

## 1 Title

2 Knee-extensor strength, symptoms, and need for surgery after two, four, or six exercise sessions/week  
3 using a home-based *one*-exercise program: A randomized dose-response trial of knee-extensor resistance  
4 exercise in patients eligible for knee replacement (the QUADX-1 trial).

5

6 Rasmus Skov Husted PT, PhD<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Anders Troelsen MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Henrik Husted MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>, Birk Mygind  
7 Grønfeldt PT, MSc<sup>1,2</sup>, Kristian Thorborg PT, PhD<sup>2,4</sup>, Thomas Kallemose MSc<sup>1</sup>, Michael Skovdal Rathleff PT,  
8 PhD<sup>5,6,7</sup>, Thomas Bandholm PT, PhD<sup>1,2,3,8</sup>

9 <sup>1</sup>Department of Clinical Research, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.

10 <sup>2</sup>Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation Research – Copenhagen (PMR-C); Department of Physical and  
11 Occupational Therapy; Department of Clinical Research; Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Copenhagen  
12 University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.

13 <sup>3</sup>Clinical Orthopedic Research Hvidovre (CORH), Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Copenhagen University  
14 Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.

15 <sup>4</sup>Sports Orthopaedic Research Center – Copenhagen (SORC-C), Department of Orthopedic Surgery,  
16 Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Hvidovre, Denmark.

17 <sup>5</sup>Center for General Practice at Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.

18 <sup>6</sup>Department of Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark.

19 <sup>7</sup>Department of Health Science and Technology, Aalborg University, Denmark.

20 <sup>8</sup>Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

21

22 E-mail addresses: Anders Troelsen ([a\\_troelsen@hotmail.com](mailto:a_troelsen@hotmail.com)), Henrik Husted ([henrik.husted@regionh.dk](mailto:henrik.husted@regionh.dk)),

23 Birk Mygind Grønfeldt ([birk.mygind.groenfeldt@regionh.dk](mailto:birk.mygind.groenfeldt@regionh.dk)), Kristian Thorborg

24 ([kristian.thorborg@regionh.dk](mailto:kristian.thorborg@regionh.dk)), Thomas Kallemose ([thomas.kallemose@regionh.dk](mailto:thomas.kallemose@regionh.dk)), Michael Skovdal

25 Rathleff ([misr@hst.aau.dk](mailto:misr@hst.aau.dk)), Thomas Bandholm ([thomas.quaade.bandholm@regionh.dk](mailto:thomas.quaade.bandholm@regionh.dk))

26

27 \*Primary investigator and corresponding author. Department of Clinical Research (Section 056),

28 Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Kettegaard Allé 30, 2650 Hvidovre, Denmark. Mail:

29 [rasmus.skov.husted@regionh.dk](mailto:rasmus.skov.husted@regionh.dk)

30

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

## 31 Abstract

### 32 Objective

33 To investigate firstly the efficacy of three different dosages of *one* home-based, knee-extensor resistance  
34 exercise on knee-extensor strength in patients eligible for knee replacement, and secondly, the influence of  
35 exercise on symptoms, physical function and decision on surgery.

### 36 Method

37 One-hundred and forty patients eligible for knee replacement were randomized to three groups: 2, 4 or 6  
38 home-based knee-extensor resistance exercise-sessions per week (group 2, 4 and 6 respectively) for 12  
39 weeks. Primary outcome: isometric knee-extensor strength. Secondary outcomes: Oxford Knee Score, Knee  
40 injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, average knee pain last week (0-10 numeric rating scale), 6-minute  
41 walk test, stair climbing test, exercise adherence and “need for surgery”.

### 42 Results

43 Primary analysis: Intention-to-treat analysis of 140 patients did not find statistically significant differences  
44 between the groups from baseline to after 12 weeks of exercise in isometric knee-extensor strength: Group  
45 2 vs. 4 (0.003 Nm/kg (0.2%) [95% CI -0.15 to 0.15], P=0.965) and group 4 vs. 6 (-0.04 Nm/kg (-2.7%) [95% CI  
46 -0.15 to 0.12], P=0.628). Secondary analysis: Intention-to-treat analyses showed statistically significant  
47 differences between the two and six sessions/week groups in favor of the two sessions/week group for  
48 Oxford Knee Score: 4.8 OKS points (15.2%) [1.3 to 8.3], P=0.008) and avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10): -  
49 1.3 NRS points (-19.5%) [-2.3 to -0.2], P=0.018. After the 12-week exercise intervention, data were available  
50 for 117 patients (N=39/group): 38 (32.5%) patients wanted surgery and 79 (67.5%) postponed surgery. This  
51 was independent of exercise dosage.

## 52 Conclusion

53 In patients eligible for knee-replacement we found no between-group differences in isometric knee  
54 extensor strength after 2, 4 and 6 knee-extensor resistance exercise sessions per week. We saw no  
55 indication of an exercise dose-response relationship for isometric knee-extensor strength and only clinically  
56 irrelevant within group changes. For some secondary outcome (e.g. KOOS subscales) we found clinically  
57 relevant within group changes, which could help explain why only one in three patients decided to have  
58 surgery after the simple home-based exercise intervention.

59

## 60 Trial registration

61 ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: [NCT02931058](#). Preprint: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.07.21254965>.

## 62 Key words

63 Knee osteoarthritis, knee-extensor resistance exercise, dose-response, knee replacement, coordinated non-  
64 surgical and surgical care

65

## 66 Introduction

67 Exercise therapy can reduce symptoms and postpone surgery in about 50% of patients with knee OA<sup>1-4</sup> and  
68 guidelines recommend that exercise therapy is tried out before surgery is considered in patients eligible for  
69 knee replacement.<sup>5-10</sup> Because the indication for knee replacement is not clear-cut, identifying the right  
70 patients to operate at the right time is difficult<sup>11,12</sup> – making the coordination of non-surgical and surgical  
71 care crucial in selecting the right candidates for knee replacement.<sup>13-16</sup> Any changes in symptoms after  
72 exercise therapy may play an important role in the shared decision-making process for surgery.<sup>17-20</sup>

73  
74 Exercise programs for patients with knee OA like ‘Good Life with osteoArthritis in Denmark’ (GLA:D) -  
75 successfully implemented worldwide<sup>21</sup> - and ‘Better management of patients with OsteoArthritis’ (BOA)  
76 support the effectiveness of exercise therapy and education for these patients and deliver optimized  
77 care.<sup>22-25</sup> The exercise programs are supervised, require physical attendance at fixed times and often  
78 require self-payment; factors which can be barriers for some patients and hinder participation and long-  
79 term adherence, creating inequality for the care accessible.<sup>26-29</sup> An important element in exercise programs  
80 for patients with knee OA is knee-extensor strength<sup>30</sup>, as decreased knee-extensor strength is associated  
81 with an increased risk of developing knee OA,<sup>31</sup> risk of knee pain and decline in function.<sup>32</sup> According to the  
82 American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) two exercise sessions per week is the recommended  
83 minimum dosage required for muscle strength gains, four is likely optimal, and six is likely to have no  
84 additional benefit, but could increase pain.<sup>33,34</sup> Based on this, we investigated the dose-response  
85 relationship of *one* home-based resistance exercise targeting the knee-extensor muscles, using a very  
86 simple and low-cost exercise option. Compared to supervised exercise programs, this solution does not  
87 require physical attendance at fixed times and is free of charge – providing patients with an alternative  
88 treatment option.

89

90 We asked the following:

- 91 1) Is there a dose-response relationship between knee-extensor resistance exercise and change in  
92 isometric knee-extensor strength in patients eligible for knee replacement?  
93 2) Do different dosages of simple knee-extensor resistance exercise change symptoms and decision on  
94 surgery in patients eligible for knee replacement?

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

101

## 102 Methods

### 103 Trial design

104 The QUADX-1 trial is a three-arm parallel-group randomized dose-response trial with three intervention  
105 groups and no control group. The trial was pre-registered on [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) on 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2016  
106 ([NCT02931058](#)) before enrollment of the first patient, and the full trial protocol – including protocol  
107 amendments – was published 18<sup>th</sup> January, 2018.<sup>35</sup> Approvals from the Ethics Committee of the Capital  
108 Region, Denmark (H-16025136) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (2012-58-0004) were obtained  
109 before the first patient was enrolled.

110

## 111 Trial amendments

112 Due to an oversight, the second research question and purpose were not pre-registered. Hence, we  
113 consider them secondary and exploratory. All other trial amendments are reported in the trial protocol.<sup>35</sup>

114

## 115 Participants

116 Patients potentially eligible for trial participation were recruited at the surgical outpatient clinic. The  
117 inclusion criteria were: eligible for knee replacement due to knee OA (assessed by an orthopedic surgeon),  
118 radiographically verified knee OA with Kellgren-Lawrence classification  $\geq 2$  (Kellgren-Lawrence scores 2  
119 were included to mimic everyday clinical practice),<sup>36,37</sup> average knee pain  $\geq 3$  (Numeric Rating Scale (NRS))  
120 in the last week, eligible for home-based knee-extensor resistance exercise, age  $\geq 45$  years, resident in one  
121 of three municipalities involved in the trial (Copenhagen, Hvidovre or Broendby) and able to speak and  
122 understand Danish. The exclusion criteria were: exercise therapy being contra-indicated, neurological  
123 disorder, diagnosed systemic disease (American Society of Anesthesiologists' physical status classification  
124 score  $\geq 4$ ),<sup>38</sup> terminal illness, severe bone deformity demanding use of non-standard implants, or a greater  
125 weekly alcohol consumption than the national recommendation.<sup>39</sup>

126

## 127 Interventions

128 Following baseline assessment, the patients were referred to a physiotherapist in their local municipal  
129 rehabilitation setting. Here the patients were instructed how to perform a single knee-extensor resistance  
130 exercise at home. The knee-extensor resistance exercise was performed sitting on a chair with an exercise  
131 band wrapped around the ankle and fixed behind a door for resistance. Patients were provided with a  
132 personal exercise band for exercising at home and a brochure with instructional notes and illustrations. The  
133 patients were randomized to one of three exercise dosage groups for twelve weeks: the two sessions/week

134 group, the four sessions/week group or the six sessions/week group. For all groups, training comprised only  
135 the single knee-extensor resistance exercise. Patients were instructed to perform the exercise in three sets  
136 of twelve repetitions with each repetition lasting eight seconds (concentric phase 3 s, isometric phase 1 s,  
137 eccentric phase 4 s). The intervention was personalized to the extent where each patient was exercising  
138 with an individual absolute resistance corresponding to a relative load of twelve repetition maximum (RM).  
139 The patients were instructed to continue until volitional muscular failure. That is, until the knee-extensor  
140 muscles were maximally fatigued, and they were not able to perform further repetitions. If volitional  
141 muscular failure occurred before twelve RM, the resistance of the elastic band was adjusted so that the  
142 pre-determined number of repetitions could be completed (decrease in distance between the two  
143 endpoints of the elastic band). Whenever the resistance in the elastic band became too low (i.e., more than  
144 twelve repetitions per set could be performed), the patients were instructed to increase the resistance in  
145 the elastic band to achieve a new resistance corresponding to a relative load of twelve RM (increase in  
146 distance between the two endpoints of the elastic band). Detailed intervention description can be found in  
147 the trial protocol<sup>35</sup> and a walkthrough video of the exercise is freely available online (<https://bit.ly/3i59CJn>).

