Title: Developing usage guidelines for outpatient rehabilitation after total knee arthroplasty: A Delphi study

Authors: Jeremy Graber[1,2], Laura Churchill[2], Tamara Struessel[2], Shane O'Malley[3], Michael Bade[1,2], Jennifer Stevens-Lapsley[1,2]

Affiliations:

[1]VA Eastern Colorado Geriatric Research, Education, and Clinical Center (GRECC), VA Eastern Colorado Health Care System, Aurora, Colorado, USA,

[2]Physical Therapy Program, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Colorado, Aurora, Colorado, USA

[3]VA Eastern Colorado Health Care System, Aurora, Colorado, USA

Abstract:

Objective

Little evidence exists to guide the usage of outpatient rehabilitation (i.e., frequency, timing, duration of care) after total knee arthroplasty. In the absence of guiding evidence, rehabilitation usage varies considerably among different clinicians, facilities, and geographic locations, which may limit the quality and cost-effectiveness of care. We sought to develop outpatient rehabilitation usage guidelines after total knee arthroplasty.

Methods

We used a 2-round Delphi process to develop expert consensus for rehabilitation usage guidelines. The Delphi panel consisted of surgeons, physical therapists, and advanced practice providers (N=29) with clinical and research expertise in recovery after total knee arthroplasty.

Results

The panel reached consensus on eight visit frequency guidelines for use in the first three months after total knee arthroplasty. These guidelines are responsive to patients' time since surgery and their recovery status relative to expected. Twelve additional complementary guidelines were developed to be used with the visit frequency guidelines.

Conclusions

We used the Delphi process to develop guidelines for outpatient rehabilitation usage afte r total knee arthroplasty. We envision these guidelines may help inform usage decisions and facilitate a more preference-sensitive approach to postoperative rehabilitation.

Keywords: total knee arthroplasty, rehabilitation, utilization, usage, preference-sensitive care, Delphi

Abbreviations: total knee arthroplasty (TKA), coefficient of variation (CV)

Introduction

Little evidence exists to guide the usage of supervised rehabilitation (i.e., frequency, timing, duration of care) after total knee arthroplasty (TKA). Guidance for postoperative rehabilitation usage is particularly lacking in the outpatient setting,[1] where usage varies considerably among clinicians, facilities, and geographic locations.[2-6] Although rehabilitation after TKA is widely recommended[1,7] and may improve patient outcomes,[8] this usage variability may undermine its overall quality and cost-effectiveness.[9] This highly variable usage paradigm may soon become unsustainable as payors seek to reduce joint replacement costs.[10,11]

Given the dearth of evidence available to guide rehabilitation usage after TKA, expert opinion could be useful for developing preliminary guidelines. In 2014, Westby et al. used the Delphi process to build consensus around best practices for TKA rehabilitation.[12] This study produced many key practice recommendations, but it did not develop consensus regarding post-acute rehabilitation usage. The lack of consensus may have been partially due to (1) the wide scope of included rehabilitation topics, which might have limited the focus on usage and (2) the opinion among participants that rehabilitation should be individually tailored.[12]

Patients do have unique needs, goals, and expectations after TKA,[13,14] which suggests a preference-sensitive approach to rehabilitation usage may be ideal.[15,16] Preference-sensitive care occurs when well-informed patients make health care decisions in line with their individual preferences.[16-18] Some patients with TKA may prefer extensive rehabilitation to help them achieve ambitious goals, while others may prefer to recover independently. However, since no

evidence currently exists to help patients make informed decisions, rehabilitation usage is more likely driven by the local health care system's capacity.[17-20] This type of supply-sensitive care fosters overutilization and ignores patients' individual needs. Thus, patients and clinicians would benefit from guidelines to anchor preference-sensitive decisions for outpatient rehabilitation usage after TKA.

In this study, we used the Delphi method to develop consensus among experts for outpatient rehabilitation usage guidelines after TKA. We focused on the optimal visit frequency, timing, and duration of rehabilitation; we hypothesized this focused approach would avoid the challenges experienced in previous studies for developing consensus. Our overall goal was to create evidence that can be used to facilitate a preference-sensitive approach to outpatient rehabilitation usage after TKA.

