

Project Plan – August 2021

PARTICIPANTS

Core Oversight Team

Susan M. Goodman, MD (ACR Principal Investigator)
Matthew S. Austin, MD (AAHKS Co-principal Investigator)
Adolph Yates, Jr., MD, FAAOS, FAOA (AAHKS Co-principal Investigator)
Jasvinder Singh, MD, MPH (ACR Literature Review Leader)
Charles P. Hannon, MD, MBA (AAHKS Literature Review Leader)
Gordon Guyatt, MD (GRADE Expert)

Literature Review Team

Nicholas Bedard, MD
Jason L. Blevins, MD
Cara A. Cipriano, MD
P. Maxwell Courtney, MD
Lauren King, MD
Alexa Simon Meara, MD
Bella Mehta, MBBS, MS
Adam J. Rana, MD
Nancy Sullivan, BA
Marat Turgunbaev, MD, MPH (ACR)
Katherine D. Wysham, MD
Kevin Yip, MD
Linda Yue, MD
Michael Zywiel, MD, MSc

ACR Board Liaison

TBD

AAHKS Key Support Member

Sigita Wolfe

Voting Panel

Joshua F. Baker, MD, MSCE
Delamo Isaac Bekele, MBBS
David S. Jevsevar, MD, MBA
C. Kent Kwoh, MD
Claudette M. Lajam, MD
Larry W. Moreland, MD
Linda A. Russell, MD
Bryan D. Springer, MD
Linda I. Suleiman, MD
Jesse Wolfstadt, MD, MSc, FRCSC

Patient Panel

TBD

ACR Staff

Cindy Force Regina Parker Amy Turner



Project Plan – August 2021

ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT

1 2 3

4

This is a collaborative project of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) and the American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons (AAHKS). The group includes rheumatologists, orthopedic surgeons, patients, and methodologists, supported by ACR and AAHKS staff.

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BACKGROUND While hip and knee arthroplasty performed for symptomatic osteoarthritis or osteonecrosis are two of the most common surgeries performed in the United States, with excellent overall outcomes, there is wide variability in risk and outcomes associated with factors such as comorbidities, age, BMI, or even operative joint anatomy or deformity. There are no evidence-based indications for the two procedures that consider the impact of these clinically important factors. Opinions differ on if and when hip or knee arthroplasty should be performed in patients with certain medical comorbidities (e.g., diabetes mellitus, nicotine use) or certain patient characteristics such as obesity. In addition, evidence is limited on the effectiveness of nonoperative treatment options such as physical therapy in these patients with end-stage osteoarthritis. Existing Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs), based on the current state of the scientific literature, provide evidence-supported, consensusdriven best practices for operative and non-operative treatment of arthritis of the hip and knee. They are designed for the use of medical professionals caring for patients with the knowledge that there are significant gaps in the literature regarding both non-operative and operative care of the arthritic patient. These CPGs focus on the general diagnosis of osteoarthritis and prompt a dichotomous choice of nonoperative versus operative options and do not offer guidance on when non-operative interventions lose efficacy and arthroplasty is indicated. Evidence-based guidelines to guide indications and timing for total hip or knee arthroplasty do not exist. The purpose of this CPG project is to develop evidence-based consensus recommendations for common clinical situations encountered in people with advanced symptomatic osteoarthritis or osteonecrosis of the knee or the hip and include consideration of those factors that are known to increase operative risk or change outcome.

262728

29

30

31 32 For the purposes of this clinical practice guideline, our defined population is patients with radiographically moderate to advanced osteoarthritis of the hip or knee and moderate to severe pain or loss of function. Moderate to severe pain or loss of function may be measured on a validated patient reported outcome scale (e.g., HOOS, KOOS, VAS, or WOMAC) or by patients' reported symptoms such as walking limited to less than two blocks or night pain. Radiographic severity may be measured by validated grading systems such as Kellgren-Lawrence or Tonnis.

