



University of Southern Denmark

## Criteria used when deciding on eligibility for total knee arthroplasty

### Between thinking and doing

Skou, Søren T; Roos, Ewa M.; Laursen, Mogens B; Rathleff, Michael S; Arendt-Nielsen, Lars; Simonsen, Ole; Rasmussen, Sten

*Published in:*  
The Knee

*DOI:*  
[10.1016/j.knee.2015.08.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2015.08.012)

*Publication date:*  
2016

*Document version*  
Accepted manuscript

*Document license*  
CC BY-NC-ND

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Skou, S. T., Roos, E. M., Laursen, M. B., Rathleff, M. S., Arendt-Nielsen, L., Simonsen, O., & Rasmussen, S. (2016). Criteria used when deciding on eligibility for total knee arthroplasty: Between thinking and doing. *The Knee*, 23(2), 300-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2015.08.012>

#### Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark through the SDU Research Portal. Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving. If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim. Please direct all enquiries to [puresupport@bib.sdu.dk](mailto:puresupport@bib.sdu.dk)

1                   **CRITERIA USED WHEN DECIDING ON ELIGIBILITY FOR TOTAL KNEE**  
2                   **ARTHROPLASTY – BETWEEN THINKING AND DOING**

3 Søren T. Skou, PT, PhD <sup>a,b</sup>; Ewa M. Roos, PT, PhD <sup>a</sup>; Mogens B. Laursen, MD, PhD <sup>c,d</sup>; Michael S.  
4 Rathleff, PT, PhD <sup>d</sup>; Lars Arendt-Nielsen, PhD, DMSc <sup>d</sup>; Ole Simonsen, MD, DMSc <sup>c,d</sup>; Sten  
5 Rasmussen MD <sup>c,d</sup>  
6

7 <sup>a</sup> Research Unit for Musculoskeletal Function and Physiotherapy, Institute of Sports Science and  
8 Clinical Biomechanics, University of Southern Denmark, 5230 Odense, Denmark

9 <sup>b</sup> Clinical Nursing Research Unit, Aalborg University Hospital, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark

10 <sup>c</sup> Orthopaedic Surgery Research Unit, Aalborg University Hospital, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark

11 <sup>d</sup> Center for Sensory-Motor Interaction (SMI), Department of Health Science and Technology,  
12 Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg University, 9220 Aalborg, Denmark

13 **Mail:**

14 STS: [sots@rn.dk](mailto:sots@rn.dk); ER: [eroos@health.sdu.dk](mailto:eroos@health.sdu.dk); MBL: [mogens.berg.laursen@rn.dk](mailto:mogens.berg.laursen@rn.dk); MSR:  
15 [misr@rn.dk](mailto:misr@rn.dk); LAN: [LAN@hst.aau.dk](mailto:LAN@hst.aau.dk); OS: [ohs@rn.dk](mailto:ohs@rn.dk); SR: [sten.rasmussen@rn.dk](mailto:sten.rasmussen@rn.dk)

16  
17 **Original research article for The Knee**

18 **Running title: Surgery or no surgery – factors influencing the surgeon’s decision**

19 **Corresponding Author**

20 Søren Thorgaard Skou

21 Aalborg University Hospital, Research and Innovation Center

22 15 Soendre Skovvej

23 DK-9000 Aalborg

24 Email: [sots@rn.dk](mailto:sots@rn.dk)

25 Telephone: +45 23 70 86 40

26 **Funding sources**

27 This trial is partially funded by The Danish Rheumatism Association, Obel Family Foundation,  
28 Spar Nord Foundation, The Bevica Foundation, The Association of Danish Physiotherapists  
29 Research Fund, Medical Specialist Henrich Kopps Grant, and The Danish Medical Association  
30 Research Fund. The funders do not have any role in this study other than to provide funding.

31 **Conflict of interest**

32 None declared.

33           **CRITERIA USED WHEN DECIDING ON ELIGIBILITY FOR TOTAL KNEE**  
34           **ARTHROPLASTY – BETWEEN THINKING AND DOING**

35   **Manuscript: currently 2,903 words**

36   **Abstract: currently 236 words**

37   **ABSTRACT**

38   *Background:* Clinical decision-making in total knee arthroplasty (TKA) is a complex process  
39   needing further clarification. The aim of this study was to compare TKA eligibility criteria  
40   considered most important by orthopaedic surgeons (OS) to characteristics of patients with knee  
41   osteoarthritis (OA) eventually found eligible for TKA.

42   *Methods:* Nine OS chose the five criteria most important when deciding on TKA eligibility. Cross-  
43   sectional data from 200 patients found either eligible (n=100) or not eligible (n=100) for TKA by  
44   one of the nine OS, were analyzed in a regression analyses with TKA eligibility as the dependent  
45   variable.

46   *Results:* Radiographic severity (n=8), pain (n=9), functional disability (n=8) and not responding to  
47   the recommended non-surgical treatment (n=7) were considered most important by OS.

48   Associations ( $P<0.25$ ) between TKA eligibility and criteria found important by the OS were  
49   demonstrated for worse radiographic severity and more functional limitations, but not for pain and  
50   not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment.

51   Furthermore, more comorbidities and higher BMI were associated with TKA-eligibility, but not  
52   found important for TKA eligibility by the OS.

