups were pooled into one sample. No association was observed between the level of exercise adherence and pre-operative changes for any outcomes, except for a weak inverse association between *total number of sessions* and change in the *six-minute walk test* (Slope -0.7323 [95% -1.819 to -0.1826]) (Appendix 7).

Harms

A total of 14 adverse events were registered during the trial period. Exacerbated knee pain due to the exercise intervention was reported as the most frequent cause of harm (Table 7). See the flow chart for elaboration on the adverse events across the three groups (Figure 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 7. Harms

Time-point	Baseline to after exercise (t_0-t_1)	Acutely after surgery (0-8 days) (t_2)	From surgery to three months after surgery (t_2-t_3)
All patients, N	9	4	1
Group 2, N	2	1	0
Group 4, N	2	2	1
Group 6, N	5	1	0

Registered adverse events from baseline (t_0) to the final assessment three months after surgery (t_3). Elaboration of the adverse events is provided in the flowchart (Figure 2).

Discussion (Generalizability, Interpretation)

The QUADX-1 trial found that none of the different prescribed knee-extensor exercise dosages (2, 4 and 6 sessions/week) in patients eligible for knee replacement were superior in improving isometric knee-extensor strength, while an exercise dosage of 2 exercise sessions/week seems superior to 6 sessions/week for Oxford Knee Score and average knee pain last week (0-10 numeric rating scale). Furthermore, independent of exercise dosage, only one in three patients completing the exercise therapy intervention decided to undergo surgery for their knee OA.

The results of the present trial are relevant for the following reasons. Firstly, larger exercise dosages do not seem to be more effective than smaller.[50] Secondly, an exercise intervention with *one* home-based exercise can lead to clinically relevant improvements in symptoms comparable to more comprehensive interventions in patients eligible for knee replacement.[22,50,51] Finally, a simple exercise therapy intervention using only *one* exercise, in a model of coordinated care, can prompt the majority of patients eligible for knee replacement to postpone surgery.

Decision on surgery – Coordinated non-surgical and surgical care

The large number of patients who postponed surgery highlights the importance of coordinating non-surgical and surgical care in patients eligible for knee replacement. The proportion of patients postponing and choosing surgery across the three groups was similar – indicating that the decision to postpone surgery is independent of prescribed exercise therapy dosage. This also fits the general pattern of comparable improvements in all three dosage groups. A contributing factor explaining the large number and similar distribution of patients postponing surgery among the three groups could be the non-specific effect of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

applied 'model' of coordinated non-surgical and surgical care.[16,52–54] In this 'model', the patients' decision on surgical treatment was re-evaluated, following exercise therapy, by the patient and their orthopedic surgeon. This re-evaluation of treatment after exercise therapy, based on change in knee OA related symptoms, combined with additional attention from an orthopedic surgeon could facilitate the patients' decision to postpone surgery.[55–58] This is exemplified in table 5 showing that patients who believe they need surgery, undergo surgery, while those who "don't know" or do not believe they need surgery postpone it. We do not know if or when the QUADX-1 trial participants who postponed surgery will undergo surgery, something of great interest to clinicians,[49] but we will follow this cohort of patients and report findings in the future.

Using exercise therapy in the care pathway to evaluate the need for surgical care challenges the current premise for exercise therapy before surgery (exercise-based pre-habilitation) in the Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) concept where it is assumed that exercise therapy before planned surgery is always followed by surgery.[59–63] Instead of being a predetermined care pathway (leading to surgery), exercise therapy before potential surgery could be used to inform the shared decision-making process when planning a care pathway.[8,17,18] A more optimal way of coordinating the two treatment options, exercise therapy before potential surgery and knee replacement, could be to incorporate the effect of exercise therapy to further inform the shared decision-making. In this way patients without an acute need for surgery can be screened, and untimely surgery with potential complications avoided – something which is not possible at a one-time outpatient consultation. A care pathway in which exercise therapy is employed prior to knee replacement complies with guideline recommendations while also being cost-effective.[5–10,64] We have previously argued that the premise for exercise therapy before potential surgery to enhance post-operative outcomes in patients eligible for knee replacement should be questioned[33] as several systematic reviews conclude no clinically relevant effect.[33,65–74] In line with this and based on the results from the QUADX-1 trial, we suggest the use of exercise therapy within the ERAS concept is to "pre-evaluate" to promote shared decision-making in an enhanced care pathway for patients with severe knee OA rather than to "prepare" patients for surgery. However, a prerequisite for successful coordination of care is that the involved healthcare professionals trust in the effectiveness and legitimacy of the different treatment modalities available, i.e. exercise therapy and surgery.[13,49,75,76]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Implications for *one* home-based exercise

The results from the QUADX-1 trial suggest no dose-response relationship between the prescribed knee-extensor exercise dosages and change in outcomes. In fact, the lowest dosage seems to have the largest effect on patient-reported outcomes. Interestingly, results from the QUADX-1 trial are comparable to other trials reporting similar proportions of patients who postpone surgery and corresponding clinically relevant improvements in patient-reported outcomes after exercise therapy.[51,77] Compared to the intervention in the QUADX-1 trial, the exercise therapy interventions in these trials are more comprehensive and costly, comprising more exercises and supervision. This suggests that the intervention and associated exercise dosage needed to improve symptoms in patients eligible for knee replacement does not necessarily have to be either extensive or comprehensive.[50] This corresponds well to the results from the supplementary regression analyses and our recent meta-regression analysis indicating no dose-response between prescribed pre-operative knee-extensor exercise dosage and change in outcomes before scheduled knee replacement – although this was not a randomized comparison.[33] The objective assessment of exercise adherence showed that group 2 exercised half as much as group 4 and 6 (total sessions and TUT). This further supports the finding of no dose-response relationship, and that even small exercise dosages for this patient population may result in improved outcomes.

In general, patients in the QUADX-1 trial improved knee function and patient reported outcomes – suggesting that exercise therapy, and not dosage, is the most important element in improving these outcomes for patients eligible for knee replacement. A potential explanation for this is that patients eligible for knee replacement have an inactive lifestyle due to their knee condition.[78,79] An inactive lifestyle can lead to decreased physical ability and muscle strength leaving a large potential for improvement with exercise therapy.[43,80–82] Thus, patients eligible for knee replacement might not need large exercise dosages to improve their symptoms.[43,50,83] This suggests that *one* well-instructed home-based knee-extensor exercise is a viable treatment alternative to supervised exercise for patients with severe knee OA. For example, for patients who have a busy daily schedule, patients who live far from a clinic and patients who cannot afford or are not interested in attending formal group exercise sessions at a clinic at fixed times.[26]

Limitations

The trial was designed without a non-exercise comparator, so we do not know how patients would respond to the intervention without an exercise component. It is well established, however, that patients with knee OA benefit from exercise compared to non-exercise controls.[7] The Danish healthcare system is publicly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

funded and treatment is therefore free. Refusing surgery after having been on a waiting list does not postpone the possibility of surgery for years. The patients can be re-assessed by an orthopaedic surgeon within months and have surgery scheduled if needed. This might limit the comparability to other countries with a different healthcare system.