34

33



Project Plan – August 2021

37		
38	OB	JECTIVES
39		
40		e objective of this project is to develop a clinical practice guideline that includes evidence-based
41	COI	nsensus recommendations regarding indications for total hip and knee replacement versus
42	COI	nservative treatments in patients with moderate to severe osteoarthritis or osteonecrosis of the hip
43	or	knee.
44		
45		ecifically, we aim to:
46 47	1.	Define the indications for conservative treatment in patients with moderate to severe osteoarthritis or osteonecrosis.
48	2.	Define indications for total hip and knee replacement in patients with moderate to severe
49		osteoarthritis or osteonecrosis.
50	3.	Develop recommendations regarding the timing of hip or knee arthroplasty for patients with specific
51		medical co-morbidities.
52	ME	ETHODS
53		
54		entification of Studies
55		erature search strategies, based on PICO questions (Population/patients, Intervention, Comparator,
56		d Outcomes; see Appendix A and Appendix C) were drafted by the Core Team and a research librarian.
57	Sea	arches were performed in OVID Medline (1946 +), Embase (1974 +), and PubMed (mid-1960s +).
58		
59		e search strategies were developed using the controlled vocabulary or thesauri language for each
60		tabase: Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) for OVID Medline and PubMed; and Emtree terms for
61 62	EII	base. Text words were also used in OVID Medline, PubMed, and Embase.
63	Sec	arch Limits
64		ly English language articles will be retrieved.
65	011	The state of the s
66	Lite	erature Search Update
67		erature searches will be updated just before the voting panel meeting to ensure completeness.
68		
69	Inc	lusion/Exclusion Criteria
70	Αp	pendix A includes the project's PICO questions, which outline the defined patient population,
71	int	erventions, comparators, and outcomes (also in Appendix C). Appendix B includes the list of
72	inc	lusion/exclusion criteria.



Project Plan – August 2021

74	Management of	f Studies	and Date	а
----	---------------	-----------	----------	---

References and abstracts have been imported into bibliographic management software (EndNote) (1), duplicates removed, and exported to Distiller SR, a web-based systematic review manager (2). Screening and data abstraction forms are being created in Distiller SR. Search results will be divided among reviewers, and two reviewers will screen each title/abstract, with disagreements at the title/abstract screening stage defaulting to inclusion for full manuscript review. Following the same dual review process, disagreements at the full manuscript screening stage will be discussed and adjudicated by the literature review leadership, if necessary.

Phases

- 1. A search for randomized controlled trials and observational studies has been performed to determine existing studies covering outcomes of interest.
- 2. Additionally, recently published systematic reviews covering outcomes of interest will also be sought and used for reference cross-checking.
- 3. Chosen studies will be quality-assessed using the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses.
- 4. Subsequently, identified studies will be assessed using the RevMan (4) and GRADE Pro tools (5).

GRADE Methodology

GRADE methodology will be used in this project to grade available evidence and facilitate development of recommendations. The certainty in the evidence (also known as 'quality' of evidence) will be graded as high, moderate, low or very low. The recommendations will have a strength, strong or conditional, and a direction, as in favor or against the intervention. The strength of recommendations will not depend solely on the certainty in the evidence, but also on patient preferences and values, and the weight between benefits and harms. A series of articles that describe the GRADE methodology can be found on the GRADE working group's website: www.gradeworkinggroup.org.

Data Analysis and Synthesis

The literature review team will analyze and synthesize data from included studies that address the PICO questions. An evidence profile, including a GRADE Summary of Findings table, will be prepared for each PICO question using Review Manager (RevMan) (4) and GRADEprofiler (GRADEpro) software (5). The Summary of Findings table contains the benefits and harms for each outcome across studies, the assumed and corresponding risk for comparators and interventions (95% CI), the absolute risk and relative effect (95% CI), the number of participants/number of studies, and the certainty in the evidence for each critical and important outcome (i.e., high, moderate, low or very low).



