5-31-2024

TENDINopathy severity assessment–achilles (TENDINS-A): Evaluation of reliability and validity in accordance with COSMIN recommendations

Myles C. Murphy
Edith Cowan University

Fergus McCleary

Dana Hince

Ruth Chimenti

Paola Chivers

See next page for additional authors

Authors

Myles C. Murphy, Fergus McCleary, Dana Hince, Ruth Chimenti, Paola Chivers, J. Turner Vosseller, Sophia Nimphius, Nonhlanhla S. Mkumbuzi, Peter Malliaras, Nicola Maffulli, Robert J. de Vos, and Ebonie K. Rio

1 **TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A): Evaluation of reliability and validity in**

2 **accordance with COSMIN recommendations.**

3

4 Myles C Murphy [1,2,] Fergus McCleary [2], Dana Hince [3], Ruth L Chimenti [4], Paola T Chivers [3,5], J. Turner

5 Vosseller [6], Sophia Nimphius [5], Nonhlanhla Mkumbuzi [7-10], Peter Malliaras [11], Nicola Maffuli [12-14], Robert-Jan

6 De Vos [15], Ebonie Rio [16-18]

7

8 [1] Nutrition and Health Innovation Research Institute, School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan

9 University, Joondalup, Western Australia, Australia

10 [2] School of Health Sciences and Physiotherapy, The University of Notre Dame Australia, Fremantle, Western

11 Australia, Australia

12 [3] Institute for Health Research, The University of Notre Dame Australia, Fremantle, Western Australia, Australia

13 [4] Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Science, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, United

14 States of America

15 [5] School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Western Australia, Australia

16 [6] Jacksonville Orthopaedic Institute, Jacksonville, Florida, United States of America

17 [7] Department of Sports, Exercise, and Rehabilitation, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United

18 Kingdom

19 [8] Department of Rehabilitation, Midlands State University, Gweru, Zimbabwe

20 [9] Department of Human Movement Science, Nelson Mandela University, Summerstrand, Gqeberha, South

21 Africa

22 [10] NtombiSport Pty Ltd, Cape Town, South Africa

23 [11] School of Primary and Allied Health Care, Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Science, Monash

24 University, Victoria, Australia

25 [12] Department of Medicine, Surgery and Dentistry, University of Salerno, Baronissi, Salerno, Italy

26 [13] Faculty of Medicine, School of Pharmacy and Bioengineering, Keele University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

27 [14] Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Centre for Sports and Exercise Medicine, Queen

28 Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

29 [15] Department of Orthopaedics and Sports Medicine, Erasmus MC University Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The

30 Netherlands.

31   [16] La Trobe Sport and Exercise Medicine Research Centre, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria, Australia

32   [17] Victorian Institute of Sport, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

33   [18] The Australian Ballet, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

34

35   ***Corresponding author:** Dr Myles C Murphy. Nutrition and Health Innovation Research Institute, School of

36   Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Western Australia, Australia Email:

37   ███████████

38

39

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate the construct validity (structural validity and hypothesis-testing), reliability (test-retest reliability, measurement error and internal consistency) and minimal important change (MIC) of the 13-item TENDINopathy Severity assessment–Achilles (TENDINS-A).

Methods: Participants with Achilles pain completed an online survey including: demographics, TENDINS-A, Foot and Ankle Outcome Score (FAOS), and Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Achilles (VISA-A). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) assessed dimensionality. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) assessed structural validity [root-mean-squared error of approximation (RMSEA); Comparative Fit Index (CFI); Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI); Standardised Root Measure Square (SRMS)]. Correlations between TENDINS-A and the FAOS or VISA-A assessed hypothesis-testing. Intraclass correlation (ICC) assessed test-retest reliability. Cronbach's α assessed internal consistency. Standard error of the measurement (SEM) assessed measurement error. A distribution-based approach assessed MIC.

Results: Seventy-nine participants (51% female) with a mean (SD) age=42.6 (13.0) years, height=175.0 (11.7) cm and body mass=82.0 (19.1) kg were included. EFA identified three meaningful factors, proposed as pain, symptoms and function. The best model identified using CFA for TENDINS-A had structural validity (RMSEA= 0.101, CFI= 0.959, TLI= 0.947, SRMS=0.068), which included three factors (Pain, Symptoms, and Function), but excluded three items from the original TENDINS-A. TENDINS-A exhibited moderate positive correlation with FAOS (rho=0.598,$p<0.001$) and a moderate, negative correlation with VISA-A (r=-0.639,$p<0.001$). Reliability of the TENDINS-A was excellent (ICC=0.930; Cronbach's α=0.808; SEM=6.54 units), with an MIC of 12 units.

Conclusions: Our evaluation of the revised 10-item TENDINS-A determined it has construct validity and excellent reliability, compared to the VISA-A and FAOS which lack content and construct validity. The TENDINS-A is recommended as the preferred patient-reported outcome measure to assess disability in people with Achilles tendinopathy.

What is already known: The TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A) has been co-designed with patients, clinicians and researchers as a new patient-reported outcome measure (PROM) to assess the severity of disability in Achilles tendinopathy, but its psychometric properties have not been previously reported.

69   **What this study adds:** The TENDINS-A has content validity, construct validity and excellent reliability in the

70   assessment of the severity of disability in Achilles tendinopathy.

71   **How this study might affect practice:** The TENDINS-A is recommended for use in both clinical practice and

72   research to assess the severity of disability in Achilles tendinopathy.

