

1 **An International Consensus Definition for Contextual Factors: Findings from a Nominal**
2 **Group Technique**

3 Chad E Cook ^{1,2,3}¶ ; Antoine Bailliard ^{1,4}&; Jennifer Bent*⁵&; Joel Bialosky ^{6a,6b}&; Elisa Carlino
4 ⁷&; Luana Colloca ⁸&, Jorge E Esteves^{9,10}&; Dave Newell ¹¹&; Alvisa Palese¹²&; William R.
5 Reed¹³&; Jennifer Plumb Vilaradaga¹⁴&; Giacomo Rossetini ¹⁵¶

6 ¹Department of Orthopaedics, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, United States of
7 America

8 ²Department of Population Health Sciences, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, United
9 States of America

10 ³Duke Clinical Research Institute, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, United States of
11 America

12 ⁴Occupational Therapy Doctorate Division, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, United
13 States of America

14 ⁵Department of Physical and Occupational Therapy, Duke University Hospital System, Durham,
15 North Carolina, United States of America

16 ^{6a} Department of Physical Therapy, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, United States of
17 America

18 ^{6b} Brooks-PHHP Research Collaboration, Gainesville, Florida, United States of America

19 ⁷ Department of Neuroscience Rita Levi Montalcini, University of Turin, Italy

20 ⁸ Departement of Pain and Translational Symptom Science and the Placebo Beyond Opinions
21 Center, University of Maryland School of Nursing, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of
22 America

23 ⁹Clinical-Based Human Research Department, Foundation COME Collaboration, Pescara, Italy

24 ¹⁰Malta ICOM Educational, Gzira, Malta

25 ¹¹ AECC University College, Bournemouth, Dorset, United Kingdom

26 ¹² Department of Medical Sciences, School of Nursing, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

27 ¹³Department of Physical Therapy, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham,
28 Alabama, United States of America

29 ¹⁴Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina,
30 United States of America

31 ¹⁵School of Physiotherapy, University of Verona, Verona, Italy

32

33

34 *Corresponding Author

35 E-mail: Jennifer.bent@duke.edu (JB)

36

37 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

38 &These authors also contributed equally to this work.

39

40

41

42

43

44 **Abstract**

45 Emerging literature suggests contextual factors are important components of therapeutic
46 encounters and may substantially influence clinical outcomes of a treatment intervention. At
47 present, a single consensus definition of contextual factors, which is universal across all health-
48 related conditions is lacking. The objective of this study was to create a consensus definition of
49 contextual factors to better refine this concept for clinicians and researchers. The study used a
50 multi-stage virtual Nominal Group Technique (vNGT) to create and rank contextual factor
51 definitions. Nominal group techniques are a form of consensus-based research, and are beneficial
52 for identifying problems, exploring solutions and establishing priorities. The 10 international
53 vNGT participants had a variety of clinical backgrounds and research specializations and were
54 all specialists in contextual factors research. The initial stages of the vNGT resulted in the
55 creation of 14 independent contextual factor definitions. After a prolonged discussion period, the
56 initial definitions were heavily modified, and 12 final definitions were rank ordered by the vNGT
57 participants from first to last. A sixth round was used to identify a final consensus, which
58 reflected the complexity of contextual factors and included three primary domains: 1) an overall
59 definition; 2) qualifiers that serve as examples of the key areas of the definition; and 3) how
60 contextual factors may influence clinical outcomes. Our consensus definition of contextual
61 factors seeks to improve the understanding and communication between clinicians and
62 researchers. These are especially important in recognizing their potential role in
63 moderating/mediating clinical outcomes.

64 **Keywords:** Clinical outcomes, Consensus research, Contextual factors, Nominal group
65 technique, Placebo.

66

67 **Introduction**

68 Tools such as patient reported outcome measures (PROMs), physical performance
69 measures, and patient experience measures, are used to measure a patient's health outcomes [1],
70 and are influenced by a number of internal (within the person) and external (outside the person)
71 factors. These factors may include comorbidities [2], cognition and mood [2], socioeconomic
72 and social status [3,4], and care timing and provider specialization [5-7]. Targeted
73 treatment/interventions may also influence outcomes but are commonly moderated and/or
74 mediated by factors such as expectations [8,9], the patient-clinician relationship [10], legal status
75 [11], workers compensation [11], social risk variables [3,4], common factors [12], and natural
76 history [13]. These factors influence disparate individuals differently; consequently,
77 understanding the role that interventions contribute toward patient outcomes becomes
78 challenging.

79 The ecological landscape in which the clinical encounter occurs, sometimes referred to as
80 therapeutic context, constituting a range of factors increasingly referred to as contextual factors,
81 can also markedly moderate or mediate outcomes [14]. Although increasingly well studied,
82 contextual factors/effects are defined differently across a majority of studies [10, 15-21].
83 Definitions vary and have included sociodemographic variables [15], person-related factors
84 (race, age, patient beliefs and characteristics) [15], and physical and social environments [16]. At
85 a micro-level, contextual factors have been defined by seemingly disparate terms such as
86 therapeutic alliance [10], one's role in the environment [17], treatment characteristics [18],
87 healthcare processes [19], placebo or nocebo effects [20], government agencies [17], and cultural

88 beliefs. Occasionally, at a macro-level, they are described as confounders or effect modifiers that
89 are not an outcome of the study, but need to be recognized (and measured) [16,21].