Project Plan – August 2021

The evidence profile documents the overall certainty in the evidence for each critical and important
outcome across studies and summarizes the rationale of the GRADE criteria for downgrading (risk of
bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias), or upgrading the certainty in a body
of evidence (large magnitude of effect, dose-response gradient, and all plausible confounding that
would reduce a demonstrated effect).

Development of Recommendation Statements

PICO questions will be revised into drafted recommendation statements. Using the GRADE Evidence Profiles and Summaries of Findings tables, the voting panel, consisting of 5 rheumatologists, 5 orthopedic surgeons, and 2 patients who have undergone total joint replacement, will consider the drafted recommendation statements in two stages. The first assessment will be done individually, and the results will be anonymous; this vote will only be used to determine where consensus might or might not already exist and develop the voting panel meeting agenda. At the face-to-face voting panel meeting, chaired by the principal investigators, the panelists will discuss the evidence in the context of their clinical experience and expertise to arrive at consensus on the final recommendations. The voting panel meeting discussions will be supported by the literature review leader, the GRADE expert, and selected members of the literature review team, who will attend the meeting to provide details about the evidence, as requested. Voting panel discussions and decisions will also be informed by a separately convened patient panel, which will meet in the days before the voting panel meeting, to provide unique patient perspectives on the drafted recommendations based on their experiences and the available literature.

PLANNED APPENDICES (AT MINIMUM)

- A. Final literature search strategies
- 138 B. Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria
 - C. GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables for each PICO question

AUTHORSHIP

Authorship of the guideline will include: ACR principal investigator, Dr. Susan Goodman, and AAHKS coprincipal investigators, Drs. Adolph Yates and Matthew S. Austin, as lead authors; ACR literature review leader Dr. Jasvinder Singh; AAHKS literature review leader Dr. Charlie Hannon; and Dr. Gordon Guyatt, GRADE expert. Members of the voting panel and literature review team will also be authors. The PIs will determine final authorship, dependent on the efforts made by individuals throughout the guideline development process, using international authorship standards as guidance.



Project Plan – August 2021

DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

can be	CR's disclosure and COI policies for guideline development will be followed for this project. These found in the ACR Guideline Manual on this page of the ACR web site, under Policies & Jures. See Appendix D for participant disclosures.
REFER	ENCES
1.	EndNote [software]. https://endnote.com
2.	DistillerSR. Ottawa, Canada: Evidence Partners; 2013. http://systematic-review.net/
3.	Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS)
	for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2010. Available:
	http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp
4.	Review Manager [software]. https://training.cochrane.org/online-learning/core-software-
	cochrane-reviews/revman
5.	GRADEprofiler [software]. https://gradepro.org/



Project Plan – August 2021

167	APPENDIX A – PICO Questions
168 169	DRAFT QUESTIONS FOR ACR/AAHKS HIP AND KNEE ARTHROPLASTY INDICATIONS WORKGROUP
170	
171	1. In our defined population, what is the relative impact of a 3 month "waiting period" prior to arthroplasty versus no waiting period on patient
172	reported outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
173 174	All answers to the following questions assume the waiting period in #1 has been met and the patient meets our defined inclusion criteria listed
175	above.
176	
177	2. In our defined population, what is the relative impact of physical therapy versus arthroplasty at one year on patient important outcomes
178	including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
179 180	3. In our defined population, what is the relative impact of NSAIDs versus arthroplasty in patient important outcomes including pain,
181	function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
182	
183	4. In our defined population, what is the relative impact of braces/ambulatory aides versus arthroplasty on patient important outcomes
184	including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
185	5. In our defined population, what is the relative impact of corticosteroid injections versus arthroplasty at one year on patient important
186	outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
107	
187 188	6. In our defined population, what is the relative impact of viscosupplementation versus arthroplasty at one year on patient important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
100	outcomes melaumg pam, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year:



