

Accepted Manuscript

Title: Is impaired knee confidence related to worse kinesiophobia, symptoms, and physical function in people with knee osteoarthritis after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction?

Author: Harvi F. Hart Natalie J. Collins David C. Ackland Kay M. Crossley



PII: S1440-2440(14)00196-0
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2014.09.011>
Reference: JSAMS 1092

To appear in: *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*

Received date: 4-4-2014
Revised date: 6-9-2014
Accepted date: 20-9-2014

Please cite this article as: Hart HF, Collins NJ, Ackland DC, Crossley KM, Is impaired knee confidence related to worse kinesiophobia, symptoms, and physical function in people with knee osteoarthritis after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction?, *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport* (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2014.09.011>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 **Title**

2 **Is impaired knee confidence related to worse kinesiophobia, symptoms, and physical function in**
3 **people with knee osteoarthritis after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction?**

4 Harvi F. Hart^A, Natalie J. Collins^B, David C. Ackland^C, Kay M. Crossley^D

5 ^ADepartment of Physiotherapy and Department of Mechanical Engineering; The University of
6 Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

7 ^BDepartment of Physiotherapy and Department of Mechanical Engineering; The University of Melbourne,
8 Parkville, Victoria, Australia

9 ^CDepartment of Mechanical Engineering; The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

10 ^DDivision of Physiotherapy; The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

11 **Address for correspondence**

12 A/Prof. Kay M. Crossley

13 Division of Physiotherapy, School of Health & Rehabilitation Sciences

14 The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD. 4072, AUSTRALIA

15 Telephone: +61 7 3365 3008 Fax: +61 7 3365 2775 E-mail: k.crossley@uq.edu.au

16 **Authors' contributions**

17 All authors were involved in drafting the article and all authors approved the final version submitted for
18 publication.

19

20

21

1 **Abstract**

2 *Objectives:* To compare knee confidence and kinesiophobia (fear of re-injury) in those with and without
3 knee osteoarthritis (OA) following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction (ACLR), and determine
4 whether poorer knee confidence is associated with greater kinesiophobia, worse knee-related symptoms,
5 and functional impairments in those with knee OA.

6 *Design:* Cross-sectional

7 *Methods:* Sixty-six individuals, 5-12 years following ACLR, with (n=30) and without (n=36) knee OA
8 were included. Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) quality-of-life question (Q3),
9 assessed knee confidence and Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia assessed kinesiophobia. In the OA group,
10 knee-related symptoms (International Knee Documentation Committee (IKDC), Anterior Knee Pain Scale
11 (AKPS)), self-reported function (KOOS activities daily living (KOOS-ADL), sport/recreation (KOOS-
12 S/R), and performance-based function (hopping, one leg rise tasks) were assessed. Between-group
13 differences in knee confidence and kinesiophobia were evaluated with the Chi square test and analysis of
14 variance (ANOVA) respectively. In the OA group, between-group differences (none, mild/moderate and
15 severe/extreme problems with knee confidence) in kinesiophobia, symptoms and function were
16 determined with ANOVAs: $p < 0.05$.

17 *Results:* Following ACLR, participants with knee OA had significantly worse knee confidence ($p=0.010$)
18 and greater kinesiophobia ($p=0.006$) than those without OA. In those with knee OA, poorer knee
19 confidence was significantly associated with worse symptoms (AKPS, $p=0.001$; IKDC, $p < 0.001$),
20 kinesiophobia ($p=0.030$), KOOS-ADL ($p=0.005$), KOOS-S/R ($p=0.001$), single-leg hop ($p=0.011$), side-
21 to-side hop ($p=0.013$) and one leg rise ($p=0.001$).

22 *Conclusions:* Psychological impairments are evident in people with knee OA following ACLR, compared
23 to those without. Future studies should further investigate the psychological impairments associated with
24 knee OA after ACLR.

25 **Keywords:** anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction; osteoarthritis; knee; injury; function

1 Introduction

2 Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury is a well-recognised risk factor for post-traumatic knee
3 osteoarthritis (OA), with 50-70% of people developing knee OA 10-15 years following injury.^{1,2} Surgical
4 reconstruction (ACLR) does not reduce the risk of OA.³ Knee OA after ACLR primarily affects younger
5 adults,⁴ with potential to limit physical activity.⁵ Consequently, any physical and psychological
6 impairments may adversely impact quality of life and work participation. Recently, our research team
7 observed that greater knee OA severity is associated with worse symptoms and poorer function at 5-10
8 years following ACLR.⁶ While functional impairments such as muscle weakness and poorer functional
9 performance are well-described in ACLR populations,^{5, 7} the nature and impact of psychological
10 impairments remain largely unknown, especially in those with knee OA.

