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}

¹Department of Clinical Research, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.

²Physical 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.

³Clinical Orthopedic Research Hvidovre (CORH), Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.

⁴Sports Orthopaedic Research Center – Copenhagen (SORC-C), Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.

⁵Center for General Practice at Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.

⁶Department of Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark.

⁷Department 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

29 Abstract

30 Objectives

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

35 Design

36 Randomized dose-response trial.

37 Setting

38 Primary and secondary care.

39 Participants

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

42 Interventions

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

46 Main outcome measures

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

52 Results

53 After 12 weeks of exercise, data were available for 117 patients (N=39/group). Isometric knee-extensor
54 strength increased in all groups but intention-to-treat analysis showed no difference between the three
55 groups in change from baseline to after 12 weeks of exercise in isometric knee-extensor muscle strength:
56 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
57 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

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](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT02931058), pre-registered October 10th, 2016. Protocol PubMed (PMID: [29347947](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29347947/)).

Key words

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

85 What is already known on this topic

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

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

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

92

93 What this study adds

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

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

98 This study successfully employed a model of coordinated care where the patients' decision on surgical
99 treatment was re-evaluated based on symptom changes following simple home-based exercise therapy.

100 These findings suggest using a model of coordinated non-surgical and surgical care to improve the decision
101 on surgery for patients eligible for knee replacement.

102 Introduction

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

111
 112 Exercise programs for patients with knee OA like ‘Good Life with osteoArthritis in Denmark’ (GLA:D) - now
 113 successfully implemented worldwide²¹ - and ‘Better management of patients with OsteoArthritis’ (BOA)
 114 support the effectiveness of exercise therapy and education for this patient population and deliver
 115 optimized care.²²⁻²⁵ These exercise programs are supervised, require physical attendance at fixed times and
 116 often require self-payment; factors which can be barriers for some patients and hinder participation and
 117 long-term adherence, creating inequality for the care accessible.²⁶⁻²⁹ An important element in exercise
 118 programs for patients with knee OA is knee-extensor strength³⁰, as decreased knee-extensor strength is
 119 associated with an increased risk of developing knee OA,³¹ risk of knee pain and decline in function.³² Our
 120 recent meta-regression analysis suggest no dose-response relationship between prescribed knee-extensor
 121 exercise and change in outcomes after knee-extensor exercise in patients scheduled for knee replacement
 122 – indicating that small exercise dosages might be equally effective to larger.³³ Based on these results, we
 123 investigated the dose-response relationship of *one* home-based exercise targeting the knee-extensor
 124 muscles, using a very simple and low-cost exercise option. Compared to supervised exercise programs, this
 125 solution does not require physical attendance at fixed times and is free of charge – providing patients with
 126 an alternative treatment option.

127
 128 The QUADX-1 trial was designed within a model of coordinated care where the patients’ decision on
 129 surgical treatment was re-evaluated based on symptom changes following home-based exercise therapy.
 130 The re-evaluation was a shared decision-making process between the patient and an orthopedic surgeon.

131 We asked the following questions:

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

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](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study?term=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

163 Participants

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

176

177 Interventions

178 Detailed intervention descriptions and all related intervention material can be found in the open access
 179 trial protocol³⁴ – including a link to an instructional video (<http://bit.ly/2EV7NrF>). Following baseline
 180 assessment, the patients were referred to a physiotherapist in their local municipal rehabilitation setting.
 181 Here the patients were instructed how to perform a single knee-extensor exercise at home. The knee-
 182 extensor exercise was performed sitting on a chair with an exercise band wrapped around the ankle and
 183 fixed behind a door for resistance (Figure 1). Patients were provided with a personal exercise band for
 184 exercising at home and a brochure with instructional notes and illustrations. The patients were randomized
 185 to one of three weekly exercise dosages: two, four or six sessions per week for twelve weeks. For all groups
 186 training comprised just the single knee-extensor strength exercise. Patients were instructed to perform the
 187 exercise in three sets of twelve repetitions at a load corresponding to twelve repetition maximum (RM) in
 188 each set with each repetition lasting eight seconds (concentric phase 3 s, isometric phase 1 s, eccentric
 189 phase 4 s) (Table 1). The rationale for prescribing *one* home-based exercise was that it is a simple and low-
 190 cost alternative to supervised exercise therapy programs. Further, it is pragmatic and time-saving, and
 191 therefore has the potential to facilitate adherence and mastery of the exercise while stressing the knee
 192 joint minimally.^{38–40} A BandCizer© sensor was attached to the exercise band to objectively assess exercise
 193 adherence.