53   *Conclusion:* Radiographic severity and functional limitations were confirmed as drivers for TKA  
54   eligibility, while pain was not. Not responding to non-surgical treatment was not included in the

55 decision-making, suggesting low uptake of clinical guidelines in clinical practice. This study  
56 highlights the complexity of the decision-making with some overlap between the criteria that OS  
57 think they apply and what is actually applied in clinical practice.

58 **Keywords:** Osteoarthritis; Knee; Decision-making; Arthroplasty; Therapeutics.

59

## 60 **1. INTRODUCTION**

61 The incidence of total knee arthroplasty (TKA) in the US has increased markedly from 31.2 per  
62 100.000 person-years in 1971-76 to 220.9 in 2005-2008 [1], and is expected to increase by almost  
63 700% towards 2030 [2].

64 TKA is an effective treatment of end-stage knee osteoarthritis (OA) [3]. However, a systematic  
65 review have demonstrated that 20% undergoing TKA experience only small or no improvements in  
66 pain [4], and more knee pain is known to be related to lower patient satisfaction [5]. One possible  
67 way to improve patient outcomes after TKA would be to refine eligibility criteria in order to select  
68 patients that are more likely to benefit from the procedure.

69 Clinical disease severity in patients undergoing total joint arthroplasty is known to vary between  
70 countries [6]. Although patients found eligible for TKA and total hip arthroplasty (THA) have more  
71 severe pain and functional limitations than patients not eligible, there is a considerable overlap in  
72 patient status, even when adjusting for radiographic severity, thereby making it impossible to  
73 establish cut-off values for eligibility for arthroplasty [7]. This could be due to the fact that pain,  
74 disability and radiographic severity poorly reflect the complexity of decision-making when the  
75 orthopaedic surgeon (OS) evaluates eligibility for TKA/THA [3,6,8].

76 Other criteria considered important for TKA eligibility and/or suggested in the literature to affect  
77 the decision-making are: Not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatments [3], duration  
78 of symptoms [9], being medically fit [3,10], age [3,9] and Body Mass Index (BMI) [3,9]. However,  
79 no reports exist on whether criteria considered important for TKA eligibility are actually applied in  
80 clinical practice, or which combination of criteria best reflect the complexity of the decision on  
81 eligibility. Studies on this topic would improve the understanding of the decision-making process  
82 and should be accompanied by an investigation of how patient preferences affect whether or not  
83 they choose to proceed with surgery.

84 Therefore, the purpose of this study was to compare criteria regarded important by OS when  
85 deciding on TKA eligibility to characteristics of patients with knee OA who were actually found  
86 eligible for TKA by the same OS. Our primary hypothesis was that the eligibility criteria considered  
87 important by OSs and the patient characteristics actually associated with TKA eligibility would be  
88 the same, and that a combination of criteria would explain most of the variance in TKA eligibility.

89

## 90 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### 91 **2.1. Study design**

92 This was a cross-sectional study conforming to the STROBE statement for reporting cross-sectional  
93 studies [11].

### 94 **2.2. Participants**

95 Baseline data from 200 patients with knee OA (confirmed by radiography) enrolled in one of two  
96 randomized controlled trials (RCT) investigating the effectiveness of TKA (n=100) [12] and non-  
97 surgical treatments (n=100) [13] between September 2011 and December 2013 were analyzed. All

98 patients were referred from primary care to an OS in one of two specialized public hospital units in  
99 The North Denmark Region for evaluation of TKA eligibility.

100 The main difference between the two RCT populations was eligibility for TKA, with one including  
101 only patients eligible [12] and the other only patients not eligible for TKA [13]. For a full list of  
102 eligibility criteria, see the published study protocols [12,13].

103 Ethics approval was obtained for both RCTs from the Ethics Committee of The North Denmark  
104 Region (N-20110024 and N-20110085) and both trials were registered on ClinicalTrials.gov  
105 (NCT01410409 and NCT01535001).

### 106 **2.3. Outcome Variable**

107 Eligibility for TKA (yes/no) as assessed by the OS was the outcome variable, dividing the study  
108 population into two equally sized groups (n=100).

### 109 **2.4. Predictor criteria for the decision on TKA eligibility**

110 A list of ten potential criteria influencing the OS’ decision on whether or not patients with knee OA  
111 are eligible for TKA was defined by the authors of the study based on recent recommendations [3],  
112 a review of the literature, and from interviews with two high-volume OS: 1) radiographic severity  
113 of the knee OA, 2) knee pain during several activities of daily living (Knee pain during ADL), 3)  
114 knee pain at night, 4) knee pain demanding morphine or morphine-like drugs, 5) functional  
115 limitations in daily activities due to the knee OA (functional limitations), 6) not responding to the  
116 recommended non-surgical treatment, 7) duration of symptoms, 8) comorbidities, 9) age, and 10)  
117 BMI (Table 1). The criteria were assessed as part of the baseline assessment when the participants  
118 were enrolled in the RCTs.

### 119 **2.5. Statistical analyses**

120 The 200 patients allowed us to conduct the analyses using a minimum of 20 predictor variables  
121 [20]. We decided only to apply 10 variables.

### 122 **2.5.1. Model including criteria considered important by orthopedic surgeons for TKA** 123 **eligibility**

124 All nine OS involved in recruiting patients for the two RCTs were asked to choose the five most  
125 important criteria which they applied when deciding on TKA eligibility and prioritize them  
126 according to the importance of each individual criterion. Criteria regarded important by at least half  
127 of the nine OS ( $n \geq 5$ ) were included in one multivariable model (the surgeon-based model).