90 Recently, through a multi-step process, the Outcome Measures in Rheumatology
91 (OMERACT) initiative created a consensus definition for contextual factors [21]. The principal
92 goal of OMERACT was to identify contextual factors that were relevant for clinical trials.
93 Initially, OMERACT defined a contextual factor as a “*variable that is not an outcome of the*
94 *study, but needs to be recognized (and measured) to understand the study results. This includes*
95 *potential confounders and effect modifiers*” [22]. Through semi-structured interviews and Delphi
96 research, the OMERACT group further qualified contextual factor types (relevant for clinical
97 trials) as: 1) effect modifying (those that modify the treatment effect); 2) outcome influencing
98 (those that predict the prognosis and may confound results); and 3) measurement affecting (those
99 that influence measurement properties such as reliability and validity).

100 The OMERACT’s broad definition is useful for understanding results in a clinical trial, in
101 that it exists within a more historic paradigm that seeks to remove effects rather than enhance
102 them. In this role it fails to resolve some of the confusion associated with the multitudes of ways
103 contextual factors are presently defined (specifically, whether internal and external domains are
104 potentially contextual factors), does not include qualifiers to improve one’s understanding, and
105 provides no guidance as to how clinicians may identify contextual factors within clinical
106 encounters in order to enhance positive and minimize negative effects. Subsequently, the
107 objective of this study was to create a consensus definition of contextual factors to better
108 encapsulate this concept both to guide clinicians in clinical scenarios as well as broaden
109 definitions for researchers. This study used a virtual nominal group technique (vNGT) [23], and
110 included researchers and research clinicians from multiple professions who specialized in the

111 study of contextual effects research. Similar to the OMERACT group, we endeavored to identify
112 a consensus definition that reflects the complexity of contextual factors and describe how
113 contextual factors may influence clinical outcomes, but were also interested in a more detailed
114 set of qualifiers that serve as examples of the key areas of the definition.

115

116 **Methods**

117 *Study Design:* The mixed methods study used a vNGT [23]. The vNGT was performed in
118 October of 2022. Nominal group techniques are beneficial for identifying problems, exploring
119 solutions and establishing priorities, and encourages contributions from all participants and treats
120 each person equally [23]. The Institutional Review Board of Duke University, Durham, North
121 Carolina, USA, approved the study (ro00111522-INIT-1.0).

122 *Nominal Group Technique Participants:* Optimal NGT participants are stated as five to
123 nine individuals [23], but values may vary. NGT participants were identified by their expertise in
124 contextual factors and/or by their targeted clinical background or specialization and invited to
125 participate in the vNGT.

126 *Study Procedure:* Participants were provided with pre-work prior to the vNGT. Each
127 individual was provided with an article [23] that outlined the vNGT processes and were asked to
128 consider early development of their own versions of a definition for contextual factors.

129 During the virtual session, a five-stage NGT process following the protocol by Potter et
130 al. [23] was used (Figure 1). The virtual session was conducted using Microsoft Zoom

131 (Microsoft Corp, Redmond, WA) and the moderator for the session was a mixed-methods
132 researcher with a contextual factors background and prior experience with vNGT research and
133 moderation.

134 **Fig. 1 The Five Stage Process of a Virtual Nominal Group Technique according to Potter**
135 **[23].**

136 Stage one (Introduction and Explanation): An introduction and welcome to all
137 participants with an explanation of the purpose and procedure of the workshop.

138 Stage two (Silent Idea Generation): The question was introduced to the participants:
139 “What is a working definition of contextual factors”? All participants were asked to create a list
140 of ideas that come to mind when considering the question and to place these ideas on a shared
141 Google document. During this stage, all participants were asked not to consult or discuss ideas
142 with each other. A total of 10 minutes was provided for each participant to create their selected
143 definitions.

144 Stage three (Sharing Ideas): During Stage three, each participant introduced their
145 definitions that were recorded on the google documents. This document was shared on the screen
146 so that all participants can see the list in real time. This stage continued in a round robin format
147 until all ideas had been presented. No debate or discussion occurred at this stage.

148 Stage four (Group Discussion): Participants were invited to seek verbal explanation or
149 further details about any ideas that were produced during stage three. The moderator ensured that
150 each person was able to contribute and that all ideas were discussed without spending too long
151 on a single idea. At this stage, participants were able to suggest new items for discussion or

152 combining of items to modify the current list. Each participant “owned” each definition and
153 edited the definition only if they agreed on the change requested.

154 Unique to this vNGT, participants had up to one week to modify or delete their own
155 contributions or request edits to another definition that they did not generate. We elected to
156 provide additional time to edit each person’s definition, since the concept is complex and since
157 there were a variety of definitions presented in Stage two and three, which were further discussed
158 and modified in Stage four.

