#### SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX 1: Methods

## ACR/AF 2019 Guideline for the Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hand, Hip and Knee

#### Methodology Overview

This guideline followed the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) guideline development process (<u>http://www.rheumatology.org/Practice-Quality/Clinical-Support/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines</u>). This process includes using GRADE methodology (<u>www.gradeworkinggroup.org</u>) to rate the quality of the available evidence and to develop the recommendations (1-3). GRADE methodology specifies that panels make recommendations based on the balance of benefits and harms, the quality of the evidence (i.e., confidence in effect estimates) and patients' values and preferences. ACR policy guided disclosures and the management of conflicts of interest (<u>https://www.rheumatology.org/Practice-Quality/Clinical-Support/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines/Osteoarthritis</u>).

This work involved four teams selected by the ACR Quality of Care Committee and Guideline Subcommittee after reviewing individual and group volunteer applications to an open call for interested participants: 1) a Core Leadership Team, which supervised and coordinated the project and drafted the clinical questions, recommendation statements and manuscript; 2) a Literature Review Team, which completed the literature screening, data abstraction and synthesis; 3) an Expert Panel, which helped develop the clinical questions and decide on the project scope; and 4) a Voting Panel, which included rheumatologists, physical and occupational therapists, and two patients. Supplementary Appendix 3 presents rosters of all guideline development team members. Additionally, a Patient Panel consisting of patients with varied experiences related to osteoarthritis (OA) provided input on their values and preferences, which was reviewed before discussion of each section of the guideline (e.g., pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic) and was incorporated into discussions and formulation of recommendations. In accordance with ACR policy, the principal investigator and the Literature Review Team leader were free of conflicts, and all teams had >50% members free of conflicts.

#### Framework for the Guideline Development and Scope of the Guideline

The objective of this project is to develop recommendations for the pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic management of OA of the hand, hip, and knee. At the scoping meeting, the Core Leadership Team, Voting Panel and Expert Panel decided that the guideline would focus on management options available in the United States and, for pharmacologic therapies, additionally focused on agents that are available in pharmaceutical grade formulations. Thus, nutraceuticals were not considered unless they were known to be available in pharmaceutical grade. In addition, clinicaltrials.gov was searched for Phase 2 and 3 trials to identify agents that may potentially become available by the time of publication or soon thereafter.

## Systematic Synthesis of the Literature

Direct evidence in OA patient populations relating to OA questions was obtained through systematic searches of the published English-language literature, including OVID Medline, PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Library (including Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and Health Technology Assessments) from the beginning of each database through October 15, 2017 (Supplementary Appendix 4); updated searches were conducted on August 1, 2018. Duplications were identified via DistillerSR software (https://distillercer.com/products/distillersr-systematic-reviewsoftware/) (Supplementary Appendix 5). All retrieved articles were screened in duplicate and the lead methodologist resolved any conflicts. For all included papers, reviewers entered extracted data describing details of the population, interventions (if any), and results into RevMan v.5.3 software (http://tech.cochrane.org/revman) which was used to calculate summary effect sizes (4), and evaluate risk of bias with the Cochrane risk of bias tool (http://handbook.cochrane.org/). RevMan files were exported into GRADEpro software to formulate a

GRADE summary of findings table (Supplementary Appendix 2) for each PICO question (5). Evidencebased models use the PICO process for framing a question; PICO elements include Population, Intervention, Comparison, and Outcome. For data not appropriate for RevMan (e.g., non-comparative data), reviewers abstracted data describing details of the population, interventions (if any), and results into Word tables. GRADE criteria provided the framework for judging the overall quality of evidence (1). When using GRADE, the overall quality of evidence rating for a given treatment comparison is based on the lowest quality rating for any critical outcome. Pain and function were identified as critical outcomes (see Table 1 and 2 below). Therefore, if the quality of evidence for pain is moderate and the quality of evidence for function is low, the overall quality of evidence rating would be low for that treatment comparison. The PICO questions and level of evidence that formed the basis for the recommendations in this guideline are outlined in Table 3 and 4.