Methods

Panelist recruitment

We sought to enroll a heterogenous Delphi panel consisting of physical therapists, orthopedic surgeons, and advanced practice providers (e.g., physician assistants) with both clinical and research expertise in TKA recovery. We recruited participants from our own professional networks and through author lists of recently published literature in TKA rehabilitation. We limited our recruitment to individuals based in the United States because practice patterns can vary widely between countries. Individuals were eligible to participate if they had $\geq$ 5 years of

TKA-related experience and met one of the following volume criteria: (1) physical therapist who sees ≥ 10 patients with TKA/year in the outpatient setting, (2) orthopedic surgeon who performs ≥ 50 TKAs per year, or (3) advanced practice provider who sees ≥ 50 patients with TKA/year. Additionally, clinicians from these professions who did not meet the volume criteria were eligible to participate if they had ≥ 5 years of experience conducting and publishing TKA-related research. We aimed to enroll 30 participants with representation from each eligible profession; we chose this sample size as previous Delphi studies have observed stability with as few as 23 participants.[21] After enrollment, we sent participants personalized email reminders for each Delphi round to maximize response rates.

Guideline Development Phase

Before recruiting panelists, we developed a list of candidate guidelines for outpatient rehabilitation usage after TKA. We developed these guidelines using our collective expertise and feedback from local colleagues; we aimed to create a comprehensive list for panelists to consider during the Delphi process. We developed two categories of guidelines: (1) visit frequency guidelines and (2) complementary guidelines, which were designed to be used with the visit frequency guidelines. None of the individuals involved in the development phase participated on the Delphi panel.

(1) Visit frequency guidelines

We framed the visit frequency guidelines around efficient rehabilitation usage, which we defined as the minimum frequency of supervised visits needed to provide adequate care.

We used two main strategies to develop these visit frequency guidelines. First, we anchored each guideline to a specific timeframe after surgery (i.e., postoperative month 1, 2, or 3). We used this strategy because visit frequency recommendations may depend on postoperative tissue healing.[12] Also, clinicians typically re-evaluate rehabilitation treatment plans on monthly intervals, and patients often discharge from rehabilitation within three months after surgery.[3] Second, we anchored each guideline according to patients' observed recovery status relative to their expected recovery (i.e., patient is demonstrating a slow, typical, or fast recovery relative to expected). We used this strategy because patients are expected to recover differently based on their individual characteristics,[1,22] and monitoring recovery against an expected value can be a useful decision-making strategy.[23] Together, these strategies resulted in the development of nine separate combinations of recovery month + recovery status (e.g., postoperative month 1, recovering slower than expected). For each of these combinations, we asked panelists to rate their level of agreement with six different visit frequency options (0x/month, 1x/month, 2x/month, 1x/week, 2x/week, 3x/week). Overall, panelists considered 54 different visit frequency guidelines (nine combinations of recovery month + recovery status with six frequency options each). See Box 1 for an illustration of the structure used to create these guidelines.

Box 1. General structure used to create 54 different candidate visit frequency guidelines

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following visit frequency guideline for outpatient rehabilitation frequency after TKA:								
During the $\frac{\text{first, second, or third}}{\text{select one}}$ month after TKA, the most efficient visit frequency of outpatient rehabilitation for patients demonstrating a $\frac{\text{typical, slow, or fast}}{\text{select one}}$ recovery relative to expected should be $\frac{\text{0x/month, 1x/month, 2x/month, 1x/week, 2x/week, or 3x/week}}{\text{select one}}$								
1 Strongly Disagree	**2**	**3 Somewhat Disagree**	**4**	**5 Neutral**	**6**	**7 Somewhat Agree**	**8**	**9 Strongly Agree**

(2) Complementary guidelines

We designed the complementary guidelines to be used with the visit frequency guidelines. They queried panelists' opinions on (1) the optimal timing for initiating and stopping outpatient rehabilitation, (2) important range of motion recovery thresholds, (3) the approximate proportion of patients who demonstrate slow, typical, or fast recovery relative to expected, and (4) the safety and effectiveness of telerehabilitation for TKA.

Delphi Structure

We compiled the list of candidate guidelines into surveys for panelists to consider in Round 1 of the Delphi process. Panelists were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with the visit frequency guidelines using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree)(see Box 1). We used the RAND UCLA method to define consensus,[24] where guidelines with a median response of $\geq$ 7/9 and less than 30% of responses

in the 1-3 range were considered to have reached consensus.[25,26] Because panelists separately rated six different visit frequency options for each combination of recovery month + recovery status, more than one frequency within a combination could potentially meet our definition of consensus. In this case, we considered the frequency with the higher mean response to have reached consensus.