11
12 Knee confidence and kinesiophobia are two psychological factors that are likely to be impaired in those
13 with knee OA following ACLR. Kinesiophobia, defined as “an irrational and debilitating fear of physical
14 movement and activity resulting from a feeling of vulnerability to painful injury or (re) injury”,⁸ predicts
15 return to sport after ACLR.^{9,10} Furthermore, people who have not returned to sport are less confident
16 about their ACLR knee than those who have.^{9,10} Worse knee confidence is also described in people with
17 knee OA, and associated with higher pain and greater knee instability.¹¹ Knee OA is highly prevalent after
18 ACLR, and factors such as knee confidence and kinesiophobia play a key role in those recovering from
19 ACL injury^{9,10} and in those at risk of¹² or with knee OA.¹¹ Thus, it is important to understand whether the
20 presence of knee OA following ACLR in younger adults increases these psychological impairments,
21 beyond those seen after ACLR alone.

22
23 Psychological and functional impairments are likely to co-exist and be inter-related.^{9,11,12} Worse
24 kinesiophobia is associated with lower physical activity levels after ACLR⁹ and reduced daily

1 functioning¹³ in those with knee OA. While no studies have investigated knee confidence in those with
2 knee OA after ACLR, lower knee-related confidence is associated with lower physical function¹² and
3 quadriceps strength¹¹ in older knee OA populations. Thus, it appears that knee confidence and
4 kinesiophobia are psychological impairments that may contribute to, or result from, functional
5 impairments. It is important to understand whether the relationship between psychological and functional
6 impairments is seen in young adults with knee OA following ACLR. Knowledge of this relationship may
7 provide a more comprehensive approach to rehabilitation.

8
9 The aims of this study were twofold. Firstly, to compare knee confidence and kinesiophobia between
10 those with and without knee OA after ACLR; and secondly, to investigate the relationship between knee
11 confidence and kinesiophobia, knee-related symptoms, and functional impairments in those with knee OA
12 after ACLR. We hypothesised that those with knee OA after ACLR would have poorer knee confidence
13 and greater kinesiophobia than those without knee OA. In addition, we hypothesised that poorer knee
14 confidence would be associated with greater kinesiophobia, worse knee-related symptoms and worse
15 functional impairments in those with knee OA after ACLR.

16

17 **Materials and methods**

18 Volunteers who had undergone a primary ACLR (hamstring-tendon or patellar-tendon graft) five to 12
19 years prior were recruited from the community via advertisements and referrals from orthopedic surgeons,
20 allied health and medical practitioners. Exclusion criteria for all participants were: i) aged <18 years at the
21 time of ACLR; ii) subsequent arthroplasty performed on the reconstructed knee; iii) concomitant pain
22 from the hips, ankles, feet or lumbar spine; iv) neurological or medical conditions; v) contraindications
23 for x-ray (pregnancy, breastfeeding); and vi) an inability to understand written and spoken English.
24 Participants with OA were included if they were symptomatic¹⁴ and had radiographic knee OA (Kellgren

1 and Lawrence (KL) grade ≥ 2) in at least one compartment (tibiofemoral or patellofemoral) of the
2 reconstructed knee¹⁵ (OA group). Participants were included in the no-OA group if they were
3 asymptomatic¹⁴ without radiographic knee OA (KL ≤ 1 in all knee compartments). A trained observer
4 (KMC) assessed all radiographs, blinded to symptoms. All participants provided written informed consent
5 prior to undergoing radiographs and data collection. Data pertaining to age, gender, height, and weight
6 were recorded. Ethics approval for the study was obtained from the University of Melbourne Human
7 Research Ethics Committee (0931086).

8
9 Knee confidence was assessed in all participants. Since there is no specific patient-reported outcome
10 measure for knee confidence, we used Item 3 of the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score
11 (KOOS) quality of life (QOL) subscale,¹² “*How much are you troubled with lack of confidence in your*
12 *knee?*” Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale, which consisted of: not at all (0); mildly (1);
13 moderately (2); severely (3); and extremely (4). Kinesiophobia was assessed in all participants using the
14 Tampa Kinesiophobia Scale.¹⁶ The Tampa Scale quantifies fear of movement and re-injury due to
15 movement and physical activity. It consists of statements on subjective experience of injury and physical
16 activity on a scale from 0 to 68, where 68 indicates greater fear of re-injury due to movement.