148

## 149 Assessments and outcomes

150 Outcomes were assessed: at baseline ( $t_0$ ), after twelve weeks of home-based exercise/before surgery ( $t_1$ ),  
151 at hospital discharge (1-8 days after surgery) ( $t_2$ ) and three months after surgery ( $t_3$ ). Outcomes at  
152 endpoints  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  were only collected for patients that underwent surgery. The primary endpoint was  
153 after the exercise period ( $t_1$ ) and the secondary endpoints were just before hospital discharge ( $t_2$ ) and three  
154 months after surgery ( $t_3$ ). After the 12-week exercise period, at endpoint  $t_1$ , each patient's decision on  
155 surgery was re-evaluated in a shared decision-making process between the patient and orthopedic surgeon  
156 (i.e. continue with exercise therapy or schedule knee replacement). Outcome assessments were performed  
157 blinded by the primary investigator and a research assistant dedicated to the trial.

158

## 159 Primary outcome

160 The primary outcome was change in isometric knee-extensor strength from baseline to after the exercise  
161 period ( $t_0$ - $t_1$ ). Isometric knee-extensor strength was measured using a computerized strength chair (Good  
162 Strength Chair, Metitur Oy, Jyvaskyla, Finland), which is valid and reliable in the knee replacement  
163 population.<sup>40</sup> Five measurements of maximal isometric knee-extensor strength at 60° knee flexion were  
164 completed, separated by 60-s pauses. The patients were instructed to extend their knee as forcefully as  
165 possible with a gradual increase in force over a 5-s period while receiving strong standardized verbal  
166 encouragement. Isometric knee-extensor strength is expressed as the maximal voluntary torque per  
167 kilogram body mass (Nm/kg). The highest obtained value was used for analysis.

168

## 169 Secondary outcomes

170 The secondary outcomes were change in performance-based function comprising six-minute walk test  
171 (6MWT) and stair climb test (SCT), self-reported disability; Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score  
172 (KOOS), Oxford Knee Score (OKS), current knee pain and average knee pain during the last week (0-10 NRS),  
173 “need for surgery” and objectively measured exercise adherence ( $t_0$ - $t_1$ ,  $t_0$ - $t_2$  and  $t_0$ - $t_3$ ). Other outcomes  
174 were registration of adverse events and harms.

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

180 Exercise therapy adherence was objectively quantified using a sensor attached to the exercise band  
181 (BandCizer© sensor technology).<sup>41-43</sup> The sensor collects and stores data on date, time, number of sets,  
182 repetitions and time-under-tension (TUT). Patients were defined as adherent if >75% of the prescribed  
183 exercise sessions were completed.



184 Detailed information on the secondary outcomes is reported in the protocol paper.<sup>35</sup>

185

## 186 Sample size

187 The sample size was calculated for a test of superiority (four knee-extensor resistance exercise sessions per  
188 week is superior to two or six sessions per week). For the primary planned three-group one-way ANOVA  
189 analysis, a sample size of 126 patients (42 per group) was required to obtain a power of 80%. The a priori  
190 sample size calculation was based on a normal mean difference with a two-sided significance level of 0.025  
191 (Bonferroni correction for two tests (2 vs. 4 and 4 vs. 6), a minimal clinical important difference (MCID) of  
192 0.15 Nm/kg (15%) and a common standard deviation of 0.22 Nm/kg in isometric knee-extensor strength.<sup>44</sup>  
193 To allow for a dropout rate of 10%, a total of 140 patients were included in the intention-to-treat (ITT)  
194 analysis.

195

## 196 Randomization

197 The patients were randomly assigned by a 1:1:1 allocation ratio. The random allocation sequence was  
198 computer-generated using simple (unrestricted) randomization by a statistician otherwise not involved in  
199 the trial. One hundred and forty sequentially numbered sealed opaque envelopes were generated. When a  
200 patient was included in the trial a research assistant independent of the trial opened an envelope and  
201 informed the patient's municipality of the exercise group allocation.

202

## 203 Blinding

204 All outcome assessors and the data analysts were blinded to the exercise group allocation. At outcome  
205 assessments the assessors started by informing the patients not to mention their exercise dosage. For  
206 analysis, the data was coded to conceal group allocation, blinding the data assessors and analysts to the

207 patients' allocation. The physiotherapists and patients were not blinded to the allocation due to the nature  
208 of the intervention, however, the patients were blinded to the other exercise dosages and the study  
209 hypothesis.

210

## 211 **Statistics**


212 The primary intention-to-treat superiority analysis tested the hypothesis that an exercise dosage of four  
213 knee-extensor resistance exercise sessions per week would elicit a greater change in isometric knee-  
214 extensor strength pre-operatively compared to two or six sessions per week. For all outcomes, between  
215 group contrasts were compared using analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA). Normality assumptions of the  
216 model residuals were checked to ensure that the underlying assumptions of the statistical model were met.  
217 Normal distribution of data was checked by q-q plots and histograms. Analyses were adjusted for the  
218 following baseline variables: isometric knee-extensor strength, KOOS symptoms, KOOS ADL, KOOS sport  
219 and 6MWT. These adjustments were not prespecified. In a secondary analysis, the two sessions/week and  
220 six sessions/week groups were compared and follow the same principles as the primary analysis. As  
221 supplementary analyses, simple regression models were performed using the pooled exercise adherence  
222 data across all three groups. The dependent variables were the primary and secondary outcomes and the  
223 independent variable was exercise adherence quantified in two ways: 1) as total number of completed  
224 exercise sessions and 2) as total time-under-tension (TUT) per patient. All analyses followed the ITT  
225 principle and to create full datasets, missing data were imputed using multiple imputation (100 imputation  
226 sets). Multiple imputation models were based on age, gender, group allocation and all previous scores in  
227 relevant outcomes. Missing data break down is presented in Supplement 1. All analyses followed the pre-  
228 specified analysis plan<sup>35</sup> and were performed in SAS Enterprise Guide 7.1.

229

## 230 Results

### 231 Participants

232 Between 25<sup>th</sup> October 2016 and 8<sup>th</sup> January 2019, 898 patients potentially eligible for knee replacement  
233 were assessed for eligibility. One-hundred and forty patients were included and randomized (Figure 1).  
234 Assessments at the primary endpoint (after 12 weeks of exercise [t<sub>1</sub>]) was completed for 117 patients  
235 (39/group). At the two secondary endpoints, 32 patients were available for assessment. Reasons for drop-  
236 out and missing data are provided in figure 1. Baseline characteristics are provided in table 1 and in  
237 Supplement 2.  
238



240 Figure 1. Flow chart of each assessment time-point of the trial according to the CONSORT guidelines.<sup>86</sup> ITT = intention-  
241 to-treat analysis. Dotted lines indicate assessment time-points after surgery. \*6 patients (N=2/group) wanted surgery  
242 but had competing co-morbidities disqualifying them as candidates for surgery (Supplement 6).

243

**Table 1. Baseline characteristics (t<sub>0</sub>).**

Characteristics	All patients N = 140	Two sessions/week N = 47	Four sessions/week N = 47	Six sessions/week N = 46
Gender (f/m)	76 (54)/64 (46)	22 (47)/25 (53)	29 (62)/18 (38)	25 (54)/21 (46)
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 (53)/44 (31)/22 (16)	22 (47)/16 (34)/9 (19)	23 (49)/16 (34)/8 (17)	29 (63)/12 (26)/5 (11)
Kellgren and Lawrence score (2/3/4)*	20 (15)/61 (44)/57 (41)	5 (11)/20 (44)/21 (45)	9 (20)/19 (41)/18 (39)	6 (13)/22 (48)/18 (39)
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 Symp (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)

For continuous data mean and SD are provided. For categorical data N and % are provided. Abbreviations: Cph = Copenhagen, Hvi = Hvidovre, Bro = Broendby, NRS = Numeric Rating Scale, KOOS = Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test. \* = missing data on two patients.

244

245

## 246 Assessment after exercise

247 Primary outcome: Intention-to-treat analysis did not find statistically significant differences between the  
248 groups in change between baseline and following 12 weeks of exercise (primary endpoint (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>1</sub>)) in  
249 *isometric knee-extensor strength*: two sessions/week group vs. four sessions/week group; 0.003 Nm/kg

250 (0.2%) [95% CI -0.15 to 0.15], P=0.965, and four sessions/week group vs. six sessions/week group; -0.04  
 251 Nm/kg (-2.7%) [95% CI -0.15 to 0.12], P=0.628 (Figure 2) (Table 2).

252 Secondary outcomes: Intention-to-treat analyses showed no between group differences for any group  
 253 comparisons or secondary outcomes at the primary endpoint after 12 weeks exercise. Results from  
 254 regression analyses in Supplement 4.

255 Secondary analysis: Intention-to-treat analyses showed statistically significant differences between the two  
 256 and six sessions/week groups in favor of the two sessions/week group for *Oxford Knee Score*: 4.8 OKS  
 257 points (15.2%) [1.3 to 8.3], P=0.008) and *avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)*: -1.3 NRS points (-19.5%) [-2.3  
 258 to -0.2], P=0.018. No other differences were found for the secondary analysis (Supplement 3).

259 Due to the large proportion of patients who postponed surgery after the exercise intervention, only 32  
 260 patients were available for the post-operative intention-to-treat analyses. No between group differences  
 261 for any outcomes were observed at these endpoints (Supplement 5).