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.

213 Primary outcome

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

224

225 Secondary outcomes

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

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

237 Exercise therapy adherence was objectively quantified using a sensor attached to the exercise band
238 (BandCizer© sensor technology). The sensor collects and stores data on date, time, number of sets,
239 number of repetitions and time-under-tension (TUT). The sensor technology has been reported to be valid
240 and reliable for musculoskeletal conditions.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷ In the present trial patients were defined as adherent if
241 >75% of the prescribed exercise sessions were completed.

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

243

244 Sample size

245 For the planned three-group one-way ANOVA analysis, a sample size of 126 patients (42 per group) was
 246 required to obtain a power of 80%. The a priori sample size calculation was based on a normal mean
 247 difference with a two-sided significance level of 0.05, a minimal clinical important difference of 0.15 Nm/kg
 248 (15%) and a common standard deviation of 0.22 Nm/kg in isometric knee-extensor strength.⁴⁸ To allow for
 249 a dropout rate of 10%, a total of 140 patients were included in the intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis.

250

251 Randomization, sequence generation, allocation concealment mechanisms and 252 implementation

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

261

262 Blinding

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

269

270 Statistical methods

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

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 $\pm$ 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 $\pm$ 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 physiotherapists⁴⁹ 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

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

312

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).

317

Table 2. Baseline characteristics (t₀).

Characteristics	All patients	Group 2	Group 4	Group 6
Mean (SD)	N = 140	N = 47	N = 47	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 = Brøndby, 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.

318

319 Numbers analyzed, Outcomes and estimation and Ancillary analyses

320 The outcome scores for the primary and secondary outcomes at the primary endpoint (t₁) are presented in
 321 table 3. Due to the large proportion of patients who postponed surgery after the exercise intervention, only
 322 32 patients were available for the post-operative intention-to-treat analyses at the secondary endpoints;
 323 acutely after surgery (t₂) and three months after surgery (t₃). Separate baseline characteristics of the 32
 324 patients who had surgery is presented in appendix 4. No between group differences for any outcomes were
 325 observed for the assessments at these endpoints (Appendix 5 and 6).

326

327 Assessment after exercise (primary endpoint (t₁))

328 Primary outcome – Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg): The intention-to-treat analysis showed no
 329 difference between the three groups in change between baseline and following 12 weeks of exercise
 330 (primary endpoint (t₀-t₁)) in *isometric knee-extensor muscle strength*: group 2 vs. 4; 0.009 Nm/kg (0.1%)
 331 [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
 332 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

333 between baseline and following 12 weeks of exercise showed an increase in *isometric knee-extensor muscle*
 334 *strength* for the whole sample and all three groups separately, though not statistically significant for group
 335 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%
 336 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
 337 (11.7%) [95% CI 0.04 to 0.25], $P = 0.007$ (Table 3).

338 Secondary outcomes: The intention-to-treat analyses showed a significant difference in change between
 339 baseline and following 12 weeks of exercise between group 2 and 6 in favour of group 2 for *Oxford Knee*
 340 *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
 341 0-10): -1.1 NRS points (-19.5%) [95% -2.2 to -0.1], $P = 0.030$ (Table 3). No between group differences were
 342 observed for any other group comparisons or secondary outcomes at the primary endpoint after 12 weeks
 343 exercise. Within group changes showed a positive change for the whole sample, and all three groups
 344 separately, for all secondary outcomes at the primary endpoint. Larger changes were observed in group 2
 345 compared to group 4 and 6, and in group 4 compared to group 6. For the outcome “*need for surgery*”; 37
 346 patients answered “*Yes, I believe I need surgery*”, 25 “*I do not know*” and 55 “*No, I do not believe I need*
 347 *surgery*”. For the distribution of answers between the three groups, see table 3.

348

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%

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%

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”

	<i>Yes, I believe I need surgery</i>	<i>I do not know</i>	<i>No, I do not believe I need surgery</i>
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 Rating 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 t₁ 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?”.