17
18 In the OA group, knee-related symptoms were assessed using the 2000 International Knee Documentation
19 Committee (IKDC) Subjective Knee Evaluation Form¹⁷ and the Anterior Knee Pain Scale (AKPS).¹⁸ The
20 IKDC measures knee-related symptoms and function in daily living and sports activities on a scale from
21 0-100, with zero indicating lowest levels of knee function and maximum knee symptoms. The IKDC is
22 widely used in assessing symptoms in individuals with knee pathology including ligament and articular
23 cartilage injury and arthritis.¹⁹ The AKPS measures items including limp, weight-bearing, walking, stairs,

1 squatting, running, pain, swelling. A score of zero on AKPS indicates maximum anterior knee pain
2 symptoms and disability.²⁰

3

4 In the OA group, patient-reported functional impairments were measured using the KOOS activities of
5 daily living (ADL) and sport and recreation (S/R) subscales.²¹ A normalised score (0-100) was calculated
6 for each subscale, where 100 indicated no limitations with function in ADL and S/R, and zero indicated
7 maximum limitations. Physical activity levels relating to work and sporting activities were evaluated
8 using the Tegner Activity Scale (TAS).²² A score of zero indicated sick leave or disability pension
9 because of knee problems, and a score of 10 indicated participation at the level of national or international
10 elite competitive sports.

11 The following physical tests were used to evaluate performance-based functional impairments in the OA
12 group:

- 13 i) Single-leg hop for distance evaluated as the maximum horizontal distance (centimetres) hopped
14 by the participant with the ACLR leg;²³
- 15 ii) Side to side hop, evaluated by the maximum number of hops performed by the participant over
16 two parallel strips (40cm apart) in a 30-second period;²⁴ and
- 17 iii) One leg rise test, evaluated by the number of times the participant could stand up from a sitting
18 position using only the ACLR leg (up to a maximum of 50 repetitions).²⁵

19 Data were analysed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (PASW Statistics 18, SPSS Inc.,
20 Chicago, IL). Between-group differences in participant characteristics were assessed using independent t-
21 tests for continuous variables, and Chi square tests for categorical variables. Between-group differences in
22 knee confidence categories and Tampa Scores were evaluated with Chi square tests and analysis of
23 variance (ANOVA), respectively ($p=0.05$). Any knee confidence category with less than three individuals

1 was combined with the category below. Two combined categories were formed: “*mildly or moderately*
2 *troubled by lack of confidence*” and “*severely or extremely troubled by lack of knee confidence*”.¹² Thus,
3 within each group (OA and no-OA), three categories were formed based on the knee confidence: i) no
4 trouble; ii) mildly-moderately troubled; and iii) severely-extremely troubled. Where appropriate,
5 ANOVAs were re-run using covariates identified as being associated (Pearson’s correlation coefficients
6 (r)) with the dependent variable (e.g. age, gender, height, pain on a visual analogue scale during testing).
7 *Post hoc* tests of simple effects (Least Significant Difference) were used to compare the three categories
8 of knee confidence in the OA group for the Tampa Scores, with a trend value set at 0.05 and significance
9 set at 0.01.

10

11 **Results**

12 Thirty OA participants (mean±SD: age 45±11 years, height 1.72±0.08 m, body weight 78±14kg, BMI
13 26±4 kg.m⁻², time since ACLR 9±2years) and 36 no-OA participants (age 39±9 years, height 1.71±0.08
14 m, body weight 79±15kg, BMI 27±4 kg.m⁻² time since ACLR 8±2years) were included. There were no
15 significant differences in height ($p=0.070$), body weight ($p=0.598$), BMI ($p=0.533$), and time since ACLR
16 ($p=0.167$); however there was a significant difference in age ($p=0.022$). The participants in the OA group
17 had mild to moderate symptomatic (KOOS: Pain, 82±19; Symptoms, 75±18; ADL, 88±17; sport/rec,
18 69±23; quality of life, 69±25) and radiographic OA severity.