262

**Table 2. Mean change in all outcomes between baseline and following 12 weeks home-based exercise (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>1</sub>). 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
<b>Primary outcome</b>						
<b>Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)</b>						
All patients	0.13 (0.07 to 0.19)	<0.0001	10.2%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	0.003 (-0.15 to 0.15)	0.965 0.2%
Two sessions/week	0.12 (0.02 to 0.22)	0.021	9.2%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-0.04 (-0.15 to 0.12)	0.628 -2.7%
Four sessions/week	0.11 (-0.007 to 0.23)	0.064	9.0%			
Six sessions/week	0.15 (0.04 to 0.25)	0.007	11.7%			
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>						
<b>KOOS Symp (0-100)</b>						
All patients	9.1 (5.6 to 12.6)	<0.0001	16.5%		6.9 (-1.2 to 15.0)	0.093 4.9%

Two sessions/week	12.9 (6.2 to 19.6)	0.0001	21.9%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	8.0 (2.6 to 13.4)	0.003	17.0%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	2.6 (-10.6 to 5.7)	0.552	4.8%
Six sessions/week	6.5 (0.5 to 12.5)	0.032	12.3%				
<b>KOOS Pain (0-100)</b>							
All patients	9.9 (6.7 to 13.2)	<0.0001	19.9%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	6.1 (-1.6 to 13.8)	0.119	6.4%
Two sessions/week	13.7 (7.5 to 19.8)	<0.0001	26.5%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	1.9 (-9.8 to 5.8)	0.615	6.4%
Four sessions/week	9.7 (4.7 to 14.8)	<0.0001	20.1%				
Six sessions/week	6.8 (1.4 to 12.2)	0.014	13.7%				
<b>KOOS ADL (0-100)</b>							
All patients	9.2 (5.9 to 12.4)	<0.0001	16.6%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	4.2 (-3.6 to 11.9)	0.284	1.7%
Two sessions/week	11.6 (6.0 to 17.2)	<0.0001	20.1%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-0.5 (-7.3 to 8.3)	0.897	6.1%
Four sessions/week	9.5 (3.9 to 14.9)	<0.0001	18.4%				
Six sessions/week	6.9 (1.3 to 12.7)	0.015	12.3%				
<b>KOOS Sport (0-100)</b>							
All patients	8.4 (4.3 to 12.6)	<0.001	40.0%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	5.2 (-3.9 to 14.2)	0.260	2.6%
Two sessions/week	10.7 (2.0 to 19.5)	0.015	43.7%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	1.1 (-8.1 to 10.4)	0.810	-5.9%
Four sessions/week	6.9 (0.5 to 13.5)	0.036	41.1%				
Six sessions/week	7.5 (1.3 to 13.6)	0.016	35.2%				
<b>KOOS QoL (0-100)</b>							
All patients	8.2 (4.6 to 11.8)	<0.0001	25.1%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	5.7 (-3.1 to 14.5)	0.351	9.4%
Two sessions/week	11.6 (4.9 to 18.2)	<0.0001	32.8%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	0.4 (-8.4 to 9.2)	0.930	4.1%
Four sessions/week	7.3 (1.6 to 12.9)	0.012	23.4%				
Six sessions/week	6.0 (-0.6 to 12.7)	0.076	19.3%				
<b>OKS (0-48)</b>							
All patients	4.5 (3.0 to 5.9)	<0.0001	18.1%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	2.5 (-1.0 to 5.9)	0.163	3.3%
Two sessions/week	6.4 (3.8 to 9.0)	<0.0001	24.4%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	2.3 (-1.1 to 5.8)	0.181	11.9%
Four sessions/week	4.9 (2.6 to 7.1)	<0.0001	21.1%				
Six sessions/week	2.3 (-0.3 to 4.8)	0.080	9.2%				
<b>Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)</b>							
All patients	-0.3 (-0.8 to 0.1)	0.168	-13.6%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	-0.4 (-1.5 to 0.7)	0.443	-14.3%
Two sessions/week	-0.4 (-1.2 to 0.4)	0.327	-19.0%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	0.4 (-0.8 to 1.5)	0.527	16.1%
Four sessions/week	-0.1 (-0.9 to 0.6)	0.709	-4.8%				
Six sessions/week	-0.5 (-1.3 to 0.3)	0.264	-20.8%				
<b>Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)</b>							
All patients	-1.2 (-1.6 to -0.8)	<0.0001	-20.7%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	-0.8 (-1.8 to 0.2)	0.121	-12.6%
Two sessions/week	-1.8 (-2.6 to -1.1)	<0.0001	-31.6%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-0.4 (-1.4 to 0.6)	0.391	-6.9%
Four sessions/week	-1.1 (-1.8 to -0.4)	0.001	-19.0%				

Six sessions/week	-0.7 (-1.4 to 0.04)	0.062	-12.1%	Six sessions/week			
<b>6MWT (m)</b>							
All patients	19.2 (3.0 to 35.4)	0.020	4.8%	Two sessions/week vs.	30.3 (-9.7 to 70.2)	0.135	5.3%
Two sessions/week	33.7 (3.5 to 63.8)	0.028	8.1%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	10.9 (-16.6 to 38.6)	0.435	2.8%	Four sessions/week vs.	-5.4 (-45.0 to 34.2)	0.785	-0.5%
Six sessions/week	13.5 (-15.4 to 42.5)	0.359	3.4%	Six sessions/week			
<b>SCT up (secs)</b>							
All patients	-0.9 (-1.6 to -0.2)	0.010	-9.6%	Two sessions/week vs.	-0.4 (-2.2 to 1.3)	0.616	2.5%
Two sessions/week	-1.4 (-2.8 to 0.1)	0.065	-16.1%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	-1.4 (-2.6 to -0.1)	0.031	-13.6%	Four sessions/week vs.	-1.0 (-0.7 to 2.7)	0.246	-13.0%
Six sessions/week	-0.05 (-1.1 to 0.9)	0.929	-0.6%	Six sessions/week			
<b>SCT down (secs)</b>							
All patients	-1.4 (-2.3 to -0.5)	0.001	-13.5%	Two sessions/week vs.	0.7 (-1.5 to 2.9)	0.514	1.9%
Two sessions/week	-1.4 (-2.8 to 0.1)	0.060	-15.7%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	-2.1 (-3.9 to -0.2)	0.028	-17.6%	Four sessions/week vs.	-1.3 (-3.4 to 0.9)	0.251	-10.0%
Six sessions/week	-0.8 (-2.1 to 0.5)	0.204	-7.7%	Six sessions/week			

**“Need for surgery”  
N (%)**


	<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%)
Two sessions/week (N=39)	9 (23.1%)	7 (18.0%)	23 (58.9%)
Four sessions/week (N=39)	13 (33.3%)	7 (18.0%)	19 (48.7%)
Six sessions/week (N=39)	15 (38.5%)	11 (28.2%)	13 (33.3%)

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Analyses were adjusted for the following baseline scores: isometric knee-extensor strength, KOOS symptoms, KOOS ADL, KOOS sport and 6MWT. These adjustments were not prespecified. ¥ = unadjusted numbers. Isometric knee-extensor strength reported as Nm/kg (positive change = improvement); Knee injury and 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 t<sub>1</sub> 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?”. “Need for surgery” data presented as N and corresponding %.

263

264





265

266 Figure 2. Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg) at baseline ( $t_0$ ) and after twelve weeks of home-based knee-  
267 extensor strength exercise ( $t_1$ ) across the three groups. The X represents the mean value and the whiskers the  
268 corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

269

## 270 Exercise adherence

271 Data from 95 patients was available for the exercise adherence assessment. Of the 45 patients without  
272 available data, 23 did not complete the 12 weeks of exercise (dropped-out and missing data), 8 had less  
273 than 6 recorded exercise sessions and 14 had technical problems or lost the BandCizer© sensor. Exercise  
274 adherence was quantified as 1) *total number of sessions* and 2) *total time-under-tension (TUT)*. When  
275 exercise adherence was quantified as *total number of sessions* both the two and four sessions/week groups  
276 completed >75% of the prescribed dosage (84.8% and 81.9%, respectively). When quantified as *total time-*  
277 *under-tension (TUT)* no groups completed >75% of the prescribed dosage (Table 3) (Figure 3).

278

279


**Table 3. Exercise adherence (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>1</sub>).**

<b>Total number of sessions</b>						
	Number of prescribed sessions	Number of completed sessions (SD)	Percentage of completed sessions (SD)		Mean percentage difference between groups (95% CI)	P
All patients (N=95)	144	107.6 (14.2)	76.9% (33.6%)	Two sessions/week vs.	-2.8%	0.741
Two sessions/week (N=32)	24	20.3 (7.3)	84.8% (30.4%)	Four sessions/week	(-19.6% to 13.9%)	
Four sessions/week (N=29)	48	39.3 (18.4)	81.9% (38.4%)	Four sessions/week vs.	15.3%	0.069
Six sessions/week (N=34)	72	48.0 (21.6)	66.7% (30.1%)	Six sessions/week	(-1.3% to 31.8%)	
<b>Time-under-tension (TUT)</b>						
	Prescribed TUT in secs	Completed TUT in secs (SD)	Percentage of completed TUT (SD)		Mean percentage difference between groups (95% CI)	P
All patients (N=95)	41472	23412.5 (2918.5)	56.5% (31.9%)	Two sessions/week vs.	0.3%	0.965
Two sessions/week (N=32)	6912	4477.3 (2161.9)	64.8% (31.3%)	Four sessions/week	(-15.5% to 16.2%)	
Four sessions/week (N=29)	13824	9002.2 (4870.4)	65.1% (35.2%)	Four sessions/week vs.	17.2%	0.031
Six sessions/week (N=34)	20736	9933.0 (5596.3)	47.9% (26.9%)	Six sessions/week	(1.6% to 32.8%)	

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.

280

281



282

283 Figure 3. Adherence to prescribed exercise dosage across the three groups with exercise quantified as *total number of*  
284 *exercise sessions*. Circles represent the mean number of recorded exercise sessions for each patient. Red circles  
285 represent patients prescribed two exercise sessions per week. Black circles represent patients prescribed four exercise  
286 sessions per week. Blue circles represent patients prescribed six exercise sessions per week. The red dotted line  
287 represents the prescribed exercise dosage in the two sessions/week group (24 sessions). The black dotted line  
288 represents the prescribed exercise dosage in the four sessions/week group (48 sessions). The blue dotted line  
289 represents the prescribed exercise dosage in the six sessions/week group (72 sessions).