### 128 **2.5.2. Model including characteristics of patients found eligible**

129 Furthermore, univariable and multivariable logistic regression analyses were applied to investigate  
130 whether the a priori hypothesized predictor criteria for TKA eligibility were actually associated  
131 with TKA eligibility. The construction of this model (the statistically-based model) followed the  
132 construction proposed by Bursac et al. [21]. Criteria with a  $P < 0.25$  in the univariable analyses were  
133 included in another multivariable analysis, since traditional levels can fail in identifying important  
134 criteria [21]. A criterion included in the first model was removed if  $P \geq 0.10$  and changing the  
135 estimate of the other criteria  $< 20\%$ . Criteria not selected for the first model due to ( $P \geq 0.10$ ) in the  
136 univariable analyses were re-entered into the model one at a time to identify criteria that contributed  
137 to the model in the presence of the other criteria. If a criterion had a  $P$ -value  $< 0.10$ , it was kept in the  
138 final model. The significance level of the final regression model was set at  $P < 0.05$ .

139 A priori, possible interactions were defined between the following criteria: 2 and 3, 2 and 4, 3 and  
140 4, 2 and 5, 2 and 10, 5 and 10, 5 and 8, and 8 and 10. These interactions were tested in both the  
141 model based on criteria considered important by the OS for TKA eligibility and the model based on

142 characteristics of patients found eligible for TKA if both interacting criteria were in the model. The  
143 interaction was kept in the final models if  $P < 0.10$  or changing the estimate of the other criteria  
144  $> 20\%$ .

145 Odds ratios (OR) were used to assess the association between each predictor criterion and TKA  
146 eligibility and Nagelkerke’s  $R^2$  was used to compare the performance of each of the predictor  
147 criteria and a as measure of overall performance of both of the models (explained variation, i.e. how  
148 good the model fits the data).

149

### 150 **3. RESULTS**

151 Demographic variables for the participants are presented in table 2. BMI data from eight  
152 participants (four eligible and four not eligible for TKA) was missing. Therefore these participants  
153 were excluded, and a total of 192 patients were included in the analyses.

#### 154 **3.1. Model including criteria considered important by orthopedic surgeons for TKA eligibility**

155 The OS’ prioritization is presented in table 3. One OS stated that findings from the clinical  
156 examination were also important when deciding upon eligibility. Four criteria were regarded as  
157 important when deciding on TKA eligibility by at least half of the OS: radiographic severity of the  
158 knee OA (n=8), knee pain during ADL (n=9), functional limitations (n=8) and not responding to the  
159 recommended non-surgical treatment (n=7). These criteria were included in the surgeon-based  
160 model (Table 5). The model accounted for 23% of the variance in TKA eligibility (Nagelkerke’s  $R^2$   
161  $= 0.228$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).

#### 162 **3.2. Model including characteristics of patients found eligible**



163 In the univariable analyses worse radiographic OA severity, worse pain during ADL, morphine  
164 usage, more functional limitations, more comorbidities and higher BMI were associated with being  
165 eligible for TKA (Table 4). The model including criteria associated with TKA eligibility in the  
166 univariable analyses (Table 5) consisted of radiographic severity, functional limitations,  
167 comorbidities, and BMI. This model significantly accounted for 27% of the variance in TKA  
168 eligibility (Nagelkerke’s  $R^2 = 0.267$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).

169 No interactions were found in neither of the models ( $P > 0.10$  and changing the estimates  $< 20\%$ ).

170

#### 171 **4. DISCUSSION**

172 Radiographic severity and functional limitations were confirmed as drivers for TKA eligibility,  
173 while pain and not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment were found important by  
174 the OS but not associated with TKA eligibility. When combined in a model, criteria associated with  
175 TKA eligibility in the univariable analyses (radiographic severity, functional limitations,  
176 comorbidities and BMI) only accounted for 27% of the variance in TKA eligibility and only 23% of  
177 the variance was accounted for when including the criteria found important by at least half of the  
178 OS in a model. This study highlights that the decision on TKA eligibility is a multifactorial process  
179 with some overlap between the criteria that OS consider important and what they actually apply in  
180 clinical practice.

##### 181 **4.1. Non-surgical treatment before TKA**

182 Most of the OS (n=7) found not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment to be  
183 important for their decision on TKA eligibility. However, it was not associated with TKA  
184 eligibility. Even though being a recognized eligibility criterion for TKA [3] it is well known that

185 clinical practice does not reflect the recommendations [22-25]. In a study from the US using data  
186 from the United Healthcare Database only 10% undergoing TKA in 2009 had participated in  
187 rehabilitation in the preceding five years [23], while 3% had received a mechanical intervention,  
188 such as a knee brace, and 44% an intra-articular corticosteroid injection [23]. Results from a recent  
189 systematic review and meta-analysis summarizing studies using quality indicators to assess the  
190 quality of care in OA confirmed the suboptimal care of OA patients for both pharmacological and  
191 non-pharmacological treatments [25]. The study found pass rates, defined as the percentage of  
192 patients receiving appropriate care according to guidelines, of only 37.5% (95% CI 30.8–44.5%)  
193 and 36.1% (95% CI 27.8-44.7%), respectively, for pharmacological and non-pharmacological  
194 treatment of OA [25]. Therefore, the lack of association between TKA eligibility and not  
195 responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment could merely be a result of lack of  
196 adherence to the recommended non-surgical treatment. The implementation of evidence-based  
197 guidelines in clinical practice is challenging due to a wide range of barriers and requires a  
198 comprehensive approach tailored to the specific settings and target groups to succeed [26].  
199 Nationwide initiatives comprising training of physical therapists to deliver evidence-based,  
200 individualized exercise and education to OA patients [27] in combination with information and  
201 education of other health care professions and the population have been successfully introduced in  
202 Denmark[28] and Sweden[29], and represents a way to improve adherence to OA guidelines.