19

20 A significantly greater proportion of participants in the OA group reported worse knee confidence in their
21 ACLR knee than no-OA group ($p=0.010$) (Figure 1). In the no-OA group, 58% had no trouble with knee
22 confidence, 33% were mildly-moderately troubled, and 8% were severely-extremely troubled. In the OA
23 group, 27% had no trouble with knee confidence, 40% were mildly-moderately troubled, and 33% were
24 severely-extremely troubled. Tampa Scale data were available for 47 participants (93% of OA-group and

1 53% of no-OA group). However, despite the smaller sample, we observed significantly worse
2 kinesiophobia in the OA-group (mean±SD, 36±4) than those in the no-OA group (32±3; mean difference
3 -5, 95% confidence interval [CI] -1 to -8). While older age was significantly correlated with better Tampa
4 Score ($r=-0.289$; $p=0.049$), inclusion of age as a covariate did not change the between-group difference in
5 Tampa scores.

6
7 There was a significant difference in Tampa Score between the categories of knee-related confidence
8 ($p=0.031$) (Table 1). Compared to those not troubled by knee confidence, post-hoc tests revealed trends of
9 worse kinesiophobia in participants who were severely-extremely (mean difference -7, 95% CI -14 to 0),
10 and in participants who were mildly-moderately troubled (-6, -12 to 0). AKPS scores were significantly
11 different between the three categories of knee-related confidence ($p<0.001$). Post-hoc tests revealed that
12 participants who were severely-extremely troubled with a lack of knee confidence had worse AKPS
13 scores than those not troubled (22, 10 to 34). Significantly worse AKPS scores were also observed in
14 participants mildly-moderately troubled (12, 1 to 24) when compared to those not troubled by a lack of
15 knee confidence. Male gender and higher Tegner activity levels were both significantly correlated with
16 higher AKPS score ($r=0.425$, $p=0.019$; $r=0.382$, $p=0.037$, respectively), but did not alter outcomes of
17 analyses when included as covariates.

18
19 IKDC scores were also significantly different between the three categories of knee confidence ($p<0.001$).
20 Participants who were severely-extremely troubled with a lack of knee confidence had lower IKDC scores
21 than those not troubled (mean difference 33, 95% CI 18 to 48) and those mildly-moderately troubled (15,
22 2 to 29). Participants who were mildly-moderately troubled by a lack of knee confidence also had lower
23 IKDC scores than those not troubled with a lack of knee confidence (17, 3 to 32). Inclusion of gender and

1 Tegner Activity score as covariates in further analyses did not change outcomes, with differences between
2 groups remaining significant.

3

4 In participants with knee OA, those with worse knee confidence had lower KOOS-ADL scores ($p=0.005$)
5 and KOOS-S/R scores ($p=0.001$). Those severely-extremely troubled by a lack of knee confidence had
6 significantly lower KOOS-ADL scores than those not troubled (mean difference 14, 95% CI 4 to 23).
7 Trends for lower KOOS-ADL scores were also noted in participants who were severely-extremely
8 troubled by a lack of knee confidence when compared to those mildly-moderately troubled (7, -1 to 16).
9 Similarly, participants who were severely-extremely troubled had significantly lower KOOS-S/R scores
10 than those not troubled with a lack of knee confidence (37, 16 to 59). Trends of lower KOOS-S/R were
11 observed in those severely-extremely troubled compared to those mildly-moderately troubled with a lack
12 of knee confidence (21, 1 to 40). Similar trends were noted when those who were mildly-moderately
13 troubled were compared with those not troubled with lack of knee confidence (17, -4 to 37).

14

15 Worse knee confidence was significantly associated with worse performance on single-leg hop for
16 distance ($p=0.011$), side to side hop ($p=0.013$), and one leg rise ($p=0.001$) tasks. Post-hoc tests revealed
17 that those who were severely-extremely troubled with a lack of knee confidence exhibited poorer
18 performance than those with no trouble with knee confidence in the single-leg hop for distance (mean
19 difference 43cm, 95% CI 8 to 79), side to side hop (14 repetitions, 2 to 26) and one leg rise (24
20 repetitions, 9 to 39). Trends for poorer performance on the single-leg hop for distance (30cm, -2 to 62)
21 and side to side hop (10 repetitions, -1 to 22) were noted in those who were severely-extremely troubled
22 with a lack of knee confidence when compared with those mildly-moderately troubled. Post-hoc tests
23 also revealed significantly poorer performance in one leg rise (17 repetitions, 4 to 30) in participants who

1 were severely-extremely troubled with a lack of knee confidence compared to those mildly-moderately
2 troubled. Inclusion of gender and height as covariates did not change outcomes.