73

74   **INTRODUCTION**

75   Achilles tendinopathy is characterised by focal Achilles tendon pain accompanied by impaired function with

76   mechanical loading,[1] which is typically managed using predominantly exercise rehabilitation.[2 3] Achilles

77   tendinopathy is common in the running population [prevalence of 4.2% (diagnosed using a pain mapping

78   approach) in runners training for an event][4 5] and also prevalent within the general population.[6] People with

79   tendinopathy, expert clinicians and researchers have identified several core health domains as important in

80   tendinopathy, including tendon-related disability.[7] However, multiple different measures to quantify tendon-

81   related disability are used across studies, with no existing consensus.[8 9] In clinical practice measures of tendon-

82   related disability are not commonly used,[10] in part due to inadequate content validity.[11 12] Thus, despite a

83   consensus that tendon-related disability is an important aspect of health,[7] there remains no measure of tendon-

84   related disability that is validated for research or clinical use.

85   The consensus-based standards for the selection of measurement instruments (COSMIN) guidelines represent

86   international best-practice for the design and appraisal of Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs).[13 14]

87   However, the value of a PROM is not in its availability but in its quality, reflected by its clinometric

88   properties.[15] Valid and reliable PROMs should be used and recommended, but this is not currently possible in

89   Achilles tendinopathy research of the disability domain.[16] Existing PROMs that assess tendon-related disability,

90   such as the Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment – Achilles (VISA-A),[16 17] have historically been

91   recommended in the absence of other tools,[18] but do not satisfy the guidelines set out by COSMIN and suffer

92   from substantial flaws in their design.

93   Using the VISA-A as an example, it has inadequate content and structural validity. VISA-A development did not

94   involve patients[11] and methodological testing of the VISA-A scale using Rasch analysis has demonstrated it has

95   insufficient structural validity[19] and hypothesis testing of the VISA-A shows it is significantly correlated to

96   participant age and body mass index.[20] The recommendations from several reviews and original research studies

97   highlight the VISA-A is not valid and should not be used in research or clinical practice.[11 12 19 20]

98 The newly developed TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A) assesses the severity of the

99 Tendinopathy Core Health Domain of Disability,[7] and consists of questions covering sub-domains of pain,

100 symptoms, and physical function related to Achilles tendinopathy.[21] The TENDINS-A has adequate content

101 validity, being co-designed by people with Achilles tendinopathy, expert clinicians and researchers.[21] Whilst the

102 TENDINS-A has sufficient content validity, the structural validity and other measurement properties of this new

103 PROM (e.g., reliability) remain unknown.

104 **Objective**

105 The objective of this study was to evaluate the construct validity (including structural validity and hypothesis

106 testing), reliability (including test-retest reliability, measurement error and internal consistency) and minimal

107 important change of the TENDINS-A.

108 **Hypotheses**

109 The TENDINS-A will have adequate criteria-based structural validity, demonstrate moderate significant

110 correlations to commonly utilised PROMS for Achilles tendinopathy[16] [VISA-A and Foot and Ankle Outcome

111 Score (FAOS)], no correlation to unrelated constructs such as baseline characteristics (e.g., age or body mass

112 index) and excellent reliability.

113 **METHODS**

114 **Study Design**

115 Cross-sectional cohort study evaluating the psychometric properties of the TENDINS-A.

116 **Participants and setting**

117 We used a network of greater than 20 clinicians known to the research team (exercise scientists, general

118 practitioners, orthopaedic surgeons, physiotherapists, podiatrists, rheumatologists and sport and exercise

119 physicians) and Achilles tendon researchers to identify participants with either mid-portion or insertional

120 Achilles tendinopathy and provide them with our online survey using Qualtrics (convenience sampling). This

121 was accessed via a quick response (QR) code or anonymous web link. Any person over the age of 18 years, who

122 could read the English language, with self-reported Achilles tendinopathy was eligible.

123 **Inclusion criteria**

124 Participants self-identified as having Achilles tendon pain and were provided with a pain map of established

125 locations of Achilles tendon symptoms and asked to select all markings that corresponded to their region of pain

126 (which is superior to both palpation and ultrasound tissue characterisation for pain localisation).[22] Participants

127 who selected the insertion of mid-portion Achilles tendon were included within this validation study and this

128 methodology provides 'near-perfect' agreement to Sports Physician diagnosis of Achilles tendinopathy.[23]

129 **Outcome measures**

130 All outcome measures were completed by participants within a single survey and the survey forced responses to

131 avoid missing data.

132 *Participant characteristics*

133 Age (years), sex (male/female/intersex), height (cm), body mass (kg), ethnicity, country of residence, languages

134 other than English spoken by the participant (self-reported), whether the participant performed moderate to

135 vigorous physical activity (MVPA) most days (yes/no), highest level of education, work status and total

136 household income were reported.

137 *TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A)*

138 The original TENDINS-A (which consists of 13 scoreable items numbered 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13A, 13B,

139 13C, 13D, 13E, and 4 non-scoreable items numbered 1, 2, 5, 9) was provided to participants as the first PROM

140 within the survey and was scored between 0 and 100, with '0' representing a perfect score (no disability) and

141 '100' representing complete disability.[21] If participants were unable to perform one of the pain-with-loading

142 tests (e.g., single leg hop), they were instructed to leave it blank and a score of '10' was provided.

143 Participants completed the TENDINS-A prior to the FAOS and the VISA-A. Directly after completing the

144 VISA-A questionnaire, the TENDINS-A was immediately repeated. This ensured the clinical status of

145 participants was unchanged,[24] whilst still allowing for any potential interference effects. Specifically, the

146 participant would be unable to remember responses to the initial TENDINS-A as they have no option to go back

147 in the survey and 50 questions (i.e., the VISA-A and FAOS) separated the initial and then repeated TENDINS-

148 A.

149 *Foot and Ankle Outcome Score*

150 The 42-item FAOS[25] was performed following the TENDINS-A, with a mean total score calculated for the

151 purposes of this study and used for hypothesis testing. A score of '0' represented a perfect score (no disability),

152 with a score of '100' representing complete disability. The FAOS is a reliable tool and has adequate internal

153 consistency,[25] however it has inadequate content validity (as it was not developed for Achilles tendinopathy) and

154 its construct validity in Achilles tendinopathy is unknown.