A few of the complementary guidelines were scored using the Likert scale and method described above, but most of them required numeric responses. We did not employ a formal definition of consensus for these numerically scored guidelines because they were meant to be supportive—not definitive. Instead, we calculated the mean response for these guidelines during the final Delphi round. In addition to Likert and numeric responses, the Delphi survey also included open-ended text boxes to record panelists' comments after each guideline. Panelists were encouraged to comment on the rationale behind their response, their opinions on specific guidelines, or suggestions for new/revised guidelines.

We conducted additional rounds as needed to develop consensus. During each subsequent round, we included all previous guidelines that had not reached consensus, and we revised and added new guidelines based on panelist feedback. We also provided panelists with (1) a list of guidelines that previously reached consensus, (2) a comparison between the individual's response and the group's response for each guideline, and (3) a qualitative summary of the group's comments for guidelines from the previous round.

To determine whether additional rounds were needed, we examined the response stability for each guideline that had not reached consensus. Specifically, we compared the absolute difference in the coefficient of variation (CV, standard deviation / mean) between rounds and considered values < 0.2 to be indicative of stability.[27,28] We also monitored the number and content of comments between rounds; we considered fewer comments with no major change in content as further evidence of response stability.[29] See Figure 1 below for a summary of the Delphi round structure.



Figure 1. Summary of Delphi structure

All study procedures were approved by the Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board. We administered all surveys electronically via REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at the University of Colorado.[30,31] We assured panelists their responses and identities would be anonymous throughout the study.

Results

We invited 49 individuals to participate, and 30 panelists enrolled with 29 completing two Delphi rounds. The panel had an average of 17 years of TKA experience and included individuals from 11 US states and 22 unique zip codes. The panel included representation from the Department of Veterans Affairs (n=6), university settings (n=6), non-profit organizations (n=9), private practice (n=5), and other practice settings (n=3). Twelve out of the 18 participating physical therapists held either a PhD or board-certified specialization. Additional details regarding the panel's experience and participation by round are available in Table 1 and Figure 2, respectively. We did not conduct additional rounds beyond Round 2 because (1) the absolute difference in CV between Rounds 1-2 was small (< 0.2) for all guidelines included on both rounds and (2) no major changes were identified from panelist's comments between rounds.



Figure 2. Flow chart depicting panelist recruitment and participation

Table 1. Summary of panel's TKA-related experience

Characteristic	Orthopedic surgeons (n=8)	Physical therapists (n=18)	Advanced practice providers (n=3)	Total (N=29)
Years of TKA experience	15.5 (11 – 36)	15 (6 – 48)	6 (6 – 18)	15 (6 – 48)
Type of TKA experience				
Primarily clinical	n = 5	n = 12	n = 3	n = 19
Equally clinical + research	n = 3	n = 4	n = 0	n = 8
Primarily research	n = 0	n = 2	n = 0	n = 2
TKAs performed/year	250 (120 – 400)	NA	NA	250 (120 – 400)
Percentage of clinical caseload related to TKA	Not captured	25 (4 – 70)	38 (10 – 50)	25 (4 – 70)

*All values are presented as median (range) unless otherwise noted.

Visit frequency guidelines for outpatient TKA rehabilitation

The panel reached consensus in Round 1 for visit frequency guidelines in eight of the nine combinations of recovery month + recovery status. The panel did not reach consensus on a visit frequency for patients recovering faster than expected in postoperative month 3 during either round. In both rounds, many panelists commented that a fast-recovering individual's need for rehabilitation at postoperative month 3 is highly contingent upon their postoperative goals. Other panelists commented that fast-recovering patients should already be discharged by postoperative month 3.