290

### 291 Treatment decision after exercise therapy

292 As a post hoc analysis, the number of patients who underwent surgery and those who postponed surgery  
293 were registered. Of the 117 patients with follow-up assessments after 12 weeks of exercise (Figure 1), 79

294 (67.5%) postponed surgery, 32 (27.4%) underwent knee replacement, and 6 (5.1%) wanted surgery, but the  
295 orthopedic surgeon deemed this contra-indicated due to co-morbidities (Table 4) (Supplement 6).

296

**Table 4. 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?”		
	“Yes, I believe I need surgery”	Answer to question “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 (Supplement 6).

297

298

## 299 Harms

300 A total of 14 adverse events were registered during the trial period. Exacerbated knee pain due to the  
301 exercise intervention was the most frequent cause of harm (Figure 1).

302

## 303 Discussion

304 In patients eligible for knee replacement four knee-extensor resistance exercise sessions per week were not  
305 superior to two and six sessions per week in improving isometric knee-extensor strength – indicating no  
306 exercise dose-response relationship. Independent of exercise dosage, only one in three patients completing  
307 the exercise therapy intervention decided to undergo surgery for their knee OA.

308 The results of the present trial are relevant for the following reasons. Firstly, larger exercise dosages do not  
309 seem to be more effective than smaller. Secondly, an exercise intervention with *one* home-based exercise  
310 can lead to clinically relevant improvements in symptoms comparable to more comprehensive  
311 interventions in patients eligible for knee replacement.<sup>1-4,22,45,46</sup> Finally, a simple exercise therapy

312 intervention, in a model of coordinated care, can prompt the majority of patients eligible for knee  
313 replacement to postpone surgery.

314

### 315 Efficacy of different knee-extensor resistance exercise dosages

316 We found no difference in knee-extensor strength gains between the three investigated exercise dosages  
317 after twelve weeks as no between-group contrasts reached the MCID of 0.15 Nm/kg. This finding is  
318 unexpected based on the ACSM recommendations for muscle strength gains (larger exercise dosages lead  
319 to larger muscle strength gains).<sup>33</sup> A possible explanation is that the ACSM recommendations are based on  
320 healthy people, not patients with knee OA eligible for knee replacement. Patients with severe knee OA  
321 likely respond differently to knee-focused exercise due to their condition and associated impairments (e.g.  
322 arthrogenic muscle inhibition )<sup>47</sup> – something which could interfere with the exercise dose-response  
323 relationship classically seen in healthy people.<sup>48</sup> The results suggest that patients eligible for knee  
324 replacement increase their knee-extensor strength equally when exercising with large or small dosages.  
325 This is supported by the result from our recent meta-regression analysis, in which we found no relationship  
326 between knee-extensor resistance exercise dosage and change in knee-extensor strength in patients  
327 eligible for knee replacement (meta-regression was completed after initiation of the QUADX-1 trial).<sup>49</sup>  
328 Patients with knee OA might not need large exercise dosages to improve muscle strength – something also  
329 suggested in the recent START trial.<sup>45</sup> In the START trial, high-intensity strength training was not superior to  
330 low-intensity strength training, nor to an attention-control in knee OA.<sup>45</sup> It suggests that a classic exercise-  
331 dose-response relationship may not exist in knee OA, and that some of the effect, believed to be exercise-  
332 specific, may in fact be caused by “unspecific” or “contextual” factors.<sup>45,50</sup>

333 Another factor that may contribute to our finding of no dose-response relationship is adherence to the  
334 prescribed dosages. As seen in figure 3 there is some overlap between the completed exercise sessions

335 across the three groups. This likely makes the difference in completed exercise between the groups less  
336 clear. Even-though the six sessions/week group completed more exercise in total, compared with the two  
337 and four sessions/week groups, the six sessions/week group had the lowest adherence relative to the  
338 prescribed dosage (66.7% of prescribed sessions), not reaching the predefined criterion of >75%. This lack  
339 of completed exercise could lead to a missing physiological response and concomitant increase in knee-  
340 extensor strength.<sup>34,51</sup>

341 Finally, the applied MCID of 0.15 Nm/kg might have been too large to establish differences between  
342 groups. However, the level of change in knee-extensor strength should also be large enough to potentially  
343 affect clinical outcomes. A meta-regression analysis from 2017 suggested that an increase of 30-40% in  
344 knee-extensor strength is needed to induce beneficial effects on pain and disability in patients with knee  
345 OA.<sup>52</sup>

346

## 347 Secondary outcomes

348 For the secondary outcomes in the primary analysis, none of the differences between the groups were  
349 statistically significant or reached the MCID for any outcome. In the secondary analysis, significant  
350 differences between groups two and six sessions/week were found for OKS and avg. knee pain last week  
351 (NRS 0-10), 4.8 OKS and 1.3 NRS points, respectively, although none of the differences reached the MCID.

352 The two and four sessions/week groups both reached the MCID of 8-10 points for the KOOS subscales  
353 symptoms, pain and ADL, while only the two sessions/week group also reached this change for subscales  
354 sport and quality of life.<sup>53</sup> The six sessions/week group did not reach the MCID for any KOOS subscales. A  
355 similar tendency was seen for OKS and 6MWT where the two sessions/week group reached the MCID of 6  
356 points and 20 m, respectively, while the four and six sessions/week groups did not.<sup>54,55</sup> On the NRS 0-10  
357 scale for pain the two and four sessions/week groups both reached 'slightly better' improvements, with -

358 1.8 and -1.1 changes in avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10), respectively, while the six sessions/week did  
359 not.<sup>56</sup> Finally, for the SCT no MCID is known while the minimal detectable change is reported to be 2.6  
360 seconds.<sup>57</sup> No groups reached this for neither the up or down stair climbing assessment.

361 In general, the two and four sessions/week groups reached the MCID for the outcomes more often than  
362 the six sessions/week group. This could be explained by the larger exercise dose with more frequent  
363 sessions leaving less time to recover between sessions – something that could lead to increase in knee pain  
364 and decreased physical function.

365

### 366 [Implications for \*one\* home-based exercise and coordinated non-surgical and surgical care](#)

367 The results from the QUADX-1 trial are comparable to other trials reporting similar proportions of patients  
368 with severe OA who postpone surgery and corresponding clinically relevant improvements in patient-  
369 reported outcomes after exercise therapy.<sup>1-4</sup> Compared to the intervention in the QUADX-1 trial, the  
370 exercise therapy interventions in these trials are more comprehensive and costly, comprising more  
371 exercises and supervision. This suggests that the intervention and associated exercise dosage needed to  
372 improve symptoms in patients eligible for knee replacement does not have to be extensive or  
373 comprehensive.<sup>45</sup> This corresponds well to the results from the supplementary regression analyses and our  
374 recent meta-regression analysis indicating no dose-response between exercise dosage and change in  
375 outcomes before scheduled knee replacement.<sup>49</sup> A minimal exercise approach as part of coordinated non-  
376 surgical and surgical care pathway in severe knee OA seems relevant based on current dose-response  
377 findings<sup>49</sup> and specific exercise effects in knee OA.<sup>50</sup> The effects observed in the present trial across  
378 different outcomes may be a small specific effect of exercise and/or of other contextual factors. It could be  
379 caused by contact with healthcare professionals<sup>58-60</sup>, regression to the mean, natural cause of the disease,<sup>61</sup>  
380 or simply by placebo effect<sup>50</sup> – making it difficult to ascribe too much specific cause-of-effect to exercise  
381 therapy. In line with this, the recent DISCO trial found equivalent improvements after a supervised exercise

382 and education program, and saline injections in patients with knee OA.<sup>50</sup> These factors question the best  
383 way to provide (exercise) care for patients with knee OA and could suggest that supervised exercise is not  
384 the most cost-effective approach.

385 The large number of patients who postponed surgery highlights the importance of coordinating non-  
386 surgical and surgical care in patients eligible for knee replacement. The proportion of patients postponing  
387 and choosing surgery across the three groups appeared similar – indicating that the decision to postpone  
388 surgery was independent of the prescribed exercise therapy dosage (not powered for this outcome). A  
389 contributing factor explaining the large number of patients postponing surgery could be the non-specific  
390 effect of the applied ‘model’ of coordinated non-surgical and surgical care.<sup>16,59,60,62–64</sup> In this ‘model’, the  
391 patients’ decision on surgical treatment was re-evaluated by the patient and orthopedic surgeon after the  
392 exercise period. This re-evaluation based on symptom changes, combined with additional attention from an  
393 orthopedic surgeon, could have facilitated the patients’ decision to postpone surgery.<sup>58–60,65–68</sup> This is  
394 exemplified in table 4 showing that patients who believe they need surgery, undergo surgery, while those  
395 who “don’t know” or do not believe they need surgery postpone it.

396 In the Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) concept it is assumed that exercise therapy before planned  
397 surgery (exercise-based pre-habilitation) is always followed by surgery.<sup>69–73</sup> We have previously argued that  
398 the premise for exercise therapy before potential surgery – to enhance post-surgical outcomes in patients  
399 eligible for knee replacement – should be questioned<sup>49</sup> as several systematic reviews conclude no clinically-  
400 relevant effect post-operatively.<sup>49,74–83</sup> Instead of being a predetermined care pathway (leading to surgery),  
401 exercise therapy before potential surgery could be used to inform the shared decision-making process  
402 when planning a care pathway,<sup>8,17,18</sup> which complies with guideline recommendations while being cost-  
403 effective.<sup>5–10,84</sup> Based on the results from the QUADX-1 trial, we suggest using simple (*one* exercise) home-  
404 based resistance exercise therapy within the ERAS concept to “pre-evaluate” the need for surgery in  
405 patients with severe knee OA rather than to “prepare” patients for surgery.