Conclusion

Knee-extensor strength increased with both 2, 4 and 6 exercise sessions per week but none of the prescribed exercise dosages were superior to each other for the primary outcome isometric knee-extensor strength after 12 weeks. Two home-based knee-extensor exercise sessions a week seems superior to six for patient-reported outcomes, and across exercise dosages, only one in three patients decided to have surgery after the coordinated home-based exercise intervention. We suggest using a model of coordinated non-surgical and surgical care to improve the decision on surgery for patients eligible for knee replacement. Exercise before potential surgery should be used to evaluate the need for surgery and not to change outcomes after surgery in this patient population.

Other information

Registration

ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT02931058, pre-registered October 10th, 2016.

Protocol

Open access Protocol PubMed (PMID: 29347947).[34]

Funding

This work was supported by grants from The Capital Region's strategic funds (R142-A5363), The Capital Region's foundation for cross-continuum research (P-2015-1-01, P-2018-1-02, P-2019-1-03), The Danish

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Rheumatism Association (R156-A4923) and Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre's strategic funds (2019-800). The funding sources had no role in this work.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement go to: Research assistant Line Holst for help with trial management and outcomes assessment, and to the physiotherapists in the participating municipalities (Broendby, Hvidovre and Copenhagen) and the orthopedic surgeons at the Orthopedic Department at Copenhagen University Hospital, Hvidovre.

Contributors

RSH and TB drafted the manuscript. All other authors (AT, HH, TK, KT, BG, MSR) revised the manuscript. RSH prepared the figures and tables. RSH and TK conducted the statistical analyses. RSH and TB are the guarantors. The corresponding author (RSH) attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Transparency statement

The corresponding author (RSH) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the trial being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as originally planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Dissemination declaration

Trial results will be disseminated via social media, media releases, newsletters and national and international conferences and symposia. Participating patients will be informed of the trial results via personal digital letters.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form. Anders Troelsen declares research support, consulting fees and advisory board member (Pfizer Denmark and Zimmer Biomet), travel/accommodations/meeting expenses, payment for lectures including service on speakers bureaus (Zimmer Biomet) unrelated to listed activities, and participation on a data safety monitoring board: Danish knee arthroplasty register. Thomas Bandholm declares payment for lectures (Zimmer Biomet, Novartis), fees for book chapters (Munksgaard) and for organizing post-graduate education (Danish Physical Therapy Organization). Thomas Bandholm is an editorial board member with British Journal of Sports Medicine and PLOS ONE. All other authors declare no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Data sharing statement

The de-identified patient data is available by contacting the corresponding author Rasmus Skov Husted via email: rasmus.skov.husted@regionh.dk.

References

1. Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Rasmussen S, et al. Total knee replacement and non-surgical treatment of knee osteoarthritis: 2-year outcome from two parallel randomized controlled trials. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2018 Sep;26(9):1170–80.

2. Gwynne-Jones JH, Wilson RA, Wong JMY, Abbott JH, Gwynne-Jones DP. The Outcomes of Nonoperative Management of Patients With Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis Triaged to a Physiotherapy-Led Clinic at Minimum 5-Year Follow-Up and Factors Associated With Progression to Surgery. J Arthroplasty. 2020 Feb;

3. Dabare C, Le Marshall K, Leung A, Page CJ, Choong PF, Lim KK. Differences in presentation, progression and rates of arthroplasty between hip and knee osteoarthritis: Observations from an osteoarthritis cohort study-a clear role for conservative management. Int J Rheum Dis. 2017 Oct;20(10):1350–60.

4. Dell'Isola A, Jönsson T, Rolfson O, Cronström A, Englund M, Dahlberg D. Willingness to undergo joint surgery following a first-line intervention for osteoarthritis: data from the BOA register. Arthritis Care Res. 2020;

5. Sundhedsstyrelsen - Knæartrose. Knæartrose – nationale kliniske retningslinjer og faglige visitationsretningslinjer. 1st ed. Kbh.; 2012. 1–80 p.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

6. Bannuru, R. R., Osani, M. C., Vaysbrot, E. E., Arden, N. K., Bennell KL, Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M. A., et al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2019;27(11).

7. Fransen M, McConnell S, Bell M. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015;9(1):CD004376.

8. Geenen R, Overman CL, Christensen R, Åsenlöf P, Capela S, Huisinga KL, et al. EULAR recommendations for the health professional's approach to pain management in inflammatory arthritis and osteoarthritis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2018 May 3;annrheumdis-2017-212662.

9. NICE. Osteoarthritis: care and management in adults. Clinical guideline CG177. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2014.

10. Kolasinski SL, Neogi T, Hochberg MC, Oatis C, Guyatt G, Block J, et al. 2019 American College of Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation Guideline for the Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hand, Hip, and Knee. Arthritis Care Res. 2020 Feb;72(2):149–62.

11. Cobos R, Latorre A, Aizpuru F, Guenaga JI, Sarasqueta C, Escobar A, et al. Variability of indication criteria in knee and hip replacement: an observational study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2010 Dec;11(1).

12. Gossec L, Paternotte S, Bingham CO, Clegg DO, Coste P, Conaghan PG, et al. OARSI/OMERACT Initiative to Define States of Severity and Indication for Joint Replacement in Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis. An OMERACT 10 Special Interest Group. J Rheumatol. 2011 Aug;38(8):1765–9.

13. Hofstede SN, Marang-van de Mheen PJ, Vliet Vlieland TPM, van den Ende CHM, Nelissen RGHH, van Bodegom-Vos L. Barriers and Facilitators Associated with Non-Surgical Treatment Use for Osteoarthritis Patients in Orthopaedic Practice. Coles JA, editor. PLOS ONE. 2016 Jan 22;11(1):e0147406.

14. Allen KD, Choong PF, Davis AM, Dowsey MM, Dziedzic KS, Emery C, et al. Osteoarthritis: Models for appropriate care across the disease continuum. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2016 Jun;30(3):503–35.