159 Stage five (Voting): During stage five, and after the week of modifying or deleting their
160 own contributions, vNGT participants were allowed to “rank order” the definitions generated
161 during stage four. Rank ordering was performed using a Qualtrics survey and a “ranking”
162 function. In this survey, each NGT participant ranked all 12 definitions from 1 (top choice) to 12
163 (lowest choice).

164 Modifications of a five round NGT are not uncommon and may be warranted when
165 working with complex populations or topics that require maturation before final evaluation [24].
166 If consensus voting does not identify a clear ranked winner, a sixth round, which includes re-
167 voting on the top ranked choices, can be implemented to assure a true consensus choice [23,24].
168 Our vNGT used a sixth round of voting to identify a clear consensus definition.

169

170 **Results**

171 *Participants Characteristics:* The NGT included 10 individuals with clinical/research
172 backgrounds in rehabilitation (chiropractic, osteopathy, physical therapy, or occupational
173 therapy), clinical psychology, medicine, and nursing. Advanced research training included
174 community engagement, molecular biology, nursing science, neurobiology, neuroscience,
175 placebo/nocebo, rehabilitation medicine, and social determinants of health (Table 1). The NGT
176 participants averaged 19 publications on contextual factors, and represented 4 countries across
177 two continents.

178 **Table 1. Virtual Nominal Group Technique Voting Participants' Backgrounds.**

Clinical Background	Research Training and Background	Location	Number of Publications involving Contextual Factors
Chiropractic	Anatomical Sciences and Neurobiology Neuroscience with a research focus in physiological and pain-related mechanisms	United States	30
Medical Physician / Neurophysiologist	Neuroscience	United States	10
None	Molecular Biology, Musculoskeletal Health	UK	9

Nursing	Nursing Science	Italy	15
Occupational Therapy	Community-based mental health service delivery models, sensory processing and participation	United States	19
Osteopathy	Cognitive Science	Malta	10
Physiotherapist	Placebo and Nocebo effects associated with contextual factors	Italy	18
Physiotherapist	Rehabilitation Science	United States	21
Psychologist	Neuroscience	Italy	34
Psychologist	Behavioral Intervention, Development and implementation, and Mediators and Moderators of Intervention Effects	United States	21

180 *Findings of the Nominal Group Technique:* Stage two generated 14 definitions of
181 contextual factors (Table 2). Seven vNGT participants submitted one definition, whereas two
182 participants submitted two definitions and one submitted three. Consistent domains included
183 internal and external factors, which influenced outcomes associated with any of the treatments
184 provided. Stage three refined the definitions through audience (clinicians and researchers)
185 discussion and the need for a single consensus definition including qualifiers that help define the
186 definition and how contextual factors may influence outcomes.

187 **Table 2. Initial Contextual Factor Definitions (Upon Completion of Stage Two).**

188

Definition Number	Definition
One	Contextual factors are the context elements always presented during the patient's interaction with the healthcare provider. They are involved in the placebo or nocebo effects and can influence the therapeutic outcomes. Some examples of them are: (1) the clinician's features (e.g., professionalism, mindset and appearance), (2) the patient's features (e.g., beliefs, previous experiences and expectations), 3) the patient clinician relationship (e.g., the words, gestures and behavior), 4) the characteristics of the treatment (e.g., the rituality, the invasiveness and the marketing), and 5) the overall healthcare setting (e.g., furniture, the architectural design and the overall impression of the clinic).

Two	<p>Contextual factors are elements of the context that accompanies the administration of a treatment (active or placebo). These elements can change the effectiveness of the treatment in a positive (placebo effect) or negative (nocebo effect) way. Contextual factors can be labeled as internal, external or relational.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Internal factors consist of memories, emotions, expectations and psychological and genetic characteristics of the patient involved in the therapy.● External factors include the physical aspects of therapy, such as the kind of treatment (e.g. pharmacological or manual) and the place in which the treatment is delivered.● Relational factors are represented by all the social cues that characterize the patient-physiotherapist relationship, such as the verbal information that the physiotherapist gives to the patient, the communication style or the body language.
Three	<p>Contextual factors are past and present environmental cues perceived by individuals either consciously or unconsciously that have the capacity to alter the prediction of future events including outcomes of therapeutic encounters</p>
Four	<p>Contextual factors are mechanisms through which some treatment effects occur including; factors related to the patient such as their expectations and beliefs; the therapist such as their personality, preferences, and beliefs, and the interaction between the therapist and the patient such as the strength of their relationship. Contextual factors are the mechanisms through which placebo and nocebo effects occur; however, clinically, contextual factors reflect mechanisms underlying treatment effects as opposed to placebo/nocebo effects. Contextual factors do not result in general, non-specific effects of interventions. Rather, contextual factors result in specific effects dependent on the individual beliefs of the patient and provider for a specific intervention.</p>