406

## 407 Limitations

408 The Danish healthcare system is publicly funded, and treatment is therefore free. Refusing surgery after  
409 having been on a waiting list does not postpone the possibility of surgery for years. The patients can be re-  
410 assessed by an orthopaedic surgeon within months and have surgery scheduled if needed. This might limit  
411 the comparability to other countries with a different healthcare system. The patients were aware that the  
412 sensor attached to the exercise band recorded their exercise adherence. This might potentially have  
413 affected their exercise adherence.<sup>85</sup>

414

## 415 Conclusion

416 In patients eligible for knee-replacement we found no between-group differences in isometric knee  
417 extensor strength after 2, 4 and 6 knee-extensor resistance exercise sessions per week. We saw no  
418 indication of an exercise dose-response relationship for isometric knee-extensor strength and only clinically  
419 irrelevant within group changes. For some secondary outcome (e.g. KOOS subscales) we found clinically  
420 relevant within group changes, which could help explain why only one in three patients decided to have  
421 surgery after the simple home-based exercise intervention.

422

423

## 424 Acknowledgements

425 Acknowledgement go to: Research assistant Line Holst for help with trial management and outcomes  
426 assessment, and to the physiotherapists in the participating municipalities (Broendby, Hvidovre and

427 Copenhagen) and the orthopedic surgeons at the Orthopedic Department at Copenhagen University  
428 Hospital Amager-Hvidovre.

429

## 430 Contributions

431 Conception and design: Husted, Troelsen, Rathleff, Thorborg and Bandholm.

432 Data acquisition: Husted and Grønfeldt.

433 Analysis and interpretation of the data: All authors.

434 Drafting of the article: Husted.

435 Critical revision of the article for important intellectual content: All authors.

436 Statistical expertise: Kallemose.

437 Final approval of the article: All authors. Mr. Husted ([rasmus.skov.husted@regionh.dk](mailto:rasmus.skov.husted@regionh.dk)) and Prof. Bandholm  
438 ([thomas.quaade.bandholm@regionh.dk](mailto:thomas.quaade.bandholm@regionh.dk)) takes responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole.

439

## 440 Funding and Role of the funding source

441 This work was supported by grants from The Capital Region's strategic funds (R142-A5363), The Capital  
442 Region's foundation for cross-continuum research (P-2015-1-01, P-2018-1-02, P-2019-1-03), Copenhagen  
443 University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre's strategic funds (2019-800), and The Danish Rheumatism Association  
444 (R156-A4923). The funding sources had no role in this work.

445

## 446 Competing interests

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

457

## 458 References

- 459 1. Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Rasmussen S, et al. Total knee  
460 replacement and non-surgical treatment of knee osteoarthritis: 2-year outcome from two parallel  
461 randomized controlled trials. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2018 Sep;26(9):1170–80.
- 462 2. Gwynne-Jones JH, Wilson RA, Wong JMY, Abbott JH, Gwynne-Jones DP. The Outcomes of  
463 Nonoperative Management of Patients With Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis Triaged to a Physiotherapy-  
464 Led Clinic at Minimum 5-Year Follow-Up and Factors Associated With Progression to Surgery. *J*  
465 *Arthroplasty*. 2020 Feb;
- 466 3. Dabare C, Le Marshall K, Leung A, Page CJ, Choong PF, Lim KK. Differences in presentation,  
467 progression and rates of arthroplasty between hip and knee osteoarthritis: Observations from an  
468 osteoarthritis cohort study—a clear role for conservative management. *Int J Rheum Dis*. 2017  
469 Oct;20(10):1350–60.
- 470 4. Dell’Isola A, Jönsson T, Rolfson O, Cronström A, Englund M, Dahlberg D. Willingness to undergo joint  
471 surgery following a first-line intervention for osteoarthritis: data from the BOA register. *Arthritis Care*  
472 *Res*. 2020;
- 473 5. Sundhedsstyrelsen - Knæartrose. Knæartrose – nationale kliniske retningslinjer og faglige  
474 visitationsretningslinjer. 1st ed. Kbh.; 2012. 1–80 p.

- 475 6. Bannuru, R. R., Osani, M. C., Vaysbrot, E. E., Arden, N. K., Bennell KL, Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M. A., et al.  
476 OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis.  
477 *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2019;27(11).
- 478 7. Fransen M, McConnell S, Bell M. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. *Cochrane Database Syst*  
479 *Rev*. 2015;9(1):CD004376.
- 480 8. Geenen R, Overman CL, Christensen R, Åsenlöf P, Capela S, Huisinga KL, et al. EULAR  
481 recommendations for the health professional's approach to pain management in inflammatory  
482 arthritis and osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2018 May 3;annrheumdis-2017-212662.
- 483 9. NICE. Osteoarthritis: care and management in adults. Clinical guideline CG177. London: National  
484 Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2014.
- 485 10. Kolasinski SL, Neogi T, Hochberg MC, Oatis C, Guyatt G, Block J, et al. 2019 American College of  
486 Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation Guideline for the Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hand, Hip,  
487 and Knee. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2020 Feb;72(2):149–62.
- 488 11. Cobos R, Latorre A, Aizpuru F, Guenaga JI, Sarasqueta C, Escobar A, et al. Variability of indication  
489 criteria in knee and hip replacement: an observational study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2010  
490 Dec;11(1).
- 491 12. Gossec L, Paternotte S, Bingham CO, Clegg DO, Coste P, Conaghan PG, et al. OARSI/OMERACT  
492 Initiative to Define States of Severity and Indication for Joint Replacement in Hip and Knee  
493 Osteoarthritis. An OMERACT 10 Special Interest Group. *J Rheumatol*. 2011 Aug;38(8):1765–9.
- 494 13. Hofstede SN, Marang-van de Mheen PJ, Vliet Vlieland TPM, van den Ende CHM, Nelissen RGHH, van  
495 Bodegom-Vos L. Barriers and Facilitators Associated with Non-Surgical Treatment Use for  
496 Osteoarthritis Patients in Orthopaedic Practice. Coles JA, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2016 Jan  
497 22;11(1):e0147406.
- 498 14. Allen KD, Choong PF, Davis AM, Dowsey MM, Dziedzic KS, Emery C, et al. Osteoarthritis: Models for  
499 appropriate care across the disease continuum. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol*. 2016 Jun;30(3):503–  
500 35.
- 501 15. Briggs AM, Jordan JE, Jennings M, Speerin R, Bragge P, Chua J, et al. Supporting the Evaluation and  
502 Implementation of Musculoskeletal Models of Care: A Globally Informed Framework for Judging  
503 Readiness and Success. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2017 Apr;69(4):567–77.
- 504 16. Brown C, Gordon B, Bucknill A. The Impact of the Osteoarthritis Hip and Knee Service (OAHKS) in  
505 Melbourne health: a review from 2006–2009. *Orthop Proc*. 2011;93-B (Suppl. II)(211).
- 506 17. Ditmyer MM, Topp R, Pifer M. Prehabilitation in preparation for orthopaedic surgery. *Orthop Nurs*.  
507 2002;21(5):43–54.
- 508 18. Slover J, Shue J, Koenig K. Shared Decision-making in Orthopaedic Surgery. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*.  
509 2012 Apr;470(4):1046–53.
- 510 19. Hurley MV, Walsh NE, Mitchell H, Nicholas J, Patel A. Long-term outcomes and costs of an integrated  
511 rehabilitation program for chronic knee pain: A pragmatic, cluster randomized, controlled trial.  
512 *Arthritis Care Res*. 2012 Feb;64(2):238–47.

- 513 20. Ravaud P, Flipo R-M, Boutron I, Roy C, Mahmoudi A, Giraudeau B, et al. ARTIST (osteoarthritis  
514 intervention standardized) study of standardised consultation versus usual care for patients with  
515 osteoarthritis of the knee in primary care in France: pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2009  
516 Feb 23;338(feb23 1):b421–b421.
- 517 21. GLA:D® International Network. GLA:D® International Network [Internet]. 2021. Available from:  
518 <https://gladinternational.org/home/>
- 519 22. Jönsson T, Eek F, Dell’Isola A, Dahlberg LE, Ekvall Hansson E. The Better Management of Patients with  
520 Osteoarthritis Program: Outcomes after evidence-based education and exercise delivered nationwide  
521 in Sweden. Pan F, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2019 Sep 19;14(9):e0222657.
- 522 23. Thorstensson CA, Garellick G, Rystedt H, Dahlberg LE. Better Management of Patients with  
523 Osteoarthritis: Development and Nationwide Implementation of an Evidence-Based Supported  
524 Osteoarthritis Self-Management Programme. *Musculoskeletal Care*. 2015 Jun;13(2):67–75.
- 525 24. Skou ST, Roos EM. Good Life with osteoArthritis in Denmark (GLA:D™): evidence-based education and  
526 supervised neuromuscular exercise delivered by certified physiotherapists nationwide. *BMC*  
527 *Musculoskelet Disord* [Internet]. 2017 Dec [cited 2018 Mar 5];18(1). Available from:  
528 <http://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12891-017-1439-y>
- 529 25. GLA:D Denmark. GLA:D Denmark. Annual report 2019 [Internet]. 2019. Available from:  
530 [https://www.glaiddk/pdf/GLAD%20annual%20report%202019%20eng%20final\\_2.pdf](https://www.glaiddk/pdf/GLAD%20annual%20report%202019%20eng%20final_2.pdf)
- 531 26. Lawford BJ, Hinman RS, Nelligan RK, Keefe F, Rini C, Bennell KL. “I could do it in my own time and  
532 when I really needed it”: perceptions of online pain coping skills training for people with knee  
533 osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care Res* [Internet]. 2019 Oct 18 [cited 2020 Nov 19]; Available from:  
534 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/acr.24093>
- 535 27. Hunter DJ, March L, Chew M. Osteoarthritis in 2020 and beyond: a Lancet Commission. *The Lancet*  
536 [Internet]. 2020 Nov [cited 2020 Nov 6]; Available from:  
537 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673620322303>
- 538 28. Luong M-LN, Cleveland RJ, Nyrop KA, Callahan LF. Social determinants and osteoarthritis outcomes.  
539 *Aging Health*. 2012 Aug;8(4):413–37.
- 540 29. Ackerman IN, Livingston JA, Osborne RH. Personal Perspectives on Enablers and Barriers to Accessing  
541 Care for Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis. *Phys Ther*. 2016 Jan 1;96(1):26–36.
- 542 30. Juhl C, Christensen R, Roos EM, Zhang W, Lund H. Impact of Exercise Type and Dose on Pain and  
543 Disability in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Regression Analysis of Randomized  
544 Controlled Trials: Impact of Exercise Type and Dose in Knee Osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2014  
545 Mar;66(3):622–36.
- 546 31. Øiestad BE, Juhl CB, Eitzen I, Thorlund JB. Knee extensor muscle weakness is a risk factor for  
547 development of knee osteoarthritis. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*.  
548 2015 Feb;23(2):171–7.
- 549 32. Culvenor AG, Ruhdorfer A, Juhl C, Eckstein F, Øiestad BE. Knee Extensor Strength and Risk of  
550 Structural, Symptomatic, and Functional Decline in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and