350

351 Figure 3. Isometric knee-extensor muscle strength (Nm/kg) at baseline (t₀) and after twelve weeks of home-based
 352 knee-extensor exercise (t₁) across the three groups. The X represents the mean value and the whiskers the
 353 corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

354

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

360 Treatment decision after exercise therapy

361 As a post hoc analysis, the number of patients who underwent surgery and those who postponed surgery
362 were registered. Of the 117 patients with follow-up assessments after 12 weeks of exercise (Figure 2), 79
363 (67.5%) postponed surgery, 32 (27.4%) underwent KR, and 6 (5.1%) wanted surgery, but the orthopedic
364 surgeon deemed this as contra-indicated due to co-morbidities (Appendix 3) (Table 4).

365

Table 4. Shared surgical decision after exercise therapy.

	All patients N = 117	Group 2 N = 39	Group 4 N = 39	Group 6 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).

366

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).

367

368 Exercise adherence

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

377

Table 6. Exercise adherence (t₀-t₁).

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

379

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

385

386 Supplementary analyses

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

391

392 Harms

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

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 (t₀) to the final assessment three months after surgery (t₃). 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

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

430 Using exercise therapy in the care pathway to evaluate the need for surgical care challenges the current
 431 premise for exercise therapy before surgery (exercise-based pre-habilitation) in the Enhanced Recovery
 432 After Surgery (ERAS) concept where it is assumed that exercise therapy before planned surgery is always
 433 followed by surgery.^{59–63} Instead of being a predetermined care pathway (leading to surgery), exercise
 434 therapy before potential surgery could be used to inform the shared decision-making process when
 435 planning a care pathway.^{8,17,18} A more optimal way of coordinating the two treatment options, exercise
 436 therapy before potential surgery and knee replacement, could be to incorporate the effect of exercise
 437 therapy to further inform the shared decision-making. In this way patients without an acute need for
 438 surgery can be screened, and untimely surgery with potential complications avoided – something which is
 439 not possible at a one-time outpatient consultation. A care pathway in which exercise therapy is employed
 440 prior to knee replacement complies with guideline recommendations while also being cost-effective.^{5–10,64}
 441 We have previously argued that the premise for exercise therapy before potential surgery to enhance post-
 442 operative outcomes in patients eligible for knee replacement should be questioned³³ as several systematic
 443 reviews conclude no clinically relevant effect.^{33,65–74} In line with this and based on the results from the
 444 QUADX-1 trial, we suggest the use of exercise therapy within the ERAS concept is to “pre-evaluate” to
 445 promote shared decision-making in an enhanced care pathway for patients with severe knee OA rather
 446 than to “prepare” patients for surgery. However, a prerequisite for successful coordination of care is that
 447 the involved healthcare professionals trust in the effectiveness and legitimacy of the different treatment
 448 modalities available, i.e. exercise therapy and surgery.^{13,49,75,76}

449

450 Implications for *one* home-based exercise

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

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

476

477 Limitations

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

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

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

509

510 Acknowledgements

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

515

516 Contributors

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

521

522 Transparency statement

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

526

527 Dissemination declaration

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

531

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.

