

15 KNEE OSTEOARTHRITIS DEVELOPMENT FIVE YEARS FOLLOWING ARTHROSCOPIC PARTIAL MENISCECTOMY OR EXERCISE THERAPY FOR DEGENERATIVE MENISCAL TEARS: THE ODENSE-OSLO MENISCECTOMY VERSUS EXERCISE TRIAL

B. Berg^{1,2}, E.M. Roos³, M. Englund⁴, N.J. Kise⁵, A. Tiulpin^{6,7}, S. Saarakkala^{6,7}, L. Engebretsen^{1,8}, C.N. Eftang⁹, I. Holm^{1,2}, M.A. Risberg^{1,8}. ¹Oslo Univ. Hosp., Oslo, Norway; ²Univ. of Oslo, Oslo, Norway; ³Univ. of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark; ⁴Lund Univ., Lund, Sweden; ⁵Martina Hansens Hosp., Sandvika, Norway; ⁶Univ. of Oulu, Oulu, Finland; ⁷Oulu Univ. Hosp., Oulu, Finland; ⁸Norwegian Sch. of Sport Sci., Oslo, Norway; ⁹Akershus Univ. Hosp., Lørenskog, Norway

Purpose: Degenerative meniscal tears per se and partial meniscectomy are strong risk factors for knee osteoarthritis (OA) development. Several randomized controlled trials have found that partial meniscectomy provides no clinically relevant benefit compared to exercise therapy for degenerative meniscal tears. However, long-term follow-up studies of randomized controlled trials are lacking. Hence, the aim of this five-year follow-up of the Odense-Oslo Meniscectomy versus Exercise (OMEX) trial was to compare progression of individual radiographic features of the knee, incident radiographic knee OA and changes in patient-reported outcome measures following partial meniscectomy or exercise therapy for degenerative meniscal tears.

Methods: One hundred and forty middle-aged patients with an MRI-verified degenerative meniscal tear and 97% without radiographic knee OA were included. Participants were randomized to either arthroscopic partial meniscectomy or a 12-weeks exercise therapy program. Tibiofemoral joint space narrowing and marginal osteophytes in the medial and lateral compartment were assessed semi-quantitatively using the OARS1 atlas. The risk for progression for each individual radiographic feature was compared between groups. Additionally, a total radiographic score was calculated, and comparison made between treatment groups. Development of incident radiographic knee OA (Kellgren & Lawrence grade ≥ 2), changes in medial tibiofemoral fixed joint space width (fJSW, quantitatively assessed) and in patient-reported outcome measures (Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score [KOOS]) were also compared between groups. Poisson regression with robust standard errors was applied to compare groups with respect to progression of the individual radiographic features and incident radiographic knee OA. The results are presented as risk ratio with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). All models were adjusted for the stratification variable, gender. Between-group difference in change in total radiographic score was assessed by linear regression, adjusted for gender and baseline value of the outcome. Changes in medial fJSW and in all five KOOS subscales were analyzed by analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with gender and baseline value of the outcome as covariates. Statistical analyses were performed using a full-set analysis, as well as per protocol and as treated analysis.

Results: Radiographic assessment at the five-year follow-up was performed on 120 participants (86%) (62 participants in the surgery group and 58 in the exercise therapy group). For the surgery group the risk ratios (95% CI) for progression of joint space narrowing and medial and lateral osteophytes were 0.89 (0.55-1.43), 1.15 (0.79-1.67) and 0.77 (0.42-1.42), respectively, compared to the exercise therapy group. The linear regression model indicated no difference between groups in the total radiographic score ($B = -0.02$, 95% CI -0.51 to 0.49). Sixteen percent in both groups developed radiographic knee OA over the follow-up period (Risk ratio 1.03, 95% CI 0.46 to 2.30). The mean change (95% CI) in medial fJSW was -0.50 mm (-0.69 to -0.30) for the surgery group and -0.30 mm (-0.51 to -0.09) for exercise therapy group. The between-group difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.17$, 95% CI -0.48 to 0.09). No statistically significant or clinically relevant differences were found between groups for the five KOOS subscales. Per protocol and as treated analysis yielded similar results to the full-set analysis.

Conclusions: We found no statistically significant differences in individual risks for progression of joint space narrowing, marginal osteophytes or change in total radiographic score between surgical and exercise therapy treatments for degenerative meniscal tears. Further, there was no statistically significant or clinically relevant differences between arthroscopic partial meniscectomy and exercise therapy in patient-reported outcome measures.

