



Moderators of the effect of therapeutic exercise for knee and hip osteoarthritis: a systematic review and individual participant data meta-analysis



Melanie A Holden, Miriam Hattle, Jos Runhaar, Richard D Riley, Emma L Healey, Jonathan Quicke, Danielle A van der Windt, Krysia Dziedzic, Marienke van Middelkoop, Danielle Burke, Nadia Corp, Amardeep Legha, Sita Bierma-Zeinstra, Nadine E Foster, on behalf of the STEER OA Patient Advisory Group and the OA Trial Bank Exercise Collaborative*

Summary

Background Many international clinical guidelines recommend therapeutic exercise as a core treatment for knee and hip osteoarthritis. We aimed to identify individual patient-level moderators of the effect of therapeutic exercise for reducing pain and improving physical function in people with knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both.

Methods We did a systematic review and individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials comparing therapeutic exercise with non-exercise controls in people with knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both. We searched ten databases from March 1, 2012, to Feb 25, 2019, for randomised controlled trials comparing the effects of exercise with non-exercise or other exercise controls on pain and physical function outcomes among people with knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both. IPD were requested from leads of all eligible randomised controlled trials. 12 potential moderators of interest were explored to ascertain whether they were associated with short-term (12 weeks), medium-term (6 months), and long-term (12 months) effects of exercise on self-reported pain and physical function, in comparison with non-exercise controls. Overall intervention effects were also summarised. This study is prospectively registered on PROSPERO (CRD42017054049).

Findings Of 91 eligible randomised controlled trials that compared exercise with non-exercise controls, IPD from 31 randomised controlled trials (n=4241 participants) were included in the meta-analysis. Randomised controlled trials included participants with knee osteoarthritis (18 [58%] of 31 trials), hip osteoarthritis (six [19%]), or both (seven [23%]) and tested heterogeneous exercise interventions versus heterogeneous non-exercise controls, with variable risk of bias. Summary meta-analysis results showed that, on average, compared with non-exercise controls, therapeutic exercise reduced pain on a standardised 0–100 scale (with 100 corresponding to worst pain), with a difference of –6.36 points (95% CI –8.45 to –4.27, borrowing of strength [BoS] 10.3%, between-study variance [τ^2] 21.6) in the short term, –3.77 points (–5.97 to –1.57, BoS 30.0%, τ^2 14.4) in the medium term, and –3.43 points (–5.18 to –1.69, BoS 31.7%, τ^2 4.5) in the long term. Therapeutic exercise also improved physical function on a standardised 0–100 scale (with 100 corresponding to worst physical function), with a difference of –4.46 points in the short term (95% CI –5.95 to –2.98, BoS 10.5%, τ^2 10.1), –2.71 points in the medium term (–4.63 to –0.78, BoS 33.6%, τ^2 11.9), and –3.39 points in the long term (–4.97 to –1.81, BoS 34.1%, τ^2 6.4). Baseline pain and physical function moderated the effect of exercise on pain and physical function outcomes. Those with higher self-reported pain and physical function scores at baseline (ie, poorer physical function) generally benefited more than those with lower self-reported pain and physical function scores at baseline, with the evidence most certain in the short term (12 weeks).

Interpretation There was evidence of a small, positive overall effect of therapeutic exercise on pain and physical function compared with non-exercise controls. However, this effect is of questionable clinical importance, particularly in the medium and long term. As individuals with higher pain severity and poorer physical function at baseline benefited more than those with lower pain severity and better physical function at baseline, targeting individuals with higher levels of osteoarthritis-related pain and disability for therapeutic exercise might be of merit.

Funding Chartered Society of Physiotherapy Charitable Trust and the National Institute for Health and Care Research.

Copyright © 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an Open Access article under the CC BY 4.0 license.

Introduction

Osteoarthritis, particularly of the knee and hip, is a leading cause of disability worldwide, with an estimated global age-standardised point prevalence of 3754.2 (95% uncertainty interval [UI] 3389.4–4187.6) per

100 000 people in 2017.¹ This is an increase of 9.3% (95% UI 8.0–10.7) from 1990.¹ The burden of osteoarthritis is rising with an ageing, increasingly obese population.² International clinical guidelines, such as those from the American College of

Lancet Rheumatol 2023;
5: e386–400

Published Online
June 12, 2023

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913\(23\)00122-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913(23)00122-4)

This online publication has been corrected. The corrected version first appeared at thelancet.com/rheumatology on June 26, 2023

See [Comment](#) page e365

*Members of the OA Trial Bank Exercise Collaborative and the STEER OA Patient Advisory Group are listed in the appendix (pp 77–79)

School of Medicine, Primary Care Centre Versus Arthritis, Keele University, Keele, UK (Prof M A Holden PhD, M Hattle PhD, J Runhaar PhD, Prof R D Riley PhD, E L Healey PhD, J Quicke PhD, Prof D A van der Windt PhD, Prof K Dziedzic PhD, D Burke PhD, N Corp PhD, A Legha MSc, Prof N E Foster DPhil); Erasmus MC University, Medical Center, Rotterdam, Netherlands (J Runhaar, M van Middelkoop PhD, Prof S Bierma-Zeinstra PhD); University of Birmingham, Institute of Applied Health Research, Birmingham, UK (Prof R D Riley); Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, London, UK (J Quicke); Surgical Treatment and Rehabilitation Service, The University of Queensland and Metro North Health, Herston, Brisbane, QLD, Australia (Prof N E Foster)

Correspondence to: Professor Melanie Ann Holden, School of Medicine, Primary Care Centre Versus Arthritis, Keele University, Keele ST5 5BG, UK m.holden@keele.ac.uk
See [Online](#) for appendix

Research in context

Evidence before this study

Although international clinical guidelines consistently recommend therapeutic exercise for individuals with knee and hip osteoarthritis, improvements in pain and physical function are, on average, small to moderate compared with non-exercise controls. This could be due to individual variability in response to exercise. Previous exploratory secondary analyses of randomised controlled trials of knee osteoarthritis provide tentative evidence that not all people with osteoarthritis respond similarly to therapeutic exercise. However, these post-hoc analyses have low statistical power to detect treatment-effect moderators. Individual participant data (IPD) meta-analyses can provide a more robust investigation of individual response to therapeutic exercise. This approach enables inclusion of more participants and has greater power to identify treatment-effect moderators and avoid the risk of aggregation (ecological) bias. We did a systematic review and IPD meta-analysis to explore whether potential moderators were associated with short-term (12 weeks), medium-term (6 months), and long-term (12 months) effects of exercise on pain and physical function among people with knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both, in comparison with non-exercise controls. Overall intervention effects were also summarised. We searched Medline, EMBASE, Allied and Complementary Medicine Database, Health Management Information Consortium, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature, Web of Science, Cochrane Database of

Systematic Reviews, the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness, the Cochrane Controlled Trials Register, and the NHS Economic Evaluation Database from March 1, 2012, to Feb 25, 2019, and, in collaboration with the OA Trial Bank, invited leads of eligible randomised controlled trials to share IPD for inclusion in our IPD meta-analysis.

Added value of this study

This study is, to the best of our knowledge, the first IPD meta-analysis of therapeutic exercise for people with knee or hip osteoarthritis, or both, and the largest international IPD meta-analysis of an intervention for osteoarthritis. It highlights a small, positive overall effect of therapeutic exercise on pain and physical function in individuals with knee or hip osteoarthritis, compared with non-exercise controls. However, this benefit is of questionable clinical importance, particularly in the medium and long term. Most importantly, our findings suggest that individuals with higher pain severity and poorer physical function at baseline might benefit more from therapeutic exercise than those with lower pain severity and better physical function at baseline.

Implications of all the available evidence

Given the small overall positive effect of therapeutic exercise on pain and physical function compared with non-exercise controls (which is of questionable clinical importance), targeting individuals with higher levels of osteoarthritis-related pain and disability for therapeutic exercise might be of merit.

Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation,³ Osteoarthritis Research Society International,⁴ and the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence,⁵ recommend therapeutic exercise as a core treatment for knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both. Therapeutic exercise (subsequently referred to as exercise) involves participation in physical activity that is planned, structured, repetitive, and purposeful for the improvement or maintenance of a specific health condition such as osteoarthritis. It encompasses general aerobic exercise, strengthening, flexibility, balance, or body-region specific exercises.⁶ Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials have consistently shown that such exercise is beneficial for pain and physical function.⁷⁻¹⁰ However, the observed effect sizes are small to moderate compared to non-exercise controls, can decline over time, and only up to approximately 50% of participants achieve a clinically important treatment response.¹¹⁻¹⁴ This could be due to individual variability in response to exercise. Better targeting of individuals with knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both, for exercise could potentially lead to improved overall mean treatment effects and reduced variability in outcomes, as well as more efficient use of health-care services.