155 *Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment – Achilles*

156 The 8-item VISA-A[17] was performed following the FAOS and used for hypothesis testing. The VISA-A is

157 inversely scored when compared to the TENDINS-A and FAOS with a score of '100' represented a perfect score

158 (no disability), and a score of '0' representing complete disability. Where participants selected multiple

159 responses in item 8 (related to how much physical activity can be performed before cessation due to symptoms

160 is required), the lowest score was retained for analysis. The VISA-A is a reliable tool and has adequate internal

161 consistency,[17] however it has inadequate content validity[11] and construct validity.[19]

162 **Power calculation**

163 Study size was informed by the recommendations of the COSMIN risk of bias checklist[13 14] rather than formal

164 power calculations. Questions 1, 2, 5 and 9 are not scored in the TENDINS-A; therefore the PROM was initially

165 considered to have 13 scorable items as one item has five secondary scales.[21] COSMIN guidelines suggest that

166 six-times the number of persons to items is adequate for assessing structural validity using classical test theory,[13]

167 [14] thus the minimum sample size for this study was determined to be 78 persons. We also required all

168 communalities in exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to be >0.3, thus samples of <100 participants are justified.[26]

169 Furthermore, a sample of >50 participants is considered adequate for reliability and internal consistency.[13 14]

170 **Statistical analysis**

171 The different statistical analyses, per each measurement property, are described below. All statistical analyses

172 were performed within IBM SPSS statistics (version 29.0), or IBM SPSS Amos (version 29.0) and we have

173 provided a glossary of statistical terminology used in Table 1. Where appropriate, confidence intervals are

174 presented, and statistical significance was considered when $p < 0.05$.

175 For the purposes of clarity in this manuscript, when referencing an Item (e.g., Item 7) these will always be in

176 reference to the original 13 items of the TENDINS-A. However, item numbers for the final TENDINS-A

177 (presented as an appendix) are different and have been re-ordered to avoid confusion (e.g., labelled 1-10).

178 **Table 1. Glossary of statistical terminology**

Term	Definition
Bartlett's test of Sphericity	Assesses the probability that the correlation matrix has significant correlations amongst items in the dataset, which is a requirement for factor analysis.
Communality	Proportion of the common variance for an individual item, relative to all factors.
Comparative Fit Index	Assessment of model fit by quantifying discrepancies between the sample data and the model while adjusting for sample size.

Eigenvalues	Quantification of the proportion of the variance accounted for by an individual factor.
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	An assessment of whether data is appropriate for factor analysis by determining the proportion of variance among all items that might be from a common variance.
Root-mean-squared error of the approximation	Estimate of the discrepancy the sample data and the model-implied data covariance matrices per degree of freedom.
Scree Plot	Graphical representation of eigenvalues to visually assess when new factors are unlikely to explain a sufficient level of the variance.
Standardised Root Measure Square	Square root of the calculated discrepancy between the sample covariance matrix and the model covariance matrix.
Tucker-Lewis Index	Measure of goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures.

179

180 *Dimensionality*

181 We performed EFA for all scoreable items using SPSS Statistics to assess dimensionality. To proceed to

182 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), we required all communalities to exceed 0.3,[27] required the Kaiser-Meyer-

183 Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy to exceed 0.7 [28] and for Bartlett's test of Sphericity to be significant

184 (p<0.01),[29] which are all recognised criteria for progression to factor analysis.

185 Factors were eligible for inclusion within EFA where the Eigenvalues exceeded 1.0 (which are deemed

186 substantial). The Scree plot was also visually inspected and additional models were performed to include more/

187 less factors, based on author (MCM) judgement and with the TENDINS-A being proposed to measure three

188 factors related to disability: pain, symptoms and function.[21] A principal axis factoring method was used to

189 determine our initial factor matrix. As per standard practice, factors were considered meaningful when an item

190 loaded at ≥0.4 for that factor.[30] As 'disability' is a domain that reflects pain, symptoms and function,[7] we

191 hypothesised the TENDINS-A to have three factors identified by EFA.

192 *Structural Validity*

193 Confirmatory factor analysis was performed using SPSS Amos (22) to assess structural validity. We included all

194 three factors (which were identified in the EFA and TENDINS-A content validity study),[21] within the initial

195 model, and then removed variables as needed to achieve the best fit. Items with categorical (yes/ no only)

196   responses were not included within CFA (not appropriate for CFA but had been tested in EFA). Models were

197   tested and selected based off the best root-mean-squared error of the approximation (RMSEA) and overall

198   model chi-squared statistics, with a lower chi-squared statistic representing a better model fit. An overall

199   acceptable model would require a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) OR Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) of >0.95 AND

200   RMSEA of <0.06 or Standardised Root Measure Square (SRMS) of <0.08.[13]

201   The CFA provided standardised factor loading and error variance per item. Composite reliability of >0.70 is

202   considered adequate.[31] Composite reliability was calculated using the formula below when λ = standardised

203   factor loading and ε = error variance:

204
$$Composite\ reliability = \frac{(\sum \lambda_i)^2}{(\sum \lambda_i)^2 + (\sum \varepsilon_i)}$$

205   Convergent validity was assessed using the average variance extracted (AVE). An AVE of >0.50 is considered

206   adequate.[32] The AVE was calculated using the formula below when λ = standardised factor loading and ε = error

207   variance:

208
$$Average\ variance\ extracted = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} Var(\varepsilon_i)}$$

209

210   The criteria for adequate structural validity of the final model were:

211   1.   CFI or TLI >0.95,[13]

212   2.   RMSEA of <0.06 or SRMS of <0.08,[13]

213   3.   Composite Reliability >0.70,[31] and

214   4.   AVE >0.50.[32]

215   *Test-retest reliability*

216   Test-retest reliability of the TENDINS-A was calculated as a continuous scale. The absolute and relative test-

217   retest reliability (which is a sub-type of reliability and demonstrates how closely someone will generate the