### Moving from Evidence to Recommendations

Given that GRADE methodology specifies that panels make recommendations based on the balance of benefits and harms, the quality of the evidence, and patients' values and preferences, deciding on the balance between desirable and undesirable outcomes requires estimating the relative value patients place on those outcomes. When the literature provided very limited guidance, the experience of the Voting Panel members in managing the relevant patients and problems also provided an important source of evidence. Patient values and preferences were crucial to all recommendations made, and derived from input from the members of the Patient Panel; these were particularly salient in situations with limited literature. In addition, if a systemically acting therapy (e.g., oral medication) only had evidence available for a single anatomic site (e.g., the knee), those evidence could be considered as indirect for the other anatomic sites (e.g., hand, hip) where appropriate. GRADE methodology allows for the possibility of not coming to a decision, and in such cases, a summary of the discussion is noted.

#### **Consensus Building**

During a two-day face-to-face meeting and group emails, Voting Panel members voted on the direction (for or against) and strength (conditional or strong) of the recommendations related to the PICO questions. Some recommendation statements were dropped due to lack of data or relevance, and others were combined based on level of evidence and Voting Panel discussion. Recommendations required a 70% level of agreement as used previously in other similar processes (6). If 70% agreement was not achieved during an initial vote, the panel members held additional discussions before re-voting. For all conditional recommendations, a written explanation is provided, describing the reasons for this decision.

# Moving from Recommendations to Practice

These recommendations are designed to help health care providers, caregivers, and patients engage in shared decision-making regarding disease management. Level of disease activity, comorbidities, response and tolerance of prior therapies, and patient-specific factors, values and preferences should all

be taken into consideration in choosing optimal therapy.

<b>Outcomes: Critical</b>	Pain	Function: Self-Reported	Function: Performance Based
Outcomes Measures	ALISCAN	ALISCAN	
(sorted	AUSCAN	AUSCAN	
alphabetically):	DASH	Cochin	СОРМ
	MHQ	DASH	GAT
	PRWE	FIHOA	Grip Strength
	QuickDASH	MHQ	JFHT
	VAS	PRWE	МАМ
		QuickDASH	Pinch Strength
AHFT=Arthritis Hand Function Test AUSCAN=Australian Canadian Osteoarthritis Hand Index;			
Cochin=Cochin Hand Function Scale; COPM=Canadian Occupational Performance Measure ;			
DASH=Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand Questionnaire; FIHOA=Functional Index for Hand			

# Table 1. Critical Outcomes and Outcome Measures for Hand OA:

Osteoarthritis (aka Dreiser Functional Hand Index); GAT=Grip Ability Test; JHFT=Jebsen Hand Function Test; MHQ=Michigan Hand Outcomes Questionnaire; MAM=Manual Ability Measure; PRWE=Patient Rated Wrist Evaluation; VAS=Visual Analog Scale

|--|

Outcomes: Critical	Pain	Function: Self- Reported	Function: Performance Based
Outcomes Measures (sorted per established hierarchy):	(after Juhl 2012): (1) WOMAC pain subscale (Likert/100mm) or KOOS or HOOS (2) Pain during activity (VAS) (3) Pain during walking (VAS) (4) Global knee pain (VAS) (5) Pain at rest (VAS) (6) SF-36 (bodily pain (BP) subscale) (7) HAQ (pain subscale), Lequesne algofunctional index (pain subscale), AIMS (pain subscale), Knee-Specific Pain Scale (KSPS), McGill Pain Questionnaire (pain intensity)	Reported (after Juhl 2012): (1) WOMAC subscale function (Likert/100mm) or KOOS or HOOS (2) SF-36 (subscale physical function (PF) (3) Physical composite score (PCS) based on SF-36, SF-12, or SF-8 (4) HAQ (disability subscale), PDI (pain disability index), ASES (disability subscale)	<ul> <li>(after Dobson 2013):</li> <li>(1) sit-to-stand (30-sec chair stand test)</li> <li>(2) walking short distances (4x10m fast paced walk) [gait speed]</li> <li>(3) stair negotiation (no test recommended)</li> <li>(4) ambulatory transitions (timed up and go)</li> <li>(5) aerobic capacity/walking long distances (6-min walk test)</li> </ul>
	(8) Pain at night (VAS), pain during activity (NRS), pain on walking (NRS), number of painful days (days)		

AIMS=Arthritis Impact Measurement Scale; ASES=Arthritis Self Efficacy Scale; HAQ=Health Assessment Questionnaire; HOOS=Hip Disability and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score; KOOS=Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score; NRS=Numerical Rating Scale; VAS=Visual Analog Scale; WOMAC=Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index

Dobson F, Hinman RS, Roos EM, Abbott JH, Stratford P, Davis AM, Buchbinder R, Snyder-Mackler L, Henrotin Y, Thumboo J, Hansen P, Bennell KL. OARSI recommended performance-based tests to assess physical function in people diagnosed with hip or knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 2013;21(8):1042-1052.