191 192	7. In our defined population with BMI between 35-39, what is the relative impact of delaying arthroplasty to achieve weight reduction to BMI <35 versus proceeding to arthroplasty on patient important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
193 194 195	8. In our defined population with BMI between 40-49, what is the relative impact of delaying arthroplasty to achieve weight reduction to BMI <40 versus proceeding to arthroplasty on patient important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
196 197 198	9. In our defined population with BMI between >50, what is the relative impact of delaying arthroplasty to achieve weight reduction to BMI <50 versus proceeding to arthroplasty on patient important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
199 200 201	10. In our defined population with poorly controlled diabetes mellitus, what is the relative impact of delaying arthroplasty to improve glycemic control versus proceeding to arthroplasty on patient important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
202 203	11. In our defined population with nicotine dependence, what is the relative impact of delaying arthroplasty for nicotine cessation versus proceeding to arthroplasty on patient important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
204 205 206	12. In our defined population who have bone loss with deformity, or severe ligamentous instability, what is the relative impact of delaying arthroplasty for optimization of non-life-threatening conditions versus proceeding to arthroplasty on patient important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
207 208	13. In our defined population who have a neuropathic joint, what is the relative impact of delaying arthroplasty for optimization of non-life-threatening conditions versus proceeding to arthroplasty at one year?



Project Plan – August 2021

209	
210	14. In our defined population with unicompartmental osteoarthritis, what is the impact of medical co-morbidities such as obesity or
211	inflammatory arthritis or mechanical conditions such as instability or deformity on unicondylar versus total joint arthroplasty on patien
212	important outcomes including pain, function, infection, hospitalization, and death at one year?
213	



Project Plan – August 2021

	e purpose of this clinical practice guideline is to provide evidence-based recommendations regarding indications for total joint arthroplasty
and	d conservative treatments in patients with moderate to severe degenerative joint disease of the hip or knee.
Foi	the purposes of this clinical practice guideline, our defined population is patients with radiographically moderate to advanced osteoarthritis
pat	the hip or knee and moderate to severe pain or loss of function. Moderate to severe pain or loss of function may be measured on a validated tient reported outcome scale (e.g. HOOS, KOOS, VAS, or WOMAC) or by patients' reported symptoms such as walking limited to less than two
bic	cks or night pain. Radiographic severity may be measured by validated grading systems such as Kellgren-Lawrence or Tonnis.
Be	ow are the inclusion and exclusion criteria reviewers will consider when reviewing titles/abstracts and full manuscripts.
1.	Study must have had a full journal publication; studies published only as meeting abstracts will be excluded.
2.	Study must be an English language publication.
3.	Study must include a population, intervention, comparison, and outcome specified in the protocol.
4.	Population studied must include patients with moderate to severe degenerative joint disease of the hip or knee. If patients with both mild
	and moderate to severe degenerative joint disease are included in the study, data must be able to be extracted for only the subset of
	patients with moderate to severe degenerative joint disease.
5.	The following study designs may be included:
	a. Randomized controlled trial



Project Plan – August 2021

237		c. Prospective cohort study
238		d. Retrospective cohort study
239		e. Case-control study
240		f. Registry studies
241		g. Systematic review
242		i. Systematic reviews will be included only to scan reference lists to capture relevant individual studies that may have been
243		missed by the literature search.
244		
245	6.	Studies of the following designs should be excluded:
246		a. Case series
247		b. Case report
248		c. Narrative review
249		d. Editorials or commentaries
250		e. Surveys
251		f. Expert opinion
252		g. Foreign language studies
253		
254	7.	Studies evaluating conservative treatment must have a minimum of 20 patients with moderate or severe degenerative joint disease.
255		
256	8.	Studies evaluating arthroplasty must have a minimum of 20 patients who underwent hip or knee arthroplasty.