Some previous research has examined whether outcomes from exercise for individuals with osteoarthritis

vary for subgroups defined by individual-level characteristics (treatment-effect moderators).¹⁵ Exploratory secondary analyses of randomised controlled trials provide tentative evidence that not all people with osteoarthritis respond similarly to exercise.¹⁵ However, these post-hoc analyses have low statistical power to detect significant subgroup effects.¹⁶ A more robust method to investigate individual response to exercise is to conduct a meta-analysis of individual participant data (IPD).^{17,18} This approach enables the inclusion of more participants and has greater power to identify treatment-effect moderators, and avoids the risk of aggregation bias and study-level confounding.^{17,18}

The aim of the Subgrouping and TargetEd Exercise pRogrammes for knee and hip OsteoArthritis study (STEER OA) was to identify moderators of the effect of exercise in people with knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both, thus facilitating better targeting of future exercise interventions. Specific analytical objectives were to ascertain the short-term (12 weeks), medium-term (6 months), and long-term (12 months) overall effects of exercise on pain and function in people with knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, or both, compared with non-exercise controls. To address the main aim, we then identified individual-level characteristics (ie, treatment-effect moderators) that are

associated with the short-term, medium-term, and long-term effects of exercise on pain and physical function.

Methods

Search strategy and selection criteria

We updated a previous systematic review⁸ and conducted an IPD meta-analysis with embedded Patient and Public Involvement and Engagement (PPIE), reported with the PRISMA IPD systematic reviews guidelines.¹⁹ The full protocol has previously been published.²⁰ Ethical approval was not required as no new data were collected.^{21,22} This study is prospectively registered on PROSPERO (CRD42017054049). The other aims and analytical objectives of STEER OA, as outlined in the protocol, will be addressed separately and reported elsewhere.

We updated our previous search strategy to identify randomised controlled trials comparing the effects of exercise with non-exercise or other exercise controls on pain and physical function outcomes among people with knee or hip osteoarthritis, or both.⁸ The search was re-run from the date of the previous search (March 1, 2012) up to Feb 25, 2019, in the following electronic databases: Medline, EMBASE, Allied and Complementary Medicine Database (AMED), Health Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHLPlus), Web of Science, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE), the Cochrane Controlled Trials Register (CCTR), and the NHS Economic Evaluation Database (NHS EED); the search strategy is summarised in the appendix (pp 1–2). Bibliographies of relevant review articles and selected articles were also examined. No language restrictions were applied. Two investigators (either MAH, JR, ELH, JQ, or AL) independently screened titles and abstracts and subsequent full texts to identify which randomised controlled trials met the eligibility criteria (appendix pp 3–4). In line with the specific analytical objectives detailed above, randomised controlled trials that compared exercise with non-exercise controls were the focus of this study.

In collaboration with the OA Trial Bank, we requested IPD from leads of all eligible randomised controlled trials. The terms of collaboration were specified in a data sharing agreement. De-identified, transferred data were assessed for integrity. Original results from randomised controlled trials were re-analysed (by MH) to ensure that they could be reproduced. Discrepancies were discussed and clarified with trial leads; if not resolved, the data were not included in the meta-analysis. After harmonisation of potential treatment-effect moderators (appendix pp 5–6) and outcome measures, individual trial datasets were combined within Stata 16 to form a new master dataset with a variable added to indicate the original randomised controlled trial.

Data analysis

From the original publications and IPD, the following study-level data were extracted into tables: sample size, site of osteoarthritis (knee, hip, or mixed), exercise intervention or interventions, comparator, and outcome assessment.²⁰

Before obtaining IPD and analysing the data, a consensus process was undertaken with a large international group of STEER OA collaborators to identify the most important potential treatment-effect moderators for exercise.²³ The following moderators that could be considered in the available IPD were prioritised: pain severity, physical function, age, BMI, physical activity, arthritis self-efficacy, mental wellbeing, comorbidity, muscle strength (quadriceps), educational attainment (as a proxy measure of socioeconomic status), pain duration, and radiographic joint structure (appendix pp 5–6). Outcomes of interest were self-reported pain and physical function in the short term (nearest timepoint to 12 weeks), medium term (nearest timepoint to 6 months), and long term (nearest timepoint to 12 months). If more than one measure of pain or physical function was used within randomised controlled trials, we chose the highest in the hierarchy of outcome measures, as recommended by the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Review Group.^{20,24}

We used the Cochrane Collaboration's tool (version 1.0) for assessing the risk of bias, based on their published reports.²⁵ Two investigators (either MAH, JR, ELH, JQ, or AL) independently graded the risk of bias (unclear, high, or low) for sequence generation, allocation concealment, masking of outcome assessors, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting and other reasons (eg, uncertainty about baseline data being collected before randomisation). If necessary, the IPD obtained for each randomised controlled trial were used to inform the risk of bias assessment.

All meta-analyses used a two-stage approach whereby each randomised controlled trial was analysed separately in the first stage (which accounts for clustering of participants within randomised controlled trials) to produce study-specific estimates, which were then synthesised in the second stage to produce summary meta-analysis results.^{17,18} All analyses were done in Stata 16 on an intention-to-treat principle, with all estimates reported with 95% CIs. Under a missing-at-random assumption, individuals and randomised controlled trials were included even if they did not record outcomes at all timepoints of interest, as partially missing outcome values were handled naturally in the first stage (via a longitudinal model) and second stage (via a multivariate meta-analysis model).^{26,27}

This study had two objectives. First, for the meta-analysis to estimate an overall treatment effect, all available comparisons were grouped into any exercise intervention versus non-exercise controls. Outcomes were continuous and, given the use of different scales

across randomised controlled trials, were standardised to a 0–100 scale (pain: 0=no pain, 100=worst pain; physical function: 0=best physical function, 100=worst physical function). Longitudinal models were fitted in the first stage to account for participant-level correlation between outcome values at multiple timepoints,²⁶ with time included as a discrete factor (12 weeks, 6 months, or 12 months). For each randomised controlled trial, the model included baseline pain or function, treatment, time, and treatment-by-time interaction terms. The second stage required a multivariate meta-analysis framework, which jointly synthesises the treatment-effect estimates from multiple timepoints across randomised controlled trials, accounting for within-trial and across-trial correlations between the multiple timepoints.²⁷ The correlation matrix was unstructured, both within and between studies, and thus allows distinct variances for each timepoint and distinct correlations between each pair of timepoints. Given the anticipated heterogeneity in treatment effects across randomised controlled trials (eg, due to variability in participant characteristics and exercise interventions), we assumed a multivariate random-effects meta-analysis model to estimate the summary results of interest using restricted maximum likelihood estimation, and with 95% CIs for the summary effect derived with the Hartung-Knapp approach for multivariate meta-analyses.²⁸ Heterogeneity in treatment effects across randomised controlled trials was summarised by the estimated between-trial variance (τ^2). The gain in information from analysing correlated outcomes using a multivariate meta-analysis over a univariate meta-analysis was quantified with the borrowing of strength (BoS) statistic.²⁹

Second, IPD were further analysed to examine treatment-effect modification at the individual level; that is, whether individual participant characteristics (potential moderators) were associated with differences in the effect of exercise compared with non-exercise controls. Under a missing-at-random assumption, missing baseline characteristics within randomised controlled trials were imputed (before stage 1) through the following methods: continuous measures were imputed by use of mean imputation and binary measures with the missing indicator method, since such single imputation approaches are appropriate for randomised controlled trials.³⁰ To test effect modification, longitudinal models were fitted as described above for the first objective and also included interaction terms between the intervention and potential moderators of interest. The pooled interaction effects for each timepoint were obtained by a multivariate random-effects meta-analysis of the interaction effect estimates from each randomised controlled trial. We explored non-linear relationships for the potential moderators since a linear association might not always be appropriate. To fit a non-linear relationship, we modelled the potential treatment-effect moderator

using restricted cubic splines with 3 knots.^{17,31} Longitudinal models were fitted with the baseline pain or function, treatment, time, treatment-by-time interaction terms, and the interaction terms between the intervention and potential moderators. The potential moderator of interest was included in the longitudinal model with the spline functions that had been fitted. The pooled interaction effects for each timepoint for each spline function were obtained by a multivariate random-effects meta-analysis of the parameter estimates defining the (non-linear) interaction estimate from each randomised controlled trial. These were plotted with the respective 95% CIs, such that the function of the interaction could be visually explored.

In sensitivity analyses, effect estimates were explored with data only from randomised controlled trials that were deemed to be at a low risk of bias across all domains assessed. Contour-enhanced funnel plots and tests for asymmetry were used to investigate small study effects and the potential for publication bias.