218   same score on a PROM when repeated in a specified timeframe) were determined.[33] Relative test-retest

219   reliability was reported as the intraclass correlation (ICC), with a two-way mixed approach used to assess

220   absolute agreement of a single measure.[34] Absolute test-retest reliability is a sub-type of reliability and

221   demonstrates the degree of uncertainty in a measurement. For example, measurements with more uncertainty

222 will have greater measurement error, hence it is systematic and random error that is not reflective of true

223 change.[34] The standard error of the measurement[35] was calculated using the following equation:

224 $$Standard\ error\ of\ the\ measurment = SD_{baseline}\sqrt{1-ICC}$$

225 *Minimal important change*

226 The Minimal important change (MIC) and 95% confidence intervals was calculated using a distribution-based

227 method,[36] using the following equation:

228 $$Minimal\ important\ change = \frac{SD_{baseline}}{2}$$

229 *Internal consistency*

230 Internal consistency is a sub-type of reliability that investigates whether different items that measure the same

231 construct give comparable outcomes. The internal consistency for the entire 13-item TENDINS-A was

232 calculated using the average inter-item correlation and a Cronbach's Alpha was reported with a positive rating

233 given for values >0.7.[13]

234 *Convergent and divergent validity*

235 In addition to the convergent validity assessed using CFA, we also assessed convergent and divergent validity of

236 the TENDINS-A scale using a correlation between scores of the TENDINS-A and another PROM theorised to

237 measure the same overall core health domain of tendinopathy (disability)[7 16] or unrelated constructs, such as age

238 and BMI (given they are continuous variables that should not be related to tendon-related disability). The

239 TENDINS-A, FAOS and the VISA-A were assessed for normality using visual assessment and the one-sample

240 Kolomogorov-Smirnov Test. For normally distributed data the Pearson's correlation coefficient was used and for

241 non-normally distributed data the non-parametric Spearman rho correlation was used. Correlations were

242 considered very weak (between 0-0.25), weak (0.26-0.49), moderate (0.5-0.69), strong (0.7-0.89) and very

243 strong (0.9-1).

244 *Comparison between sub-groups*

245 To ensure that significant difference between sub-groups did not exist we calculated between-group differences

246 for key baseline characteristics [sex (male/ female), MVPA most days (yes/no), multilingual status (yes/ no), and

247 whether tendon loading activities are typically performed daily (yes/no)] using independent t-tests.

248 **Equity, diversity and inclusion**

249 The authorship group are of diverse gender, geographical location and research experience. Furthermore, the

250 participants included in this study were diverse in relation to many demographic variables (e.g., sex, age, BMI,

251 geographical location or education level).

252

RESULTS

Participants

Seventy-nine (n=79) participants (51% female, 49% male) provided survey data and were included within our

analysis with no missing data. Participants had a mean (SD) age of 42.6 (13.0) years, height of 175.0 (11.7) cm

and body mass of 82.0 (19.1) kg. Participants were predominantly of 'Australian' ethnicity (79.7%) and were

not multi-lingual (64.6%) with those multilingual participants predominantly having English as their first

language (53.6%). A significant number of participants reported that they performed MVPA most days (69.6%).

Participant education level and employment varied, with most having completed tertiary studies (74.6%) and

working full time (63.3%). Income levels ranged from less than $30,000 Australian Dollars (AUD) (5.1%) to

greater than $200,000 AUD (27.8%), per annum. The activities that aggravated the pain of participants with

Achilles tendinopathy varied: walking slow (15.2%), walking fast (44.3%), walking up and down stairs (43.0%),

running up and down stairs (46.8%), running slow (60.8%), running fast (54.4%), hopping and jumping

(62.0%), and rapidly changing direction while running (44.3%). The complete breakdown of participant

characteristics is provided in Appendix A.

Uni-dimensionality

Bartlett's test of Sphericity suggested that the results of our correlation matrix were not random [$\chi^2(78) = 708$,

p<0.001]. Our Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (0.811) far exceeded the minimum cut-off

of 0.70. Thus, our correlation matrix was appropriate. The extracted communalities (Mean=0.67, SD= 0.16,

Range= 0.18 to 0.93) for all but three items (items 6, 8 and 12) exceeded our cut-off score for CFA inclusion

(Appendix B).

Principal axis factoring analysis was performed and the initial Eigen values of three factors exceeded 1.0 (see

appendix C), explained 67.9% of the total variance and the first factor accounted for >20% of the variability.

The three identified factors were included within the Factor Matrix, and associated factor loading per item, are

presented within Table 2. However, no items were associated with a loading of >0.4 on Factor Three.

Table 2. Factor Loading with Principal Axis Factoring Analysis for all items with loading >0.4 (n=79).

TENDINS- A	Factor One	Factor Two	Factor Three
Item 3	0.412		0.400
Item 4	0.496	0.479	
Item 6			

Item 7		0.644	
Item 8		0.504	
Item 10		0.672	
Item 11	0.614		
Item 12			
Item 13A	0.731		
Item 13B	0.888		
Item 13C	0.915		
Item 13D	0.916		
Item 13E	0.917		

278 *Blank cells represent loading of <0.4

279 **Structural Validity** Several Maximum Likelihood Estimates CFA models were trialled, informed by the factor

280 loading from EFA, and subscales from our content validity study to generate our final CFA model. The best

281 model used three factors [a) Pain, b) Symptoms, and c) Function] and eight items (Figure 1). Question 12 was

282 excluded because of poor EFA initial communality, non-meaningful factor loading within EFA and being unable

283 to load onto either of the three factors within CFA. Question 13A and 13B were removed as their exclusion

284 resulted in substantially improved model fit (Appendix D). The scoring for the remaining 12 questions was

285 amended to maintain a score range from 0 to 100, as presented within Appendix E.