- 566 6. Bannuru, R. R., Osani, M. C., Vaysbrot, E. E., Arden, N. K., Bennell KL, Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M. A., et al.
567 OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis.
568 Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2019;27(11).
- 569 7. Fransen M, McConnell S, Bell M. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. Cochrane Database Syst
570 Rev. 2015;9(1):CD004376.
- 571 8. Geenen R, Overman CL, Christensen R, Åsenlöf P, Capela S, Huisinga KL, et al. EULAR
572 recommendations for the health professional's approach to pain management in inflammatory
573 arthritis and osteoarthritis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2018 May 3;annrheumdis-2017-212662.
- 574 9. NICE. Osteoarthritis: care and management in adults. Clinical guideline CG177. London: National
575 Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2014.
- 576 10. Kolasinski SL, Neogi T, Hochberg MC, Oatis C, Guyatt G, Block J, et al. 2019 American College of
577 Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation Guideline for the Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hand, Hip,
578 and Knee. Arthritis Care Res. 2020 Feb;72(2):149–62.
- 579 11. Cobos R, Latorre A, Aizpuru F, Guenaga JJ, Sarasqueta C, Escobar A, et al. Variability of indication
580 criteria in knee and hip replacement: an observational study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2010
581 Dec;11(1).
- 582 12. Gossec L, Paternotte S, Bingham CO, Clegg DO, Coste P, Conaghan PG, et al. OARSI/OMERACT
583 Initiative to Define States of Severity and Indication for Joint Replacement in Hip and Knee
584 Osteoarthritis. An OMERACT 10 Special Interest Group. J Rheumatol. 2011 Aug;38(8):1765–9.
- 585 13. Hofstede SN, Marang-van de Mheen PJ, Vliet Vlieland TPM, van den Ende CHM, Nelissen RGHH, van
586 Bodegom-Vos L. Barriers and Facilitators Associated with Non-Surgical Treatment Use for
587 Osteoarthritis Patients in Orthopaedic Practice. Coles JA, editor. PLOS ONE. 2016 Jan
588 22;11(1):e0147406.
- 589 14. Allen KD, Choong PF, Davis AM, Dowsey MM, Dziedzic KS, Emery C, et al. Osteoarthritis: Models for
590 appropriate care across the disease continuum. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2016 Jun;30(3):503–
591 35.
- 592 15. Briggs AM, Jordan JE, Jennings M, Speerin R, Bragge P, Chua J, et al. Supporting the Evaluation and
593 Implementation of Musculoskeletal Models of Care: A Globally Informed Framework for Judging
594 Readiness and Success. Arthritis Care Res. 2017 Apr;69(4):567–77.
- 595 16. Brown C, Gordon B, Bucknill A. The Impact of the Osteoarthritis Hip and Knee Service (OAHKS) in
596 Melbourne health: a review from 2006–2009. Orthop Proc. 2011;93-B (Suppl. II)(211).
- 597 17. Ditmyer MM, Topp R, Pifer M. Prehabilitation in preparation for orthopaedic surgery. Orthop Nurs.
598 2002;21(5):43–54.
- 599 18. Slover J, Shue J, Koenig K. Shared Decision-making in Orthopaedic Surgery. Clin Orthop Relat Res.
600 2012 Apr;470(4):1046–53.
- 601 19. Hurley MV, Walsh NE, Mitchell H, Nicholas J, Patel A. Long-term outcomes and costs of an integrated
602 rehabilitation program for chronic knee pain: A pragmatic, cluster randomized, controlled trial.
603 Arthritis Care Res. 2012 Feb;64(2):238–47.