- 551 Meta-Analysis: Risk of Deterioration in Knee OA and Knee Extensor Strength. *Arthritis Care Res.* 2017  
552 May;69(5):649–58.
- 553 33. Ratamess NA, Alvar BA, Evetoch TK, Housh TJ, Kibler WB, Kraemer WJ, et al. Progression Models in  
554 Resistance Training for Healthy Adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2009 Mar;41(3):687–708.
- 555 34. Rhea MR, Alvar BA, Burkett LN, Ball SD. A Meta-analysis to Determine the Dose Response for Strength  
556 Development. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2003 Mar;35(3):456–64.
- 557 35. Husted RS, Troelsen A, Thorborg K, Rathleff MS, Husted H, Bandholm T. Efficacy of pre-operative  
558 quadriceps strength training on knee-extensor strength before and shortly following total knee  
559 arthroplasty: protocol for a randomized, dose-response trial (The QUADX-1 trial). *Trials.* 2018  
560 Dec;19(1):47.
- 561 36. Riis A, Rathleff MS, Jensen MB, Simonsen O. Low grading of the severity of knee osteoarthritis pre-  
562 operatively is associated with a lower functional level after total knee replacement: a prospective  
563 cohort study with 12 months' follow-up. *Bone Jt J.* 2014 Nov;96-B(11):1498–502.
- 564 37. Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Simonsen O, et al. Criteria used when  
565 deciding on eligibility for total knee arthroplasty--Between thinking and doing. *The Knee.* 2016  
566 Mar;23(2):300–5.
- 567 38. American Society of Anesthesiologists. ASA Physical Status Classification System. American Society of  
568 Anesthesiologists; 2014.
- 569 39. Sundhedsstyrelsen, Statens Serum Institut. Alkoholstatistik 2015. Nationale data. 2015.
- 570 40. Gagnon D, Nadeau S, Gravel D, Robert J, Bélanger D, Hilsenrath M. Reliability and validity of static  
571 knee strength measurements obtained with a chair-fixed dynamometer in subjects with hip or knee  
572 arthroplasty. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2005 Oct;86(10):1998–2008.
- 573 41. Rathleff MS, Bandholm T, Ahrendt P, Olesen JL, Thorborg K. Novel stretch-sensor technology allows  
574 quantification of adherence and quality of home-exercises: a validation study. *Br J Sports Med.* 2014  
575 Apr;48(8):724–8.
- 576 42. Rathleff MS, Thorborg K, Rode LA, McGirr KA, Sørensen AS, Bøggild A, et al. Adherence to commonly  
577 prescribed, home-based strength training exercises for the lower extremity can be objectively  
578 monitored using the Bandcizer. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2015;29(3):627–636.
- 579 43. Riel H, Matthews M, Vicenzino B, Bandholm T, Thorborg K, Rathleff MS. Feedback Leads to Better  
580 Exercise Quality in Adolescents with Patellofemoral Pain: *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018 Jan;50(1):28–35.
- 581 44. Bennell KL, Kyriakides M, Metcalf B, Egerton T, Wrigley TV, Hodges PW, et al. Neuromuscular Versus  
582 Quadriceps Strengthening Exercise in Patients With Medial Knee Osteoarthritis and Varus  
583 Malalignment: A Randomized Controlled Trial: Neuromuscular Exercise and Knee Adduction Moment.  
584 *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 2014 Apr;66(4):950–9.
- 585 45. Messier SP, Mihalko SL, Beavers DP, Nicklas BJ, DeVita P, Carr JJ, et al. Effect of High-Intensity  
586 Strength Training on Knee Pain and Knee Joint Compressive Forces Among Adults With Knee  
587 Osteoarthritis: The START Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2021 Feb 16;325(7):646.

- 588 46. Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Simonsen O, et al. A Randomized,  
589 Controlled Trial of Total Knee Replacement. *N Engl J Med*. 2015 Oct 22;373(17):1597–606.
- 590 47. Rice DA, McNair PJ. Quadriceps Arthrogenic Muscle Inhibition: Neural Mechanisms and Treatment  
591 Perspectives. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 2010 Dec;40(3):250–66.
- 592 48. Regnaud J-P, Lefevre-Colau M-M, Trinquart L, Nguyen C, Boutron I, Brosseau L, et al. High-intensity  
593 versus low-intensity physical activity or exercise in people with hip or knee osteoarthritis. *Cochrane*  
594 *Musculoskeletal Group*, editor. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015 Oct 29;29(10):CD010203.
- 595 49. Husted RS, Juhl C, Troelsen A, Thorborg K, Kallemsen T, Rathleff MS, et al. The relationship between  
596 prescribed pre-operative knee-extensor exercise dosage and effect on knee-extensor strength prior to  
597 and following total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of  
598 randomized controlled trials. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2020 Sep;(28):1412–26.
- 599 50. Bandak E, Christensen R, Overgaard A, Kristensen LE, Ellegaard K, Guldborg-Møller J, et al. Exercise  
600 and education versus saline injections for knee osteoarthritis: a randomised controlled equivalence  
601 trial. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2021 Nov 29;annrheumdis-2021-221129.
- 602 51. Borde R, Hortobágyi T, Granacher U. Dose–Response Relationships of Resistance Training in Healthy  
603 Old Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med*. 2015 Dec;45(12):1693–720.
- 604 52. Bartholdy C, Juhl C, Christensen R, Lund H, Zhang W, Henriksen M. The role of muscle strengthening in  
605 exercise therapy for knee osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of  
606 randomized trials. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 2017 Mar;47(1):9–21.
- 607 53. Roos EM, Lohmander LS. The Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS): from joint injury  
608 to osteoarthritis. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2003;8.
- 609 54. Harris KK, Dawson J, Jones LD, Beard DJ, Price AJ. Extending the use of PROMs in the NHS—using the  
610 Oxford Knee Score in patients undergoing non-operative management for knee osteoarthritis: a  
611 validation study. *BMJ Open*. 2013 Aug;3(8):e003365.
- 612 55. Perera S, Mody SH, Woodman RC, Studenski SA. Meaningful Change and Responsiveness in Common  
613 Physical Performance Measures in Older Adults: MEANINGFUL CHANGE AND PERFORMANCE. *J Am*  
614 *Geriatr Soc*. 2006 May;54(5):743–9.
- 615 56. Salaffi F, Stancati A, Silvestri CA, Ciapetti A, Grassi W. Minimal clinically important changes in chronic  
616 musculoskeletal pain intensity measured on a numerical rating scale. *Eur J Pain*. 2004 Aug;8(4):283–  
617 91.
- 618 57. Almeida GJ, Schroeder CA, Gil AB, Fitzgerald GK, Piva SR. Interrater Reliability and Validity of the Stair  
619 Ascend/Descend Test in Subjects With Total Knee Arthroplasty. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2010  
620 Jun;91(6):932–8.
- 621 58. Hafliðadóttir SH, Juhl CB, Nielsen SM, Henriksen M, Harris IA, Bliddal H, et al. Placebo response and  
622 effect in randomized clinical trials: meta-research with focus on contextual effects. *Trials*. 2021  
623 Dec;22(1):493.
- 624 59. Zhang W, Robertson J, Jones AC, Dieppe PA, Doherty M. The placebo effect and its determinants in  
625 osteoarthritis: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2008 Dec 1;67(12):1716.

- 626 60. Rossettini G, Carlino E, Testa M. Clinical relevance of contextual factors as triggers of placebo and  
627 nocebo effects in musculoskeletal pain. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2018 Dec;19(1):27.
- 628 61. Englund M. Bout of the corner men and not the boxers? Contextual effects flex their muscles. *Ann*  
629 *Rheum Dis*. 2018 Feb;77(2):159–61.
- 630 62. Blasini M, Peiris N, Wright T, Colloca L. The Role of Patient–Practitioner Relationships in Placebo and  
631 Nocebo Phenomena. In: *International Review of Neurobiology* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018 [cited 2020  
632 Dec 17]. p. 211–31. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S007477421830062X>
- 633 63. Miller FG, Colloca L, Kaptchuk TJ. The Placebo Effect: Illness and Interpersonal Healing. *Perspect Biol*  
634 *Med*. 2009;52(4):518–39.
- 635 64. Hardman DI, Geraghty AW, Howick J, Roberts N, Bishop FL. A discursive exploration of public  
636 perspectives on placebos and their effects. *Health Psychol Open*. 2019 Jan;6(1):205510291983231.
- 637 65. Kaplan SH, Greenfield S, Gandek B, Rogers WH, Ware JE. Characteristics of Physicians with  
638 Participatory Decision-Making Styles. *Ann Intern Med*. 1996 Mar 1;124(5):497.
- 639 66. Frosch DL, Kaplan RM. Shared decision making in clinical medicine: past research and future  
640 directions. *Am J Prev Med*. 1999 Nov;17(4):285–94.
- 641 67. Epstein RM, Alper BS, Quill TE. Communicating Evidence for Participatory Decision Making. *JAMA*.  
642 2004;May 19(291):8.
- 643 68. Miller FG, Kaptchuk TJ. The power of context: reconceptualizing the placebo effect. *J R Soc Med*. 2008  
644 May;101(5):222–5.
- 645 69. Ljungqvist O, Hubner M. Enhanced recovery after surgery—ERAS—principles, practice and feasibility  
646 in the elderly. *Aging Clin Exp Res*. 2018 Mar;30(3):249–52.
- 647 70. Bardram L, Funch-Jensen P, Jensen P, Crawford ME, Kehlet H. Recovery after laparoscopic colonic  
648 surgery with epidural analgesia, and early oral nutrition and mobilisation. *The Lancet*. 1995  
649 Mar;345(8952):763–4.
- 650 71. Wainwright TW, Gill M, McDonald DA, Middleton RG, Reed M, Sahota O, et al. Consensus statement  
651 for perioperative care in total hip replacement and total knee replacement surgery: Enhanced  
652 Recovery After Surgery (ERAS<sup>®</sup>) Society recommendations. *Acta Orthop*. 2019 Oct 30;1–17.
- 653 72. Gao K, Yu P, Su J, He C, Liu L, Zhou Y, et al. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing screening and pre-  
654 operative pulmonary rehabilitation reduce postoperative complications and improve fast-track  
655 recovery after lung cancer surgery: A study for 342 cases: CPET and rehabilitation of lung surgery.  
656 *Thorac Cancer*. 2015 Jul;6(4):443–9.
- 657 73. Pouwels S, Willigendael EM, van Sambeek MRHM, Nienhuijs SW, Cuyppers PWM, Teijink JAW.  
658 Beneficial Effects of Pre-operative Exercise Therapy in Patients with an Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm: A  
659 Systematic Review. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2015 Jan;49(1):66–76.
- 660 74. Moyer R, Ikert K, Long K, Marsh J. The Value of Preoperative Exercise and Education for Patients  
661 Undergoing Total Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JBJS Rev*. 2017  
662 Dec;5(12):e2.