#### 203 **4.2. Is pain less important for TKA eligibility?**

204 Pain was not associated with TKA, even though all OS (n=9) found it to be important for their  
205 decision on TKA eligibility, supported by the results from a study on THA eligibility [30]. The OS  
206 in our study prioritized pain as the most important, and functional limitations as the second most

207 important criterion, while radiographic severity was only third. However, looking at the explained  
208 variation from the univariable analyses pain and functional limitations explained less variation in  
209 TKA eligibility than both comorbidities and BMI with radiographic severity explaining most of the  
210 variation in TKA eligibility. Since pain is considered one of the key criteria for TKA eligibility  
211 [3,7,9,10,31], it was expected that it would be one of the most important predictor criteria.  
212 However, our study highlights that pain is not the only criterion important for TKA eligibility  
213 [7,32,33] and it could be so that while pain is an important criterion for TKA eligibility pain  
214 severity is not as important as other influencing criteria [8]. This is supported by our results and  
215 underlines the importance of not restricting TKA to one type of patient over another based on one  
216 criterion alone [8]. Another potential explanation could be, that one of the exclusion criteria for  
217 both studies from which the current patient population was drawn was knee pain >60 mm on a 100  
218 mm VAS. This could affect the results, since patients eligible for TKA presumably have higher pain  
219 scores than patients not eligible for TKA thereby excluding some patients eligible for TKA from  
220 this analysis.

#### 221 **4.3. Age, BMI and comorbidities**

222 Interestingly, age was not associated with eligibility and higher BMI and more comorbidities were  
223 associated with eligibility for TKA, even though patients being morbidly obese or of less than 55  
224 years have demonstrated more variable outcome following TKA than patients with lower BMI and  
225 older than 55 years [34-40]. However, since most patients in the present study had few  
226 comorbidities and were not morbidly obese or younger than 55 the lack of association with age and  
227 conflicting association with BMI and comorbidities could be a result of this age-restricted study

228 population. Furthermore, it is important to recognize, that even though being risk factors for poorer  
229 outcome, neither age nor BMI are contraindications for TKA [3].

#### 230 **4.4. Consensus criteria for TKA eligibility are needed**

231 In agreement with current recommendations [3] the OS in our study regarded pain, function,  
232 radiographic severity and not responding to non-surgical treatment to be important for their decision  
233 on TKA eligibility. However, the analyses showed that more severe radiographic severity, greater  
234 functional limitations, more comorbidities and higher BMI were the patient characteristics actually  
235 associated with TKA eligibility. This is similar to the findings from a study on eligibility for THA,  
236 where severe cardiovascular disease, quality of life with regards to physical function, and  
237 radiographic OA severity were related to eligibility for THA when combined in a model [30]. The  
238 model based on patient characteristics associated with TKA eligibility accounted for only 27% of  
239 the variance in TKA eligibility, while the model based on criteria found important by at least half of  
240 the OS accounted for only 23% of the variance, thereby leaving about 75% of the variance in TKA  
241 eligibility unaccounted for. Including patient preferences could potentially improve this, since it is  
242 known to affect whether or not patients undergo total joint arthroplasty [41]. Since our study did not  
243 evaluate whether or not the participants underwent TKA, but if they were found eligible for TKA  
244 by the OS, the authors believe that not including patient preferences in the analyses was  
245 appropriate. Future studies should evaluate the effects of patient preferences on whether or not the  
246 procedure is actually performed. Furthermore, additional unknown criteria influence the decision-  
247 making and points out that consensus on the indications for TKA is highly demanded with the  
248 possibility to better identify patients that will benefit from the procedure [8] and potentially improve  
249 outcomes following TKA further.

#### 250 **4.5. Limitations**

251 Our results should be evaluated with respect to some limitations. Firstly, the exclusion criteria knee  
252 pain >60 mm on a 100 mm VAS applied in both studies could be a limitation to the study. Since  
253 severe knee pain is considered an important indication for TKA [3], the lack of associations  
254 between pain and TKA in our study could merely be the result of not including those with more  
255 severe pain. However, KOOS pain scores of both the patients eligible and not eligible for a TKA in  
256 our study (mean scores of 49 and 53 respectively on a 0-100 worst to best scale) were comparable  
257 to previous pre-surgery pain scores of patients eligible for TKA [7,42]. Secondly, this study did not  
258 have the power to assess inter-surgeon variability or the predictive capacity of the model with  
259 regards to the individual OS. This could have increased the internal validity of the findings, since it  
260 would give the possibility to compare the criteria found most important by the individual OS to the  
261 criteria associated with his/her decision on TKA eligibility. Thirdly, the criteria applied in our study  
262 were not restricted to local surgeon-specific criteria. We applied questionnaires reflecting pain,  
263 function and comorbidities not necessarily used by the individual OS. Since wide variations in pain  
264 [7,31,32], function [7,31,32] and comorbidities [31] have been demonstrated among countries,  
265 centers and OS when deciding on TKA eligibility we decided to use valid, reliable and recognized  
266 measures. We believe this increases the external validity of the results instead of applying a local  
267 set of measures not generalizable to other centers and countries. Future studies should elucidate  
268 whether the findings are similar in other countries.