Five	Contextual factors are a critical component of the ecological niche surrounding the delivery of care. They are a broad range of factors/mechanisms that can positively or negatively influence the process of care. These include intra- and interpersonal factors (practitioner's belief system and style of practice, patient's expectations, prior experiences of care and predictive responses to care, communication styles, therapeutic alliance), environmental factors (clinical setting, online presence, organizational value system, communication), cultural/social factors (word of mouth/referral based on recommendations by friends and family, role of the practitioner/organization in the community).
Six	Contextual factors are physical, psychological and social elements that characterize the therapeutic encounter with the patient. They are actively interpreted by the patient and are capable of eliciting expectations, memories and emotions that, in turn, can influence the health-related outcome, producing placebo or nocebo effects.
Seven	Contextual factors are cues or information of the clinical or experimental context that accompanies the administration of a treatment. These elements are perceived and actively interpreted by the patient's brain
Eight	Contextual factors present during clinical care are perceived characteristics of the therapeutic environment considered important by patients and that curate a sense of what the encounter means which can modulate patient expectations as to what the likely outcomes might be
Nine	The Contextual factors represent the whole atmosphere around the therapy; the context that accompanies any healthcare treatment.
Ten	Contextual factors constitute implicitly or explicitly perceived information used by individuals to estimate/predict future individual

	<p>states. Such estimations can influence central sensory processing in such a way as to make such estimated sensory states true for the individual.</p>
Eleven	<p>The context of an action includes all micro, meso, and macro environmental factors (i.e., natural, sensorial, temporal, built, economic, political, cultural, social) and personal factors of individuals, groups and populations involved in the expression of the action being analyzed.</p>
Twelve	<p>Contextual factors are everything verbal and non-verbal outside of the therapeutic intervention that is experienced by the patient in relation to personal and environmental interaction during the clinical encounter. These include internal (patient expectations, emotions, etc.), external (facility, treatment room etc.) and relational factors (clinician-patient interaction, staff-patient interaction, etc.).</p>
Thirteen	<p>Contextual factors are the context in which any therapeutic treatment occurs and iteratively influence the trajectory of any health-related outcome. These include the current environment as well as current and historical physical, emotional, social, and cultural experiences that affect both patient and provider behavior, interactions, and expectations throughout the course of care.</p>
Fourteen	<p>Contextual factors are the external factors around a treatment. Any treatment is given not in a vacuum. The clinical setting, the patient-clinician including patient-caregiver-clinician interactions, occur within a specific context (where, when, and how). The contextual factors are external factors. Psychosocial factors are internal factors, which complement the contextual factors.</p>

190 At the end of Stage four (consolidation of ideas), there were 12 definitions that were rank
191 ordered (Table 3). Three definitions were clearly ranked higher than (Table 4) the remaining nine
192 with the majority (80%) of the vNGT selecting these choices as one of the top three selections.
193 These three were similar in content and scope and finished with mean “ranked” scores of 3.0, 3.7
194 and 3.8 respectively. Following a further poll of the group it was felt that it was necessary to vote
195 again (Round six), but to only include the three aforementioned definitions. Upon re-vote, one
196 clear winner was identified.

197 **Table 3. Modified Contextual Factor Definitions (Upon Completion of Stage Four)**

Definition Number	Definition
One	Contextual factors (CFs) are components of the therapeutic encounter whereby interventions, medications, pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments are given. CFs encompass the patient and provider personal (i.e., race/ethnicity and expectations), historical (i.e., clinical history and prior experiences), cultural (i.e., social norms, spirituality/religion and power differentials), environmental (i.e., settings and rituals), physical (i.e., sensorial perception and clinical procedures), and rhetorical (i.e., verbal and non-verbal elements of communication) dimensions around the therapeutic encounter and the patient-clinician interaction influencing moderators/mediators of therapeutic mechanisms and the response to any interventions/treatments and ultimately, the overall clinical outcomes. CFs can change the effectiveness of the treatment in a positive (placebo effect) or negative (nocebo effect) way.

Two	<p>Contextual factors (CFs) are components of the therapeutic encounter whereby interventions, medications, pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments are given. CFs encompass the patient and provider personal (e.g., race/ethnicity, genetic variables, expectations, values and preference), historical (e.g., clinical history, prior experiences), cultural (e.g., social norms, spirituality/religion and power differentials), environmental (e.g., settings and rituals), physical (e.g., sensorial perception, clinical examination and modalities in which the therapy is delivered), and rhetorical (e.g., verbal and non-verbal communication) dimensions around the therapeutic encounter and the patient-clinician interaction influencing moderators/mediators of therapeutic mechanisms and the response to any interventions/treatments and ultimately, the overall clinical outcomes. CFs can change the effectiveness of the treatment in a positive (placebo effect) or negative (nocebo effect) way.</p>
Three	<p>Contextual factors are mechanisms through which some treatment effects occur including; factors related to the patient such as their expectations and beliefs; the therapist such as their personality, preferences, and beliefs, and the interaction between the therapist and the patient such as the strength of their relationship. Contextual factors are the mechanisms through which placebo and nocebo effects occur; however, clinically, contextual factors reflect mechanisms underlying treatment effects as opposed to placebo/nocebo effects. Contextual factors do not result in general, non-specific effects of interventions. Rather, contextual factors result in specific effects dependent on the individual beliefs of the patient and provider for a specific intervention.</p>