b. Controlled clinical trial

236



Project Plan – August 2021

259	1.	Infection including peri- and post-operative
260		Deep surgical site infections within 30 days, within 90 days, within 1 year
261		· Superficial surgical site infections within 30-90 days
262		· Minor, non-surgical site infections within 30-90 days
263		· Serious, non-surgical site infections such as pneumonia, bacteremia/sepsis within 30-90 days
264		· Delayed wound healing within 30-90 days
265	2.	Venous thromboembolic disease within 30-90 days
266	3.	Acute cardiac/cardiovascular events within 30-90 days
267	4.	Death within 30-90 days
268	5.	Need for revision surgery within 5 years
269	6.	Return to OR within 30-90 days
270	7.	Readmission to the hospital within 30-90 days
271	8.	Emergency department visits within 30-90 days
272	9.	Admission to a higher level of care (ICU or CCU) during index hospital admission
273	10.	Overall complication rates within 30-90 days
274	11.	Length of hospital stay
275	12.	Discharge to long-term care facility up to 3 weeks post-op and the duration of long-term facility use
276		Arthroplasty patient-reported outcomes up to 5 years

258

APPENDIX C: OUTCOMES



277	0	Pain
278	0	Function
279	0	Quality of life scores
280	0	Work/at-home productivity
281	0	Social participation, and
282	0	Patient satisfaction



Project Plan – August 2021

APPENDIX D: DISCLOSURES

Participant Disclosures - American College of Rheumatology (ACR) and American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons (AAHKS) Guideline: Indications for Total Hip and Knee Replacement

In order for the College to most effectively further its mission and to otherwise maintain its excellent reputation in the medical community and with the public, it is important that confidence in the College's integrity be maintained. The cornerstone of the ACR's Disclosure Policy is disclosure of actual and potential conflicts so that they can be evaluated by the College in order to avoid undue influence of potential conflicts. The purpose of the ACR's Disclosure Policy is identification of relationships which may pose actual or potential conflicts. These actual or potential conflicts can then be evaluated by the College so that adjustments can be made that will avoid any undue influence. This policy is based on the principle that, in many cases, full disclosure of the actual or potentially conflicting relationship will of itself suffice to protect the integrity of the College and its interests.

Participants	Role	Primary Employer	Interest Held By	Interest Type	Entity/Licensee	Additional Information	Value
Susan M. Goodman	Core Team - ACR Co-PI	Hospital for Special Surgery	Self	Independent Contractor - Data and Safety Monitoring	UCB Biosciences Inc.		\$5,000.00
			Self	Grant/Contract	Novartis		\$601,771.00
Matthew S. Austin	Core Team - AAHKS Co-PI	Rothman Orthopaedic Specialty Hospital	Self	Intellectual Property - Other Intellectual Property			
			Self	Intellectual Property - Patent			
			Self	Stock	Corin Group		\$200,000.00
Adolph Yates, Jr.	Core Team - AAHKS Co-PI	University of Pittsburgh Medical Center		NA		Nothing to disclose	
Jasvinder Singh	Core Team - ACR Literature Review Leader	University of Alabama at Birmingham	Self	Stock	TPT Global Tech		\$440.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Trio Health		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Putnam Associates		
			Self	Stock	Moderna		\$8,300.00



Spouse/ Partner	Stock	Amarin Pharma Inc.		\$1,997.00
Self	Stock	Charlotte's Web Holdings		\$2,375.00
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Simply Speaking		\$10,650.00
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	WebMD		
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Jupiter Life Science		
Self	Independent Contractor - FDA Arthritis Advisory Committee Committee member	U.S. FDA		
Self	Stock	Vaxart		\$1,900.00
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Clearview Healthcare Partners		
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Spherix		
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	UBM, LLC		
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Two Labs Inc.		
Self	Independent Contractor - committee chair	Veterans Affairs Rheumatology Field Advisory Committee	No compensation	
Self	Independent Contractor - Steering Committee Member	OMERACT		
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Focus Forward		
Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Adept Field Solutions		
Self	Independent Contractor - editor and the Director of the center	University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) Cochrane Musculoskeletal Group	No compensation received for this position.	