- 604 20. Ravaud P, Flipo R-M, Boutron I, Roy C, Mahmoudi A, Giraudeau B, et al. ARTIST (osteoarthritis
605 intervention standardized) study of standardised consultation versus usual care for patients with
606 osteoarthritis of the knee in primary care in France: pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2009
607 Feb 23;338(feb23 1):b421–b421.
- 608 21. GLA:D® International Network. GLA:D® International Network [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
609 <https://gladinternational.org/home/>
- 610 22. Jönsson T, Eek F, Dell’Isola A, Dahlberg LE, Ekwall Hansson E. The Better Management of Patients with
611 Osteoarthritis Program: Outcomes after evidence-based education and exercise delivered nationwide
612 in Sweden. Pan F, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2019 Sep 19;14(9):e0222657.
- 613 23. Thorstensson CA, Garellick G, Rystedt H, Dahlberg LE. Better Management of Patients with
614 Osteoarthritis: Development and Nationwide Implementation of an Evidence-Based Supported
615 Osteoarthritis Self-Management Programme. *Musculoskeletal Care*. 2015 Jun;13(2):67–75.
- 616 24. Skou ST, Roos EM. Good Life with osteoArthritis in Denmark (GLA:D™): evidence-based education and
617 supervised neuromuscular exercise delivered by certified physiotherapists nationwide. *BMC*
618 *Musculoskelet Disord* [Internet]. 2017 Dec [cited 2018 Mar 5];18(1). Available from:
619 <http://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12891-017-1439-y>
- 620 25. GLA:D Denmark. GLA:D Denmark. Annual report 2019 [Internet]. 2019. Available from:
621 https://www.glaiddk/pdf/GLAD%20annual%20report%202019%20eng%20final_2.pdf
- 622 26. Lawford BJ, Hinman RS, Nelligan RK, Keefe F, Rini C, Bennell KL. “I could do it in my own time and
623 when I really needed it”: perceptions of online pain coping skills training for people with knee
624 osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care Res* [Internet]. 2019 Oct 18 [cited 2020 Nov 19]; Available from:
625 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/acr.24093>
- 626 27. Hunter DJ, March L, Chew M. Osteoarthritis in 2020 and beyond: a Lancet Commission. *The Lancet*
627 [Internet]. 2020 Nov [cited 2020 Nov 6]; Available from:
628 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673620322303>
- 629 28. Luong M-LN, Cleveland RJ, Nyrop KA, Callahan LF. Social determinants and osteoarthritis outcomes.
630 *Aging Health*. 2012 Aug;8(4):413–37.
- 631 29. Ackerman IN, Livingston JA, Osborne RH. Personal Perspectives on Enablers and Barriers to Accessing
632 Care for Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis. *Phys Ther*. 2016 Jan 1;96(1):26–36.
- 633 30. Juhl C, Christensen R, Roos EM, Zhang W, Lund H. Impact of Exercise Type and Dose on Pain and
634 Disability in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Regression Analysis of Randomized
635 Controlled Trials: Impact of Exercise Type and Dose in Knee Osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2014
636 Mar;66(3):622–36.
- 637 31. Øiestad BE, Juhl CB, Eitzen I, Thorlund JB. Knee extensor muscle weakness is a risk factor for
638 development of knee osteoarthritis. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*.
639 2015 Feb;23(2):171–7.
- 640 32. Culvenor AG, Ruhdorfer A, Juhl C, Eckstein F, Øiestad BE. Knee Extensor Strength and Risk of
641 Structural, Symptomatic, and Functional Decline in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and

- 642 Meta-Analysis: Risk of Deterioration in Knee OA and Knee Extensor Strength. *Arthritis Care Res.* 2017
643 May;69(5):649–58.
- 644 33. Husted RS, Juhl C, Troelsen A, Thorborg K, Kallermose T, Rathleff MS, et al. The relationship between
645 prescribed pre-operative knee-extensor exercise dosage and effect on knee-extensor strength prior to
646 and following total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of
647 randomized controlled trials. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2020 Sep;(28):1412–26.
- 648 34. Husted RS, Troelsen A, Thorborg K, Rathleff MS, Husted H, Bandholm T. Efficacy of pre-operative
649 quadriceps strength training on knee-extensor strength before and shortly following total knee
650 arthroplasty: protocol for a randomized, dose-response trial (The QUADX-1 trial). *Trials.* 2018
651 Dec;19(1):47.
- 652 35. Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gøtzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010
653 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *Int J*
654 *Surg.* 2012;10(1):28–55.
- 655 36. American Society of Anesthesiologists. ASA Physical Status Classification System. American Society of
656 Anesthesiologists; 2014.
- 657 37. Sundhedsstyrelsen, Statens Serum Institut. Alkoholstatistik 2015. Nationale data. 2015.
- 658 38. McLean SM, Burton M, Bradley L, Littlewood C. Interventions for enhancing adherence with
659 physiotherapy: A systematic review. *Man Ther.* 2010 Dec;15(6):514–21.
- 660 39. Lin D-H, Lin C-HJ, Lin Y-F, Jan M-H. Efficacy of 2 Non-Weight-Bearing Interventions, Proprioception
661 Training Versus Strength Training, for Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *J*
662 *Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2009 Jun;39(6):450–7.
- 663 40. Newman S, Steed L, Mulligan K. Chronic physical illness: self- management and behavioural
664 interventions. NewmanS,SteedL,MulliganK.Chronicphysicalillness:self- maMaidenhead: Open
665 University Press; 2009.
- 666 41. Gagnon D, Nadeau S, Gravel D, Robert J, Bélanger D, Hilsenrath M. Reliability and validity of static
667 knee strength measurements obtained with a chair-fixed dynamometer in subjects with hip or knee
668 arthroplasty. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2005 Oct;86(10):1998–2008.
- 669 42. Hall M, Hinman RS, Wrigley TV, Kasza J, Lim B-W, Bennell KL. Knee extensor strength gains mediate
670 symptom improvement in knee osteoarthritis: Secondary analysis of a randomised controlled trial.
671 *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2018 Feb;26(4):495–500.
- 672 43. Ratamess NA, Alvar BA, Evetoch TK, Housh TJ, Kibler WB, Kraemer WJ, et al. Progression Models in
673 Resistance Training for Healthy Adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2009 Mar;41(3):687–708.
- 674 44. Borde R, Hortobágyi T, Granacher U. Dose–Response Relationships of Resistance Training in Healthy
675 Old Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med.* 2015 Dec;45(12):1693–720.
- 676 45. Rathleff MS, Bandholm T, Ahrendt P, Olesen JL, Thorborg K. Novel stretch-sensor technology allows
677 quantification of adherence and quality of home-exercises: a validation study. *Br J Sports Med.* 2014
678 Apr;48(8):724–8.