15. Briggs AM, Jordan JE, Jennings M, Speerin R, Bragge P, Chua J, et al. Supporting the Evaluation and Implementation of Musculoskeletal Models of Care: A Globally Informed Framework for Judging Readiness and Success. Arthritis Care Res. 2017 Apr;69(4):567–77.

16. Brown C, Gordon B, Bucknill A. The Impact of the Osteoarthritis Hip and Knee Service (OAHKS) in Melbourne health: a review from 2006–2009. Orthop Proc. 2011;93-B (Suppl. II)(211).

17. Ditmyer MM, Topp R, Pifer M. Prehabilitation in preparation for orthopaedic surgery. Orthop Nurs. 2002;21(5):43–54.

18. Slover J, Shue J, Koenig K. Shared Decision-making in Orthopaedic Surgery. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2012 Apr;470(4):1046–53.

19. Hurley MV, Walsh NE, Mitchell H, Nicholas J, Patel A. Long-term outcomes and costs of an integrated rehabilitation program for chronic knee pain: A pragmatic, cluster randomized, controlled trial. Arthritis Care Res. 2012 Feb;64(2):238–47.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

20. Ravaud P, Flipo R-M, Boutron I, Roy C, Mahmoudi A, Giraudeau B, et al. ARTIST (osteoarthritis intervention standardized) study of standardised consultation versus usual care for patients with osteoarthritis of the knee in primary care in France: pragmatic randomised controlled trial. BMJ. 2009 Feb 23;338(feb23 1):b421–b421.

21. GLA:D® International Network. GLA:D® International Network [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://gladinternational.org/home/

22. Jönsson T, Eek F, Dell'Isola A, Dahlberg LE, Ekvall Hansson E. The Better Management of Patients with Osteoarthritis Program: Outcomes after evidence-based education and exercise delivered nationwide in Sweden. Pan F, editor. PLOS ONE. 2019 Sep 19;14(9):e0222657.

23. Thorstensson CA, Garellick G, Rystedt H, Dahlberg LE. Better Management of Patients with Osteoarthritis: Development and Nationwide Implementation of an Evidence-Based Supported Osteoarthritis Self-Management Programme. Musculoskeletal Care. 2015 Jun;13(2):67–75.

24. Skou ST, Roos EM. Good Life with osteoArthritis in Denmark (GLA:D™): evidence-based education and supervised neuromuscular exercise delivered by certified physiotherapists nationwide. BMC Musculoskelet Disord [Internet]. 2017 Dec [cited 2018 Mar 5];18(1). Available from: http://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12891-017-1439-y

25. GLA:D Denmark. GLA:D Denmark. Annual report 2019 [Internet]. 2019. Available from: https://www.glaid.dk/pdf/GLAD%20annual%20report%202019%20eng%20final_2.pdf

26. Lawford BJ, Hinman RS, Nelligan RK, Keefe F, Rini C, Bennell KL. "I could do it in my own time and when I really needed it": perceptions of online pain coping skills training for people with knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Care Res [Internet]. 2019 Oct 18 [cited 2020 Nov 19]; Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/acr.24093

27. Hunter DJ, March L, Chew M. Osteoarthritis in 2020 and beyond: a Lancet Commission. The Lancet [Internet]. 2020 Nov [cited 2020 Nov 6]; Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673620322303

28. Luong M-LN, Cleveland RJ, Nyrop KA, Callahan LF. Social determinants and osteoarthritis outcomes. Aging Health. 2012 Aug;8(4):413–37.

29. Ackerman IN, Livingston JA, Osborne RH. Personal Perspectives on Enablers and Barriers to Accessing Care for Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis. Phys Ther. 2016 Jan 1;96(1):26–36.

30. Juhl C, Christensen R, Roos EM, Zhang W, Lund H. Impact of Exercise Type and Dose on Pain and Disability in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Regression Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials: Impact of Exercise Type and Dose in Knee Osteoarthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2014 Mar;66(3):622–36.

31. Øiestad BE, Juhl CB, Eitzen I, Thorlund JB. Knee extensor muscle weakness is a risk factor for development of knee osteoarthritis. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2015 Feb;23(2):171–7.

32. Culvenor AG, Ruhdorfer A, Juhl C, Eckstein F, Øiestad BE. Knee Extensor Strength and Risk of Structural, Symptomatic, and Functional Decline in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Meta-Analysis: Risk of Deterioration in Knee OA and Knee Extensor Strength. Arthritis Care Res. 2017 May;69(5):649–58.

33. Husted RS, Juhl C, Troelsen A, Thorborg K, Kallemose T, Rathleff MS, et al. The relationship between prescribed pre-operative knee-extensor exercise dosage and effect on knee-extensor strength prior to and following total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of randomized controlled trials. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2020 Sep;(28):1412–26.

34. Husted RS, Troelsen A, Thorborg K, Rathleff MS, Husted H, Bandholm T. Efficacy of pre-operative quadriceps strength training on knee-extensor strength before and shortly following total knee arthroplasty: protocol for a randomized, dose-response trial (The QUADX-1 trial). Trials. 2018 Dec;19(1):47.

35. Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gøtzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. Int J Surg. 2012;10(1):28–55.

36. American Society of Anesthesiologists. ASA Physical Status Classification System. American Society of Anesthesiologists; 2014.

37. Sundhedsstyrelsen, Statens Serum Institut. Alkoholstatistik 2015. Nationale data. 2015.

38. McLean SM, Burton M, Bradley L, Littlewood C. Interventions for enhancing adherence with physiotherapy: A systematic review. Man Ther. 2010 Dec;15(6):514–21.

39. Lin D-H, Lin C-HJ, Lin Y-F, Jan M-H. Efficacy of 2 Non-Weight-Bearing Interventions, Proprioception Training Versus Strength Training, for Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2009 Jun;39(6):450–7.

40. Newman S, Steed L, Mulligan K. Chronic physical illness: self- management and behavioural interventions. NewmanS,SteedL,MulliganK.Chronicphysicalillness:self- maMaidenhead: Open University Press; 2009.

41. Gagnon D, Nadeau S, Gravel D, Robert J, Bélanger D, Hilsenrath M. Reliability and validity of static knee strength measurements obtained with a chair-fixed dynamometer in subjects with hip or knee arthroplasty. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2005 Oct;86(10):1998–2008.

42. Hall M, Hinman RS, Wrigley TV, Kasza J, Lim B-W, Bennell KL. Knee extensor strength gains mediate symptom improvement in knee osteoarthritis: Secondary analysis of a randomised controlled trial. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2018 Feb;26(4):495–500.

43. Ratamess NA, Alvar BA, Evetoch TK, Housh TJ, Kibler WB, Kraemer WJ, et al. Progression Models in Resistance Training for Healthy Adults. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2009 Mar;41(3):687–708.