- 663 75. Wang L, Lee M, Zhang Z, Moodie J, Cheng D, Martin J. Does preoperative rehabilitation for patients  
664 planning to undergo joint replacement surgery improve outcomes? A systematic review and meta-  
665 analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(2):e009857.
- 666 76. Ma J, Zhang L, Kuang M, Zhao J, Wang Y, Lu B, et al. The effect of preoperative training on functional  
667 recovery in patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J*  
668 *Surg* [Internet]. 2018 Jan [cited 2018 Feb 16]; Available from:  
669 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S174391911830493X>
- 670 77. Ackerman I, Bennell K. Does pre-operative physiotherapy improve outcomes from lower limb joint  
671 replacement surgery? A systematic review. *Aust J Physiother*. 2004;50(1):25–30.
- 672 78. Chesham RA, Shanmugam S. Does preoperative physiotherapy improve postoperative, patient-based  
673 outcomes in older adults who have undergone total knee arthroplasty? A systematic review.  
674 *Physiother Theory Pract*. 2016 Oct 13;33(1):9–30.
- 675 79. Skoffler B, Dalgas U, Mechlenburg I. Progressive resistance training before and after total hip and knee  
676 arthroplasty: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil*. 2015;Jan 29(1):14–29.
- 677 80. Jordan RW, Smith NA, Chahal GS, Casson C, Reed MR, Sprowson AP. Enhanced education and  
678 physiotherapy before knee replacement; is it worth it? A systematic review. *Physiotherapy*. 2014  
679 Dec;100(4):305–12.
- 680 81. Kwok IHY, Paton B, Haddad FS. Does Pre-Operative Physiotherapy Improve Outcomes in Primary Total  
681 Knee Arthroplasty? — A Systematic Review. *J Arthroplasty*. 2015 Sep;30(9):1657–63.
- 682 82. Wallis JA, Taylor NF. Pre-operative interventions (non-surgical and non-pharmacological) for patients  
683 with hip or knee osteoarthritis awaiting joint replacement surgery – a systematic review and meta-  
684 analysis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2011 Dec;19(12):1381–95.
- 685 83. Gawel JA, Brown SE, Collins JC, McCallum C. Does pre-operative physical therapy improve post-  
686 surgical outcomes of patients undergoing a total knee and/or total hip arthroplasty? A systematic  
687 review. *Physiother Pract Res*. 2013;(1):9–20.
- 688 84. Skou ST, Roos E, Laursen M, Arendt L, Rasmussen S, Simonsen O, et al. Cost-e-ffectiveness of total  
689 knee replacement in addition to non-s-urgical treatment: a 2--year outcome from a randomised trial  
690 in secondary care in Denmark. *BMJ Open*. 2020;11.
- 691 85. Spencer EA, Mahtani K. Catalogue of Bias Collaboration. Hawthorne effect. In *Catalog of Bias*.  
692 [Internet]. 2017. Available from: <https://catalogofbias.org/biases/hawthorne-effect/>
- 693 86. Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gøtzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010  
694 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *Int J*  
695 *Surg*. 2012;10(1):28–55.
- 696
- 697

698 Supplement 1. Missing data at the different endpoints.  
699

**eTable 1. Missing data at the different endpoints.**

Outcomes	Baseline (t <sub>0</sub> )			
	All patients N = 140	Two sessions/week N = 47	Four sessions/week N = 47	Six sessions/week 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 Symp (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

Outcomes	Following 12 weeks home-based exercise (t <sub>1</sub> )			
	All patients N = 140	Two sessions/week N = 47	Four sessions/week N = 47	Six sessions/week 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 Symp (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

Outcomes	Acutely after surgery (t <sub>2</sub> )			
	All patients N = 32	Two sessions/week N = 7	Four sessions/week N = 12	Six sessions/week 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

<b>Three months after surgery (t<sub>3</sub>)</b>				
Outcomes	All patients	Two sessions/week	Four sessions/week	Six sessions/week
	N = 32	N = 7	N = 12	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 Symp (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 injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test. Group A = 2 exercise sessions/week, Group B = 4 exercise sessions/week, Group C = 6 exercise sessions/week.

700

701

702 Supplement 2. Separate baseline characteristics for the patients lost to follow-up, the  
703 remaining patients and the sub-sample that underwent surgery.  
704

**eTable 2. Baseline characteristics (t<sub>0</sub>). Participants lost to follow-up.**

Characteristics	All patients	Two sessions/week	Four sessions/week	Six sessions/week
Mean (SD)	N = 23	N = 8	N = 8	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 Symp (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 injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test.

705

**eTable 3. Baseline characteristics (t<sub>0</sub>). Remaining participants.**

Characteristics	All patients	Two sessions/week	Four sessions/week	Six sessions/week
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 Symp (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 injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test.

706

**eTable 4. Baseline characteristics for the sub-sample that underwent surgery (to).**

Characteristics	All patients	Two sessions/week	Four sessions/week	Six sessions/week
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 Symp (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 injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test, TKA = Total Knee Arthroplasty, UKA = Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty.

707

708

709

710

711 Supplement 3. Secondary analyses (Mean change between group two and six  
712 sessions/week)  
713

**eTable 5.**

**Mean change between group two and six sessions/week for all outcomes between baseline and following 12 weeks home-based exercise (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>1</sub>). Intention-to-treat analysis, N = 140. One-way ANOVA based on imputed data.**

Mean change (95% CI) from baseline between groups (effect = time*group) <b>Two sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week</b>	Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change¥
Primary outcome			
<b>Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)</b>	-0.03 (-0.19 to 0.12)	0.654	-2.6%
Secondary outcomes			
<b>KOOS Symp (0-100)</b>	9.4 (1.1 to 17.7)	0.027	9.6%
<b>KOOS Pain (0-100)</b>	8.1 (0.1 to 16.1)	0.046	12.8%
<b>KOOS ADL (0-100)</b>	4.7 (-3.1 to 12.5)	0.234	7.8%
<b>KOOS Sport (0-100)</b>	4.1 (-5.1 to 13.2)	0.376	8.5%
<b>KOOS QoL (0-100)</b>	5.3 (-3.5 to 14.1)	0.232	13.5%
<b>OKS (0-48)</b>	4.8 (1.3 to 8.3)	0.008	15.2%
<b>Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)</b>	0.1 (-1.1 to 1.2)	0.901	1.8%
<b>Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)</b>	-1.3 (-2.3 to -0.2)	0.018	-19.5%
<b>6MWT (m)</b>	24.9 (-14.9 to 64.7)	0.218	4.7%
<b>SCT up (secs)</b>	-1.5 (-3.2 to 0.3)	0.095	-15.5%
<b>SCT down (secs)</b>	-0.8 (-2.8 to 1.3)	0.468	-8.0%

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Analyses were adjusted for the following baseline scores: isometric knee-extensor strength, KOOS symptoms, KOOS ADL, KOOS sport and 6MWT. These adjustments were not prespecified. ¥ = unadjusted numbers. Isometric knee-extensor strength reported as Nm/kg (positive change = improvement); Knee injury and 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).

714

715 Supplement 4. Supplementary regression analyses

716

717 For the supplementary regression analyses the three groups were pooled into one sample. No association  
718 was observed between the level of exercise adherence and pre-operative changes for any outcomes,  
719 except for a weak inverse association between *total number of sessions* and change in the *six-minute walk*  
720 *test* (Slope -0.7323 [95% -1.819 to -0.1826]) (eTable 6).

**eTable 6. Simple regression models.**

Independent variable	Dependent variable - Change scores from baseline to after 12 weeks of exercise (t <sub>0</sub> -t <sub>1</sub> )	Slope	95% CI
<b>Exercise adherence quantified as total number of sessions</b>			
	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
<b>Exercise adherence quantified as total time-under-tension (TUT)</b>			
	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 injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score, OKS = Oxford Knee Score, 6MWT = Six-minute walk test, SCT = Stair climb test.

721

722

723 Supplement 5. Results for the post-surgical assessments (t<sub>2</sub> and t<sub>3</sub>)

724

725 Primary analyses (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>2</sub>)

**eTable 7. Mean change in all outcomes between baseline and acutely after surgery (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>2</sub>). 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
<b>Primary outcome</b>							
<b>Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)</b>							
All patients	-0.62 (-0.86 to -0.39)	<0.001	-47.5%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	0.06 (-0.51 to 0.63)	0.822	9.2%
Two sessions/week	-0.49 (-0.98 to 0.01)	0.052	-52.0%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-0.14 (-0.66 to 0.38)	0.568	-6.9%
Four sessions/week	-0.63 (-1.03 to -0.23)	0.003	-42.7%				
Six sessions/week	-0.68 (-1.05 to -0.32)	<0.001	-49.6%				
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>							
<b>Current pain (NRS 0-10)</b>							
All patients	1.6 (0.3 to 2.8)	0.017	69.6%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	-1.5 (-5.8 to 2.8)	0.465	-16.5%
Two sessions/week	0.7 (-2.2 to 3.5)	0.627	36.8%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-0.05 (-3.8 to 3.7)	0.976	51.7%
Four sessions/week	1.6 (-0.7 to 3.9)	0.159	53.3%				
Six sessions/week	2.1 (0.3 to 3.8)	0.025	105.0%				

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Analyses were adjusted for the following baseline scores: isometric knee-extensor strength, KOOS symptoms, KOOS ADL, KOOS sport and 6MWT. These adjustments were not prespecified. ¥ = unadjusted numbers. 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).