harles P. Hannon	Core Team - AAHKS Literature Review Leader	Rush University Medical Center	Self	Independent Contractor - Committee Member	American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	The American College of Rheumatology	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Navigant Consulting	
			Self	Stock	Viking Pharmaceuticals	\$2,600.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Medisys	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Rheumatology Field Advisory Committee member, now Chair	Veterans Affairs Rheumatology Field Advisory Committee	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Fidia Pharma USA Inc.	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Clinical Care Options	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Medscape	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	PK Med	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	MedIQ	\$2,625.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	National Institutes of Health Krog Partners	
			Self Self	Independent Contractor - Editorial Board Member Independent Contractor - Consultant	BMC Medicine Foundation for the	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Health Advances	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Horizon Orphan LLC	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Editorial Board Member	JCR: Journal of Clinical Rheumatology	



			Self	Independent Contractor - Health Policy Fellow	American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Investigator	American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons		
Gordon Guyatt	Core Team - GRADE Expert	McMaster University				Nothing to disclose	
TBD	ACR Board of Directors Liaison					Disclosures forthcoming	
Kim Bartosiak	Literature Review Team					Disclosures forthcoming	
Nicholas Bedard	Literature Review Team	University of Iowa Hospitals & Clinics	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	DePuy Orthopaedics Inc.		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Editorial Board Member	Journal of Arthroplasty		
Jason L. Blevins	Literature Review Team	Hospital for Special Surgery	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Limacorporate S.p.A.		\$2,000.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Globus Medical, Inc.		\$1,000.00
Cara A. Cipriano	Literature Review Team					Disclosures forthcoming	
Anna R. Cohen-Rosenblum	Literature Review Team					Disclosures forthcoming	
P. Maxwell Courtney	Literature Review Team	Rothman Orthopaedic Specialty Hospital	Self	Independent Contractor - Data and Safety Monitoring	Hip Innovation Technology		
			Self	Fiduciary Officer	AAHKS		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Smith and Nephew		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Stryker		
			Self	Stock	Parvizi Surgical Innovation		\$100,000.00



Ruth Fernandez	Literature Review Team	NYU Langone Medical Center	Self	Employment	NYU Langone Medical Center		
Elizabeth Gausden	Literature Review Team					Disclosures forthcoming	
Lauren King	Literature Review Team	University of Toronto	Self	Independent Contractor - Canadian Rheumatology Association Annual Scientific Meeting Committee Member	Canadian Rheumatology Association		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Canadian Rheumatology Association Research Committee	Canadian Rheumatology Association		
			Self	Grant/Contract	Canadian Institutes of Health Research		\$560,000.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - OMERACT Flares in Osteoarthritis Working Group Steering Committee	OMERACT		
Alexa Simon Meara	Literature Review Team	The Ohio State Wexner Medical Center	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	AbbVie Biotherapeutics		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Ampel		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Aurinia		
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	GLG		
Bella Mehta	Literature Review Team	Hospital for Special Surgery	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Novartis		\$2,500.00
Adam J. Rana	Literature Review Team	Maine Medical Partners	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Smith and Nephew Orthopaedics		
Nancy Sullivan	Literature Review Team	ECRI		NA		Nothing to disclose	
Marat Turgunbaev	Literature Review Team	American College of Rheumatology		NA		Nothing to disclose	
Katherine D. Wysham	Literature Review Team	VA Puget Sound Health Care System	Brother	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Verathon		



			Brother	Independent Contractor - Consultant	AstraZeneca		
							440,000,00
			Parent- Mother	Grant / Contract	Corcept Therapeutics		\$10,000.00
			Parent-	Grant / Contract	Regeneron		\$15,000.00
			Mother	Grant / Contract	Pharmaceuticals, Inc.		\$15,000.00
			Parent	Independent Contractor - President	Endocrine Society		
			Brother	Other Business Ownership	Veronix		
			Parent- Mother	Grant / Contract	Allergan		\$25,000.00
			Parent- Mother	Grant / Contract	Abbott Diabetes Care		\$12,000.00
			Self	Grant / Contract	Rheumatology Research Foundation		\$225,000.00
			Parent- Mother	Grant / Contract	Eli Lilly and Company		\$36,000.00
			Self	Employment	U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs		
			Parent- Mother	Grant / Contract	Novo Nordisk		\$40,000.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Chapter Lead	Association of Women in Rheumatology		
Kevin Yip	Literature Review Team	Hospital for Special Surgery	Self	Independent Contractor - OMERACT Fellow	OMERACT	Fellow in rheumatology training	
Linda Yue	Literature Review Team	Hospital for Special Surgery		NA		program at HSS Nothing to disclose	
Michael Zywiel	Literature Review Team					Disclosures forthcoming	