286 In the final model, the chi-squared statistic was $\chi^2(22)= 39.2$, the CFI was 0.959, the TLI was 0.947, the

287 RMSEA was 0.101 and the SRMS was 0.068, indicating sufficient structural validity. The model was also

288 assumed accurate with CMIN/DF= 1.796, parsimony comparative fit index= 0.753 and parsimony normed fit

289 index= 0.717.

290 The standardised factor loadings and error variance for the final model are included within Table 3. The

291 correlation between 'Pain' and 'Symptoms' was estimated at 0.642 with significant covariances (Estimate=

292 4.104, standard error= 1.101 and composite reliability= 3.728, p<0.001). The correlation between 'Pain' and

293 'Function' was estimated at 0.668 with significant covariances (Estimate= 5.424, standard error= 1.300 and

294 composite reliability= 4.171, p<0.001). The correlation between 'Symptoms' and 'Function' was estimated at

295 0.275 with significant covariances (Estimate= 2.818, standard error= 1.353 and composite reliability= 2.082,

296 p=0.037).

297   **Table 3. Standardised Factor Loadings of the TENDINS-A (n=79)**

TENDINS- A	Factor	Standardised Factor Loading	Error Variance
Item 11	Pain	0.643	0.587
Item 3	Pain	0.605	0.634
Item 4	Pain	0.627	0.607
Item 7	Symptoms	0.741	0.451
Item 10	Symptoms	0.855	0.269
Item 13C	Function	0.921	0.152
Item 13D	Function	0.975	0.049
Item 13E	Function	0.967	0.065

298   *Internal consistency.* For the 8-items assessed using CFA included in TENDINS-A theorised to measure

299   'disability', the internal consistency was 0.842, hence displaying sufficient internal consistency.

300   *Composite reliability.* For the 8-items assessed using CFA included in TENDINS-A theorised to measure

301   'disability', the composite reliability was 0.934, hence displaying sufficient composite reliability.

302   *Convergent validity.* For the 8-items assessed using CFA included in TENDINS-A theorised to measure

303   'disability', the AVE was 0.648, hence displaying sufficient convergent validity.

304   Thus, our final CFA model could determine the contribution of different items in measuring 'Pain', 'Symptoms'

305   and 'Function' and the TENDINS-A has sufficient structural validity. Consequently, the scores for the remaining

306   items were amended to ensure the TENDINS-A retained a maximal score of 100 (40 units for 'Pain', 30 units

307   for 'symptoms' and 30 units for 'function'). Questions 6 and 8 were also excluded from CFA modelling being

308   dichotomous (Yes/No) items but were retained within the complete TENDINS-A in the 'symptoms' domain. All

309   subsequent analyses therefore relate to the revised TENDINS-A, presented in Appendix E.

310 **Distribution of data**

311 Whilst data for the TENDINS-A (Kolomogorov-Smirnov test statistic=0.09, p=0.097) and the VISA-A

312 (Kolomogorov-Smirnov test statistic= 0.06, p=0.200) were normally distributed, the FAOS were not

313 (Kolomogorov-Smirnov test statistic= 0.12, p=0.019). The TENDINS-A data had a minimum score of 0 and a

314 maximum score of 100. The mean (SD) of the TENDINS-A was 47.89 (24.71) points, the FAOS was 23.60

315 (18.63) percent, and the VISA was 53.58 (23.96) points. The mean (SD) of the repeated TENDINS-A was 44.34

316 (24.16) points.

317 **Reliability**

318 *Intraclass correlation co-efficient*

319 The 10-item TENDINS-A mixed-effect ICC for absolute agreement of a single measure was ICC= 0.930 (95%

320 CI = 0.881 to 0.959), p= < 0.001.

321 *Internal consistency*

322 The Cronbach's Alpha for the 10-items of the TENDINS-A was reported as α=0.808, representing excellent

323 internal consistency.

324 *Standard error of the measurement*

325 The TENDINS-A standard error of the measurement was calculated as 6.54 units.

326 **Minimal important change**

327 The MIC for the 10-item TENDINS-A was calculated as 12.36 (95% CI= 5.46 to 19.25) units of difference,

328 representing 25.6% points of change from a mean TENDINS-A score of 47.89.

329 **Convergent validity**

330 The TENDINS-A exhibited a moderate positive correlation with the FAOS (rho=0.598, 95%CI= 0.408 to 0.738,

331 p<0.001), and a moderate, negative correlation with the VISA-A (r=-0.639, 95%CI= -0.764 to -0.467, p<0.001).

332 **Divergent validity**

333 The TENDINS-A showed no evidence of a statistically significant association with age (p=0.426) or BMI

334 (p=0.189).

335 **Comparison between sub-groups**

336 Between-group differences (Table 4) were observed for self-reported MVPA most days, with those performing

337 moderate to vigorous physical activity most days having a lower TENDINS-A score (p=0.002) and males

338 reported a lower TENDINS-A score (p=0.044). No differences in TENDINS-A score were observed for those

339 performing specific tendon-loading exercise versus those who did not (p=0.079), or whether participants were

multi-lingual (p=0.397). As more males performed MVPA than females in our sample, we performed a *post hoc* linear regression model to assess whether group differences due to sex were a result of higher levels of MVPA in males than females. The model supported this idea, with no association between the TENDINS-A score and sex (p=0.061) after adjusting for MVPA [17.7 (95%CI= 6.46 to 28.97) unit increase in TENDINS-A score, p=0.002].

Table 4. Between group differences in TENDINS-A score.