3

4 **Discussion**

5 We observed that those participants with OA following ACLR had lower knee confidence and higher
6 kinesiophobia than those without knee OA. In the OA group, poorer knee confidence was associated with
7 greater kinesiophobia and worse patient-reported and performance-based functional impairments.

8

9 The proportion of participants troubled with severe to extreme lack of knee confidence was similar to that
10 observed in older individuals (62 ± 7 years) with medial compartment OA and varus knee malalignment
11 (32%).¹¹ However, our cohort contained a greater proportion of participants troubled with severe to
12 extreme lack of knee confidence (33%) than older individuals (62 ± 9 years) with or at high risk of
13 developing knee OA (7%).¹² The lower rate of worse knee confidence reported by Colbert et al.¹² may
14 reflect their inclusion of people at risk of knee OA as well as those with symptomatic and radiographic
15 OA. Similarly, we observed that those with knee OA following ACLR had worse knee confidence than
16 those without knee OA after ACLR. Combined, these findings suggest that worsening of knee confidence
17 might be a consequence of knee OA in non-traumatic and post-ACLR populations. Impairments in
18 muscle strength, proprioception and balance are frequently reported in knee OA populations^{26, 27} and may
19 be the features that lead to lack of knee confidence in individuals with knee OA.¹¹ Further studies are
20 required to confirm this relationship.

21

22 Our study is the first to show that individuals with knee OA after ACLR have worse kinesiophobia than
23 those without knee OA. While no previous studies have evaluated kinesiophobia in people with knee OA,

1 it has been evaluated in ACLR cohorts. In our post-ACLR OA group, greater kinesiophobia was observed
2 than that previously reported in athletes 3-4years after ACLR (Tampa score mean±SD 17±6).⁹ It is
3 plausible that the persistent pain and symptoms that accompany knee OA drive increasing kinesiophobia
4 over time. Worse kinesiophobia is associated with altered muscle activation patterns in people with
5 chronic low back pain²⁸, and similar relationships may exist in knee OA populations. Considering that
6 neuromuscular impairments are frequently reported in both ACLR⁷ and knee OA⁴ populations, this
7 relationship requires further evaluation. Our findings of an inter-relationship between poor knee
8 confidence and high kinesiophobia also highlight the importance of psychological impairments in people
9 with knee OA following ACLR. This relationship is strengthened by previous findings of low knee
10 confidence and high kinesiophobia in athletes who fail to return to their pre-injury sporting activities after
11 ACLR.⁹ Further evaluation of psychological impairments following ACLR is necessary to better
12 understand the temporal relationship between psychological, neuromuscular, and functional impairments,
13 and the prospective effect of psychological and functional impairments on development of knee OA.

14
15 Since lower functional performance can increase the risk of knee OA development,²⁵ neuromuscular
16 impairments (e.g. hamstring or quadriceps weakness)²⁹ or psychological impairments (e.g. poor
17 confidence, greater kinesiophobia) associated with ACLR could contribute to incident knee OA after
18 ACLR. This theory is consistent with that proposed by Colbert et al.,¹² who suggested that reduced
19 physical function associated with poor knee confidence may play a critical role in initiation and
20 progression of non-traumatic knee OA. Indeed, low knee confidence was related to poor self-reported and
21 performance-based functional impairments in our study, and in older individuals with knee OA.¹² While it
22 is unlikely that psychological impairments alone can precipitate the structural disease progression
23 associated with knee OA, it is plausible that the negative spiral of knee pain leading to reduced physical
24 function following ACLR results in neuromuscular and psychological impairments and further functional
25 impairments, thus placing those who have undergone ACLR at a higher risk of developing knee OA.

1 Our study has important clinical implications. Current ACLR post-operative rehabilitation and OA
2 management programs primarily focus on pain management and therapeutic exercises to address strength
3 and functional impairments, with the primary aim of returning the individual to their desired level of
4 physical activity. Findings of this study suggest that effective management of knee OA after ACLR
5 requires a multidisciplinary approach, including education, pain management, psychological
6 interventions, and therapeutic exercise programs. Given that poor physical function seems to initiate a
7 vicious cycle of symptoms and psychological, neuromuscular, and functional impairments, and could lead
8 to development or progression of knee OA, it is important to improve and maintain physical function in
9 ACLR. Physical interventions with the potential to improve knee confidence and reduce kinesiophobia
10 may include bracing, taping, and movement retraining. Psychological interventions such as cognitive
11 behavioral therapy have been shown to be effective in the management of chronic low back pain,³⁰ and
12 thus should be investigated as a potential intervention to improve knee confidence and reduce
13 kinesiophobia in those with knee OA after ACLR. Future research should investigate a more
14 comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach to post-ACLR management to ensure both psychological and
15 functional recovery.