Patient and public involvement

A STEER OA Patient Advisory Group consisting of five members of the public with experience of exercise and osteoarthritis was convened ahead of acquiring study funding and this advisory group was actively involved in all project stages, including informing the research objectives and outcomes of interest, identifying and prioritising important potential moderators for analyses, and interpretation of results, as well as clinical and research implications (described in more detail elsewhere³²).

Role of the funding source

The funders had no role in study design; in the collection, analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the Article for publication.

Results

We downloaded 5808 unique references from the updated electronic search into Covidence, which were combined with the 60 randomised controlled trials from the original systematic review, and nine randomised controlled trials identified from other sources (including manually checking reference lists and collaborator knowledge). After screening the title and abstract, 433 full-text articles were assessed. Following full-text screening, 133 randomised controlled trials met the inclusion criteria. Of the 91 randomised controlled trials that compared exercise with non-exercise controls (9519 participants), we were unable to gain permission to include IPD from 52 studies. This was due to not being able to establish contact (n=29), communications not resulting in IPD sharing despite extensive effort (n=14), or IPD being unavailable (n=9). We obtained formal written permission to analyse 39 IPD datasets. However,




Figure 1: Study selection

*Our broad search strategy aimed to identify randomised controlled trials comparing the effect of exercise with non-exercise or other exercise controls on pain and physical function outcomes among people with knee or hip osteoarthritis, or both. Only randomised controlled trials that compared exercise with non-exercise controls were the focus of this study. †Data were not delivered for two randomised controlled trials (no reason was provided), and data were delivered but not useable from six randomised controlled trials.

data from two randomised controlled trials were not subsequently shared, despite reminders. Of the 37 datasets shared, six were unusable (eg, data not coded or labelled, imputed dataset). Therefore, 31 randomised controlled trials that compared exercise with non-exercise controls, comprising 4241 participants, were included in the meta-analysis (figure 1).^{33–63}

The 31 randomised controlled trials for which IPD were included were predominantly published in the past 15 years (24 [77%]), and were done in different continents, including Europe (18 [58%]), North and South America (seven [23%]), and Australasia (six [19%]; table).^{33–63} Randomised controlled trials were of variable size (32–786 participants) and included participants with knee (18 [58%]), hip (six [19%]), or mixed knee and hip (seven [23%]) osteoarthritis. Within randomised controlled

trials, the proportion of female participants ranged from 25% to 100%, the mean age ranged from 57 years to 79 years, and the mean BMI ranged from 25 kg/m² to 36 kg/m² (appendix pp 10–14). Overall, participants had a mean baseline pain score (on a standardised 0–100 scale) of 39.7 (SD 22.3, range 0–100), and a median baseline physical function (on a standardised 0–100 scale) of 36.8 (IQR 20.3–52.9, range 0–100).

Within the 31 randomised controlled trials, 37 different exercise interventions were tested (appendix pp 15–19). Most were land based (31 [84%]), included different types of exercise (15 [41%] mixed, 14 [38%] strengthening, six [16%] general aerobic [eg, walking], and two [5%] mind-body [eg, yoga]), and were predominantly of moderate intensity (31 [84%]) and low impact (34 [92%]). The duration of exercise interventions varied (27 [73%] were ≤12 weeks, ten [27%] were >12 weeks; range 4–104 weeks). The number of exercise sessions also varied (range 6–728), as did exercise delivery (17 [46%] individual sessions, 15 [41%] group sessions, two [5%] individual and group sessions, one [3%] based on preference, and two [5%] not stated). 24 (65%) exercise interventions were supervised, seven (19%) included supervised and unsupervised home exercise, and six (16%) comprised unsupervised home exercise only. Most exercise interventions were delivered face to face in person (33 [89%]), most commonly by a health-care professional (19 [51%]) or exercise instructor (ten [27%]).

Exercise interventions were compared with heterogeneous non-exercise controls, including being on a waiting list or no intervention (n=14), education or advice alone (n=6; either delivered at minimal intensity such as leaflet only [n=3] or as a more intense education or self-management programme [n=3]), usual medical care (n=5), maintenance of usual medication or activities (n=4), or another form of attention control (n=2; table).

Although some potential treatment-effect moderators were frequently measured in randomised controlled trials (eg, age, pain severity, physical function, and BMI), others were less common (eg, physical activity, arthritis self-efficacy, education, and radiographic joint structure; appendix pp 5–6). The majority of randomised controlled trials (27 [87%]) had a short-term follow-up. 14 (45%) had a medium-term follow-up and 13 (42%) had a long-term follow-up. The most common measures of pain were the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) pain subscale⁶⁴ (17 [55%]) and overall pain measured by a visual analogue scale or numerical rating scale (nine [29%]). The majority of randomised controlled trials (24 [77%]) measured physical function via the WOMAC physical function subscale⁶⁴ (table).

The risk of bias from included randomised controlled trials varied (appendix p 20). Selective reporting was deemed as having an unclear or high risk of bias in one (3%) randomised controlled trial, as was random

| | Country | Osteoarthritis site* | Osteoarthritis diagnosis† | Total participants‡ | Intervention or interventions | Pain outcome‡§ | Function outcome¶ | Follow-up data available‡ | Funding source |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Allen et al (2018) ³³ | USA | Knee | X-ray, clinical, or self-report | 350 (210 relevant) | 1) internet-based exercise training; 2) control (waiting list) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term, long term | Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute Award |
| Bearne et al (2011) ³⁴ | UK | Hip | Clinical | 48 | 1) rehabilitation group; 2) control (usual GP care) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term, medium term | Physiotherapy Research Foundation |
| Bennell et al (2010) ³⁵ | Australia | Knee | Combined | 89 | 1) hip strengthening group; 2) control (no intervention) | Pain overall (NRS) | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | National Health and Medical Research Council |
| Bossen et al (2013) ³⁶ | Netherlands | Mixed | Self reported | 199 | 1) automated web-based physical activity intervention; 2) control (waiting list) | Pain overall (VAS) | Composite disability score other than WOMAC (KOOS/HOOS function) | Short term, long term | Not stated |
| Brosseau et al (2012) ³⁷ | Canada | Knee | Combined | 222 | 1) walking and behavioural intervention; 2) walking intervention; 3) control (education leaflet) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short, medium, and long term | Canadian Institutes of Health Research; University Research Chair; the Ministry of Human Resources |
| Cochrane et al (2005) ³⁸ | UK | Mixed | Clinical | 312 | 1) water-based exercise; 2) control (education leaflet) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Medium term, long term | National Institute of Health Research, Health Technology Assessment |
| de Rooij et al (2017) ³⁹ | Netherlands | Knee | Clinical | 126 | 1) individualised, co-morbidity adapted exercise programme; 2) control (waiting list) | Pain overall (NRS) | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term, medium term | Merck Sharp & Dohme; Royal Dutch Society for Physical Therapy |
| Fernandes et al (2010) ⁴⁰ | Norway | Hip | Combined | 109 | 1) patient education plus supervised exercise; 2) control (patient education alone: "hip school", 1× individual physical therapy visit, 3× group based sessions, 20 h of education in total) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term, long term | Norwegian Foundation for Health and Rehabilitation; Norwegian Rheumatism Association; South Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority |
| Fransen et al (2007) ⁴¹ | Australia | Mixed | Clinical | 152 | 1) hydrotherapy classes; 2) Tai Chi classes; 3) control (waiting list) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | National Arthritis and Musculoskeletal Conditions Improvements grant |
| French et al (2013) ⁴² | Ireland | Hip | Combined | 143 (88 relevant) | 1) exercise therapy; 2) control (waiting list) | Pain on activities other than walking (NRS) | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | Health Research Board, Ireland |
| Hale et al (2012) ⁴³ | New Zealand | Mixed | Self-reported osteoarthritis or pain | 39 | 1) water-based programme; 2) control (time-matched computer training program) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short, medium, and long term | Not Stated (no commercial party had a direct financial interest in the results) |
| Hay et al (2006) ⁴⁴ | UK | Knee | Self-reported osteoarthritis or pain | 325 (217 relevant) | 1) community physical therapy; 2) control (advice leaflet reinforced by telephone call) | Pain overall (NRS) | WOMAC disability subscale | Short, medium, and long term | Arthritis Research Campaign; North Staffordshire Primary Care Research Consortium; Department of Health National Co-ordinating Centre for Research Capacity Development |
| Henriksen et al (2014) ⁴⁵ | Denmark | Knee | Combined | 48 | 1) supervised exercise therapy; 2) control (no intervention) | Other algofunctional scale (KOOS pain) | Composite disability score other than WOMAC (KOOS function) | Short term | Danish Council for Independent Research; Danish Physiotherapists association; Lundbeck Foundation; Oak Foundation |