Table 2. TKA rehabilitation visit frequency guidelines by patient's postoperative month and recovery status

Recovery status	Visit frequency guideline
Recovery month 1	
Slow	2x/week
Typical	2x/week
Fast	2x/week
Recovery month 2	
Slow	2x/week
Typical	1x/week
Fast	1x/week
Recovery month 3	
Slow	2x/week
Typical	1x/week
Fast	No consensus

All complementary guidelines that used Likert scoring reached consensus. The panel agreed that outpatient rehabilitation should be initiated within 1 week following TKA, and that telerehabilitation is safe and effective for patients demonstrating a typical or fast recovery, but not for patients demonstrating a slow recovery. The panelists also provided stable numeric responses for (1) the optimal timing for discharge from outpatient rehabilitation, (2) the proportion of patients who demonstrate a slow, typical, or fast recovery, and (3) important knee flexion and extension range of motion thresholds. The complementary guidelines are displayed in Table 3 along with the format (Likert or numerical) used to score them.

Table 3. Complementary guidelines designed to be used with visit frequency guidelines

Complementary guideline	Scoring method (score)	Potential application
Timing of outpatient rehabilitation		
Assuming a patient does not receive sub-acute or home health rehabilitation, outpatient rehabilitation should be initiated within the first week after TKA	Likert (Consensus reached)	Clinicians may recommend patients to schedule their first visit within one week after surgery
On average, patients who are demonstrating a *slower recovery* than expected are anticipated to discharge from outpatient rehabilitation around 15 weeks after surgery	Numerical (Mean = 15.2 weeks)	Clinicians may initiate discussions about discharge around these timeframes. Patients can use them to inform their preferences for when to discontinue supervised rehabilitation.
On average, patients who are demonstrating a *typical recovery* compared to expected are anticipated to discharge from outpatient rehabilitation around 10 weeks after surgery	Numerical (Mean = 10.2 weeks)	
On average, patients who are demonstrating a *faster recovery* than expected are anticipated to discharge from outpatient rehabilitation around 8 weeks after surgery	Numerical (Mean = 7.5 weeks)	
Proportion of patients who demonstrate a slow, typical, or fast recovery		
Approximately 22% of patients demonstrate a *slower recovery* than expected after TKA, which may indicate they need more rehabilitation than anticipated	Numerical (Mean = 22.4%)	Categorizing a patient's recovery requires clinical judgment. Clinicians can use these values to compare how frequently they are recommending more/less care than typical compared to expert opinion.
Approximately 54% of patients demonstrate a *typical recovery* compared to expected after TKA	Numerical (Mean = 54.3%)	
Approximately 24% of patients demonstrate a *faster recovery* than expected after TKA, which may indicate they need less rehabilitation than anticipated	Numerical (Mean = 23.6%)	
Important range of motion thresholds		
Most patients need approximately 114 degrees of knee flexion range of motion to be functional with most daily activities after TKA	Numerical (Mean = 113.6 degrees)	Certain tasks that most patients perform (e.g., walking) require a minimum range of motion. Patients who are not tracking towards these thresholds could be considered as slow recovering regardless of their recovery in other domains.
Most patients need to be within approximately 2 degrees of knee extension from neutral to be functional with most daily activities after TKA	Numerical (Mean = 2.4 degrees)	
Telerehabilitation		
Telerehabilitation *should not* be considered a safe and effective option for patients demonstrating a *slower recovery* than expected after TKA	Likert (Consensus reached)	Some patients may prefer telerehabilitation or have access to care challenges (transportation, rural area), which may influence their preference for rehabilitation usage. Clinicians may choose to offer telerehabilitation to patients if their recovery is progressing fast or typically.
Telerehabilitation *should* be considered a safe and effective option for patients demonstrating a *typical recovery* compared to expected after TKA	Likert (Consensus reached)	
Telerehabilitation *can* be considered a safe and effective option for patients demonstrating a *faster recovery* than expected after TKA	Likert (Consensus reached)	

Discussion

The panelists reached consensus on guidelines for the frequency, timing, and duration of outpatient rehabilitation after TKA based on patient's time since surgery and recovery status. We envision that patients and clinicians can use these guidelines as the starting point for preference-sensitive decisions regarding outpatient TKA rehabilitation usage. Their clinical utility may best be illustrated by example (see Box 2).

Box 2. Example case of using guidelines to facilitate preference sensitive decision-making for rehabilitation usage

> Patient A was recently re-evaluated by their physical therapist 8 weeks after their TKA (start of month 3). Patient A is pleased with their recovery because their pain is much improved, and they have met their personal goal of returning to a walking exercise program. Patient A's physical therapist informs them their recovery has progressed typically thus far. Their physical therapist suggests that most patients are recommended to be seen 1x/week at this point after surgery, and discharge is typically recommended around week 10. Patient A considers this information with respect to their goals and preferences and decides to return for one additional visit at week 10. They would prefer to rehabilitate independently until then because they feel confident with their home exercise routine and have already achieved their primary goal.