16

17 There are a number of limitations of this study that should be acknowledged. We assessed knee
18 confidence using one question from the KOOS-QOL subscale. Whilst this specific approach has not been
19 validated, this question has been shown to be a reliable method of assessing knee confidence.¹² Further
20 studies should investigate a broader range of psychological factors in people with OA after ACLR. We
21 had a smaller sample size with kinesiophobia data (n=47). However our sample size was sufficient to
22 detect a significant between-group difference and we had 93% of data in the OA group. Hence, the
23 smaller sample size didn't considerably affect our secondary aims. The cross-sectional nature of the study
24 design precludes any conclusions regarding the temporal relationship between knee confidence and knee
25 OA after ACLR. Longitudinal studies are required to ascertain the role of knee confidence and

1 progression of knee OA after ACLR. Due to insufficient sample power, factorial regression analysis could
2 not be performed to determine factors related to knee confidence. Therefore, future studies should
3 evaluate factors associated with knee confidence in a larger cohort. Finally, while our sample size may
4 limit the generalisability of our results, it was sufficient to detect significant between-group differences
5 and address the aims of our study.

6

7 **Conclusion**

8 In summary, this study identified the presence of two psychological impairments in individuals with knee
9 OA after ACLR: reduced knee confidence and greater kinesiophobia. Further research is needed to
10 determine whether these psychological impairments are a precursor or consequence of knee OA after
11 ACLR. The inter-relationship between knee confidence, kinesiophobia and patient-reported and
12 performance-based functional impairments indicates that psychological impairments associated with this
13 patient group should not be ignored in rehabilitation programs, and warrant further investigation in future
14 efficacy studies.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 **Practical implications**

- 2 • People with knee OA after ACLR have greater trouble with knee confidence and fear of re-injury
- 3 • Worse knee confidence in people with knee OA after ACLR is related to greater fear of re-injury,
4 worse knee symptoms and worse physical function
- 5 • Improvements in knee confidence may aid in improving knee symptoms and physical function

6

7 **Competing interests**

8 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

9

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 DJO Global provided funding for the radiographs. Harvi Hart is supported by a National Health and
12 Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Post-graduate Scholarship (Australia) (#813021) and Natalie
13 Collins is supported by a NHMRC (Australia) Research Training (Post-Doctoral) Fellowship (#628918).
14 Harvi Hart was awarded the ASICS Ken Maquire Award for Best New Investigator for this paper at Be
15 Active 2012.

16

17

18

19

1

2 **Table 1** Knee confidence and its relation to kinesiophobia, symptoms, self-reported and performance-
3 based functional impairments in ACLR participants with OA