		Mean (SD), range	Mean Difference (SED)	Test statistic (Independent t-test)	p-value
Moderate to vigorous physical activity most days	Yes (n=55)	37.69 (23.08), 0-91	-18.81 (5.91)	-3.18	0.002*
	No (n=24)	56.50 (26.54), 5-98			
Sex	Male (n=39)	37.56 (23.27), 5-98	-11.54 (5.63)	-2.048	0.044*
	Female (n=40)	49.10 (26.64), 0-91			
Tendon-loading exercise performed most days	Yes (n=43)	38.79 (22.35), 5-86	-10.13 (5.69)	-1.779	0.079
	No (n=36)	48.92 (28.23), 0-98			
Multilingual	Yes (n=28)	48.79 (23.57), 5-91	8.34 (5.97)	1.396	0.167
	No (n=51)	40.45 (26.32), 0-98			

Abbreviations: SD= standard deviation; SED= standard error of difference; n= number; range= min to max

* p<0.05

DISCUSSION

350 The present investigation evaluated the construct validity (consisting of structural validity and hypothesis

351 testing), as well as reliability (consisting of internal consistency, test-retest reliability and measurement error) of

352 the TENDINS-A. Based on this investigation, we present a revised TENDINS-A (Appendix E) that still includes

353 all original questions, but only 10 of the original questions are scoreable.

354 The 10-item TENDINS-A, proposed to provide an overall measure of 'disability', demonstrated sufficient

355 construct validity for three factors (pain; symptoms; function) and reliability, supporting its use in clinical and

356 research settings. Furthermore, with normally distributed scores, there was no evidence of floor or ceiling

357 effects within the sample. The TENDINS-A has a median completion time of ~8 minutes and is also likely to be

358 meaningful to people with a lived experience of Achilles tendinopathy, as the research team included such

359 individuals to inform its development.[21]

360 All continuous variables of the TENDINS-A, after the removal of item 12, 13A and 13B, were able to load onto

361 one of three factors: pain, symptoms or function. The core health domain of 'disability' is defined as the

362 "composite scores of a mix of patient-rated pain and disability due to the pain, usually relating to tendon-

363 specific activities/tasks," and included in tools such as the VISA-A.[7 16] Thus, the TENDINS-A is proposed to

364 have adequate structural validity and measure the overall composite of disability, using scores from items

365 related to 'pain', 'symptoms' and 'function'. Therefore, the TENDINS-A is the only current PROM quantifying

366 Achilles tendinopathy related disability with adequate content[21] and structural validity and should be used in

367 place of all other PROMs. Researchers may still wish to use the VISA-A in addition to the TENDINS-A to allow

368 for comparisons to previous research, but only the TENDINS-A should be used to report primary outcomes.

369 The reliability of the TENDINS-A is excellent (ICC>0.90). We opted to assess test-retest reliability on a single

370 day as tendinopathy pain and symptoms are known to fluctuate daily.[24] The internal consistency of the

371 TENDINS-A was also excellent (α>0.80), ensuring all items were being scored consistently. The terminology

372 surrounding the minimal detectable change, MIC and minimal clinically important difference (MCID) is

373 confusing and for the purposes of discussion we have included all available comparisons. We calculated the

374 minimal important change (MIC=12.4 units) of the TENDINS-A using a distribution-based method. This is

375 larger than the MIC for the VISA-A, which is reported as between 7.8 to 8.2.[37] A study using an anchor-based

376 method in the VISA-A reported the MCID as 14 units,[38] which is comparable to our estimated measure. Another

377 study using the VISA-A estimated the MCID to be 6.5 units, however this was estimated from a selective

378 sample of 15 participants with insertional Achilles tendinopathy, which may also explain the smaller MCID.[39]

379   To characterize the magnitude of change on the TENDINS-A that is meaningful to individuals with Achilles

380   tendinopathy, future longitudinal studies are needed to estimate the minimal clinically-important difference

381   (MCID).

382   The TENDINS-A demonstrated moderate correlations to both the VISA-A and FAOS, which is expected given

383   they are proposed to measure the same overall health domain of disability.[16] We did not expect strong

384   correlations to the VISA-A or FAOS given the limitations of the VISA-A,[11 12 15] which we theorised would

385   extend to the FAOS as it is also lacking content validity. This lack of a strong correlation may be due to the

386   TENDINS-A being a superior PROM to the FAOS and VISA-A (given the established content and structural

387   validity of the TENDINS-A). The lack of a strong correlation can also result from the absence of a gold standard

388   outcome measure for disability. Alternatively, we theorised the TENDINS-A should not have been associated

389   with baseline characteristics such as age or BMI, and this was confirmed by our analysis. This differs from the

390   VISA-A, whose total score is significantly associated with age and BMI,[20] reflecting a problem for previous

391   studies using the VISA-A that did not adjust for age or BMI within the statistical analysis.

392   None of our specified sub-groups (sex, being multilingual, MVPA most days, tendon-loading exercise most

393   days) showed a floor or ceiling effect. We expect this is likely due to items of the TENDINS-A being

394   specifically linked to the function and aggravating tasks typically performed by the participant, making it

395   suitable for both sedentary and physically active people with Achilles tendinopathy. Performing MVPA most

396   days was associated with a lower TENDINS-A score, as expected. This is most likely a consequence of the

397   numerous health benefits of physical activity.[40] Alternatively, the inactive group may undertake less tendon-

398   specific loading exercise and aggravate the Achilles less. However, this seems unlikely, as performing tendon-

399   loading activity was also assessed and no significant effect detected.

400   **Limitations**

401   The sample for this study, whilst diverse in some respects, was heavily reliant on participants living in Australia.

402   While other PROMS for Achilles tendinopathy showed acceptable cross-cultural validity in other languages,[41 42]

403   future research on cross-cultural adaptation of the TENDINS-A is needed. Cross-cultural adaptation of the

404   TENDINS-A is currently being performed by several different research groups internationally and these data

405   can also be used to assess differential item functioning.

406 Self-report may have resulted in a misdiagnosis of Achilles tendinopathy. However in this study, we enhanced

407 diagnostic accuracy by implementing a standardized pain map.[22] A prior investigation demonstrated a 93%

408 concordance between patient-reported Achilles tendinopathy when using a pain map and diagnoses made by a

409 physician.[23] These findings suggest that, in the majority of cases, self-reported Achilles tendinopathy aligns with

410 the clinical diagnosis.