(Table continues on next page)

| | Country | Osteoarthritis site* | Osteoarthritis diagnosis† | Total participants‡ | Intervention or interventions | Pain outcome‡§ | Function outcome¶ | Follow-up data available‡ | Funding source |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (Continued from previous page) | | | | | | | | | |
| Hinman et al (2007) ⁴⁶ | Australia | Mixed | Combined | 71 | 1) aquatic physical therapy; 2) control (continue with usual daily activities and medication) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | Australian Government Department of Health and Aging |
| Hopman-Rock and Westhoff (2000) ⁴⁷ | Netherlands | Mixed | Self-reported osteoarthritis or pain | 105 | 1) self-management and exercise programme; 2) control group (no intervention) | Other algofunctional scale (IRGL pain subscale) | Other algofunctional scale (IRGL mobility subscale) | Short term, medium term | The Netherlands Health Research and Development Council |
| Hurley et al (2007) ⁴⁸ | UK | Knee | Self-reported osteoarthritis or pain | 418 | 1) individual rehabilitation programme; 2) group rehabilitation programme; 3) usual primary care | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability Subscale | Short, medium, and long term | Arthritis Research Campaign |
| Krauß et al (2014) ⁴⁹ | Germany | Hip | Clinical | 218 | 1) exercise therapy; 2) placebo ultrasound treatment; 3) control (no intervention) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | Supported with training materials by the companies Theraband and Ludwig Artzt; no other financial support stated |
| Levinger et al (2018) ⁵⁰ | Australia | Knee | Clinical | 28 | 1) high speed resistance training; 2) high speed resistance training plus balance exercises; 3) control (usual activities) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | Arthritis Australia |
| Lim et al (2008) ⁵¹ | Australia | Knee | Combined | 107 | 1) quadriceps strengthening group 2) control (no intervention) | Pain on walking (VAS) | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | in part by United Pacific Industries through a grant from the Physiotherapy Research Foundation, Australia |
| Messier et al (2004) ⁵² | USA | Knee | Combined | 316 (158 relevant) | 1) exercise only; 2) control (education: group meetings 1xmonth for 3 months, monthly phone contact during months 4–6, contact every other month during months 7–18) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Medium term, long term | NIH grants |
| Multanen et al (2014) ⁵³ | Finland | Knee | Combined | 80 | 1) supervised progressive exercise; 2) control (no intervention) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Long term | Academy of Finland; Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture; Yrjö Jahansson Foundation |
| Munukka et al (2016) ⁵⁴ | Finland | Knee | Combined | 87 | 1) aquatic resistance exercise; 2) control (usual level of physical activity) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term, long term | Academy of Finland; Social Insurance Institution of Finland; Finnish Cultural Foundation; Yrjö Jahansson Foundation |
| Simão et al (2012) ⁵⁵ | Brazil | Knee | Combined | 32 | 1) Squat exercises on a vibratory platform; 2) squat exercises without vibration; 3) control (usual activities/physical activity) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | Not stated |
| Tak et al (2005) ⁵⁶ | Netherlands | Hip | Clinical | 109 | 1) strength training; 2) control (no intervention) | Pain overall (VAS) | Other algofunctional scale (GARS) | Short term | Not stated |

(Table continues on next page)

| | Country | Osteoarthritis site* | Osteoarthritis diagnosis† | Total participants‡ | Intervention or interventions | Pain outcome§ | Function outcome¶ | Follow-up data available | Funding source |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (Continued from previous page) | | | | | | | | | |
| Takacs et al (2017) ⁵⁷ | Canada | Knee | X-ray | 40 | 1) Dynamic balance and strength training; 2) control (no intervention) | Pain overall (NRS) | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | Arthritis Health Professions Association |
| Talbot et al (2003) ⁵⁸ | USA | Knee | Combined | 34 | 1) pedometer-driven walking program with arthritis self-management; 2) control (12-hour self-management program) | Other algofunctional scale (Pain rating scale from the McGill Pain Questionnaire) | None | Short term, medium term | Fund for Geriatric Medicine and Nursing; Johns Hopkins University; Intramural Research Program of the National Institute on Aging |
| Teirlinck et al (2016) ⁵⁹ | Netherlands | Hip | Clinical | 203 | 1) exercise therapy plus GP care; 2) control (GP care) | Pain overall (NRS) | Composite disability score other than WOMAC (HOOS function) | Short, medium, and long term | Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development; Dutch Arthritis Foundation for their centre of excellence "Osteoarthritis in primary care" |
| Thomas et al (2002) ⁶⁰ | UK | Knee | Self-reported osteoarthritis or pain | 786 (391 relevant) | 1) exercise therapy; 2) control (no intervention) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Medium term, long term | Department of Health |
| Tsai et al (2013) ⁶¹ | USA | Knee | Clinical | 55 | 1) sun style Tai Chi classes; 2) control (health education, culture-related activities and other social activities. The length and frequency of activities closely matched sun style Tai Chi classes) | WOMAC pain subscale | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term, medium term | National Institute of Nursing Research; National Center for Research Resources |
| van Baar et al (2001) ⁶² | Netherlands | Mixed | Clinical | 200 | 1) GP treatment plus physical therapist-led exercise; 2) GP treatment | Pain overall (VAS) | Other algofunctional scale (IRGL) | Short term, medium term | Dutch Fund of Investigative Medicine of the Dutch Health Insurance Council |
| Wallis et al (2017) ⁶³ | Australia | Knee | X-ray | 46 | 1) walking programme; 2) usual care (pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment delivered at health service's hip and knee clinic. Advised not to include a prescription of physical activity in the 12-week study) | Pain overall (VAS) | WOMAC disability subscale | Short term | La Trobe University's research focus area on Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation |

GARS=Groningen Activity Restriction Scale. GP=General Practitioner. HOOS=Hip Disability and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score. IRGL=Impact of Rheumatic diseases on General Health and Lifestyle scale. KOOS=Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score. NRS=Numerical Rating Scale. VAS=Visual Analogue Scale. WOMAC=Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index. *Osteoarthritis site categorised as knee, hip, or mixed (knee and hip). †Osteoarthritis diagnosis categorised as radiographic (X-ray), clinical, combined radiographic and clinical, and self-reported osteoarthritis or pain. ‡Data shown in the table are derived from individual participant data. Some slight discrepancies might therefore exist between data in the table and the published report. §Pain outcome chosen in accordance with the hierarchy recommended by the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Review Group,²⁴ as follows: pain overall; pain on walking; Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) pain subscale; pain on activities other than walking; WOMAC global scale; Lequesne osteoarthritis index global score; other algofunctional scale; patient's global assessment; physician's global assessment; other outcome; and no continuous outcome reported. ¶Physical function outcome chosen in accordance with the hierarchy recommended by the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Review Group,²⁴ as follows: global disability score, walking disability, WOMAC disability subscale, composite disability scores other than WOMAC, disability other than walking, WOMAC global scale, Lequesne osteoarthritis index global score, and other algofunctional scale. ||Follow-up time period categorised as follows: short-term corresponds to nearest timepoint to 12 weeks, medium-term corresponds to nearest timepoint to 6 months, long-term corresponds to nearest timepoint to 12 months.

Table: Summary of randomised controlled trials that shared individual participant data

allocation in two (6%) randomised controlled trials. In five (16%) randomised controlled trials, blinding of outcome assessors was judged as having an unclear or high risk of bias, as was allocation concealment in six (19%) randomised controlled trials, and incomplete outcome

data in eight (26%). Six (19%) randomised controlled trials were judged as having an unclear or high risk of bias from other sources resulting from a range of issues (eg, uncertainty about baseline data being collected before randomisation). In total, 14 (45%) randomised controlled




Figure 2: Forest plots showing overall effects of therapeutic exercise versus non-exercise controls on pain (A) and physical function (B) outcomes at various timepoints Short term=nearest timepoint to 12 weeks. Medium term=nearest timepoint to 6 months. Long term=nearest timepoint to 12 months. Weights are based on user-defined quantiles.

trials were deemed as having a low risk of bias across all domains assessed and were thus included in the sensitivity analysis.

Tables describing randomised controlled trials that did not share IPD are provided in the appendix (pp 21–35). There were some differences between randomised controlled trials that did and did not share IPD (appendix p 58). Compared to randomised controlled trials that did share IPD (or data were unusable), a higher proportion of those that did not share IPD were older (published before 2006), completed in North or South America and Asia, included short-term follow-up only, included fewer participants, and included participants with knee osteoarthritis only. Exercise interventions and non-exercise controls were heterogeneous between randomised controlled trials that did and did not share IPD. However, compared to randomised controlled trials that did share IPD, a higher proportion of those that did not share IPD tested mind-body exercise interventions, and exercise interventions that combined group and individual exercise sessions. Randomised controlled trials that did not share IPD were also more likely to have a high risk of bias in one or more domains compared with those that shared IPD (low risk of bias in all domains: 14 [23%] non-IPD and 14 [45%] IPD).