#### 269 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

270 While the OS agreed on radiographic severity, pain, functional limitations and not responding to  
271 non-surgical treatment being the most important criteria for TKA eligibility, corresponding to

272 recommendations in clinical guidelines, some discrepancy was found between these criteria and  
273 what was actually applied by the same OS in clinical practice. Radiographic severity and functional  
274 limitations were confirmed as drivers for TKA eligibility, while pain was not. This may be because  
275 our study population did not include knee OA patients with severe pain. However, pain scores of  
276 our study population was comparable to previous pre-surgery pain scores of patients eligible for  
277 TKA [7,42]. Patients found eligible for TKA had more comorbidities and higher BMI, contrary to  
278 the criteria found most important by surgeons. Having had, and not responding to, non-surgical  
279 treatment was not included in the decision-making, suggesting low uptake of clinical guidelines in  
280 clinical practice.

281 This study highlights the complexity of the decision-making on TKA eligibility in clinical practice,  
282 since about 75% of the variance in eligibility remains unexplained by the criteria found most  
283 important by the OS and the characteristics of those actually found eligible.

284

285

## 286 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

287 The authors would like to thank biostatistician, MSc, Martin Berg Johansen from the Department of  
288 Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University for statistical advice and the orthopaedic surgeons from the  
289 Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Aalborg University Hospital involved in the recruitment of  
290 patients for the two RCTs. Furthermore, the authors would like to acknowledge project workers

291 Lasse Lengsø, Mikkel Simonsen, Dorte Rasmussen, Henriette Duve, Anna Emilie Livbjerg, Anders  
292 Bundgaard Lind and Josephine Nielsen for helping with the data collection and data entry.

293

#### 294 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

295 **Study conception and design.** Skou, Roos, Laursen, Rathleff, Arendt-Nielsen, Simonsen,  
296 Rasmussen

297 **Acquisition of data.** Skou.

298 **Analysis and interpretation of data.** Skou, Roos, Laursen, Rathleff, Arendt-Nielsen, Simonsen,  
299 Rasmussen.

300 **Drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content.** Skou, Roos,  
301 Laursen, Rathleff, Arendt-Nielsen, Simonsen, Rasmussen

302 **Final approval of the article.** Skou, Roos, Laursen, Rathleff, Arendt-Nielsen, Simonsen,  
303 Rasmussen

304 Mr. Skou had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of  
305 the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

306

307

#### 308 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

309 None declared.

310

#### 311 **SOURCE OF FUNDING**

312 This trial was partially funded by The Danish Rheumatism Association, Obel Family Foundation,  
313 Spar Nord Foundation, The Bevica Foundation, The Association of Danish Physiotherapists

314 Research Fund, Medical Specialist Henirich Kopps Grant, and The Danish Medical Association  
315 Research Fund. The funders did not have any role in this study other than to provide funding.

316 **REFERENCES**

- 317 [1] Singh JA, Vessely MB, Harmsen WS, Schleck CD, Melton LJ,3rd, Kurland RL et al. A  
318 population-based study of trends in the use of total hip and total knee arthroplasty, 1969-2008.  
319 Mayo Clin Proc 2010;85:898-904.
- 320 [2] Kurtz S, Ong K, Lau E, Mowat F, Halpern M. Projections of primary and revision hip and knee  
321 arthroplasty in the United States from 2005 to 2030. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2007;89:780-5.
- 322 [3] Carr AJ, Robertsson O, Graves S, Price AJ, Arden NK, Judge A et al. Knee replacement. Lancet  
323 2012;379:1331-40.
- 324 [4] Beswick AD, Wylde V, Gooberman-Hill R, Blom A, Dieppe P. What proportion of patients  
325 report long-term pain after total hip or knee replacement for osteoarthritis? A systematic review of  
326 prospective studies in unselected patients. BMJ Open 2012;2:e000435.
- 327 [5] Ali A, Sundberg M, Robertsson O, Dahlberg LE, Thorstensson CA, Redlund-Johnell I et al.  
328 Dissatisfied patients after total knee arthroplasty. Acta Orthop 2014;85:229-33.
- 329 [6] Dieppe P, Judge A, Williams S, Ikwueke I, Guenther KP, Floeren M et al. Variations in the pre-  
330 operative status of patients coming to primary hip replacement for osteoarthritis in European  
331 orthopaedic centres. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2009;10:19.
- 332 [7] Gossec L, Paternotte S, Maillefert JF, Combescure C, Conaghan PG, Davis AM et al. The role  
333 of pain and functional impairment in the decision to recommend total joint replacement in hip and  
334 knee osteoarthritis: an international cross-sectional study of 1909 patients. Report of the OARSI-  
335 OMERACT Task Force on total joint replacement. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2011;19:147-54.
- 336 [8] Mandl LA. Determining who should be referred for total hip and knee replacements. Nat Rev  
337 Rheumatol 2013;9:351-7.
- 338 [9] Woolhead GM, Donovan JL, Chard JA, Dieppe PA. Who should have priority for a knee joint  
339 replacement? Rheumatology (Oxford) 2002;41:390-4.
- 340 [10] Curtis AJ, Wolfe R, Russell CO, Elliott BG, Hart JA, McNeil JJ. Determining priority for joint  
341 replacement: comparing the views of orthopaedic surgeons and other professionals. Med J Aust  
342 2011;195:699-702.