411 Finally, further details related to medical co-morbidities and medication usage[43] would have allowed analysis of

412 their influence on total score and would be recommended in future research trials.

413 **CONCLUSION**

414 Our evaluation of the revised TENDINS-A (Appendix E), which includes 10-scoreable items across three sub-

415 domains of pain, symptoms and physical function has adequate construct validity and reliability. These findings,

416 and previously established content validity, ensure that the revised TENDINS-A with 10-scoreable items can be

417 recommended for immediate use in both research and clinical practice, being the preferred tool over the VISA-A

418 and FAOS to assess disability in individuals with Achilles tendinopathy.

419

438 **REFERENCES**

439 1. Scott A, Squier K, Alfredson H, et al. ICON 2019: International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium

440   Consensus: Clinical Terminology. *British journal of sports medicine* 2020;54(5):260-62. doi:

441   10.1136/bjsports-2019-100885

442 2. Murphy M, Travers MJ, Gibson W, et al. The rate of improvement of pain and function in mid-portion

443   Achilles tendinopathy with loading protocols: A Systematic Review and Longitudinal Meta-Analysis.

444   *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)* 2018;48(8):1875-91. doi: 10.1007/s40279-018-0932-2.

445 3. Murphy MC, Travers MJ, Chivers P, et al. Efficacy of heavy eccentric calf training for treating mid-portion

446   Achilles tendinopathy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *British journal of sports medicine*

447   2019;53(17):1070-77. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2018-099934

448 4. Chen W, Cloosterman KLA, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA, et al. Epidemiology of insertional and midportion

449   Achilles tendinopathy in runners: A prospective cohort study. *Journal of sport and health science* 2023

450   doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2023.03.007 [published Online First: 20230323]

451 5. Lopes AD, Hespanhol LC, Yeung SS, et al. What are the Main Running-Related Musculoskeletal Injuries?

452   *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)* 2012;42(10):891-905. doi: 10.1007/bf03262301

453 6. Albers IS, Zwerver J, Diercks RL, et al. Incidence and prevalence of lower extremity tendinopathy in a Dutch

454   general practice population: a cross sectional study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2016;17(1):16. doi:

455   10.1186/s12891-016-0885-2

456 7. Vicenzino B, de Vos R-J, Alfredson H, et al. ICON 2019—International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium

457   Consensus: There are nine core health-related domains for tendinopathy (CORE DOMAINS): Delphi

458   study of healthcare professionals and patients. *British journal of sports medicine* 2019;54(8):444-51.

459   doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-100894

460 8. Murphy M, Rio E, Debenham J, et al. Evaluating the progress of mid-portion Achilles Tendinopathy during

461   rehabilitation. A Review of Outcome Measures for muscle structure and function, tendon structure and

462   neural and pain associated mechanisms. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 2018;13(3):537-51.

463 9. Murphy M, Rio E, Debenham J, et al. Evaluating the progress of mid-portion Achilles Tendinopathy during

464   rehabilitation. A Review of Outcome Measures for Self- Reported Pain and Function. *Int J Sports Phys*

465   *Ther* 2018;13(2):283-92. doi: 10.26603/ijspt20180283

466 10. Murphy M, Debenham J, Bulsara C, et al. Assessment and monitoring of Achilles Tendinopathy in clinical

467 practice: A qualitative descriptive exploration of the barrier's clinicians face. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc*

468 *Med* 2022;ePub ahead of print

469 11. Korakakis V, Kotsifaki A, Stefanakis M, et al. Evaluating lower limb tendinopathy with Victorian Institute of

470 Sport Assessment (VISA) questionnaires: a systematic review shows very-low-quality evidence for

471 their content and structural validity-part I. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2021;29(9):2749-64.

472 doi: 10.1007/s00167-021-06598-5 [published Online First: 20210521]

473 12. Korakakis V, Whiteley R, Kotsifaki A, et al. A systematic review evaluating the clinimetric properties of the

474 Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment (VISA) questionnaires for lower limb tendinopathy shows

475 moderate to high-quality evidence for sufficient reliability, validity and responsiveness—part II. *Knee*

476 *Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2021 doi: 10.1007/s00167-021-06557-0

477 13. Gagnier JJ, Lai J, Mokkink LB, et al. COSMIN reporting guideline for studies on measurement properties of

478 patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res* 2021;30(8):2197-218. doi: 10.1007/s11136-021-

479 02822-4 [published Online First: 20210405]

480 14. Terwee CB, Prinsen CAC, Chiarotto A, et al. COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of

481 patient-reported outcome measures: a Delphi study. *Qual Life Res* 2018;27(5):1159-70. doi:

482 10.1007/s11136-018-1829-0 [published Online First: 20180317]

483 15. Korakakis V, Whiteley R, Kotsifaki A, et al. Tendinopathy VISAs have expired—is it time for outcome

484 renewals? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2021 doi: 10.1007/s00167-021-06596-7

485 16. Grävare Silbernagel K, Malliaras P, de Vos R-J, et al. ICON 2020—International Scientific Tendinopathy

486 Symposium Consensus: A Systematic Review of Outcome Measures Reported in Clinical Trials of

487 Achilles Tendinopathy. *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)* 2021 doi: 10.1007/s40279-021-01588-6

488 17. Robinson JM, Cook JL, Purdam C, et al. The VISA-A questionnaire: a valid and reliable index of the clinical

489 severity of Achilles tendinopathy. *British journal of sports medicine* 2001;35(5):335-41. [published

490 Online First: 2001/10/02]

491 18. Murphy MC. Exercise rehabilitation for mid-portion Achilles tendinopathy: a critique of evidence and

492 assumptions (PhD Academy Award). *British journal of sports medicine* 2022 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-

493 2022-106024 [published Online First: 20221124]