Summary meta-analysis results from the included 31 randomised controlled trials showed that, on average, compared with non-exercise controls, exercise reduced pain on a standardised 0–100 scale, with a difference of -6.36 points (95% CI -8.45 to -4.27 , borrowing of strength [BoS] 10.3%, between-study variance τ^2 21.6) in the short term, -3.77 points (-5.97 to -1.57 , BoS 30.0%, τ^2 14.4) in the medium term, and -3.43 points (-5.18 to -1.69 , BoS 31.7%, τ^2 4.5) in the long term (figure 2A). Pooled results from 30 randomised controlled trials showed that, on average, exercise also improved physical function on a standardised 0–100 scale, with a difference of -4.46 points in the short term (95% CI -5.95 to -2.98 , BoS 10.5%, τ^2 10.1), -2.71 points in the medium term (-4.63 to -0.78 , BoS 33.6%, τ^2 11.9), and -3.39 points in the long term (-4.97 to -1.81 , BoS 34.1%, τ^2 6.4; figure 2B).

Baseline pain severity moderated the effect of exercise on pain in comparison with non-exercise controls. There was a non-linear association in the short term, with the benefit of exercise gradually increasing as baseline pain increased, but plateauing around a baseline pain score of 40 out of 100 and higher (figure 3A). A similar pattern was observed in the long term. There was some evidence to suggest that baseline pain severity was a moderator for physical function at short-term and long-term follow-ups (figure 3B).

As shown in figure 4, baseline physical function was found to moderate the effect of exercise on pain and physical function outcomes. Those with a higher baseline physical function score (ie, poorer physical function) benefited more from exercise than those with a lower

baseline physical function score, with the evidence most certain for this moderator in the short term.

There was no evidence to suggest that age, BMI, physical activity, arthritis self-efficacy, mental wellbeing,




Figure 3: Moderating effect of baseline pain severity on therapeutic exercise versus non-exercise controls on pain (A) and physical function (B) outcomes at various timepoints

Short term=nearest timepoint to 12 weeks. Medium term=nearest timepoint to 6 months. Long term=nearest timepoint to 12 months. Solid lines represent the predicted treatment covariate interaction. The shaded area represents 95% CIs.




Figure 4: Moderating effect of baseline physical function on therapeutic exercise versus non-exercise controls on pain and physical function outcomes at various timepoints

Short term=nearest timepoint to 12 weeks. Medium term=nearest timepoint to 6 months. Long term=nearest timepoint to 12 months. Solid lines represent the predicted treatment covariate interaction. The shaded area represents 95% CIs.

comorbidity, muscle strength (quadriceps), education, pain duration, or radiographic joint structure moderated the effect of exercise on pain and physical function in the short, medium, or long term (appendix pp 62–67).

Sensitivity analyses revealed broadly similar results to the summary meta-analyses when restricted to the 14 randomised controlled trials deemed to be at low risk of bias across all domains assessed, for pain (–6.70 points [95% CI –9.47 to –3.93] in the short term, –5.55 points [–10.38 to –0.72] in the medium term, and –3.47 points [–6.28 to –0.67] in the long term) and physical function (–5.42 points [95% CI –7.54 to –3.30] in the short term, –5.56 points [–9.81 to –1.32] in the medium term, and –5.18 points [–8.64 to –1.72] in the long term). There was no evidence of small study effects or publication bias (appendix p 68).

Discussion

There are two important findings from this large, international, IPD meta-analysis of 4241 participants from 31 randomised controlled trials. First, we found a differential response to exercise among people with knee, hip, or mixed knee and hip osteoarthritis; individuals who report higher pain severity and poorer self-reported physical function at baseline have greater pain relief and improved physical function after exercise than do those with lower pain severity and better physical function at baseline. Second, although the summary results showed evidence of the overall benefits of exercise for pain and physical function in the short, medium, and long term in comparison with non-exercise controls, the magnitude of the benefit was small and of questionable clinical importance.

We identified two moderators of the effect of exercise for people with knee, hip, or mixed osteoarthritis: baseline pain severity and physical function. Allowing for non-linear associations, we found that individuals with more severe pain and poorer physical function at baseline generally benefited more from exercise, with the evidence most certain in the short term. This outcome could be expected, given that the most symptomatic individuals might have the greatest benefits to gain, although additional benefits often plateaued around a baseline pain score of about 40 out of 100. Whether these additional benefits are maintained over time is less clear, as there was more uncertainty at later timepoints (the 95% CIs were wider). Of the 12 individual-level characteristics explored, no other treatment-effect modifiers were identified. This could be because the magnitude of benefit from exercise is the same for people regardless of other characteristics. If so, this finding could provide important reassurance to anyone prescribing exercise and to patients when individual-level characteristics act as barriers to optimal exercise prescription and adherence (eg, obesity or the presence of comorbidities).^{65–67} However, some of the characteristics explored might not have been detected as treatment-effect moderators due to lack of power

(leading to false negative findings). Although we had a large dataset overall, some potential moderators were measured inconsistently, so the amount of data available for each analysis was variable. The large heterogeneity of included exercise interventions might also have masked important moderators that are only relevant for certain exercise characteristics (eg, exercise type, intensity, duration, frequency, and mode of delivery). Other moderators of the effect of exercise might exist but were not explored in this study.

We reported small overall effects of exercise on pain and physical function compared with non-exercise controls, particularly in the medium and long term. Although our 0–100 standardised scales might not be directly comparable with other outcome measures, our effect sizes do not appear to reach previously used thresholds for the minimum clinically important difference for non-surgical osteoarthritis interventions (eg, range of minimum clinically important difference values used for a between-group difference in pain on a 0–100 visual analogue scale: 8.4–20.0).⁶⁸ They also appear to be smaller than those reported in previous systematic reviews of aggregate data.^{7,9,10} This discrepancy could be due to inclusion of different randomised controlled trials (with differences in inclusion and exclusion criteria between this systematic review and previous ones, and the fact that the present study included participants with knee, hip, or mixed knee and hip osteoarthritis), methodological differences (with IPD meta-analyses having several key advantages¹⁸), or as discussed below, the inability to include IPD from all eligible randomised controlled trials in our meta-analysis. Our findings question the magnitude of expected benefit from exercise in people with knee, hip, or mixed osteoarthritis, adding to a growing body of evidence that raises uncertainty about the role of exercise in osteoarthritis.^{69–74} For example, a recently published randomised controlled trial suggests that improvements from exercise might primarily be driven by placebo response phenomena, contextual factors, the natural course of the disease, and regression to the mean.⁷²

Our study has various strengths. Doing an IPD meta-analysis enabled us to explore individual-level treatment-effect moderators of exercise in people with knee, hip, or mixed knee and hip osteoarthritis more robustly than ever before,¹⁵ using participant data from many international randomised controlled trials. This is a key strength of the study, as participant-level relationships cannot be modelled directly with only study-level (aggregate) data, which is prone to aggregation bias and study-level confounding. IPD also allowed us to standardise outcome scores from 0 to 100, and to perform advanced analyses that accounted for the correlation among outcomes over time, both at the participant level and the randomised controlled trial level.

This study also has some limitations. The process of obtaining IPD (including identifying and tracking down

randomised controlled trial leads with regular reminders and follow-up emails, agreeing suitable terms in a data sharing agreement, and facilitating data transfer), checking IPD (including numerous correspondences with randomised controlled trial leads to resolve ambiguity and discrepancies), and harmonising IPD (including recoding variables and standardising variables before combining into one dataset with a variable identifying the randomised controlled trial) was extremely time intensive, taking approximately 3·5 years to complete. Despite substantial efforts, we only obtained IPD from approximately 40% of all eligible randomised controlled trials. Although this is better than previous IPD meta-analyses of other interventions for osteoarthritis,⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷ this limitation could potentially introduce bias in our findings. Within the included randomised controlled trials, there was large heterogeneity, which could have influenced our findings. Furthermore, although key baseline participant characteristics were broadly similar between randomised controlled trials that did and did not share IPD, there were some differences. Randomised controlled trials that provided IPD were larger, had longer follow-up, and a lower risk of bias across all domains assessed compared with randomised controlled trials for which IPD could not be obtained, meaning that there might have been some self-selection, with IPD shared from teams reporting higher-quality randomised controlled trials. There were also some differences in the characteristics of exercise interventions. Some exercise types were underrepresented in our dataset (eg, mind-body exercise) whereas others were overrepresented (eg, unsupervised home exercise). If these exercise characteristics are associated with the overall treatment effect, this could partly explain why the overall treatment effect in this study was smaller than in previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses. This observation highlights the importance of data sharing, which is becoming increasingly recognised as a key requirement in health research,⁷⁸ but currently remains suboptimal.⁷⁹ The predominant reason why IPD were not obtained was due to the inability to contact or get a response from randomised controlled trial teams. This limitation supports the ongoing need for condition-specific repositories such as the OA Trial Bank, as well as broader data-sharing initiatives.⁸⁰ Our search was run up to Feb 25, 2019. For a systematic review, one might argue that an update of the search strategy is warranted. However, given the time-consuming efforts of sharing and then harmonising data, this was not feasible for the present study.