44. Borde R, Hortobágyi T, Granacher U. Dose–Response Relationships of Resistance Training in Healthy Old Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Sports Med. 2015 Dec;45(12):1693–720.

45. Rathleff MS, Bandholm T, Ahrendt P, Olesen JL, Thorborg K. Novel stretch-sensor technology allows quantification of adherence and quality of home-exercises: a validation study. Br J Sports Med. 2014 Apr;48(8):724–8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

46. Rathleff MS, Thorborg K, Rode LA, McGirr KA, Sørensen AS, Bøgild A, et al. Adherence to commonly prescribed, home-based strength training exercises for the lower extremity can be objectively monitored using the Bandcizer. J Strength Cond Res. 2015;29(3):627–636.

47. Riel H, Matthews M, Vicenzino B, Bandholm T, Thorborg K, Rathleff MS. Feedback Leads to Better Exercise Quality in Adolescents with Patellofemoral Pain: Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2018 Jan;50(1):28–35.

48. Bennell KL, Kyriakides M, Metcalf B, Egerton T, Wrigley TV, Hodges PW, et al. Neuromuscular Versus Quadriceps Strengthening Exercise in Patients With Medial Knee Osteoarthritis and Varus Malalignment: A Randomized Controlled Trial: Neuromuscular Exercise and Knee Adduction Moment. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2014 Apr;66(4):950–9.

49. Husted RS, Bandholm T, Rathleff MS, Troelsen A, Kirk J. Perceived facilitators and barriers among physical therapists and orthopedic surgeons to pre-operative home-based exercise with one exercise-only in patients eligible for knee replacement: A qualitative interview study nested in the QUADX-1 trial. PLOS ONE. 2020 Oct 23;15(10):e0241175.

50. Messier SP, Mihalko SL, Beavers DP, Nicklas BJ, DeVita P, Carr JJ, et al. Effect of High-Intensity Strength Training on Knee Pain and Knee Joint Compressive Forces Among Adults With Knee Osteoarthritis: The START Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2021 Feb 16;325(7):646.

51. Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Simonsen O, et al. A Randomized, Controlled Trial of Total Knee Replacement. N Engl J Med. 2015 Oct 22;373(17):1597–606.

52. Blasini M, Peiris N, Wright T, Colloca L. The Role of Patient–Practitioner Relationships in Placebo and Nocebo Phenomena. In: International Review of Neurobiology [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018 [cited 2020 Dec 17]. p. 211–31. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S007477421830062X

53. Miller FG, Colloca L, Kaptchuk TJ. The Placebo Effect: Illness and Interpersonal Healing. Perspect Biol Med. 2009;52(4):518–39.

54. Hardman DI, Geraghty AW, Howick J, Roberts N, Bishop FL. A discursive exploration of public perspectives on placebos and their effects. Health Psychol Open. 2019 Jan;6(1):205510291983231.

55. Kaplan SH, Greenfield S, Gandek B, Rogers WH, Ware JE. Characteristics of Physicians with Participatory Decision-Making Styles. Ann Intern Med. 1996 Mar 1;124(5):497.

56. Frosch DL, Kaplan RM. Shared decision making in clinical medicine: past research and future directions. Am J Prev Med. 1999 Nov;17(4):285–94.

57. Epstein RM, Alper BS, Quill TE. Communicating Evidence for Participatory Decision Making. JAMA. 2004;May 19(291):8.

58. Miller FG, Kaptchuk TJ. The power of context: reconceptualizing the placebo effect. J R Soc Med. 2008 May;101(5):222–5.

59. Ljungqvist O, Hubner M. Enhanced recovery after surgery—ERAS—principles, practice and feasibility in the elderly. Aging Clin Exp Res. 2018 Mar;30(3):249–52.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

60. Bardram L, Funch-Jensen P, Jensen P, Crawford ME, Kehlet H. Recovery after laparoscopic colonic surgery with epidural analgesia, and early oral nutrition and mobilisation. The Lancet. 1995 Mar;345(8952):763–4.

61. Wainwright TW, Gill M, McDonald DA, Middleton RG, Reed M, Sahota O, et al. Consensus statement for perioperative care in total hip replacement and total knee replacement surgery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS ®) Society recommendations. Acta Orthop. 2019 Oct 30;1–17.

62. Gao K, Yu P, Su J, He C, Liu L, Zhou Y, et al. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing screening and pre-operative pulmonary rehabilitation reduce postoperative complications and improve fast-track recovery after lung cancer surgery: A study for 342 cases: CPET and rehabilitation of lung surgery. Thorac Cancer. 2015 Jul;6(4):443–9.

63. Pouwels S, Willigendael EM, van Sambeek MRHM, Nienhuijs SW, Cuypers PWM, Teijink JAW. Beneficial Effects of Pre-operative Exercise Therapy in Patients with an Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm: A Systematic Review. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg. 2015 Jan;49(1):66–76.

64. Skou ST, Roos E, Laursen M, Arendt L, Rasmussen S, Simonsen O, et al. Cost-e-ffectiveness of total knee replacement in addition to non-s- urgical treatment: a 2--year outcome from a randomised trial in secondary care in Denmark. BMJ Open. 2020;11.

65. Moyer R, Ikert K, Long K, Marsh J. The Value of Preoperative Exercise and Education for Patients Undergoing Total Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. JBJS Rev. 2017 Dec;5(12):e2.

66. Wang L, Lee M, Zhang Z, Moodie J, Cheng D, Martin J. Does preoperative rehabilitation for patients planning to undergo joint replacement surgery improve outcomes? A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. BMJ Open. 2016;6(2):e009857.

67. Ma J, Zhang L, Kuang M, Zhao J, Wang Y, Lu B, et al. The effect of preoperative training on functional recovery in patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Surg [Internet]. 2018 Jan [cited 2018 Feb 16]; Available from: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S174391911830493X

68. Ackerman I, Bennell K. Does pre-operative physiotherapy improve outcomes from lower limb joint replacement surgery? A systematic review. Aust J Physiother. 2004;50(1):25–30.

69. Chesham RA, Shanmugam S. Does preoperative physiotherapy improve postoperative, patient-based outcomes in older adults who have undergone total knee arthroplasty? A systematic review. Physiother Theory Pract. 2016 Oct 13;33(1):9–30.

70. Skoffer B, Dalgas U, Mechlenburg I. Progressive resistance training before and after total hip and knee arthroplasty: a systematic review. Clin Rehabil. 2015;Jan 29(1):14–29.