494   19. Comins J, Siersma V, Couppe C, et al. Assessment of content validity and psychometric properties of VISA-

495   A for Achilles tendinopathy. *PloS one* 2021;16(3):e0247152. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0247152

496   [published Online First: 20210311]

497   20. Travers N, Murphy MC, Wand B, et al. Does the Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment – Achilles assess

498   disability in people with Achilles tendinopathy: a Rasch Measurement Theory analysis. *Under Review*

499   2023

500   21. Murphy MC, Newsham-West RJ, Cook J, et al. TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-

501   A): Development and Content Validity assessment of a new Patient-Reported Outcome Measure for

502   Achilles Tendinopathy. . *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy* 2023;Epub Ahead of

503   Print

504   22. Rio EK, Rabusin C, Munteanu S, et al. Where is your pain? Pain location on loading is different to

505   palpation, imaging and recall location: a study of Achilles tendinopathy research participants. . *The*

506   *Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy* 2023;Under Review

507   23. Sleeswijk Visser TSO, van Es EM, Meuffels DE, et al. Standardized pain mapping for diagnosing Achilles

508   tendinopathy. *Journal of science and medicine in sport* 2022;25(3):204-08. doi:

509   10.1016/j.jsams.2021.10.010 [published Online First: 20211021]

510   24. Tavakkoli Oskouei S, Malliaras P, Hill KD, et al. Evaluating daily physical activity and biomechanical

511   measures using wearable technology in people with Achilles tendinopathy: A descriptive exploratory

512   study. *Musculoskeletal science & practice* 2022;58:102534. doi: 10.1016/j.msksp.2022.102534

513   [published Online First: 20220222]

514   25. Golightly YM, Devellis RF, Nelson AE, et al. Psychometric properties of the foot and ankle outcome score

515   in a community-based study of adults with and without osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*

516   2014;66(3):395-403. doi: 10.1002/acr.22162

517   26. MacCallum RC, Widaman KF, Zhang S, et al. Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*

518   1999;4(1):84-99. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84

519   27. Child D. The essentials of factor analysis: A&C Black 2006.

520   28. Kaiser HF. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika* 1974;39(1):31-36. doi: 10.1007/BF02291575

521   29. Bartlett MS. A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various χ^2 Approximations. *Journal of the*

522   *Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)* 1954;16(2):296-98.

523   30. Stevens JP. Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences: Routledge 2012.

524   31. Psychometric theory : Nunnally and Bernstein, 3rd edition; 2007.

525   32. Bagozzi RP, Yi Y. On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*

526   *Science* 1988;16(1):74-94. doi: 10.1007/BF02723327

527   33. Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Patrick DL, et al. The COSMIN study reached international consensus on

528   taxonomy, terminology, and definitions of measurement properties for health-related patient-reported

529   outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2010;63(7):737-45. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.02.006

530   34. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability

531   Research. *J Chiropr Med* 2016;15(2):155-63. doi: 10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012 [published Online First:

532   20160331]

533   35. de Vet HCW, Terwee CB, Mokkink LB, et al. Measurement in Medicine: A Practical Guide. Cambridge:

534   Cambridge University Press 2011.

535   36. Mouelhi Y, Jouve E, Castelli C, et al. How is the minimal clinically important difference established in

536   health-related quality of life instruments? Review of anchors and methods. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*

537   2020;18(1):136. doi: 10.1186/s12955-020-01344-w [published Online First: 20200512]

538   37. Challoumas D, Zouvani A, Creavin K, et al. Determining minimal important differences for patient-reported

539   outcome measures in shoulder, lateral elbow, patellar and Achilles tendinopathies using distribution-

540   based methods. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2023;24(1):158. doi: 10.1186/s12891-023-06261-9

541   [published Online First: 20230302]

542   38. Lagas IF, van der Vlist AC, van Oosterom RF, et al. Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Achilles (VISA-

543   A) Questionnaire-Minimal Clinically Important Difference for Active People With Midportion Achilles

544   Tendinopathy: A Prospective Cohort Study. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy*

545   2021;51(10):510-16. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2021.10040

546   39. McCormack J, Underwood F, Slaven E, et al. The minimum clinically important difference on the VISA-

547   Aand LEFS for patients with insertional Achilles tendinopathy. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 2015;10(5):639-

548   44.

549   40. Warburton DE, Nicol CW, Bredin SS. Health benefits of physical activity: the evidence. *CMAJ : Canadian*

550   *Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne* 2006;174(6):801-9. doi:

551   10.1503/cmaj.051351

552   41. Tu X, Tu Z, Lin W, et al. The Victorian Sports Assessment Institute-Achilles Tendinopathy Questionnaire

553   (VISA-A): Chinese cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric validation. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*

554   2022;20(1):111. doi: 10.1186/s12955-022-02025-6 [published Online First: 20220723]

555   42. Bahari M, Hadadi M, Vosoughi AR, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation, reliability and validity of the Persian

556   version of the Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Achilles questionnaire (VISA-A). *Disability and*

557   *rehabilitation* 2022;44(6):983-91. doi: 10.1080/09638288.2020.1781268 [published Online First:

558   20200714]

559   43. Rio EK, Mc Auliffe S, Kuipers I, et al. ICON PART-T 2019–International Scientific Tendinopathy

560   Symposium Consensus: recommended standards for reporting participant characteristics in

561   tendinopathy research (PART-T). *British journal of sports medicine* 2019;54(11):627-30. doi:

562   10.1136/bjsports-2019-100957

563

564

Figure 1. Factor Loading within Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Legend: Small circles to the left of the diagram (e.g., E11) represent error related to each item. Medium sized circles (e.g., Item 11) represent scores for each TENDINS-A item (known as indicators). Large circles to the right of the diagram (e.g., PAIN) represent factors causing disability (known as unobserved or latent variables). Arrows linking factors and items represent the standardised factor loading for each item. Arrows linking factors represent covariance between factors.