16 IS PHYSICAL ACTIVITY ASSESSED WITH ACCELEROMETERS MORE SENSITIVE TO KNEE PAIN THAN CONVENTIONAL FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE TESTS? - DATA FROM THE OSTEOARTHRITIS INITIATIVE

A. Wisser^{1,2}, F. Eckstein^{1,2}, W. Wirth^{1,2}. ¹Dept. of Imaging & Functional Musculoskeletal Res., Paracelsus Med. Univ., Salzburg, Austria; ²Chondrometrics GmbH, Ainning, Germany

Purpose: Functional performance measures (FPMs) represent important instruments in epidemiological and clinical trials of knee osteoarthritis, as they provide potentially more objective information than patient reported outcomes (PROs). We have shown previously that, amongst different FPMs, the Chair Stand Test (CST) is more sensitive to different levels of knee pain than the 20m and 400m walk test. Given the current interest in the use of wearables for functional evaluations in clinical trials and clinical practice, the aim of the current work was to analyze whether physical activity parameters obtained from accelerometry better discriminate between various knee pain strata than the CST.

Methods: The current analysis was conducted in 552 participants from the Osteoarthritis Initiative (OAI [47% women; age 65 ± 9 years; BMI 28 ± 4 (mean \pm SD)]) who had NRS (Numerical Rating Scale, range 0-10 [low-high]) pain measures for both knees at 48 months follow-up, CST results and accelerometer measurements available (ActiGraph GT1M uniaxial accelerometers; ActiGraph, Pensacola, FL). Participants with hip pain, and hip or knee joint replacement were excluded. Please note that accelerometry was an ancillary study to the OAI, and that data only were available for a subset of OAI participants, and only starting with the 48-month follow-up. Accelerometry parameters included the raw output as daily counts as well as minutes of light, moderate and vigorous activity, and moderate/vigorous activity representing the sum of the latter. Further, bout minutes of moderate/vigorous activity were available, with a bout being defined as an 8 out of 10-minute period with an intensity equal to, or greater than a given threshold. Three thresholds were used for each parameter, based on definitions from different authors (Freedson, Swartz, Troiano; Figure 1). Participants were divided into no (NRS 0), mild (NRS 1/2), moderate (NRS 3/4) or non-acceptable pain (NRS >4) strata, based on the knee with the greater NRS value (target knee). NRS ≤ 4 had previously been defined in the literature as a patient acceptable symptom state (PASS). Mean values and standard deviations (SDs) were calculated for all accelerometry parameters as well as the CST in each pain stratum. ANCOVA was used to compare physical activity measures and the CST between participants with mild, moderate or non-acceptable pain vs. those without pain. Cohen's D was calculated as a measure of effect size. Because age and BMI were previously identified to be significantly associated with FPM outcomes in healthy subjects, additional analyses were run with adjusting for these variables.

Results: Of the 552 subjects, 44% had no knee pain, 19% mild, 19% moderate, and 18% non-acceptable pain in the target knee. Using definitions by Freedson and Troiano, minutes of light activity represented 91-95% of the total recorded activity across all pain strata, and vigorous activity only 0.2-0.7%. Using the definition by Swartz, light activity represented 58-61% and vigorous activity 0.4-1.3%. Moderate/vigorous activity as defined by Freedson and Troiano best discriminated between participants with non-acceptable vs. no pain (5.6% vs. 7.9% and 5.3% vs. 7.4% of the total daily activity, respectively; both Cohen's $D = 0.33$, $p = 0.001$; Figure 2). Daily activity counts and light activity, in contrast, did not reveal significant differences (Figure 2). Calculating bout minutes of moderate/vigorous activity only did not improve the discrimination compared with moderate/vigorous activity (Freedson: Cohen's $D = 0.31$, $p = 0.009$; Troiano: Cohen's $D = 0.30$, $p = 0.011$ [ANCOVA]). Accelerometer parameters determined according to Swartz did not show significant differences between any of the pain strata. Despite these statistically significant findings, accelerometry did not attain the discriminatory ability of the CST for non-acceptable pain vs. no pain (Cohen's $D = 0.61$, $p < 0.001$). Moreover, the CST - unlike accelerometry - was also able to discriminate between moderate pain and no pain (Cohen's $D = 0.49$, $p < 0.001$).

Conclusions: Amongst physical activity parameters calculated from accelerometry, moderate/vigorous activity as defined by Freedson and Troiano was most sensitive in discriminating between participants with non-acceptable vs. no knee pain. Light activity, and minutes of activity