The case above demonstrates a simplified example of how these guidelines could facilitate preference-sensitive care. Patient A used the best available evidence (expert opinion in this case) to make a decision about TKA rehabilitation usage in line with their own preferences.[19] This type of preference-sensitive approach requires evidence to ensure patients are well informed, but typically the evidence is not strong enough to guide decision making

without considering patient preferences. Conversely, supply sensitive care occurs in the absence of medical theory or evidence, and care usage is driven primarily by the capacity of the local healthcare system.[17-20] Current rehabilitation usage after TKA exemplifies supply-sensitive care, where usage varies considerably by clinician, facility, and location in the absence of guidelines.[2-6] Shifting towards a more preference-sensitive approach to rehabilitation could meaningfully improve patient outcomes; patients with knee osteoarthritis who make informed, preference-sensitive care decisions have reported higher quality of life, function, and satisfaction compared to patients who do not.[32,33] It may also reduce overall rehabilitation costs,[17] which could help ensure that outpatient rehabilitation remains a valuable and reimbursable service after TKA.

The clinician's role in facilitating preference-sensitive care using this study's guidelines—or any medical evidence—should not be overlooked. To facilitate preference-sensitive care, clinicians must engage patients in the decision-making process,[17] attempt to maintain equipoise,[16] and avoid rigid guideline application.[34] Clinicians face barriers to consistently practicing this way in outpatient rehabilitation after TKA.[15] Therefore, the guidelines from this study may be most effective when combined with clinician training[35] or patient-facing support programs[36,37] to facilitate preference-sensitive decisions for rehabilitation usage.

Clinicians must also use their clinical judgement to implement the guidelines from this study. They need to determine whether a patient is demonstrating a slow, typical, or fast recovery relative to expected; the complementary guidelines were designed to aid in this

determination. For example, a clinician may determine a patient's recovery to be slower than expected if they are not on pace to achieve an important range of motion threshold (e.g., around 114 degrees of knee flexion). Additional examples of how the complementary guidelines can be applied with the visit frequency guidelines are provided in Table 3. However, clinicians must consider numerous additional factors when assessing an individual's recovery such as their preoperative prognosis,[1] pain, wound healing status,[12] and individual goals/expectations.[13,14] Clinicians and patients should work collaboratively to assess recovery and consider using these guidelines as a starting point for rehabilitation usage decisions. Clinicians should also ask patients about external factors that may influence their preferences such as familial support, access/transportation to rehabilitation, and insurance coverage.[12,15] Clinicians regularly make recommendations in consideration of these interplaying factors, but they should discuss their rationale with patients to facilitate preference-sensitive decisions.

The panelists in this study did not reach consensus on a visit frequency guideline for individuals recovering faster than expected in postoperative month 3. It appeared unlikely that additional rounds would lead to consensus because panelists' responses and comments were consistent between rounds. The panelists appeared to be split among two groups based on their comments. One group felt these patients should already be discharged from rehabilitation, while the other group felt the recommended rehabilitation frequency for these patients should depend on the ambitiousness of their goals (i.e., preference-sensitive care). Although no consensus was reached for a specific visit frequency, the complementary

guidelines suggest that clinicians should consider discussing discharge with fast-recovering patients around 8 weeks after surgery.

This study does have a few limitations. Perhaps most notably, patients with TKA were not included on the Delphi panel. We chose not to include patients because we felt it was important for panelists to have experience with a wide range of cases given the heterogeneity of the TKA population. We also envisioned that an individual patient's input on rehabilitation usage would be most valuable when applied to their own care (i.e., preference-sensitive care). Regardless, future work should examine patients' perceptions of the acceptability and usefulness of the guidelines developed in this study. This study also has notable strengths. We enrolled an experienced panel with considerable diversity in terms of profession, geography, and practice setting. To strengthen the validity of our findings, we used an iterative guideline development phase, established predefined definitions of consensus and response stability, provided participants with both quantitative and qualitative feedback between rounds, and incorporated panelist feedback into subsequent rounds.[38,39]

Conclusion

We used the Delphi method to develop guidelines for outpatient rehabilitation usage after TKA. These guidelines can be used by clinicians and patients to facilitate a preference-sensitive approach to rehabilitation usage, which may improve the quality and efficiency of care.