4

5 **Figure caption**

6 Figure 1. Proportion of participants in the no-OA and OA groups across the three knee confidence
7 categories

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2 **References**

- 3 1. Oiestad BE, Holm I, Aune AK, et al. Knee function and prevalence of knee osteoarthritis after
 4 anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a prospective study with 10 to 15 years of follow-up.
 5 *Am J Sports Med* 2010; 38(11):2201-2210.
- 6 2. Lohmander LS, Englund PM, Dahl LL, et al. The long-term consequence of anterior cruciate
 7 ligament and meniscus injuries: osteoarthritis. *Am J Sports Med.* 2007; 35(10):1756-1769.
- 8 3. Oiestad BE, Engebretsen L, Storheim K, et al. Knee Osteoarthritis After Anterior Cruciate
 9 Ligament Injury A Systematic Review. *Am J Sports Med* 2009; 37(7):1434-1443.
- 10 4. Roos EM. Joint injury causes knee osteoarthritis in young adults. *Curr Opin Rheumatol* 2005;
 11 17(2):195-200.
- 12 5. von Porat A, Roos EM, Roos H. High prevalence of osteoarthritis 14 years after an anterior
 13 cruciate ligament tear in male soccer players: a study of radiographic and patient relevant
 14 outcomes. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2004; 63(3):269-273.
- 15 6. Culvenor A, Lai C, Gabbe B, et al. Patellofemoral osteoarthritis is prevalent and associated with
 16 worse symptoms and function after hamstring tendon autograft ACL reconstruction. *Br J Sports*
 17 *Med* 2014; 48(6):435-439.
- 18 7. Ageberg E, Thomee R, Neeter C, et al. Muscle strength and functional performance in patients
 19 with anterior cruciate ligament injury treated with training and surgical reconstruction or training
 20 only: a two to five-year followup. *Arthritis Rheum* 2008; 59(12):1773-1779.
- 21 8. Kori SH MR, Todd DD. Kinesophobia: A new view of chronic pain behaviour. *Pain Manag*
 22 1990; 3:35-43.
- 23 9. Kvist J, Ek A, Sporrstedt K, et al. Fear of re-injury: a hindrance for returning to sports after
 24 anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sport Tr A* 2005;13(5):393-397.
- 25 10. Webster KE, Feller JA, Lambros C. Development and preliminary validation of a scale to
 26 measure the psychological impact of returning to sport following anterior cruciate ligament
 27 reconstruction surgery. *Physical Ther Sport* 2008; 9(1):9-15.
- 28 11. Skou ST, Wrigley TV, Metcalf BR, et al. Knee confidence is associated with pain, knee
 29 instability, muscle strength and dynamic varus-valgus joint motion in knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis*
 30 *Care Res* 2013; 21(9):1272-1280.
- 31 12. Colbert CJ, Song J, Dunlop D, et al. Knee confidence as it relates to physical function outcome in
 32 persons with or at high risk of knee osteoarthritis in the osteoarthritis initiative. *Arthritis Rheum*
 33 2012; 64(5):1437-1446.
- 34 13. Heuts PHTG, Vlaeyen JWS, Roelofs J, de Bie R, Aretz K, van Weel C, et al. Pain-related fear
 35 and daily functioning in patients with osteoarthritis. *Pain* 2004;110(1-2):228-235.
- 36 14. Englund M, Roos EM, Lohmander LS. Impact of type of meniscal tear on radiographic and
 37 symptomatic knee osteoarthritis: a sixteen-year followup of meniscectomy with matched controls.
 38 *Arthritis Rheum* 2003; 48(8):2178-2187.
- 39 15. Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis*
 40 1957; 16:485-493.
- 41 16. Vlaeyen JW, Kole-Snijders AM, Boeren RG, et al. Fear of movement/(re)injury in chronic low
 42 back pain and its relation to behavioral performance. *Pain* 1995; 62(3):363-372.
- 43 17. Irrgang JJ, Anderson AF, Boland AL, et al. Development and validation of the international knee
 44 documentation committee subjective knee form. *Am J Sports Med* 2001; 29(5):600-613.
- 45 18. Kujala UM, Jaakkola LH, Koskinen SK, et al. Scoring of patellofemoral disorders. *Arthroscopy*
 46 1993; 9(2):159-163.

- 1 19. Collins NJ, Misra D, Felson DT, et al. Measures of knee function: International Knee
2 Documentation Committee (IKDC) Subjective Knee Evaluation Form, Knee Injury and
3 Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS), Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score Physical
4 Function Short Form (KOOS-PS), Knee Outcome Survey Activities of Daily Living Scale (KOS-
5 ADL), Lysholm Knee Scoring Scale, Oxford Knee Score (OKS), Western Ontario and McMaster
6 Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC), Activity Rating Scale (ARS), and Tegner Activity
7 Score (TAS). *Arthritis Care Res* 2011; 63 Suppl 11:S208-S228.
- 8 20. Crossley KM, Bennell KL, Cowan SM, et al. Analysis of outcome measures for persons with
9 patellofemoral pain: which are reliable and valid? *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2004; 85(5):815-22.
- 10 21. Roos EM, Roos HP, Lohmander LS, et al. Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score
11 (KOOS)-development of a self-administered outcome measure. *J Orthop Sport Phys Ther* 1998;
12 28(2):88-96.
- 13 22. Tegner Y, Lysholm J. Rating systems in the evaluation of knee ligament injuries. *Clinical Orthop*
14 *Relat Res* 1985(198):43-49.
- 15 23. Jerre R, Ejerhed L, Wallmon A, et al. Functional outcome of anterior cruciate ligament
16 reconstruction in recreational and competitive athletes. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2001; 11(6):342-
17 346.
- 18 24. Gustavsson A, Neeter C, Thomee P, et al. A test battery for evaluating hop performance in
19 patients with an ACL injury and patients who have undergone ACL reconstruction. *Knee Surg*
20 *Sport Tr A* 2006;14(8):778-788.
- 21 25. Thorstensson CA, Petersson IF, Jacobsson LTH, et al. Reduced functional performance in the
22 lower extremity predicted radiographic knee osteoarthritis five years later. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2004;
23 63(4):402-407.
- 24 26. Hurley MV, Scott DL, Rees J, et al. Sensorimotor changes and functional performance in patients
25 with knee osteoarthritis. *Annals Rheum Dis* 1997; 56(11):641-648.
- 26 27. Hinman RS, Bennell KL, Metcalf BR et al. Balance impairments in individuals with symptomatic
27 knee osteoarthritis: a comparison with matched controls using clinical tests. *Rheumatology* 2002;
28 41(12):1388-1394.
- 29 28. Lamothe CJ, Daffertshofer A, Meijer OG, et al. Effects of experimentally induced pain and fear of
30 pain on trunk coordination and back muscle activity during walking. *Clin Biomech*
31 2004;19(6):551-563.
- 32 29. Ingersoll CD, Grindstaff TL, Pietrosimone BG, et al. Neuromuscular consequences of anterior
33 cruciate ligament injury. *Clin Sports Med* 2008; 27(3):383-404.
- 34 30. Richardson IH, Richardson PH, Williams AC, et al. The effects of a cognitive-behavioral pain
35 management programme on the quality of work and employment status of severely impaired
36 chronic pain patients. *Disabil Rehabil* 1994;16(1):26-34.