71. Jordan RW, Smith NA, Chahal GS, Casson C, Reed MR, Sprowson AP. Enhanced education and physiotherapy before knee replacement; is it worth it? A systematic review. Physiotherapy. 2014 Dec;100(4):305–12.

72. Kwok IHY, Paton B, Haddad FS. Does Pre-Operative Physiotherapy Improve Outcomes in Primary Total Knee Arthroplasty? — A Systematic Review. J Arthroplasty. 2015 Sep;30(9):1657–63.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

73. Wallis JA, Taylor NF. Pre-operative interventions (non-surgical and non-pharmacological) for patients with hip or knee osteoarthritis awaiting joint replacement surgery – a systematic review and meta-analysis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2011 Dec;19(12):1381–95.

74. Gawel JA, Brown SE, Collins JC, McCallum C. Does pre-operative physical therapy improve post-surgical outcomes of patients undergoing a total knee and/or total hip arthroplasty? A systematic review. Physiother Pract Res. 2013;(1):9–20.

75. Spencer EA, Heneghan C. Catalogue of Bias Collaboration. Confirmation bias. In: Catalogue Of Bias 2018. [Internet]. 2018. Available from: https://catalogofbias.org/?post_type=biases&p=9734&preview=true

76. Bunzli S, Nelson E, Scott A, French S, Choong P, Dowsey M. Barriers and facilitators to orthopaedic surgeons' uptake of decision aids for total knee arthroplasty: a qualitative study. BMJ Open. 2017;7(11):e018614.

77. Juhl C, Lind T, Hornshøj H. Effect of supervised neuromuscular exercise and education to participants with severe knee osteoarthritis — a single blinded randomized controlled trial. In 2020. Available from: http://abstract.ortopaedi.dk/k20/session10.html

78. Liu S-H, Driban JB, Eaton CB, McAlindon TE, Harrold LR, Lapane KL. Objectively Measured Physical Activity and Symptoms Change in Knee Osteoarthritis. Am J Med. 2016 May;129(5):497-505.e1.

79. Gay C, Guiguet-Auclair C, Mourgues C, Gerbaud L, Coudeyre E. Physical activity level and association with behavioral factors in knee osteoarthritis. Ann Phys Rehabil Med. 2019 Jan;62(1):14–20.

80. Goodpaster BH, Park SW, Harris TB, Kritchevsky SB, Nevitt M, Schwartz AV, et al. The Loss of Skeletal Muscle Strength, Mass, and Quality in Older Adults: The Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2006 Oct 1;61(10):1059–64.

81. Visser M, Goodpaster BH, Kritchevsky SB, Newman AB, Nevitt M, Rubin SM, et al. Muscle Mass, Muscle Strength, and Muscle Fat Infiltration as Predictors of Incident Mobility Limitations in Well-Functioning Older Persons. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2005 Mar 1;60(3):324–33.

82. Manini TM, Clark BC. Dynapenia and Aging: An Update. J Gerontol Ser A. 2012 Jan;67A(1):28–40.

83. Regnaux J-P, Lefevre-Colau M-M, Trinquart L, Nguyen C, Boutron I, Brosseau L, et al. High-intensity versus low-intensity physical activity or exercise in people with hip or knee osteoarthritis. Cochrane Musculoskeletal Group, editor. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015 Oct 29;29(10):CD010203.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Appendix

Appendix 1. Missing data at the different endpoints.

Baseline (t_0)				
Outcomes	All patients N = 140	Group 2 N = 47	Group 4 N = 47	Group 6 N = 46
Gender (f/m)	-	-	-	-
Age (years)	-	-	-	-
Weight (kg)	-	-	-	-
Height (cm)	-	-	-	-
Municipality (Cph/Hvi/Bro)	-	-	-	-
Kellgren and Lawrence score (2/3/4)	2	1	1	-
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	-	-	-	-
Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)	-	-	-	-
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	-	-	-	-
KOOS Symptoms (0-100)	-	-	-	-
KOOS Pain (0-100)	-	-	-	-
KOOS ADL (0-100)	-	-	-	-
KOOS Sport (0-100)	-	-	-	-
KOOS QoL (0-100)	1	-	1	-
OKS (0-48)	-	-	-	-
6MWT (m)	3	1	1	1
SCT up (secs)	2	-	1	1
SCT down (secs)	2	-	1	1

Following 12 weeks home-based exercise (t_1)				
Outcomes	All patients N = 140	Group 2 N = 47	Group 4 N = 47	Group 6 N = 46
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	23	8	8	7
Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)	23	8	8	7
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	23	8	8	7
KOOS Symptoms (0-100)	23	8	8	7
KOOS Pain (0-100)	23	8	8	7
KOOS ADL (0-100)	23	8	8	7
KOOS Sport (0-100)	23	8	8	7
KOOS QoL (0-100)	23	8	8	7
OKS (0-48)	23	8	8	7
6MWT (m)	29	11	9	9
SCT up (secs)	31	11	11	9
SCT down (secs)	31	11	11	9

Acutely after surgery (t_2)				
Outcomes	All patients N = 32	Group 2 N = 7	Group 4 N = 12	Group 6 N = 13
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	15	4	9	2
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	16	4	9	3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

6MWT (m)	26	5	12	9
SCT up (secs)	28	5	12	11
SCT down (secs)	28	5	12	11

Three months after surgery (t_3)				
Outcomes	All patients N = 32	Group 2 N = 7	Group 4 N = 12	Group 6 N = 13
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	7	2	4	1
Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)	7	2	4	1
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	8	2	4	2
KOOS Symptoms (0-100)	7	2	4	1
KOOS Pain (0-100)	7	2	4	1
KOOS ADL (0-100)	7	2	4	1
KOOS Sport (0-100)	7	2	4	1
KOOS QoL (0-100)	7	2	4	1
OKS (0-48)	7	2	4	1
6MWT (m)	9	2	5	2
SCT up (secs)	10	2	6	2
SCT down (secs)	10	2	6	2

Appendix 1. Cph = Copenhagen, Hvi = Hvidovre, Bro = Broendby, KOOS = Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test.

Appendix 2. Separate baseline characteristics for the patients lost to follow-up and the remaining patients.

Baseline characteristics (t_0). Participants lost to follow-up.