References

1. Jette DU, Hunter SJ, Burkett L, et al. Physical Therapist Management of Total Knee Arthroplasty. *Phys Ther*. 2020;100(9):1603-1631. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzaa099
2. Mitchell JM, Reschovsky JD, Reicherter EA. Use of Physical Therapy Following Total Knee Replacement Surgery: Implications of Orthopedic Surgeons' Ownership of Physical Therapy Services. *Health Serv Res*. 2016;51(5):1838-1857. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12465
3. Oatis CA, Li W, DiRusso JM, et al. Variations in Delivery and Exercise Content of Physical Therapy Rehabilitation Following Total Knee Replacement Surgery: A Cross-Sectional Observation Study. *Int J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2014;Suppl 5:002. doi:10.4172/2329-9096.S5-002
4. Oatis CA, Johnson JK, DeWan T, Donahue K, Li W, Franklin PD. Characteristics of Usual Physical Therapy Post-Total Knee Replacement and Their Associations With Functional Outcomes. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2019;71(9):1171-1177. doi:10.1002/acr.23761
5. Jones CA, Martin RS, Westby MD, Beaupre LA. Total joint arthroplasty: practice variation of physiotherapy across the continuum of care in Alberta. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2016;16(1):627. Published 2016 Nov 4. doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1873-9
6. Warren M, Shireman TI. Geographic Variability in Discharge Setting and Outpatient Postacute Physical Therapy After Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Phys Ther*. 2018;98(10):855-864. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzy077
7. Abdel MP, Berry DJ. Current Practice Trends in Primary Hip and Knee Arthroplasties Among Members of the American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons: A Long-Term Update. *J Arthroplasty*. 2019;34(7S):S24-S27. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2019.02.006
8. Artz N, Elvers KT, Lowe CM, Sackley C, Jepson P, Beswick AD. Effectiveness of physiotherapy exercise following total knee replacement: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2015;16:15. Published 2015 Feb 7. doi:10.1186/s12891-015-0469-6
9. Fatoye F, Yeowell G, Wright JM, Gebrye T. Clinical and cost-effectiveness of physiotherapy interventions following total knee replacement: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2021;141(10):1761-1778. doi:10.1007/s00402-021-03784-5
10. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS. Medicare program; comprehensive care for joint replacement payment model for acute care hospitals furnishing lower extremity joint replacement services. Final rule. Federal register. 2015 Nov 24;80(226):73273-554.
11. Siddiqi A, White PB, Mistry JB, et al. Effect of Bundled Payments and Health Care Reform as Alternative Payment Models in Total Joint Arthroplasty: A Clinical Review. *J Arthroplasty*. 2017;32(8):2590-2597. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2017.03.027

12. Westby MD, Brittain A, Backman CL. Expert consensus on best practices for post-acute rehabilitation after total hip and knee arthroplasty: a Canada and United States Delphi study. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2014;66(3):411-423. doi:10.1002/acr.22164

13. Weiss JM, Noble PC, Conditt MA, et al. What functional activities are important to patients with knee replacements?. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2002;(404):172-188. doi:10.1097/00003086-200211000-00030

14. Tilbury C, Haanstra TM, Leichtenberg CS, et al. Unfulfilled Expectations After Total Hip and Knee Arthroplasty Surgery: There Is a Need for Better Preoperative Patient Information and Education. *J Arthroplasty*. 2016;31(10):2139-2145. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2016.02.061

15. Graber J, Lockhart S, Matlock DD, Stevens-Lapsley J, Kittelson AJ. "This is not negotiable. You need to do this…": A directed content analysis of decision making in rehabilitation after knee arthroplasty. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2022;28(1):99-107. doi:10.1111/jep.13591

16. Elwyn G, Frosch D, Rollnick S. Dual equipoise shared decision making: definitions for decision and behaviour support interventions. *Implement Sci*. 2009;4:75. Published 2009 Nov 18. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-75

17. Wennberg JE, Fisher ES, Skinner JS. Geography And The Debate Over Medicare Reform: A reform proposal that addresses some underlying causes of Medicare funding woes: geographic variation and lack of incentive for efficient medical practices. Health affairs. 2002;21(Suppl1):W96-112.