- 343 [11] von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP et al. The  
344 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:  
345 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet* 2007;370:1453-7.
- 346 [12] Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Simonsen OH et al. Total  
347 knee replacement plus physical and medical therapy or treatment with physical and medical therapy  
348 alone: A randomised controlled trial in patients with knee osteoarthritis (the MEDIC-study). *BMC*  
349 *Musculoskelet Disord* 2012;13:67.
- 350 [13] Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Simonsen O et al. Efficacy  
351 of multimodal, systematic non-surgical treatment of knee osteoarthritis for patients not eligible for a  
352 total knee replacement: a study protocol of a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*  
353 2012;2:10.1136/bmjopen,2012-002168. Print 2012.
- 354 [14] Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of osteo-arthrosis. *Ann Rheum Dis*  
355 1957;16:494-502.
- 356 [15] Kellgren JH, Jeffrey MR, Ball J.  
357 The epidemiology of chronic rheumatism. Atlas of standard radiographs of arthritis . Oxford, UK:  
358 Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1963.
- 359 [16] Roos EM, Roos HP, Lohmander LS, Ekdahl C, Beynnon BD. Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis  
360 Outcome Score (KOOS)--development of a self-administered outcome measure. *J Orthop Sports*  
361 *Phys Ther* 1998;28:88-96.
- 362 [17] Roos EM, Toksvig-Larsen S. Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) -  
363 validation and comparison to the WOMAC in total knee replacement. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*  
364 2003;1:17.
- 365 [18] McAlindon TE, Bannuru RR, Sullivan MC, Arden NK, Berenbaum F, Bierma-Zeinstra SM et  
366 al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis*  
367 *Cartilage* 2014;22:363-88.
- 368 [19] Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic  
369 comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis* 1987;40:373-83.
- 370 [20] Vittinghoff E, McCulloch CE. Relaxing the rule of ten events per variable in logistic and Cox  
371 regression. *Am J Epidemiol* 2007;165:710-8.
- 372 [21] Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic  
373 regression. *Source Code Biol Med* 2008;3:17,0473-3-17.

- 374 [22] DeHaan MN, Guzman J, Bayley MT, Bell MJ. Knee osteoarthritis clinical practice guidelines -  
375 - how are we doing? *J Rheumatol* 2007;34:2099-105.
- 376 [23] Dhawan A, Mather RC,3rd, Karas V, Ellman MB, Young BB, Bach BR,Jr et al. An  
377 epidemiologic analysis of clinical practice guidelines for non-arthroplasty treatment of osteoarthritis  
378 of the knee. *Arthroscopy* 2014;30:65-71.
- 379 [24] Snijders GF, den Broeder AA, van Riel PL, Straten VH, de Man FH, van den Hoogen FH et al.  
380 Evidence-based tailored conservative treatment of knee and hip osteoarthritis: between knowing  
381 and doing. *Scand J Rheumatol* 2011;40:225-31.
- 382 [25] Basedow M, Esterman A. Assessing appropriateness of osteoarthritis care using quality  
383 indicators: a systematic review. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2015.
- 384 [26] Grol R, Grimshaw J. From best evidence to best practice: effective implementation of change  
385 in patients' care. *Lancet* 2003;362:1225-30.
- 386 [27] Skou ST, Odgaard A, Rasmussen JO, Roos EM. Group education and exercise is feasible in  
387 knee and hip osteoarthritis. *Dan Med J* 2012;59:A4554.
- 388 [28] Skou ST, Roos EM. GLA:D Annual Report 2014. 2015;2.
- 389 [29] Thorstensson CA, Garellick G, Rystedt H, Dahlberg LE. Better Management of Patients with  
390 Osteoarthritis: Development and Nationwide Implementation of an Evidence-Based Supported  
391 Osteoarthritis Self-Management Programme. *Musculoskeletal Care* 2015;13:67-75.
- 392 [30] Maillefert JF, Roy C, Cadet C, Nizard R, Berdah L, Ravaud P. Factors influencing surgeons'  
393 decisions in the indication for total joint replacement in hip osteoarthritis in real life. *Arthritis*  
394 *Rheum* 2008;59:255-62.
- 395 [31] Mancuso CA, Ranawat CS, Esdaile JM, Johanson NA, Charlson ME. Indications for total hip  
396 and total knee arthroplasties. Results of orthopaedic surveys. *J Arthroplasty* 1996;11:34-46.
- 397 [32] Ackerman IN, Dieppe PA, March LM, Roos EM, Nilsson AK, Brown GC et al. Variation in  
398 age and physical status prior to total knee and hip replacement surgery: a comparison of centers in  
399 Australia and Europe. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;61:166-73.
- 400 [33] Judge A, Welton NJ, Sandhu J, Ben-Shlomo Y. Modeling the need for hip and knee  
401 replacement surgery. Part 1. A two-stage cross-cohort approach. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009;61:1657-66.
- 402 [34] Amin AK, Clayton RA, Patton JT, Gaston M, Cook RE, Brenkel IJ. Total knee replacement in  
403 morbidly obese patients. Results of a prospective, matched study. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*  
404 2006;88:1321-6.