One previous systematic review explored moderators of the effects of exercise for people with knee and hip osteoarthritis, synthesising findings from individual randomised controlled trials with subgroup analyses investigating potential treatment-effect moderators.¹⁵ The systematic review included four randomised controlled trials that had explicitly carried out interaction tests for moderation.^{44,48,51,81} Knee varus malalignment was identified as a treatment-effect moderator of pain,

whereas obesity, anxiety and depression, presence of comorbidity, and exercise confidence and beliefs were not. Although joint alignment was deemed an important potential moderator by our collaborators,²³ it was not possible to explore the effect of this moderator within our IPD meta-analyses because of the absence of consistent measurements across randomised controlled trials. However, our findings support the view that obesity, anxiety and depression, and comorbidity do not moderate the effect of exercise on pain in individuals with knee, hip, or mixed knee and hip osteoarthritis.¹⁵ Recent secondary analyses of randomised controlled trials by Henriksen and colleagues^{82,83} found that people with knee osteoarthritis who take analgesics or report constant knee pain appeared to show clinically relevant benefits on knee pain from the Good Life with osteoarthritis in Denmark exercise and education programme when compared to an open-label placebo. Although direct comparisons are not possible (as baseline pain and physical function were not explored as potential moderators in these analyses), our results support these findings given that people with more severe pain are more likely to take analgesics.⁸² In line with our study, BMI, age, and radiographic disease severity were not found to moderate the effect of exercise compared to an open-label placebo control.⁸²

Three previous IPD meta-analyses have explored treatment-effect moderators for intra-articular glucocorticoids, oral glucosamine, and topical non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) in individuals with osteoarthritis.⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷ Similarly to the present study, pain severity was found to be a treatment-effect moderator for the effects of both intra-articular glucocorticoids and topical NSAIDs.^{75,77} Additionally, age, BMI, duration of complaints, and radiographic osteoarthritis severity were not found to moderate the effect of topical NSAIDs.⁷⁵

Our findings indicate that there is a differential response to exercise in people with knee, hip, or mixed knee and hip osteoarthritis, but the overall effects are likely to be small and of questionable clinical importance. Targeting individuals with higher levels of osteoarthritis-related pain and disability for exercise might therefore be of merit. Our data suggest that none of the other individual-level characteristics we explored (age, BMI, physical activity, arthritis self-efficacy, mental wellbeing, comorbidity, muscle strength [quadriceps], educational attainment, pain duration, or radiographic joint structure) can be used to target individuals for exercise therapy. Although our findings question the magnitude of expected therapeutic benefit from exercise in people with knee, hip, or mixed osteoarthritis, we acknowledge that exercise is unlikely to be harmful⁸⁴ and can have multifaceted benefits for general health and for comorbid conditions, irrespective of osteoarthritis.⁸⁵

The large heterogeneity in the included randomised controlled trials highlights the need to further examine

and compare the different characteristics of exercise programmes accounting for the effect modifiers identified. This can be achieved by an IPD network meta-analysis. Additionally, data sharing should continue to be supported. How to best measure important potential treatment-effect moderators should be agreed and included within future randomised controlled trials to facilitate further IPD meta-analyses.

In conclusion, this large international IPD meta-analysis showed a differential response to therapeutic exercise among people with knee, hip, or mixed knee and hip osteoarthritis; individuals with higher pain severity and poorer physical function at baseline benefited more from exercise than did those with lower pain severity and better physical function at baseline. Therapeutic exercise had an overall positive effect on pain and physical function compared with non-exercise controls. However, the magnitude of the overall effect was small and of questionable clinical importance, particularly in the medium to long term. Targeting individuals with higher levels of osteoarthritis-associated pain and disability for exercise therapy might therefore be of merit. Our data suggest that none of the other individual-level characteristics we explored can be used to target individuals for exercise therapy.

Contributors

MAH contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of funding, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. MH, JR, RDR, ELH, and JQ contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of data, and analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. DAvdW and KD contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of funding, acquisition of data and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. MvM contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of data, interpretation of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. DB contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of funding, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. NC contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. AL contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. SB-Z contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of data, interpretation of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. NEF contributed to the conception and design of the study, acquisition of funding, acquisition of data, interpretation of data, drafting and revising the Article, and final approval of the submitted version. MAH, RDR, and NEF are responsible for the overall content as guarantors. The guarantors accept full responsibility for the work or conduct of the study, or both, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish the manuscript. The guarantors affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that there are no discrepancies from the study as originally planned. All authors had full access to all the output data (including statistical reports and tables) in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and accuracy of the data analysis. All authors had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. MH and RDR directly accessed and verified the underlying data reported in the manuscript.

Declaration of interests

RDR receives royalties for two books: *Individual Participant Data Meta-analysis: A Handbook for Healthcare Research* and *Prognosis Research in Healthcare: Concepts, Methods and Impact*. SB-Z receives consulting fees from Infirst Healthcare and Pfizer, and payment from Osteoarthritis Cartilage as a deputy editor. DAvdW is a member of PROGRESS Medical Research Council Prognosis Research Strategy (PROGRESS) Partnership (G0902393/99558). JQ was an unpaid member of the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence osteoarthritis guideline committee (2019–22). SB-Z, MvM, KD, and MAH are unpaid members of the OA Trial Bank Steering Committee. All other authors declare no competing interests.

Data sharing

Keele University is a member of the UK Reproducibility Network and committed to the principles of the UK Concordat on Open Research Data. The Keele University School of Medicine has a long-standing commitment to sharing data from our studies to improve research reproducibility and to maximise benefits for patients, the wider public and the health and care system. De-identified IPD that underlie the results from this study will be made available to bona-fide researchers on reasonable request via the OA Trial Bank, and with permission from the original randomised controlled trial leads. Data requests and enquiries should be directed to m.holden@keele.ac.uk. We encourage collaboration with those who collected the data, to recognise and credit their contributions. Release of data will be subject to a data use agreement between the OA Trial Bank, original randomised controlled trial leads, and the third party requesting the data. De-identified IPD will be encrypted on transfer.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a grant from the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy Charitable Trust (grant number PRF/16/A07), the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) School of Primary Care Research (grant number 351), and Nadine Foster's NIHR Senior Investigator Award. DB was supported by a NIHR School of Primary Care Research Fellowship. AL was supported by a NIHR Research Methods Fellowship. JR received a fellowship from the Foundation for Research in Rheumatology (FOREUM) and a EULAR travel bursary to visit Keele University. JQ was part funded by a NIHR Clinical Research Network West Midlands Research Scholar Fellowship and by a NIHR Academic Clinical Lectureship hosted at Keele University as part of Professor Christian Mullen's NIHR Professorship (January, 2016, to January, 2019). ELH is part-funded by the NIHR Applied Research Collaborations West Midlands. KD was part-funded by a Knowledge Mobilisation Research Fellowship (KMRF-2014-03-002) from the NIHR, the NIHR Applied Research Collaborations West Midlands and an NIHR Senior Investigator Award. NEF was supported through an NIHR Research Professorship (NIHR-RP-011-015) and NIHR Senior Investigator Award. The OA Trial Bank received partial funding from the Dutch Arthritis Society. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the UK National Health Service (NHS), the NIHR, or the Department of Health. We thank all trial leads for sharing IPD from their randomised controlled trials and thus making this study possible. This includes, but is not limited to, Lucie Brosseau, Elaine Hay, and all members of the OA Trial Bank Exercise Collaborative.

References

- 1 Safiri S, Kolahi AA, Smith E, et al. Global, regional and national burden of osteoarthritis 1990–2017: a systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2020; **79**: 819–28.
- 2 Wong MCS, Huang J, Wang J, et al. Global, regional and time-trend prevalence of central obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 13.2 million subjects. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2020; **35**: 673–83.
- 3 Kolasinski SL, Neogi T, Hochberg MC, et al. 2019 American College of Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation guideline for the management of osteoarthritis of the hand, hip, and knee. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2020; **72**: 220–33.
- 4 Bannuru RR, Osani MC, Vaysbrot EE, et al. OARSIS guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2019; **27**: 1578–89.