18. Wennberg JE. Unwarranted variations in healthcare delivery: implications for academic medical centres. *BMJ*. 2002;325(7370):961-964. doi:10.1136/bmj.325.7370.961

19. Fisher ES, Wennberg JE. Health care quality, geographic variations, and the challenge of supply-sensitive care. *Perspect Biol Med*. 2003;46(1):69-79. doi:10.1353/pbm.2003.0004

20. Wennberg JE, Brownle S, Fisher ES, Skinner JS, Weinstein JN. Improving quality and curbing health care spending: opportunities for the Congress and the Obama Administration. Dartmouth Atlas White Paper. 2008.

21. Akins RB, Tolson H, Cole BR. Stability of response characteristics of a Delphi panel: application of bootstrap data expansion. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2005;5:37. Published 2005 Dec 1. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-5-37

22. Kittelson AJ, Loyd BJ, Graber J, et al. Examination of exclusion criteria in total knee arthroplasty rehabilitation trials: influence on the application of evidence in day-to-day practice. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2021;27(6):1335-1342. doi:10.1111/jep.13564

23. Glasziou PP, Irwig L, Aronson JK, editors. Chapter 2: Chooseing the best monitoring test. In: Evidence-based medical monitoring: from principles to practice. John Wiley & Sons; 2008:63-74

24. Fitch K, Bernstein SJ, Aguilar MD, Burnand B, LaCalle JR. The RAND/UCLA appropriateness method user's manual. Rand Corp Santa Monica CA; 2001 Jan 1.

25. Campbell SM, Cantrill JA, Roberts D. Prescribing indicators for UK general practice: Delphi consultation study. *BMJ*. 2000;321(7258):425-428. doi:10.1136/bmj.321.7258.425

26. Brook RH, Chassin MR, Fink A, Solomon DH, Kosecoff J, Park RE. A method for the detailed assessment of the appropriateness of medical technologies. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 1986;2(1):53-63. doi:10.1017/s0266462300002774

27. Kalaian SA, Kasim RM. Terminating sequential Delphi survey data collection. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation. 2012 Jan;17(5):n5.

28. Shah HA, Kalaian SA. Which is the best parametric statistical method for analyzing Delphi data?. Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods. 2009;8(1):20.

29. Holey EA, Feeley JL, Dixon J, Whittaker VJ. An exploration of the use of simple statistics to measure consensus and stability in Delphi studies. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2007;7:52. Published 2007 Nov 29. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-7-52

30. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-381. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010

31. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. 2019;95:103208. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208

32. Sepucha KR, Atlas SJ, Chang Y, et al. Informed, Patient-Centered Decisions Associated with Better Health Outcomes in Orthopedics: Prospective Cohort Study. *Med Decis Making*. 2018;38(8):1018-1026. doi:10.1177/0272989X18801308

33. Sepucha KR, Vo H, Chang Y, et al. Shared Decision-Making Is Associated with Better Outcomes in Patients with Knee But Not Hip Osteoarthritis: The DECIDE-OA Randomized Study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2022;104(1):62-69. doi:10.2106/JBJS.21.00064

34. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2008;336(7650):924-926. doi:10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD

35. Lawford BJ, Delany C, Bennell KL, Bills C, Gale J, Hinman RS. Training Physical Therapists in Person-Centered Practice for People With Osteoarthritis: A Qualitative Case Study. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2018;70(4):558-570. doi:10.1002/acr.23314Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken) 2018;70(4):558-570. (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/acr.23314.

36. Veroff D, Marr A, Wennberg DE. Enhanced support for shared decision making reduced costs of care for patients with preference-sensitive conditions. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2013;32(2):285-293. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2011.0941

37. Wennberg DE, Marr A, Lang L, O'Malley S, Bennett G. A randomized trial of a telephone care-management strategy. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363(13):1245-1255. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa0902321

38. Boulkedid R, Abdoul H, Loustau M, Sibony O, Alberti C. Using and reporting the Delphi method for selecting healthcare quality indicators: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(6):e20476. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0020476 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3111406/pdf/pone.0020476.pdf).

39. Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J, Radbruch L, Brearley SG. Guidance on Conducting and REporting DElphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: Recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med*. 2017;31(8):684-706. doi:10.1177/0269216317690685