Characteristics Mean (SD)	All patients N = 23	Group 2 N = 8	Group 4 N = 8	Group 6 N = 7
Gender (f/m)	14/9	4/4	7/1	3/4
Age (years)	65.7 (9.6)	68.8 (8.9)	69.6 (9.9)	57.8 (5.1)
Weight (kg)	93.9 (16.9)	100.2 (17.0)	88.3 (14.9)	93.1 (18.9)
Height (cm)	167.9 (7.4)	166.3 (8.0)	166.3 (5.3)	171.9 (8.3)
Municipality (Cph/Hvi/Bro)	16/6/1	5/3/0	6/1/1	5/2/0
Kellgren and Lawrence score (2/3/4)	5/13/5	2/4/2	2/3/3	1/6/0
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	2.1 (2.5)	2.3 (3.1)	1.8 (2.4)	2.3 (2.1)
Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)	5.9 (1.7)	6.3 (1.6)	5.6 (1.7)	5.7 (1.9)
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	1.28 (0.55)	1.19 (0.61)	1.21 (0.36)	1.46 (0.69)
KOOS Symptoms (0-100)	51.6 (18.5)	52.7 (23.4)	50.9 (13.6)	51.0 (19.9)
KOOS Pain (0-100)	46.4 (15.3)	46.3 (22.2)	49.7 (8.6)	42.9 (12.5)
KOOS ADL (0-100)	50.6 (13.8)	51.7 (18.7)	49.8 (8.6)	50.2 (14.0)
KOOS Sport (0-100)	20.0 (19.8)	28.8 (27.5)	15.0 (11.9)	15.0 (13.5)
KOOS QoL (0-100)	30.7 (16.9)	36.7 (19.9)	28.1 (14.9)	26.8 (16.0)
OKS (0-48)	22.8 (7.4)	23.3 (9.1)	22.5 (7.1)	22.7 (6.8)
6MWT (m)	403.4 (92.8)	383.4 (93.6)	388.7 (80.3)	438.2 (109.2)
SCT up (secs)	8.4 (2.8)	8.9 (2.8)	9.6 (2.9)	6.5 (1.7)
SCT down (secs)	8.9 (3.5)	9.1 (2.3)	10.7 (4.4)	6.7 (2.9)

Cph = Copenhagen, Hvi = Hvidovre, Bro = Broendby, NRS = Numeric Rating Scale, KOOS = Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Baseline characteristics (t_0). Remaining participants.

Characteristics Mean (SD)	All patients N = 117	Group 2 N = 39	Group 4 N = 39	Group 6 N = 39
Gender (f/m)	62/55	18/21	22/17	22/17
Age (years)	66.9 (9.9)	67.2 (10.1)	66.4 (9.9)	67.2 (10.1)
Weight (kg)	91.5 (20.5)	90.5 (16.9)	94.7 (23.1)	89.2 (20.9)
Height (cm)	169.5 (8.5)	169.2 (6.8)	170.7 (8.1)	168.6 (10.3)
Municipality (Cph/Hvi/Bro)	58/38/21	17/13/9	17/15/7	24/10/5
Kellgren and Lawrence score (2/3/4)	15/48/52	3/16/19	7/16/15	5/16/18
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	2.2 (2.2)	2.1 (2.3)	2.2 (2.1)	2.4 (2.2)
Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)	5.8 (1.5)	5.6 (1.6)	5.9 (1.7)	5.8 (1.4)
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	1.26 (0.53)	1.33 (0.57)	1.21 (0.55)	1.24 (0.48)
KOOS Symptoms (0-100)	55.7 (18.9)	60.2 (18.8)	53.6 (17.4)	53.2 (20.1)
KOOS Pain (0-100)	50.4 (16.8)	52.8 (15.4)	47.5 (18.1)	50.8 (16.1)
KOOS ADL (0-100)	56.2 (17.9)	58.9 (16.8)	52.2 (18.9)	57.4 (17.9)
KOOS Sport (0-100)	21.3 (20.9)	23.6 (23.3)	17.7 (18.2)	22.4 (21.2)
KOOS QoL (0-100)	33.1 (16.3)	35.1 (15.9)	32.2 (16.8)	31.9 (16.2)
OKS (0-48)	25.2 (7.6)	26.9 (7.0	23.3 (8.4)	25.3 (7.2)
6MWT (m)	425.1 (96.5)	440.5 (86.3)	412.3 (109.1)	421.2 (93.9)
SCT up (secs)	9.0 (4.4)	7.8 (3.0)	9.9 (5.3)	9.1 (4.3)
SCT down (secs)	10.0 (6.2)	8.3 (4.8)	11.1 (6.9)	10.7 (6.5)

Cph = Copenhagen, Hvi = Hvidovre, Bro = Broendby, NRS = Numeric Rating Scale, KOOS = Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test.

Appendix 3. Co-morbidities disqualifying six patients for surgery after exercise (assessed by an orthopedic surgeon).

1	Smoker, reduced lung function (diagnosed with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) and obesity.
2	Acute neurological and urological diagnoses.
3	Obesity.
4	Acute neurological diagnosis.
5	Referred to further diagnosis.
6	Personal challenges.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Assessment after surgery (secondary endpoints [t_2 and t_3])

Appendix 4. Baseline characteristics for the sub-sample that underwent surgery (t_0).

Characteristics	All patients	Group 2	Group 4	Group 6
Mean (SD)	N = 32	N = 7	N = 12	N = 13
Gender (f/m)	20/12	6/1	8/4	6/7
Age (years)	66.4 (9.0)	68.8 (12.7)	65.2 (8.3)	66.2 (7.9)
Weight (kg)	93.2 (16.6)	90.5 (16.4)	92.2 (17.0)	95.7 (17.2)
Height (cm)	170.6 (9.6)	165.7 (9.4)	169.9 (7.5)	173.9 (10.7)
Municipality (Cph/Hvi/Bro)	16/10/6	4/2/1	3/6/3	9/2/2
Kellgren and Lawrence score (2/3/4)	4/10/18	2/2/3	1/4/7	1/4/8
Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)	2.3 (2.0)	1.9 (1.3)	3.0 (2.1)	2.0 (2.2)
Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)	6.1 (1.3)	5.4 (1.0)	6.9 (1.0)	5.8 (1.4)
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)	1.18 (0.51)	1.02 (0.43)	1.10 (0.60)	1.35 (0.43)
KOOS Symptoms (0-100)	52.3 (17.8)	61.2 (16.3)	45.8 (15.7)	53.6 (19.2)
KOOS Pain (0-100)	43.6 (14.5)	47.6 (15.7)	37.0 (16.0)	47.4 (10.8)
KOOS ADL (0-100)	51.0 (14.8)	54.8 (14.1)	42.6 (15.8)	56.7 (11.3)
KOOS Sport (0-100)	16.9 (17.4)	12.9 (16.3)	13.3 (18.0)	22.3 (17.4)
KOOS QoL (0-100)	27.1 (15.4)	28.6 (16.5)	22.4 (15.6)	30.8 (14.8)
OKS (0-48)	22.6 (7.3)	24.9 (7.0)	18.5 (7.1)	25.1 (6.4)
6MWT (m)	408.0 (96.9)	428.6 (90.8)	372.7 (108.4)	429.5 (85.8)
SCT up (secs)	9.4 (4.8)	7.9 (2.6)	11.2 (5.6)	8.6 (4.6)
SCT down (secs)	10.8 (8.2)	8.3 (3.1)	13.4 (10.4)	9.7 (7.6)
TKA/UKA	20/12	5/2	7/5	8/5

Cph = Copenhagen, Hvi = Hvidovre, Bro = Broendby, KOOS = Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test, TKA = Total Knee Arthroplasty, UKA = Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty.