Four	Contextual factors are a critical component of the ecological therapeutic niche. They are a broad range of factors that can positively or negatively influence the process of care. These include intra- and interpersonal factors (practitioner's belief system and style of practice, patient's expectations, prior experiences of care and predictive responses to care, communication styles, therapeutic alliance), environmental factors (clinical setting, online presence, organizational value system, communication), cultural/social factors (word of mouth/referral based on recommendations by friends and family, role of the practitioner/organization in the community).
Five	Contextual factors are physical, psychological and social elements that characterize the therapeutic encounter with the patient. They are actively interpreted by the patient and are capable of eliciting expectations, memories and emotions that, in turn, can influence the health-related outcome, producing placebo or nocebo effects.
Six	Contextual factors are cues or information of the clinical or experimental context that accompanies the administration of a treatment. These elements are perceived and actively interpreted by the patient's brain.
Seven	Contextual factors represent the whole atmosphere around the therapy; the context that accompanies any healthcare treatment.

Eight	<p>Contextual factors (CFs) are components of all therapeutic encounters and may constitute the entirety of the perceived effects of the intervention itself or be additive to effects of interventions such as pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments. CFs are perceived cues that affect both the patient and practitioner and can arise from experiences and immediate dynamics within the encounter, or a combination of both. CFs fall into broad categories that can include patient characteristics, practitioner characteristics, treatment characteristics, characteristics of the dynamic between the patient and practitioner and characteristics of the setting within which the encounter is being delivered. CFs can be complexly interwoven in the patients and practitioners experience so as to influence what patients and practitioners expect the outcome of the encounter to be. Through such conscious and unconscious expectations, involving a range of specific neurological pathways, CFs can directly impact (both positively and negatively) symptoms and characteristics associated with the presenting condition. The proportion of clinical effects observed associated with CFs can vary from large to small depending on the characteristics of the patient, practitioner, condition and intervention.</p>
Nine	<p>Contextual factors are integral components of a therapeutic encounter and can include environmental factors (e.g., natural, sensorial, temporal, built, economic, political, cultural, social) and personal factors of all individuals involved (e.g., physical, mental, social, cultural) in the therapeutic encounter. Some contextual factors are modifiable and can be targeted in intervention to effect change to personal factors.</p>
Ten	<p>Contextual factors are everything verbal and non-verbal outside of the therapeutic intervention that is experienced by the patient in relation to personal and environmental interaction during the clinical encounter. These include internal (e.g. patient expectations, emotions, cultural), external (e.g. facility ambience, environment) and relational (e.g. clinician/staff-patient interaction, social, physical, historical) factors that impact moderators/mediators of therapeutic outcomes.</p>

Eleven	Contextual factors are moderating/mediating components of the therapeutic encounter that influence the trajectory of a health-related outcome. These include the current therapeutic environment as well as current and historical physical, emotional, social, and cultural experiences that affect both patient and provider behavior, interactions, and expectations throughout the course of care.
Twelve	Contextual factors are components of the therapeutic encounter whereby interventions, medications, pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments are given. Contextual factors encompass the patient and provider personal (e.g., race/ethnicity, expectations, values and preference), historical (e.g., clinical history, prior experiences), cultural (e.g., social norms, spirituality/religion and power differentials), environmental (e.g., settings and rituals), physical (e.g., sensorial perception, and clinical examination), and rhetorical (e.g., verbal and non-verbal communication) dimensions around the therapeutic encounter and the patient-clinician interaction influencing moderators/mediators of therapeutic mechanisms and the response to any interventions/treatments and ultimately, the overall clinical outcomes.

198

199 **Table 4. Top Three Ranked Contextual Factor Definitions (Upon Completion of Stage**
200 **Five).**

Rank Order	Definition	Average Score / Median
-----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

First	<p>Contextual factors are components of the therapeutic encounter whereby interventions, medications, pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments are given. Contextual factors encompass the patient and provider personal (e.g., race/ethnicity, expectations, values and preference), historical (e.g., clinical history, prior experiences), cultural (e.g., social norms, spirituality/religion and power differentials), environmental (e.g., settings and rituals), physical (e.g., sensorial perception, and clinical examination), and rhetorical (e.g., verbal and non-verbal communication) dimensions around the therapeutic encounter and the patient-clinician interaction influencing moderators/mediators of therapeutic mechanisms and the response to any interventions/treatments and ultimately, the overall clinical outcomes.</p>	3.0 / 2.0
-------	---	-----------