- 405 [35] Diduch DR, Insall JN, Scott WN, Scuderi GR, Font-Rodriguez D. Total knee replacement in  
406 young, active patients. Long-term follow-up and functional outcome. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*  
407 1997;79:575-82.
- 408 [36] Gillespie GN, Porteous AJ. Obesity and knee arthroplasty. *Knee* 2007;14:81-6.
- 409 [37] Lonner JH, Hershman S, Mont M, Lotke PA. Total knee arthroplasty in patients 40 years of  
410 age and younger with osteoarthritis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2000;(380):85-90.
- 411 [38] Price AJ, Longino D, Rees J, Rout R, Pandit H, Javaid K et al. Are pain and function better  
412 measures of outcome than revision rates after TKR in the younger patient? *Knee* 2010;17:196-9.
- 413 [39] Rand JA, Trousdale RT, Ilstrup DM, Harmsen WS. Factors affecting the durability of primary  
414 total knee prostheses. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2003;85-A:259-65.
- 415 [40] Samson AJ, Mercer GE, Campbell DG. Total knee replacement in the morbidly obese: a  
416 literature review. *ANZ J Surg* 2010;80:595-9.
- 417 [41] Hawker GA, Guan J, Croxford R, Coyte PC, Glazier RH, Harvey BJ et al. A prospective  
418 population-based study of the predictors of undergoing total joint arthroplasty. *Arthritis Rheum*  
419 2006;54:3212-20.
- 420 [42] Escobar A, Quintana JM, Bilbao A, Azkarate J, Guenaga JI, Arenaza JC et al. Effect of patient  
421 characteristics on reported outcomes after total knee replacement. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*  
422 2007;46:112-9.
- 423
- 424
- 425
- 426
- 427

## 428 TABLES

<b>Table 1. Description of predictor criteria for TKA eligibility used in the regression analyses</b>			
Criterion	Assessment method	Dichotomization	A priori hypothesis
Radiographic severity	Semiflexed posteroanterior radiographs recorded in standing position (on both legs) with feet pointing forward and hips in neutral ab- and adduction. The X-ray beam was centered at the level of the knee joint with a tube to film distance of 100 cm. Radiographic severity was assessed by the surgeon using the original Kellgren-Lawrence scale (K&L) [14,15].	Yes, into low (K&L 1-2) and high (K&L 3-4) K&L score	A high K&L score is associated with being eligible for total knee arthroplasty (TKA).
Knee pain during ADL	This was assessed using the subscale Pain from the KOOS [16,17]	No	A worse KOOS Pain score is associated with being eligible for TKA.
Knee pain at night	The participants rated their pain on a 100mm VAS in response to the question: “How much knee pain do you have at night?”.	Yes, into pain (VAS $\geq$ 10) and no pain (VAS<10) at night	Pain at night is associated with being eligible for TKA.
Knee pain demanding morphine or morphine-like drugs.	The participants were asked to give information on any pain killers used because of knee pain.	Yes, into using morphine or morphine-like drugs (yes/no)	The need for morphine or morphine-like drugs to relieve the knee pain is associated with being eligible for TKA.
Functional limitations	This was assessed using the subscale ADL (Function in daily living) from the KOOS [16,17]	No	A worse KOOS ADL score is associated with being eligible for TKA.
Not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment	This implies that the participant had undergone the core treatments of OA (exercise, education and weight loss (if needed)) [18] before being referred to the orthopedic surgeon. This was evaluated from questions on previous treatments held together with the	Yes, participants who had undergone the recommended non-surgical treatment without sufficient effect were rated as “not responding” while the rest were rated as “has not yet tried the recommended non-surgical treatment”.	Not responding to non-surgical treatment is associated with being eligible for TKA.

Duration of symptoms	referral to the orthopedic surgeon due to continuous symptoms- This was evaluated using the question: “When did your knee symptoms begin?”. The participants chose one of the following categories: 0-6 months ago, 6-12 months ago, 1-2 years ago, 2-5 years ago, 5-10 years ago, or more than 10 years ago.	No	A longer duration of symptoms is associated with being eligible for TKA.
Comorbidities	Comorbidities were registered using the Charlson Comorbidity Index [19].	Yes, the index was dichotomized (0-1 and 2 or above) due to the non-linearity of the index and since an univariable analysis showed that there was no difference between 0 and 1 comorbidities, but between 0 and 2 comorbidities with respect to their association with the outcome variable.	Having comorbidities is inversely associated with being eligible for TKA, since being medically fit is important when considering surgery [3]
Age	Age in years	No	Increasing age is associated with being eligible for TKA.
Body Mass Index (BMI)	Height (seca 213, seca gmbh & co. kg., Hamburg, Germany) and weight (seca 813, seca gmbh & co. kg., Hamburg, Germany) were assessed in a standardized way to calculate BMI.	No	Increasing BMI is inversely associated with being eligible for TKA, since obesity is known to affect outcome variability [3]