- 679 46. Rathleff MS, Thorborg K, Rode LA, McGirr KA, Sørensen AS, Bøgild A, et al. Adherence to commonly
680 prescribed, home-based strength training exercises for the lower extremity can be objectively
681 monitored using the Bandcizer. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2015;29(3):627–636.
- 682 47. Riel H, Matthews M, Vicenzino B, Bandholm T, Thorborg K, Rathleff MS. Feedback Leads to Better
683 Exercise Quality in Adolescents with Patellofemoral Pain: *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018 Jan;50(1):28–35.
- 684 48. Bennell KL, Kyriakides M, Metcalf B, Egerton T, Wrigley TV, Hodges PW, et al. Neuromuscular Versus
685 Quadriceps Strengthening Exercise in Patients With Medial Knee Osteoarthritis and Varus
686 Malalignment: A Randomized Controlled Trial: Neuromuscular Exercise and Knee Adduction Moment.
687 *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 2014 Apr;66(4):950–9.
- 688 49. Husted RS, Bandholm T, Rathleff MS, Troelsen A, Kirk J. Perceived facilitators and barriers among
689 physical therapists and orthopedic surgeons to pre-operative home-based exercise with one exercise-
690 only in patients eligible for knee replacement: A qualitative interview study nested in the QUADX-1
691 trial. *PLOS ONE.* 2020 Oct 23;15(10):e0241175.
- 692 50. Messier SP, Mihalko SL, Beavers DP, Nicklas BJ, DeVita P, Carr JJ, et al. Effect of High-Intensity
693 Strength Training on Knee Pain and Knee Joint Compressive Forces Among Adults With Knee
694 Osteoarthritis: The START Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2021 Feb 16;325(7):646.
- 695 51. Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Simonsen O, et al. A Randomized,
696 Controlled Trial of Total Knee Replacement. *N Engl J Med.* 2015 Oct 22;373(17):1597–606.
- 697 52. Blasini M, Peiris N, Wright T, Colloca L. The Role of Patient–Practitioner Relationships in Placebo and
698 Nocebo Phenomena. In: *International Review of Neurobiology* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018 [cited 2020
699 Dec 17]. p. 211–31. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S007477421830062X>
- 700 53. Miller FG, Colloca L, Kaptchuk TJ. The Placebo Effect: Illness and Interpersonal Healing. *Perspect Biol*
701 *Med.* 2009;52(4):518–39.
- 702 54. Hardman DI, Geraghty AW, Howick J, Roberts N, Bishop FL. A discursive exploration of public
703 perspectives on placebos and their effects. *Health Psychol Open.* 2019 Jan;6(1):205510291983231.
- 704 55. Kaplan SH, Greenfield S, Gandek B, Rogers WH, Ware JE. Characteristics of Physicians with
705 Participatory Decision-Making Styles. *Ann Intern Med.* 1996 Mar 1;124(5):497.
- 706 56. Frosch DL, Kaplan RM. Shared decision making in clinical medicine: past research and future
707 directions. *Am J Prev Med.* 1999 Nov;17(4):285–94.
- 708 57. Epstein RM, Alper BS, Quill TE. Communicating Evidence for Participatory Decision Making. *JAMA.*
709 2004;May 19(291):8.
- 710 58. Miller FG, Kaptchuk TJ. The power of context: reconceptualizing the placebo effect. *J R Soc Med.* 2008
711 May;101(5):222–5.
- 712 59. Ljungqvist O, Hubner M. Enhanced recovery after surgery—ERAS—principles, practice and feasibility
713 in the elderly. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2018 Mar;30(3):249–52.