Second	<p>Contextual factors (CFs) are components of all therapeutic encounters and may constitute the entirety of the perceived effects of the intervention itself or be additive to effects of interventions such as pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments. CFs are perceived cues that affect both the patient and practitioner and can arise from past experiences and immediate dynamics within the encounter, or a combination of both. CFs fall into broad categories that can include patient characteristics, practitioner characteristics, treatment characteristics, characteristics of the dynamic between the patient and practitioner and characteristics of the setting within which the encounter is being delivered. CFs can be complexly interwoven in the patients and practitioners experience so as to influence what patients and practitioners expect the outcome of the encounter to be. Through such conscious and unconscious expectations, involving a range of specific neurological pathways, CFs can directly impact (both positively and negatively) symptoms and characteristics associated with the presenting condition. The proportion of clinical effects observed associated with CFs can vary from large to small depending on the characteristics of the patient, practitioner, condition and intervention.</p>	3.7 / 3.0
--------	---	-----------

Third	Contextual factors (CFs) are components of the therapeutic encounter whereby interventions, medications, pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments are given. CFs encompass the patient and provider personal (e.g., race/ethnicity, genetic variables, expectations, values and preference), historical (e.g., clinical history, prior experiences), cultural (e.g., social norms, spirituality/religion and power differentials), environmental (e.g., settings and rituals), physical (e.g., sensorial perception, clinical examination and modalities in which the therapy is delivered), and rhetorical (e.g., verbal and non-verbal communication) dimensions around the therapeutic encounter and the patient-clinician interaction influencing moderators/mediators of therapeutic mechanisms and the response to any interventions/treatments and ultimately, the overall clinical outcomes. CFs can change the effectiveness of the treatment in a positive (placebo effect) or negative (nocebo effect) way.	3.8 / 3.0
-------	---	-----------

201

202

Final Definition: *Contextual factors (CFs) are components of all therapeutic*

203

encounters and may constitute the entirety of the perceived effects of the intervention itself or be

204

additive to effects of interventions such as pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments.

205

CFs are perceived cues that affect both the patient and practitioner and can arise from previous

206

experiences and immediate dynamics within the encounter, or a combination of both. CFs fall

207

into broad categories that can include patient characteristics, practitioner characteristics,

208

treatment characteristics, characteristics of the dynamic between the patient and practitioner

209

and characteristics of the setting within which the encounter is being delivered. CFs can be

210

complexly interwoven in the patients and practitioners experience so as to influence what

211 *patients and practitioners expect the outcome of the encounter to be. Through such conscious*
212 *and unconscious expectations, involving a range of specific neurological pathways, CFs can*
213 *directly influence (both positively and negatively) symptoms and characteristics associated with*
214 *the presenting condition. The proportion of clinical effects observed associated with CFs can*
215 *vary from large to small depending on the characteristics of the patient, practitioner, condition*
216 *and intervention.*

217 **Discussion**

218 The goal of the study was to develop a consensus-derived definition of contextual factors.
219 The study methodology used an vNGT, which is beneficial for identifying problems [25],
220 exploring solutions and establishing priorities, and providing a meaningful and economical
221 method of soliciting contributions from all participants [23]. Our final consensus selection
222 reflects the complexity of a definition of contextual factors and includes: 1) an overall definition,
223 2) qualifiers that serve as examples of the key areas of the definition and 3) how contextual
224 factors may influence clinical outcomes. We feel this harmonized definition will improve the
225 understanding of contextual factors and will help clinicians recognize their potential role in
226 moderating/mediating these factors to positively impact clinical outcomes. Further, we feel the
227 findings may also improve interpretation of research and deserve additional discussion.

228 The NGT participants (similar to the OMERACT group [21]) identified the influence of
229 contextual factors as mediators, moderators, or confounding variables and felt that contextual
230 factors included both internal and external factors. These fell into broad categories that included
231 patient characteristics, practitioner characteristics, treatment characteristics, characteristics of the
232 dynamic between the patient and practitioner and characteristics of the setting within which the

233 encounter is being delivered. This suggests that *who* is enrolled in a study, *who* provides care in a
234 study, and *where* that study is performed may influence clinical outcomes. Because of this,
235 studies require careful discussion on these aspects in their methodology and a discussion of their
236 potential to influence outcomes in their results.

237 Our initial set of 14 definitions identified a number of common elements associated with
238 contextual factors. The biggest differences across initial definitions included whether contextual
239 factors were considered as placebo/nocebo effects, whether the factors were actively or passively
240 perceived (or both), and whether contextual factors were considered moderators of treatment
241 (e.g., age, sex, socioeconomic status), mediators of treatment (e.g., self-efficacy, fear,
242 psychological mood) or both. Discussion during stage three highlighted the inconsistent domains
243 involved in the role of cultural versus political versus power imbalances, whether contextual
244 factors were a measurable mechanism, whether placebo/nocebo effects were a necessity within
245 the definition, if a contextual factor was a “nonspecific” finding, and its role as a prognostic
246 mediator/moderator. Thus, the emerging findings mirror the heterogeneity of conceptual
247 definition and the variability of dimensions associated with contextual factors reported in the
248 literature [14-21]. Our work acknowledged and established an initial synthesis of these complex
249 and important domains, which may in turn be fruitful to consider in future work.