Appendix 5. Mean change in all outcomes between baseline and acutely after surgery (t_0-t_2). Intention-to-treat analysis, N = 32. One-way ANOVA based on imputed data.

	Mean change (95% CI) from baseline within groups (effect = time)			Mean change (95% CI) from baseline between groups (effect = time*group)			
	Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change		Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change
			Primary outcome				
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)							
All patients	-0.62 (-0.86 to -0.39)	<0.001	-47.5%				
Group 2	-0.49 (-0.98 to 0.01)	0.052	-52.0%	Group 2 vs. 4	-0.15 (-0.77 to 0.47)	0.628	9.2%
Group 4	-0.63 (-1.03 to -0.23)	0.003	-42.7%	Group 2 vs. 6	-0.20 (-0.80 to 0.41)	0.511	2.3%
Group 6	-0.68 (-1.05 to -0.32)	<0.001	-49.6%	Group 4 vs. 6	-0.05 (-0.60 to 0.50)	0.852	-6.9%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

			Secondary outcomes				
Current pain							
All patients	1.6 (0.3 to 2.8)	0.017	69.6%				
Group 2	0.7 (-2.2 to 3.5)	0.627	36.8%	Group 2 vs. 4	0.9 (-2.7 to 4.6)	0.602	-16.5%
Group 4	1.6 (-0.7 to 3.9)	0.159	53.3%	Group 2 vs. 6	1.4 (-1.9 to 4.7)	0.393	-68.2%
Group 6	2.1 (0.3 to 3.8)	0.025	105.0%	Group 4 vs. 6	0.5 (-2.6 to 3.5)	0.747	51.7%

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Isometric knee-extensor strength reported as Nm/kg (positive change = improvement); Pain scores reported on Numeric Raring Scales (NRS 0-10) (negative change = improvement). Too few observations to run the One-way ANOVA model (model did not converge) for the outcomes: Six-minute walk test (6MWT) and Star climb test (SCT).

Appendix 6. Mean change in all outcomes between baseline and three months after surgery (t_0-t_3). Intention-to-treat analysis, N = 32. One-way ANOVA based on imputed data.

	Mean change (95% CI) from baseline within groups (effect = time)			Mean change (95% CI) from baseline between groups (effect = time*group)			
	Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change		Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change
			Primary outcome				
Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)							
All patients	-0.05 (-0.26 to 0.16)	0.631	-4.2%				
Group 2	0.23 (-0.21 to 0.67)	0.289	20.0%	Group 2 vs. 4	-0.39 (-0.96 to 0.19)	0.177	36.7%
Group 4	-0.16 (-0.51 to 0.20)	0.376	-16.7%	Group 2 vs. 6	-0.33 (-0.87 to 0.20)	0.211	27.1%
Group 6	-0.10 (-0.40 to 0.20)	0.499	-7.1%	Group 4 vs. 6	0.05 (-0.42 to 0.53)	0.811	-9.5%
			Secondary outcomes				
KOOS Symptoms							
All patients	16.6 (5.7 to 27.6)	0.004	31.7%				
Group 2	17.4 (-6.7 to 41.5)	0.148	28.4%	Group 2 vs. 4	7.0 (-37.6 to 23.7)	0.642	5.7%
Group 4	10.4 (-8.4 to 29.2)	0.263	22.7%	Group 2 vs. 6	-4.5 (-24.6 to 33.7)	0.752	-12.4%
Group 6	21.9 (5.3 to 38.5)	0.012	40.9%	Group 4 vs. 6	-11.5 (-37.3 to 14.3)	0.362	-18.2%
KOOS Pain							
All patients	28.1 (18.6 to 37.7))	<0.001	64.4%				
Group 2	37.8 (16.8 to 58.8)	0.001	79.4%	Group 2 vs. 4	14.1 (-13.3 to 41.5)	0.298	15.4%
Group 4	23.7 (6.8 to 40.6)	0.008	64.1%	Group 2 vs. 6	10.9 (-14.7 to 36.5)	0.390	22.7%
Group 6	26.9 (12.1 to 41.7)	<0.001	56.8%	Group 4 vs. 6	-3.2 (-27.4 to 21.0)	0.783	7.3%
KOOS ADL							
All patients	23.9 (16.1 to 31.7)	<0.001	46.9%				
Group 2	30.4 (12.8 to 47.9)	0.002	55.5%	Group 2 vs. 4	8.6 (-13.8 to 31.0)	0.434	4.5%
Group 4	21.7 (8.2 to 35.3)	0.003	50.9%	Group 2 vs. 6	8.0 (-13.3 to 29.3)	0.444	16.0%
Group 6	22.4 (10.2 to 34.5)	<0.001	39.5%	Group 4 vs. 6	-0.6 (-20.0 to 18.8)	0.949	11.4%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