- 5 NICE. Osteoarthritis: care and management in adults. NICE clinical guideline CG177. Feb 12, 2014. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg177> (accessed April 28, 2023).
- 6 Nicolson PJA, Bennell KL, Dobson FL, Van Ginckel A, Holden MA, Hinman RS. Interventions to increase adherence to therapeutic exercise in older adults with low back pain and/or hip/knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2017; 51: 791–99.
- 7 Goh SL, Persson MSM, Stocks J, et al. Efficacy and potential determinants of exercise therapy in knee and hip osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med* 2019; 62: 356–65.
- 8 Uthman OA, van der Windt DA, Jordan JL, et al. Exercise for lower limb osteoarthritis: systematic review incorporating trial sequential analysis and network meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2013; 347: f5555.
- 9 Fransen M, McConnell S, Harmer AR, et al. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the knee. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015; 1: CD004376.
- 10 Fransen M, McConnell S, Hernandez-Molina G, et al. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the hip. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; 2014: CD007912.
- 11 Teirlinck CH, Verhagen AP, Reijneveld EAE, et al. Responders to exercise therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020; 17: 7380.
- 12 Christensen R, Henriksen M, Leeds AR, et al. Effect of weight maintenance on symptoms of knee osteoarthritis in obese patients: a twelve-month randomized controlled trial. *Arthritis Care Res* 2015; 67: 640–50.
- 13 Hay E, Dziedzic K, Foster N, et al. Optimal primary care management of clinical osteoarthritis and joint pain in older people: a mixed-methods programme of systematic reviews, observational and qualitative studies, and randomised controlled trials. Southampton: NIHR Journals Library, 2018.
- 14 Foster NE, Thomas E, Barlas P, et al. Acupuncture as an adjunct to exercise based physiotherapy for osteoarthritis of the knee: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2007; 335: 436.
- 15 Quicke JG, Runhaar J, van der Windt DA, Healey EL, Foster NE, Holden MA. Moderators of the effects of therapeutic exercise for people with knee and hip osteoarthritis: a systematic review of sub-group analyses from randomised controlled trials. *Osteoarthr Cartil Open* 2020; 2: 100113.
- 16 Sun X, Ioannidis JP, Agoritsas T, Alba AC, Guyatt G. How to use a subgroup analysis: users' guide to the medical literature. *JAMA* 2014; 311: 405–11.
- 17 Riley RD, Debray TPA, Fisher D, et al. Individual participant data meta-analysis to examine interactions between treatment effect and participant-level covariates: statistical recommendations for conduct and planning. *Stat Med* 2020; 39: 2115–37.
- 18 Riley RD, Fisher DJ. Using IPD meta-analysis to examine interactions between treatment effect and participant-level covariates. In: Riley RD, Tierney J, Stewart LA, eds. *Individual participant data meta-analysis: a handbook for healthcare research*. Chichester: Wiley, 2021: 63.
- 19 Stewart LA, Clarke M, Rovers M, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses of individual participant data: the PRISMA-IPD Statement. *JAMA* 2015; 313: 1657–65.
- 20 Holden MA, Burke DL, Runhaar J, et al. Subgrouping and Targeted Exercise Programmes for knee and hip Osteoarthritis (STEER OA): a systematic review update and individual participant data meta-analysis protocol. *BMJ Open* 2017; 7: e018971.
- 21 Menikoff J. Office for Human Research Protections, to ICMJE Secretariat. March 7, 2017. http://www.icmje.org/news-and-editorials/menikoff_icmje_questions_20170307.pdf (accessed Nov 25, 2021).
- 22 Taichman DB, Backus J, Baethge C, et al. Sharing clinical trial data: a proposal from the international committee of medical journal editors. *JAMA* 2016; 315: 467–68.
- 23 Holden MA, Runhaar J, Burke DL, et al. Subgrouping and Targeted Exercise Programmes for Knee and Hip Osteoarthritis (STEER OA) individual participant data meta-analysis. Progress update and selection of potential moderators for analyses. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2019; 27: S446.
- 24 Cochrane Musculoskeletal Group. Proposed outcomes. <http://musculoskeletal.cochrane.org/proposed-outcomes> (accessed July 28, 2022).
- 25 Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions, version 5.1.0. March, 2011. <https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/> (accessed April 28, 2023).
- 26 Jones AP, Riley RD, Williamson PR, Whitehead A. Meta-analysis of individual patient data versus aggregate data from longitudinal clinical trials. *Clin Trials* 2009; 6: 16–27.
- 27 Riley RD, Price MJ, Jackson D, et al. Multivariate meta-analysis using individual participant data. *Res Synth Methods* 2015; 6: 157–74.
- 28 Jackson D, Riley RD. A refined method for multivariate meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Stat Med* 2014; 33: 541–54.
- 29 Jackson D, White IR, Price M, Copas J, Riley RD. Borrowing of strength and study weights in multivariate and network meta-analysis. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2017; 26: 2853–68.
- 30 Sullivan TR, White IR, Salter AB, Ryan P, Lee KJ. Should multiple imputation be the method of choice for handling missing data in randomized trials? *Stat Methods Med Res* 2018; 27: 2610–26.
- 31 Durrleman S, Simon R. Flexible regression models with cubic splines. *Stat Med* 1989; 8: 551–61.
- 32 Levis B, Holden MA, Hattle M, et al. The Keele Toolbox for IPD Meta-analyses. Jan 1, 2021. <https://www.keele.ac.uk/ipdmatoolbox/> (accessed Sept 6, 2022).
- 33 Allen KD, Arbeeveva L, Callahan LF, et al. Physical therapy vs internet-based exercise training for patients with knee osteoarthritis: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2018; 26: 383–96.
- 34 Bearne LM, Walsh NE, Jessep S, Hurley MV. Feasibility of an exercise-based rehabilitation programme for chronic hip pain. *Musculoskelet Care* 2011; 9: 160–68.
- 35 Bennell KL, Hunt MA, Wrigley TV, et al. Hip strengthening reduces symptoms but not knee load in people with medial knee osteoarthritis and varus malalignment: a randomised controlled trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2010; 18: 621–28.
- 36 Bossen D, Veenhof C, Van Beek KE, Spreeuwenberg PM, Dekker J, De Bakker DH. Effectiveness of a web-based physical activity intervention in patients with knee and/or hip osteoarthritis: randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2013; 15: e257.
- 37 Brosseau L, Wells GA, Kenny GP, et al. The implementation of a community-based aerobic walking program for mild to moderate knee osteoarthritis: a knowledge translation randomized controlled trial: part II: clinical outcomes. *BMC Public Health* 2012; 12: 1073.
- 38 Cochrane T, Davey RC, Matthes Edwards SM. Randomised controlled trial of the cost-effectiveness of water-based therapy for lower limb osteoarthritis. *Health Technol Assess* 2005; 9: iii–iv, ix–xi, 1–114.
- 39 de Rooij M, van der Leeden M, Cheung J, et al. Efficacy of tailored exercise therapy on physical functioning in patients with knee osteoarthritis and comorbidity: a randomized controlled trial. *Arthritis Care Res* 2017; 69: 807–16.
- 40 Fernandes L, Storheim K, Sandvik L, Nordstletten L, Risberg MA. Efficacy of patient education and supervised exercise vs patient education alone in patients with hip osteoarthritis: a single blind randomized clinical trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2010; 18: 1237–43.
- 41 Fransen M, Nairn L, Winstanley J, Lam P, Edmonds J. Physical activity for osteoarthritis management: a randomized controlled clinical trial evaluating hydrotherapy or Tai Chi classes. *Arthritis Rheum* 2007; 57: 407–14.
- 42 French HP, Cusack T, Brennan A, et al. Exercise and manual physiotherapy arthritis research trial (EMPART) for osteoarthritis of the hip: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2013; 94: 302–14.
- 43 Hale LA, Waters D, Herbison P. A randomized controlled trial to investigate the effects of water-based exercise to improve falls risk and physical function in older adults with lower-extremity osteoarthritis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2012; 93: 27–34.
- 44 Hay EM, Foster NE, Thomas E, et al. Effectiveness of community physiotherapy and enhanced pharmacy review for knee pain in people aged over 55 presenting to primary care: pragmatic randomised trial. *BMJ* 2006; 333: 995.
- 45 Henriksen M, Klokke L, Graven-Nielsen T, et al. Association of exercise therapy and reduction of pain sensitivity in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. *Arthritis Care Res* 2014; 66: 1836–43.