250 Despite a wide range of clinical backgrounds and research training expertise, we were
251 pleased with the collaborative nature of our vNGT. With appropriate pre-work and judicious use
252 of time [23], we were able to consolidate many disparate initial thoughts to common themes
253 within the two-hour timeframe. When properly employed, consensus agreement methods create
254 structured environments for which experts are prompted to give the best available information,
255 allowing solutions to problems that may remain otherwise unsolved [26]. This requires the

256 process to be deliberately inclusive, participatory, collaborative, and cooperative, with an
257 ultimate goal of a final consensus agreement [27]. A fundamental element of this methodology is
258 that it does not require all participants to agree on all topics (it implies only general agreement)
259 nor does it assure unanimity.

260 At the end of stage four, vNGT participants were allocated one week to modify their
261 own definitions of contextual factors and then were given a 48-hour window to rank order the
262 final definitions. Eventually, a sixth round was deemed necessary to further separate three
263 competing definitions. During stage four, notable harmonizing occurred across each of the
264 definitions, especially our first goal of obtaining an overall definition. A majority also agreed
265 that contextual factors moderated or mediated clinical outcomes and compared to the initial set
266 of definitions, most included qualifying statements with the definitions as well. The qualifying
267 statements, such as patient and provider personal, historical, cultural, environmental, physical,
268 and rhetorical dimensions around the therapeutic encounter and the patient-clinician interaction,
269 are what separates our definition from that of the OMERACT group [21].

270

271 ***Limitations***

272 Although this study provided new insights into contextual factors' definition, some
273 limitations are worth mentioning. Firstly, although we exceeded the recommended panel size of
274 an NGT, we involved a small sample of participants from a restricted number of healthcare
275 fields, possibly leaving others unrepresented (e.g., midwifery, speech therapy, and optometry).
276 Regardless, we ensured adequate representativeness and geodiversity of contextual factors
277 experts in our vNGT by balancing the number of males and females (M: F = 6:4) and including

278 clinicians and clinical researchers throughout the world [28]. Secondly, compared to conducting
279 an in-person NGT, using a virtual Zoom platform could have produced a limited interaction
280 between participants with potentially diverging opinions, thus introducing bias. Nevertheless, the
281 limited time and resource requirements of the vNGT, together with the presence of an
282 experienced moderator, guaranteed a satisfactory quality of the participatory process, considering
283 all participants' views equally and minimizing any dominant effects [28]. Lastly, we should have
284 compared the definition of contextual factors obtained with our vNGT with other methods (e.g.,
285 Delphi, brainstorming) to evaluate their similarities and differences. However, we deliberately
286 used the vNGT because it represents a suitable consensus method to reach an agreement on a
287 single and complex topic among the participants [28].

288 **Conclusion**

289 Our study, involving a panel of international experts, offered the opportunity to identify a
290 definition of contextual factors, find their qualifiers and understand their impact on the
291 therapeutic outcome. Our findings may help clinicians and researchers embrace the complexity
292 that underlies the construct of contextual factors. We acknowledge different opinions can
293 coexist; we present our definition as a starting point for future studies on the topic.

294 **References**

- 295 1. Herbert R, Jamtvedt G, Mead J, Hagen KB. Outcome measures measure
296 outcomes, not effects of intervention. Elsevier; 2005. p. 3-4.

- 297 2. Tousignant-Laflamme Y, Martel MO, Joshi AB, Cook CE. Rehabilitation
298 management of low back pain—it's time to pull it all together! *Journal of pain research*.
299 2017;10:2373.
- 300 3. Sharpe JA, Miller R, Cook CE, Hastings SN, Rethorn TJ, Allen KD, et al. Social
301 Risk Factors Are Associated With Disability Prevalence—Results From 17 States in the
302 2017 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. *American Journal of Health
303 Promotion*. 2022:08901171221132390.
- 304 4. Rethorn ZD, Cook CE, Park C, Somers T, Mummaneni PV, Chan AK, et al.
305 Social risk factors predicting outcomes of cervical myelopathy surgery. *Journal of
306 Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2022;1(aop):1-8.
- 307 5. Hudon A, Lippel K, MacEachen E. Mapping first-line health care providers' roles,
308 practices, and impacts on care for workers with compensable musculoskeletal disorders
309 in four jurisdictions: A critical interpretive synthesis. *American Journal of Industrial
310 Medicine*. 2019;62(7):545-58.
- 311 6. Lentz TA, Goode AP, Thigpen CA, George SZ. Value-based care for
312 musculoskeletal pain: are physical therapists ready to deliver? *Physical Therapy*.
313 2020;100(4):621-32.
- 314 7. Ojha HA, Wyrsta NJ, Davenport TE, Egan WE, Gellhorn AC. Timing of physical
315 therapy initiation for nonsurgical management of musculoskeletal disorders and effects
316 on patient outcomes: a systematic review. *journal of orthopaedic & sports physical
317 therapy*. 2016;46(2):56-70.