Joshua F. Baker	Voting Panel	University of Pennsylvania	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Bristol-Myers Squibb		\$2,400.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Pfizer		\$2,100.00
Delamo Isaac Bekele Voting Panel	Mayo Clinic	Matthew Koster MD, Primary Investigator	Independent Contractor - Epidemiology of Polymyalgia Rheumatica 2000-2014: A Population Based Study	Mayo Clinic			
		Self	Independent Contractor - Committee Member	SPARTAN	Meeting every 3 months		
		Cornelia Weyand MD, PI	Independent Contractor - Biomarkers in Patients with Rheumatoid Arthritis and Interstitial Lung Disease	Mayo Clinic			
			Self	Grant / Contract	Mayo Clinic		\$10,000.00
			Floranne Ernste MD, primary investigator	Independent Contractor - Use of plasma exchange for the treatment of MDA-5 positive dermatomyositis patients and anti-synthet	Mayo Clinic		
			Hu Zeng PhD	Independent Contractor - Biomarkers in Autoimmune and Inflammatory Diseases	Mayo Clinic	Co- investigator	
David S. Jevsevar	Voting Panel	Dartmouth-Hitchcock	Dartmouth- Hitchcock	Grant / Contract	DePuy Mitek		\$16,000.00
C. Kent Kwoh	Voting Panel	University of Arizona Arthritis Center	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	LG Chem		
			Self	Employment	University of Arizona		
			Self	Grant / Contract	Eli Lilly and Company		\$263,732.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Speaker	Prime Education, LLC	Speaker at CME event	



			Self	Independent Contractor - Data and Safety Monitoring	Kolon Tissue Gene	Cell and gene therapy for osteoarthritis	
			Self	Grant / Contract	GlaxoSmithKline		\$314,050.00
			Self	Fiduciary Officer	International Chinese Osteoarthirtis Research Society		
			Self	Grant / Contract	Cumberland Pharmaceuticals, Inc.		\$55,928.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Speaker at CME event	Focus Medical Communications	Speaker at CME event	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.		
			Self	Grant / Contract	AbbVie, Inc.		\$338,295.91
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Avalor Therapeutics	development of an intra- articular IL-1b inhibitor, initially for gout and CPPD	
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Express Scripts		\$32,086.00
			Self	Grant / Contract	Pfizer		\$225,841.54
Claudette M. Lajam	Voting Panel	NYU Langone Health	Self	Fiduciary Officer	American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons		



			Spouse/Part ner	Employment Fiduciary Officer	Pfizer American Association of Hip and Knee	Husband is Pfizer employee- Senior Director of Environmental Remediation, part of Global Engineering	
Larry W. Moreland	Voting Panel	University of Colorado	Self	Independent Contractor - Expert Witness	Surgeons German, Gallagher and Murtaugh	Expert testimony for medical malpractice defense Nothing to	\$13,000.00
		Anschutz Medical Campus	- 16			disclose	
Linda A. Russell	Voting Panel	Hospital for Special Surgery	Self	Independent Contractor - Physician	Arthritis Foundation		
Bryan D. Springer	Voting Panel	OrthoCarolina	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Stryker		\$800,000.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Convatec Inc.		\$15,000.00
			Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	Osteoremedies, LLC		\$20,000.00
Linda I. Suleiman	Voting Panel	DePuy Orthopaedics Inc.	Self	Independent Contractor - Consultant	DePuy Orthopaedics Inc.		\$1,800.00
Jesse Wolfstadt	Voting Panel	Mount Sinai Hospital		NA		Nothing to disclose	