429

430

431

432

<b>Table 2. Demographic variables for patients eligible (n=100) and not eligible (n=100) for total knee Arthroplasty (TKA)*</b>		
Variable	Patients eligible for a TKA	Patients not eligible for a TKA
Women, n (%)	62 (62)	51 (51)
Age (years), mean (SD)	66.4 (8.7)	66.0 (8.9)
Radiographic severity, n (%)		
Grade 1-2	12 (12)	46 (56)
Grade 3-4	88 (88)	54 (54)
Knee pain during ADL, mean (SD)	49.1 (15.4)	52.6 (14.0)
Knee pain at night, n (%)	83 (83)	78 (78)
Using morphine because of knee, n (%)	17 (17)	11 (11)
Functional limitations, mean (SD)	54.3 (16.6)	57.9 (16.8)
Not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment, n (%)	6 (6)	10 (10)
Duration of symptoms, n (%)		
0-6 months	6 (6)	6 (6)
6-12 months	7 (7)	15 (15)
1-2 years	16 (16)	15 (15)
2-5 years	25 (25)	24 (24)
5-10 years	23 (23)	12 (12)
More than 10 years	23 (23)	28 (28)
Charlson Comorbidity Index, n(%)		
0-1	73 (73)	85 (85)
2 or above	27 (27)	15 (15)
Body Mass Index, mean (SD)	32.2 (6.0)	30.0 (5.4)
* Radiographic severity: Radiographic knee osteoarthritis severity on the Kellgren-Lawrence scale; Knee pain during ADL: The subscale Pain from the Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS); Knee pain at night: The participants rated their pain on a 100mm visual analogue scale (VAS) in response to the question: “How much knee pain do you have at night?”. This was dichotomized into pain (VAS $\geq$ 10) and no pain (VAS<10) at night. Functional limitations: The subscale ADL from KOOS; Not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment: Recommended non-surgical treatment was defined as the core treatments of OA (exercise, education and weight loss (if needed); Body Mass Index was only available for 96 participants from each group.		

434

<b>Table 3: The orthopaedic surgeons’ (n=9) prioritization of criteria they use when deciding on eligibility for total knee arthroplasty*</b>					
Criteria	Prioritization (number of orthopaedic surgeons)				
	1	2	3	4	5
Radiographic severity	2	2	3	0	1
Knee pain during ADL	6	2	1	0	0
Knee pain at night	0	1	1	2	0
Using morphine because of knee	0	0	1	1	1
Functional limitations	0	4	2	2	0
Not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment	0	0	1	2	4
Duration of symptoms	0	0	0	0	2
Comorbidities	1	0	0	0	2
Age	0	0	0	1	0
Body Mass Index	0	0	0	1	0

\* One orthopaedic surgeon (OS) did not choose one of the ten criteria as prioritization number 4. One OS chose both age and body mass index as prioritization number 4. One OS chose both radiographic severity and duration of symptoms as prioritization number 5. See table 1 + 2 for further explanations.

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

<b>Table 4: Univariable logistic regression of associations between eligibility for total knee arthroplasty (TKA) and the predictor criteria for TKA eligibility*</b>				
Predictor criteria	OR	95% CI	R <sup>2</sup>	P
Radiographic severity (low K&L score as reference category)	6.25	3.04-12.83	0.183	<0.001
Knee pain during ADL	0.98	0.97-1.00	0.019	0.09
Knee pain at night (compared to no pain at night)	1.38	0.68-2.79	0.005	0.37
Using morphine because of knee (compared to not using morphine)	1.66	0.73-3.75	0.010	0.23
Functional limitations	0.99	0.97-1.00	0.017	0.11
Not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment (compared to “has not yet tried the recommended treatment”)	0.57	0.20-1.65	0.007	0.30
Duration of symptoms (0-6 months as the reference category)	-----	-----	0.046	-----
6-12 months	0.47	0.11-1.98	-----	0.30
1-2 years	1.07	0.28-4.05	-----	0.92
2-5 years	1.04	0.30-3.68	-----	0.95
5-10 years	1.92	0.51-7.24	-----	0.34
More than 10 years	0.82	0.23-2.89	-----	0.76
Comorbidities (0-1 comorbidities as reference category)	2.10	1.04-4.24	0.029	0.04
Age	1.01	0.97-1.04	0.001	0.73
Body Mass Index	1.07	1.02-1.13	0.048	0.01
*OR = odds ratio; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; R <sup>2</sup> = Nagelkerke’s R <sup>2</sup> (explained variation); K&L = Kellgren-Lawrence scale. See table 1 + 2 for further explanations.				

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454



<b>Table 5: Multivariable logistic regression model of associations between eligibility for total knee arthroplasty (TKA) and the predictor criteria for TKA eligibility*</b>			
Predictor criteria	OR	95% CI	<i>P</i>
Model based on criteria found important by the at least half of the surgeons			
Radiographic severity (low K&L score as reference category)	7.60	3.54-16.34	<0.001
Knee pain during ADL	0.99	0.96-1.02	0.61
Functional limitations	0.98	0.95-1.01	0.16
Not responding to the recommended non-surgical treatment (compared to “has not yet tried the recommended treatment”)	0.54	0.17-1.72	0.30
Model based on criteria associated with eligibility in the univariable analysis			
Radiographic severity (low K&L score as reference category)	7.82	3.51-17.42	<0.001
Functional limitations	0.98	0.96-1.00	0.048
Comorbidities (0-1 comorbidities as reference category)	2.19	0.96-5.02	0.06
Body Mass Index	1.05	0.99-1.12	0.08
*OR = odds ratio; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; K&L = Kellgren-Lawrence scale. See table 1+ 2 for further explanations.			