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-effectiveness of total knee replacement in addition to non-surgical 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. Skoffier 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.

- 752 73. Wallis JA, Taylor NF. Pre-operative interventions (non-surgical and non-pharmacological) for patients
753 with hip or knee osteoarthritis awaiting joint replacement surgery – a systematic review and meta-
754 analysis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2011 Dec;19(12):1381–95.
- 755 74. Gawel JA, Brown SE, Collins JC, McCallum C. Does pre-operative physical therapy improve post-
756 surgical outcomes of patients undergoing a total knee and/or total hip arthroplasty? A systematic
757 review. *Physiother Pract Res*. 2013;(1):9–20.
- 758 75. Spencer EA, Heneghan C. Catalogue of Bias Collaboration. Confirmation bias. In: *Catalogue Of Bias*
759 2018. [Internet]. 2018. Available from:
760 https://catalogofbias.org/?post_type=biases&p=9734&preview=true
- 761 76. Bunzli S, Nelson E, Scott A, French S, Choong P, Dowsey M. Barriers and facilitators to orthopaedic
762 surgeons' uptake of decision aids for total knee arthroplasty: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*.
763 2017;7(11):e018614.
- 764 77. Juhl C, Lind T, Hornshøj H. Effect of supervised neuromuscular exercise and education to participants
765 with severe knee osteoarthritis — a single blinded randomized controlled trial. In 2020. Available
766 from: <http://abstract.ortopaedi.dk/k20/session10.html>
- 767 78. Liu S-H, Driban JB, Eaton CB, McAlindon TE, Harrold LR, Lapane KL. Objectively Measured Physical
768 Activity and Symptoms Change in Knee Osteoarthritis. *Am J Med*. 2016 May;129(5):497-505.e1.
- 769 79. Gay C, Guiguet-Auclair C, Mourgues C, Gerbaud L, Coudeyre E. Physical activity level and association
770 with behavioral factors in knee osteoarthritis. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2019 Jan;62(1):14–20.
- 771 80. Goodpaster BH, Park SW, Harris TB, Kritchevsky SB, Nevitt M, Schwartz AV, et al. The Loss of Skeletal
772 Muscle Strength, Mass, and Quality in Older Adults: The Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. *J*
773 *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2006 Oct 1;61(10):1059–64.
- 774 81. Visser M, Goodpaster BH, Kritchevsky SB, Newman AB, Nevitt M, Rubin SM, et al. Muscle Mass,
775 Muscle Strength, and Muscle Fat Infiltration as Predictors of Incident Mobility Limitations in Well-
776 Functioning Older Persons. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2005 Mar 1;60(3):324–33.
- 777 82. Manini TM, Clark BC. Dynapenia and Aging: An Update. *J Gerontol Ser A*. 2012 Jan;67A(1):28–40.
- 778 83. Regnaud J-P, Lefevre-Colau M-M, Trinquart L, Nguyen C, Boutron I, Brosseau L, et al. High-intensity
779 versus low-intensity physical activity or exercise in people with hip or knee osteoarthritis. *Cochrane*
780 *Musculoskeletal Group*, editor. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015 Oct 29;29(10):CD010203.

781

782

783
784

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

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.

785

786 Appendix 2. Separate baseline characteristics for the patients lost to follow-up and the remaining 787 patients.

Baseline characteristics (t₀). Participants lost to follow-up.

Characteristics	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.

788

Baseline characteristics (t₀). Remaining participants.

Characteristics	All patients	Group 2	Group 4	Group 6
Mean (SD)	N = 117	N = 39	N = 39	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.

789

790

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.

791

792

793

794

795

796

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

798

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.

799

800

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%

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 Rating 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).

801

802

Appendix 6. Mean change in all outcomes between baseline and three months after surgery (t₀-t₃). 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%

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%

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 Rating 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).

803

804

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.

805

806