- 318 8. Bishop MD, Mintken P, Bialosky JE, Cleland JA. Patient expectations of benefit
319 from interventions for neck pain and resulting influence on outcomes. *Journal of*
320 *Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*. 2013;43(7):457-65.
- 321 9. Eklund A, De Carvalho D, Pagé I, Wong A, Johansson MS, Pohlman KA, et al.
322 Expectations influence treatment outcomes in patients with low back pain. A secondary
323 analysis of data from a randomized clinical trial. *European Journal of Pain*.
324 2019;23(7):1378-89.
- 325 10. Kelley JM, Kraft-Todd G, Schapira L, Kossowsky J, Riess H. The influence of
326 the patient-clinician relationship on healthcare outcomes: a systematic review and meta-
327 analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PloS one*. 2014;9(4):e94207.
- 328 11. Rodeghero JR, Cook CE, Cleland JA, Mintken PE. Risk stratification of patients
329 with low back pain seen in physical therapy practice. *Man Ther*. 2015;20(6):855-60.
- 330 12. Miciak M, Gross DP, Joyce A. A review of the psychotherapeutic ‘common
331 factors’ model and its application in physical therapy: the need to consider general effects
332 in physical therapy practice. *Scandinavian journal of caring sciences*. 2012;26(2):394-
333 403.
- 334 13. Control CoD. Section 9: Natural History and Spectrum of Disease. In: Center for
335 Surveillance E, and Laboratory Services, editor.: Deputy Director for Public Health
336 Science and Surveillance; 2012.
- 337 14. McLaren L, Hawe P. Ecological perspectives in health research. *J Epidemiol*
338 *Community Health*. 2005;59(1):6-14.
- 339 15. Nielsen SM, Tugwell P, De Wit MP, Boers M, Beaton DE, Woodworth TG, et al.
340 Identifying provisional generic contextual factor domains for clinical trials in

- 341 rheumatology: results from an OMERACT initiative. *The Journal of rheumatology*.
342 2019;46(9):1159-63.
- 343 16. Sevilla Guerra S, Jean E, Kilpatrick K, Zabalegui A, Martínez Gaitero C.
344 Contextual factors of advanced practice nursing development: A network analysis. *Int J*
345 *Nurs Pract*. 2022:e13114.
- 346 17. Kaplan HC, Brady PW, Dritz MC, Hooper DK, Linam WM, Froehle CM, et al.
347 The influence of context on quality improvement success in health care: a systematic
348 review of the literature. *Milbank Q*. 2010;88(4):500-59.
- 349 18. Sherriff B, Clark C, Killingback C, Newell D. Impact of contextual factors on
350 patient outcomes following conservative low back pain treatment: systematic review.
351 *Chiropr Man Therap*. 2022;30(1):20.
- 352 19. Rollet Q, Tron L, De Mil R, Launoy G, Guillaume É. Contextual factors
353 associated with cancer screening uptake: A systematic review of observational studies.
354 *Prev Med*. 2021;150:106692.
- 355 20. Testa M, Rossetini G. Enhance placebo, avoid nocebo: How contextual factors
356 affect physiotherapy outcomes. *Man Ther*. 2016;24:65-74.
- 357 21. Nielsen SM, Boers M, de Wit M, Shea B, van der Windt DA, Reeves BC, et al.
358 OMERACT consensus-based operational definition of contextual factors in rheumatology
359 clinical trials: A mixed methods study. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 2021;51(3):601-6.
- 360 22. Boers M, Kirwan JR, Wells G, Beaton D, Gossec L, d'Agostino MA, et al.
361 Developing core outcome measurement sets for clinical trials: OMERACT filter 2.0. *J*
362 *Clin Epidemiol*. 2014;67(7):745-53.

- 363 23. Potter M, Gordon S, Hamer P. The nominal group technique: a useful consensus
364 methodology in physiotherapy research. *NZ Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2004;32(3):126-
365 30.
- 366 24. McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP. How to use the nominal group and Delphi
367
368
369 techniques. *International journal of clinical pharmacy*. 2016;38(3):655-62.
- 370 25. Young R, Sage K, Broom D, Broomfield K, Church G, Smith C. Using nominal
371 group technique to advance power assisted exercise equipment for people with stroke.
372 *Research Involvement and Engagement*. 2021;7(1):1-12.
- 373 26. Fink A, Kosecoff J, Chassin M, Brook RH. Consensus methods: characteristics
374 and guidelines for use. *American journal of public health*. 1984;74(9):979-83.
- 375 27. Black N, Murphy M, Lamping D, McKee M, Sanderson C, Askham J, et al.
376 Consensus development methods: a review of best practice in creating clinical guidelines.
377 *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 1999;4(4):236-48.
- 378 28. Manera K, Hanson CS, Gutman T, Tong A. Consensus Methods: Nominal Group
379 Technique. In: Liamputtong P, editor. *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social*
380 *Sciences*. Singapore: Springer Singapore; 2019. p. 737-50.

381

382




Figure 1. The Five Stage Process of a Virtual Nominal Group Technique according to Potter [23].