37

38

39

40

41

42

Table 1. Knee confidence and its relation to kinesiophobia, symptoms, self-reported and performance-based functional impairments in ACLR participants with OA

	None	Mild-moderate	Severe-extreme	ANOVA	None vs. Mild-moderate	Mild-moderate vs. Severe-extreme	None vs. Severe-extreme		
	Mean (SD) [range] n=8	Mean (SD) [range] n=12	Mean (SD) [range] n=10	p-value	MD [99%CI] p-value	MD [99%CI] p-value	MD [99%CI] p-value	MD [99%CI]	p-value
Tampa	33 (4) [30 to 43]	34 (6) [23 to 41]	40 (6) [34 to 45]	0.031*	-1 [-6 to 4] 0.694	-6 [-12 to 0] 0.024*	-7 [-14 to 0] 0.020*		
AKPS	95 (10) [81 to 100]	83 (10) [56 to 97]	73 (10) [46 to 98]	0.000**	12 [1 to 24] 0.012*	10 [-1 to 21] 0.023*	22 [10 to 34] 0.000**		
IKDC	92 (12) [86 to 99]	75 (12) [56 to 92]	60 (12) [38 to 84]	0.000**	17 [3 to 32] 0.004**	15 [2 to 29] 0.006**	33 [18 to 48] 0.000**		
KOOS-ADL	98 (8) [88 to 100]	92 (8) [72 to 100]	84 (8) [13 to 96]	0.005**	6 [-3 to 16] 0.106	7 [-1 to 16] 0.041*	14 [4 to 23] 0.001**		
KOOS-S/R	89 (18) [80 to 95]	72 (18) [30 to 100]	52 (18) [25 to 100]	0.001**	17 [-4 to 37] 0.049*	21[1 to 40] 0.011*	37 [16 to 59] 0.000**		
HD (cm)	98 (29) [61 to 151]	85 (29) [10 to 118]	55 (29) [8 to 94]	0.011*	13 [-21 to 47] 0.327	30 [-2 to 62] 0.023*	43 [8 to 79] 0.004**		
SSH (n)	22 (10) [6 to 42]	18 (10) [1 to 37]	8 (10) [1 to 17]	0.013*	4 [-8 to 16] 0.417	10 [-1 to 22] 0.023*	14 [2 to 26] 0.006**		
OLR (n)	35 (12) [10 to 50]	28 (12) [16 to 50]	11 (12) [1 to 25]	0.001**	7 [-7 to 21] 0.213	17 [4 to 30] 0.003**	24 [9 to 39] 0.000**		

Abbreviations as follows: ACLR, Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction; OA, Osteoarthritis; SD, Standard deviation; MD, Mean difference; CI, Confidence Interval; Tampa, Tampa Kinesiophobia Scale; AKPS, Anterior Knee Pain Scale; IKDC, International Knee Documentation Committee Form; KOOS, Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score; ADL, Function in activities of daily living; S/R, Function in sports and recreation activities; HD, single leg hop for distance; SSH, side-to-side hop; OLR, one leg rise. * Symbol indicates $p \leq 0.05$ and ** indicate $p \leq 0.01$

Figure 1