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735



736 **Secondary analyses (Mean change between group two and six sessions/week)**

**eTable 8. Mean change between group two and six sessions/week for all outcomes between baseline and acutely after surgery (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>2</sub>). Intention-to-treat analysis, N = 32. One-way ANOVA based on imputed data.**

Mean change (95% CI) from baseline between groups (effect = time*group)	Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change¥
Two sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week			
Primary outcome			
<b>Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)</b>	-0.08 (-0.60 to 0.43)	0.731	-2.3%
Secondary outcomes			
<b>Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)</b>	-1.64 (-5.4 to 2.1)	0.369	-68.2%

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Analyses were adjusted for the following baseline scores: isometric knee-extensor strength, KOOS symptoms, KOOS ADL, KOOS sport and 6MWT. These adjustments were not prespecified. ¥ = unadjusted numbers. 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).

737

738 **Primary analyses (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>3</sub>)**

**eTable 9. Mean change in all outcomes between baseline and three months after surgery (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>3</sub>). 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						
<b>Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)</b>						
All patients	-0.05 (-0.26 to 0.16)	0.631	-4.2%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	0.26 (-0.39 to 0.90)	0.412 36.7%
Two sessions/week	0.23 (-0.21 to 0.67)	0.289	20.0%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-0.09 (-0.62 to 0.44)	0.718 -9.5%
Four sessions/week	-0.16 (-0.51 to 0.20)	0.376	-16.7%			
Six sessions/week	-0.10 (-0.40 to 0.20)	0.499	-7.1%			
Secondary outcomes						
<b>KOOS Symp (0-100)</b>						
All patients	16.6 (5.7 to 27.6)	0.004	31.7%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	21.1 (-10.7 to 52.9)	0.180 5.7%
Two sessions/week	17.4 (-6.7 to 41.5)	0.148	28.4%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-17.7 (-43.1 to 7.7)	0.157 -18.2%
Four sessions/week	10.4 (-8.4 to 29.2)	0.263	22.7%			
Six sessions/week	21.9 (5.3 to 38.5)	0.012	40.9%			
<b>KOOS Pain (0-100)</b>						
All patients	28.1 (18.6 to 37.7)	<0.001	64.4%	Two sessions/week vs. Four sessions/week	21.8 (-8.2 to 51.9)	0.144 15.4%
Two sessions/week	37.8 (16.8 to 58.8)	0.001	79.4%	Four sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week	-11.1 (-36.8 to 14.5)	0.365 7.3%
Four sessions/week	23.7 (6.8 to 40.6)	0.008	64.1%			

Six sessions/week	26.9 (12.1 to 41.7)	<0.001	56.8%	Six sessions/week			
<b>KOOS ADL (0-100)</b>							
All patients	23.9 (16.1 to 31.7)	<0.001	46.9%	Two sessions/week vs.	17.0 (-7.3 to 41.4)	0.158	4.5%
Two sessions/week	30.4 (12.8 to 47.9)	0.002	55.5%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	21.7 (8.2 to 35.3)	0.003	50.9%	Four sessions/week vs.	-8.9 (-28.9 to 10.9)	0.349	11.4%
Six sessions/week	22.4 (10.2 to 34.5)	<0.001	39.5%	Six sessions/week			
<b>KOOS Sport (0-100)</b>							
All patients	18.2 (6.3 to 30.2)	0.004	107.7%	Two sessions/week vs.	16.5 (-21.6 to 54.4)	0.375	97.4%
Two sessions/week	24.5 (-2.0 to 51.1)	0.068	189.9%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	12.3 (-8.7 to 33.2)	0.237	92.5%	Four sessions/week vs.	-18.9 (-48.4 to 10.6)	0.189	1.4%
Six sessions/week	20.3 (2.3 to 38.4)	0.029	91.0%	Six sessions/week			
<b>KOOS QoL (0-100)</b>							
All patients	29.4 (18.9 to 39.9)	<0.001	108.5%	Two sessions/week vs.	26.6 (-6.5 to 59.8)	0.109	44.1%
Two sessions/week	39.3 (16.6 to 62.1)	0.002	137.4%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	20.9 (3.0 to 38.8)	0.024	93.3%	Four sessions/week vs.	-18.2 (-44.8 to 8.4)	0.163	-10.3%
Six sessions/week	31.9 (16.2 to 47.7)	<0.001	103.6%	Six sessions/week			
<b>OKS (0-48)</b>							
All patients	9.9 (6.0 to 13.8)	<0.001	43.8%	Two sessions/week vs.	8.8 (-3.5 to 21.0)	0.152	9.0%
Two sessions/week	12.2 (3.7 to 20.6)	0.007	49.0%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	7.4 (0.7 to 14.1)	0.032	40.0%	Four sessions/week vs.	-7.0 (-17.1 to 3.1)	0.160	-3.8%
Six sessions/week	11.0 (4.9 to 17.0)	<0.001	43.8%	Six sessions/week			
<b>Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)</b>							
All patients	-1.3 (-2.0 to -0.6)	0.001	-56.5%	Two sessions/week vs.	-1.3 (-3.8 to 1.1)	0.265	-55.6%
Two sessions/week	-1.5 (-3.0 to 0.1)	0.071	-78.9%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	-0.7 (-1.9 to 0.5)	0.243	-23.3%	Four sessions/week vs.	1.5 (-0.7 to 3.7)	0.155	61.7%
Six sessions/week	-1.7 (-2.8 to -0.6)	0.003	-85.0%	Six sessions/week			
<b>Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)</b>							
All patients	-2.9 (-4.0 to -1.7)	<0.001	-47.5%	Two sessions/week vs.	-0.8 (-4.8 to 3.3)	0.699	-22.6%
Two sessions/week	-3.1 (-5.7 to -0.5)	0.022	-57.4%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	-2.4 (-4.4 to 0.4)	0.021	-34.8%	Four sessions/week vs.	1.0 (-2.2 to 4.3)	0.496	20.4%
Six sessions/week	-3.2 (-5.0 to -1.4)	0.001	-55.2%	Six sessions/week			
<b>6MWT (m)</b>							
All patients	-2.3 (-42.2 to 37.6)	0.907	-0.6%	Two sessions/week vs.	106.2 (-18.7 to 231.2)	0.091	21.1%
Two sessions/week	39.6 (-43.8 to 123.0)	0.335	9.2%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	-44.1 (-107.3 to 19.2)	0.162	-11.8%	Four sessions/week vs.	-73.0 (-173.1 to 27.1)	0.140	-15.0%
Six sessions/week	13.7 (-43.8 to 71.3)	0.627	3.2%	Six sessions/week			
<b>SCT up (secs)</b>							
All patients	-1.0 (-2.5 to 0.4)	0.162	-10.6%	Two sessions/week vs.	-2.8 (-7.0 to 1.3)	0.165	-7.9%
Two sessions/week	-1.4 (-4.7 to 1.9)	0.380	-17.7%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	-1.1 (-3.8 to 1.5)	0.395	-9.8%	Four sessions/week vs.	1.2 (-2.2 to 4.6)	0.450	-0.5%
Six sessions/week	-0.8 (-3.1 to 1.5)	0.488	-9.3%	Six sessions/week			
<b>SCT down (secs)</b>							
All patients	-1.6 (-4.1 to 0.8)	0.188	-14.8%	Two sessions/week vs.	-2.9 (-9.9 to 4.1)	0.399	0.8%
Two sessions/week	-1.3 (-6.6 to 4.1)	0.632	-15.7%	Four sessions/week			
Four sessions/week	-2.2 (-6.5 to 2.0)	0.288	-16.4%	Four sessions/week vs.	2.5 (-3.5 to 8.5)	0.386	-4.0%

Six sessions/week    -1.2 (-5.1 to 2.6)    0.508    -12.4%    Six sessions/week

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Analyses were adjusted for the following baseline scores: isometric knee-extensor strength, KOOS symptoms, KOOS ADL, KOOS sport and 6MWT. These adjustments were not prespecified. ¥ = unadjusted numbers. Isometric knee-extensor strength reported as Nm/kg (positive change = improvement); Knee injury and 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).

739

740    **Secondary analyses (Mean change between group two and six sessions/week)**

**eTable 10. Mean change between group two and six sessions/week for all outcomes between baseline and three months after surgery (t<sub>0</sub>-t<sub>3</sub>). Intention-to-treat analysis, N = 32. One-way ANOVA based on imputed data.**

Mean change (95% CI) from baseline between groups (effect = time*group)	Mean change (95% CI)	P	% change¥
Two sessions/week vs. Six sessions/week			
Primary outcome			
<b>Isometric knee-extensor strength (Nm/kg)</b>	0.12 (-0.46 to 0.69)	0.681	27.1%
Secondary outcomes			
<b>KOOS Symp (0-100)</b>	1.9 (-27.1 to 30.9)	0.889	-12.4%
<b>KOOS Pain (0-100)</b>	9.4 (-17.5 to 36.3)	0.474	22.7%
<b>KOOS ADL (0-100)</b>	7.1 (-14.7 to 28.9)	0.503	16.0%
<b>KOOS Sport (0-100)</b>	-0.2 (-35.1 to 34.7)	0.992	98.9%
<b>KOOS QoL (0-100)</b>	7.3 (-22.9 to 37.6)	0.620	33.8%
<b>OKS (0-48)</b>	1.0 (-10.2 to 12.2)	0.852	5.2%
<b>Current knee pain (NRS 0-10)</b>	-1.6 (-5.4 to 2.1)	0.360	6.1%
<b>Avg. knee pain last week (NRS 0-10)</b>	0.3 (-3.4 to 4.0)	0.867	-2.2%
<b>6MWT (m)</b>	27.8 (-91.7 to 147.3)	0.631	6.0%
<b>SCT up (secs)</b>	-1.7 (-5.5 to 2.1)	0.371	-8.4%
<b>SCT down (secs)</b>	-0.6 (-7.2 to 6.0)	0.853	-3.3%

Data presented with mean change value and corresponding 95% confidence interval. Analyses were adjusted for the following baseline scores: isometric knee-extensor strength, KOOS symptoms, KOOS ADL, KOOS sport and 6MWT. These adjustments were not prespecified. ¥ = unadjusted numbers. Isometric knee-extensor strength reported as Nm/kg (positive change = improvement); Knee injury and 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).

741

742

743

744

745 Supplement 6. Co-morbidities disqualifying six patients for surgery after exercise  
746

**eTable 11. 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.

747

748