- 46 Hinman RS, Heywood SE, Day AR. Aquatic physical therapy for hip and knee osteoarthritis: results of a single-blind randomized controlled trial. *Phys Ther* 2007; **87**: 32–43.
- 47 Hopman-Rock M, Westhoff MH. The effects of a health educational and exercise program for older adults with osteoarthritis for the hip or knee. *J Rheumatol* 2000; **27**: 1947–54.
- 48 Hurley MV, Walsh NE, Mitchell HL, et al. Clinical effectiveness of a rehabilitation program integrating exercise, self-management, and active coping strategies for chronic knee pain: a cluster randomized trial. *Arthritis Rheum* 2007; **57**: 1211–19.
- 49 Krauß I, Steinhilber B, Haupt G, Miller R, Martus P, Janßen P. Exercise therapy in hip osteoarthritis—a randomized controlled trial. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2014; **111**: 592–99.
- 50 Levinger P, Dunn J, Bifera N, Buston M, Elias G, Hill KD. Safety and feasibility of high speed resistance training with and without balance exercises for knee osteoarthritis: a pilot randomised controlled trial. *Phys Ther Sport* 2018; **34**: 154–63.
- 51 Lim BW, Hinman RS, Wrigley TV, Sharma L, Bennell KL. Does knee malalignment mediate the effects of quadriceps strengthening on knee adduction moment, pain, and function in medial knee osteoarthritis? A randomized controlled trial. *Arthritis Rheum* 2008; **59**: 943–51.
- 52 Messier SP, Loeser RF, Miller GD, et al. Exercise and dietary weight loss in overweight and obese older adults with knee osteoarthritis: the Arthritis, Diet, and Activity Promotion Trial. *Arthritis Rheum* 2004; **50**: 1501–10.
- 53 Multanen J, Nieminen MT, Häkkinen A, et al. Effects of high-impact training on bone and articular cartilage: 12-month randomized controlled quantitative MRI study. *J Bone Miner Res* 2014; **29**: 192–201.
- 54 Munukka M, Waller B, Rantalainen T, et al. Efficacy of progressive aquatic resistance training for tibiofemoral cartilage in postmenopausal women with mild knee osteoarthritis: a randomised controlled trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2016; **24**: 1708–17.
- 55 Simão AP, Avelar NC, Tossige-Gomes R, et al. Functional performance and inflammatory cytokines after squat exercises and whole-body vibration in elderly individuals with knee osteoarthritis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2012; **93**: 1692–700.
- 56 Tak E, Staats P, Van Hespden A, Hopman-Rock M. The effects of an exercise program for older adults with osteoarthritis of the hip. *J Rheumatol* 2005; **32**: 1106–13.
- 57 Takacs J, Krowchuk NM, Garland SJ, Carpenter MG, Hunt MA. Dynamic balance training improves physical function in individuals with knee osteoarthritis: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2017; **98**: 1586–93.
- 58 Talbot LA, Gaines JM, Huynh TN, Metter EJ. A home-based pedometer-driven walking program to increase physical activity in older adults with osteoarthritis of the knee: a preliminary study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; **51**: 387–92.
- 59 Teirlinck CH, Luijsterburg PA, Dekker J, et al. Effectiveness of exercise therapy added to general practitioner care in patients with hip osteoarthritis: a pragmatic randomized controlled trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2016; **24**: 82–90.
- 60 Thomas KS, Muir KR, Doherty M, Jones AC, O'Reilly SC, Bassey EJ. Home based exercise programme for knee pain and knee osteoarthritis: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2002; **325**: 752.
- 61 Tsai PF, Chang JY, Beck C, Kuo YF, Keefe FJ. A pilot cluster-randomized trial of a 20-week Tai Chi program in elders with cognitive impairment and osteoarthritic knee: effects on pain and other health outcomes. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2013; **45**: 660–69.
- 62 van Baar ME, Dekker J, Oostendorp RA, Bijl D, Voorn TB, Bijlsma JW. Effectiveness of exercise in patients with osteoarthritis of hip or knee: nine months' follow up. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2001; **60**: 1123–30.
- 63 Wallis JA, Webster KE, Levinger P, Singh PJ, Fong C, Taylor NF. A walking program for people with severe knee osteoarthritis did not reduce pain but may have benefits for cardiovascular health: a phase II randomised controlled trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2017; **25**: 1969–79.
- 64 Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, Campbell J, Stitt LW. Validation study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. *J Rheumatol* 1988; **15**: 1833–40.
- 65 Lawford BJ, Bennell KL, Allison K, Schwartz S, Hinman RS. Challenges with strengthening exercises for individuals with knee osteoarthritis and comorbid obesity: a qualitative study with patients and physical therapists. *Arthritis Care Res* 2022; **74**: 113–25.
- 66 Dobson F, Bennell KL, French SD, et al. Barriers and facilitators to exercise participation in people with hip and/or knee osteoarthritis: synthesis of the literature using behavior change theory. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2016; **95**: 372–89.
- 67 Holden MA, Nicholls EE, Young J, Hay EM, Foster NE. UK-based physical therapists' attitudes and beliefs regarding exercise and knee osteoarthritis: findings from a mixed-methods study. *Arthritis Rheum* 2009; **61**: 1511–21.
- 68 Concoff A, Rosen J, Fu F, et al. A comparison of treatment effects for nonsurgical therapies and the minimum clinically important difference in knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review. *JBJS Rev* 2019; **7**: e5.
- 69 Bennell KL, Egerton T, Martin J, et al. Effect of physical therapy on pain and function in patients with hip osteoarthritis: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2014; **311**: 1987–97.
- 70 Bennell KL, Hinman RS, Metcalf BR, et al. Efficacy of physiotherapy management of knee joint osteoarthritis: a randomised, double blind, placebo controlled trial. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2005; **64**: 906–12.
- 71 Messier SP, Mihalko SL, Beavers DP, et al. Effect of high-intensity strength training on knee pain and knee joint compressive forces among adults with knee osteoarthritis: the START Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2021; **325**: 646–57.
- 72 Bandak E, Christensen R, Overgaard A, et al. Exercise and education versus saline injections for knee osteoarthritis: a randomised controlled equivalence trial. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2022; **81**: 537–43.
- 73 Messier SP, Beavers DP, Queen K, et al. Effect of diet and exercise on knee pain in patients with osteoarthritis and overweight or obesity: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2022; **328**: 2242–51.
- 74 Englund M, Turkiewicz A. The emperor's new clothes? *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2023; **31**: 549–51.
- 75 Persson MSM, Stocks J, Varadi G, et al. Predicting response to topical non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in osteoarthritis: an individual patient data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Rheumatology* 2020; **59**: 2207–16.
- 76 Runhaar J, Rozendaal RM, van Middelkoop M, et al. Subgroup analyses of the effectiveness of oral glucosamine for knee and hip osteoarthritis: a systematic review and individual patient data meta-analysis from the OA trial bank. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2017; **76**: 1862–69.
- 77 van Middelkoop M, Arden NK, Atchia I, et al. The OA Trial Bank: meta-analysis of individual patient data from knee and hip osteoarthritis trials show that patients with severe pain exhibit greater benefit from intra-articular glucocorticoids. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2016; **24**: 1143–52.
- 78 Nosek BA, Alter G, Banks GC, et al. Scientific standards. Promoting an open research culture. *Science* 2015; **348**: 1422–25.
- 79 Ohmann C, Moher D, Siebert M, Motschall E, Naudet F. Status, use and impact of sharing individual participant data from clinical trials: a scoping review. *BMJ Open* 2021; **11**: e049228.
- 80 Tudur Smith C, Hopkins C, Sydes MR, et al. How should individual participant data (IPD) from publicly funded clinical trials be shared? *BMC Med* 2015; **13**: 298.
- 81 Ettinger WH Jr, Burns R, Messier SP, et al. A randomized trial comparing aerobic exercise and resistance exercise with a health education program in older adults with knee osteoarthritis. The Fitness Arthritis and Seniors Trial (FAST). *JAMA* 1997; **277**: 25–31.
- 82 Henriksen M, Nielsen SM, Christensen R, et al. Who are likely to benefit from the Good Life with osteoArthritis in Denmark (GLAD) exercise and education program? An effect modifier analysis of a randomised controlled trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2023; **31**: 106–14.
- 83 Henriksen M, Christensen R, Kristensen LE, et al. Exercise and education vs intra-articular saline for knee osteoarthritis: a 1-year follow-up of a randomized trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2023; **31**: 627–35.
- 84 Holden MA, Button K, Collins NJ, et al. Guidance for implementing best practice therapeutic exercise for people with knee and hip osteoarthritis: what does the current evidence base tell us? *Arthritis Care Res* 2020; **73**: 1746–53.
- 85 Piercy KL, Troiano RP, Ballard RM, et al. The physical activity guidelines for Americans. *JAMA* 2018; **320**: 2020–28.