KOOS Sport							
All patients	18.2 (6.3 to 30.2)	0.004	107.7%				
Group 2	24.5 (-2.0 to 51.1)	0.068	189.9%	Group 2 vs. 4	12.3 (-21.8 to 46.3)	0.462	97.4%
Group 4	12.3 (-8.7 to 33.2)	0.237	92.5%	Group 2 vs. 6	4.2 (-28.1 to 36.5)	0.789	98.9%
Group 6	20.3 (2.3 to 38.4)	0.029	91.0%	Group 4 vs. 6	-8.1 (-37.1 to 20.9)	0.567	1.4%
KOOS QoL							
All patients	29.4 (18.9 to 39.9)	<0.001	108.5%				
Group 2	39.3 (16.6 to 62.1)	0.002	137.4%	Group 2 vs. 4	18.4 (-10.7 to 47.5)	0.202	44.1%
Group 4	20.9 (3.0 to 38.8)	0.024	93.3%	Group 2 vs. 6	7.4 (-20.2 to 35.1)	0.584	33.8%
Group 6	31.9 (16.2 to 47.7)	<0.001	103.6%	Group 4 vs. 6	-11.0 (-35.7 to 13.7)	0.361	-10.3%
OKS							
All patients	9.9 (6.0 to 13.8)	<0.001	43.8%				
Group 2	12.2 (3.7 to 20.6)	0.007	49.0%	Group 2 vs. 4	4.8 (-6.1 to 15.6)	0.375	9.0%
Group 4	7.4 (0.7 to 14.1)	0.032	40.0%	Group 2 vs. 6	1.2 (-9.2 to 11.6)	0.818	5.2%
Group 6	11.0 (4.9 to 17.0)	<0.001	43.8%	Group 4 vs. 6	-3.6 (-12.8 to 5.7)	0.427	-3.8%
Current pain							
All patients	-1.3 (-2.0 to -0.6)	0.001	-56.5%				
Group 2	-1.5 (-3.0 to 0.1)	0.071	-78.9%	Group 2 vs. 4	-0.7 (-2.7 to 1.3)	0.448	-55.6%
Group 4	-0.7 (-1.9 to 0.5)	0.243	-23.3%	Group 2 vs. 6	0.3 (-1.7 to 2.2)	0.768	6.1%
Group 6	-1.7 (-2.8 to -0.6)	0.003	-85.0%	Group 4 vs. 6	1.0 (-0.7 to 2.8)	0.241	61.7%
Pain last week							
All patients	-2.9 (-4.0 to -1.7)	<0.001	-47.5%				
Group 2	-3.1 (-5.7 to -0.5)	0.022	-57.4%	Group 2 vs. 4	-0.7 (-4.0 to 2.6)	0.671	-22.6%
Group 4	-2.4 (-4.4 to 0.4)	0.021	-34.8%	Group 2 vs. 6	0.1 (-3.1 to 3.3)	0.948	-2.2%
Group 6	-3.2 (-5.0 to -1.4)	0.001	-55.2%	Group 4 vs. 6	0.8 (-2.0 to 3.6)	0.560	20.4%
6MWT							
All patients	-2.3 (-42.2 to 37.6)	0.907	-0.6%				
Group 2	39.6 (-43.8 to 123.0)	0.335	9.2%	Group 2 vs. 4	83.7 (-19.1 to 186.5)	0.105	21.1%
Group 4	-44.1 (-107.3 to 19.2)	0.162	-11.8%	Group 2 vs. 6	25.9 (-75.0 to 126.8)	0.600	6.0%
Group 6	13.7 (-43.8 to 71.3)	0.627	3.2%	Group 4 vs. 6	-57.8 (-139.9 to 24.3)	0.156	-15.0%
SCT up							
All patients	-1.0 (-2.5 to 0.4)	0.162	-10.6%				
Group 2	-1.4 (-4.7 to 1.9)	0.380	-17.7%	Group 2 vs. 4	-0.3 (-4.6 to 3.9)	0.883	-7.9%
Group 4	-1.1 (-3.8 to 1.5)	0.395	-9.8%	Group 2 vs. 6	-0.6 (-4.6 to 3.4)	0.751	-8.4%
Group 6	-0.8 (-3.1 to 1.5)	0.488	-9.3%	Group 4 vs. 6	-0.3 (-4.0 to 3.4)	0.860	-0.5%
SCT down							
All patients	-1.6 (-4.1 to 0.8)	0.188	-14.8%				
Group 2	-1.3 (-6.6 to 4.1)	0.632	-15.7%	Group 2 vs. 4	0.9 (-5.8 to 7.7)	0.770	0.8%
Group 4	-2.2 (-6.5 to 2.0)	0.288	-16.4%	Group 2 vs. 6	-0.009 (-6.5 to 6.5)	0.998	-3.3%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965; this version posted April 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Group 6	-1.2 (-5.1 to 2.6)	0.508	-12.4%	Group 4 vs. 6	-1.0 (-7.1 to 5.2)	0.743	-4.0%

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Isometric knee-extensor strength reported as Nm/kg (positive change = improvement); Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) subscale reported on 0-100 scale (positive change = improvement); Oxford Knee Score (OKS) reported on 0-48 scale (positive change = improvement); Pain scores reported on Numeric Raring Scales (NRS 0-10) (negative change = improvement); Six-minute walk test (6MWT) reported in meters (positive change = improvement); Star climb test (SCT) reported in seconds (negative change= improvement).

Appendix 7. Simple regression models.

Independent variable	Dependent variable - Change scores from baseline to after 12 weeks of exercise (t_0-t_1)	Slope	95% CI
Exercise adherence quantified as *total number of sessions*			
	Knee-extensor muscle strength (Nm/kg)	-0.0015	-0.0037 to 0.0008
	KOOS Symptoms	-0.0160	-0.1877 to 0.1557
	KOOS Pain	0.0078	-0.1532 to 0.1687
	KOOS ADL	0.0556	-0.1105 to 0.2218
	KOOS Sport	0.0056	-0.2013 to 0.2125
	KOOS QoL	-0.0375	-0.2280 to 0.1529
	OKS	-0.0256	-0.1065 to 0.0552
	Current pain (0-10 NRS)	-0.0165	-0.0405 to 0.0075
	Avg. pain last week (0-10 NRS)	-0.0042	-0.0282 to 0.0197
	SMWT (meters)	-0.7323	-1.2819 to -0.1826
	SCT up (seconds)	0.0174	-0.0097 to 0.0444
	SCT down (seconds)	0.0026	-0.0367 to 0.0419
Exercise adherence quantified as total *time-under-tension (TUT)*			
	Knee-extensor muscle strength (Nm/kg)	-0.000006	-0.00001 to 0.000003
	KOOS Symptoms	0.000007	-0.0007 to 0.0008
	KOOS Pain	-0.00009	-0.0007 to 0.0006
	KOOS ADL	0.00004	-0.0006 to 0.0007
	KOOS Sport	-0.00004	-0.0009 to 0.0008
	KOOS QoL	-0.0004	-0.0011 to 0.0004
	OKS	-0.0002	-0.0005 to 0.0002
	Current pain (0-10 NRS)	-0.00004	-0.0001 to 0.00005
	Avg. pain last week (0-10 NRS)	0.00002	-0.00008 to 0.0001
	SMWT (meters)	-0.0022	-0.0044 to 0.00006
	SCT up (seconds)	0.00001	-0.00009 to 0.0001
	SCT down (seconds)	-0.00007	-0.0002 to 0.00008

TUT = Time-under-tension, KOOS = Knee Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = Six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test.