Juhl C, Lund H, Roos E, Zhang W, Christensen R. A hierarchy of patient-reported outcomes for meta-analysis of knee osteoarthritis trials: empirical evidence from a survey of high impact journals. *Arthritis* 2012:136-245.

# REFERENCES

- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2008;336(7650):924-926. doi:10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
- Andrews J, Guyatt G, Oxman AD, et al. GRADE guidelines: 14. Going from evidence to recommendations: the significance and presentation of recommendations. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2013;66(7):719-725. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.03.013
- 3. Andrews JC, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, et al. GRADE guidelines: 15. Going from evidence to recommendation—determinants of a recommendation's direction and strength. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2013;66(7):726-735. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.02.003

- 4. Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.
- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):395-400. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.09.012
- Jaeschke R, Guyatt GH, Dellinger P, et al. Use of GRADE grid to reach decisions on clinical practice guidelines when consensus is elusive. *BMJ*. 2008;337:a744. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18669566.

Table 3. PICOs and levels of evidence for physical, psychosocial and mind body approach recommendations for the management of osteoarthritis (OA) of the hand, knee and hip.

RECOMMENDATION	LEVEL OF EVIDENCE	PICO #
Exercise	·	
<b>Strongly recommend</b> exercise for all patients with OA.	Moderate	1 (H/K)
	Moderate	2 (H/K)
	Moderate	3 (H/K)
	Moderate	4 (H/K)
	Moderate	5 (H/K)
	Low (hip); very low	6 (H/K)
	(knee)	7 (H/K)
	Low (hip); very low	8 (H/K)
	(knee)	9 (H/K)
	Very low	10 (H/K)
	Low	11 (H/K)
	Very low	12 (H/K)
	Very low	13 (H/K)
	Low	14 (H/K)
	Very low	16 (H/K)
	Low	17 (H/K)
	Very low	18 (H/K)
	Very low	19 (H/K)
	Very low	20 (H/K)
	Low	21 (H/K)
	Very low	22 (H/K)
	Very low	23 (H/K)
	Very low	30 (H)
	Moderate (hip); low	39 (H)
	(knee)	
	Low	
	Very low	
Weight loss		
Strongly recommend weight loss for patients with hip	Moderate	26 (H/K)
and/or knee OA who are overweight.	Moderate	36 (H/K)
Self-efficacy and self-management programs		
Strongly recommendation participation in self-efficacy	Moderate	24 (H/K)
and self-management programs for all patients with OA.	Very low	37 (H/K)
	Very low	34 (H)

Mind-body interventions		
Strongly recommend tai chi for patients with knee and	Moderate	28 (H/K)
hip OA.		
Conditionally recommend yoga for patients with knee	Moderate	28 (H/K)
OA.		
Cognitive behavioral therapy		
Conditionally recommend cognitive behavioral	Low	25 (H/K)
therapy for all patients with OA.		
Supportive devices		
Strongly recommend use of a cane for knee and hip	Moderate	29 (H/K)
OA in those patients in whom disease progression in		
one or more joints is having a sufficiently large impact		
on ambulation, joint stability and/or pain to warrant use		
of an assistive device.		
Strongly recommend tibiofemoral knee braces for	Moderate	105
knee OA patients in whom disease progression in one		(H/K)
or both knees is having a sufficiently large impact on		
ambulation, joint stability and/or pain to warrant use of		
an assistive device and are able to tolerate the		
associated inconvenience and burden.		
Conditionally recommend patellofemoral braces for	Low	106
patients with patellofemoral knee OA in whom disease		(H/K)
progression in one or both knees is having a sufficiently		
large impact on ambulation, joint stability and/or pain to		
warrant use of an assistive device and are able to		
tolerate the associated inconvenience and burden.		
<b>Conditionally recommend</b> kinesiotaping for patients	Low	107
with knee and 1st carpometacarpal joint OA.	Very low	(H/K)
		49 (H)
Strongly recommend the use of hand orthoses in the	LOW	46 (H)
1 <sup>st</sup> CMC joint for patients with hand OA.	LOW	47(H)
		48 (H)
		50 (H)
<b>Conditionally recommend</b> the use of hand orthoses		37 (H)
for patients with OA in other joints of the hand.	Very low	38 (H)
	LOW	51 (H)
Conditionally recommend against the way of		<u> </u>
conditionally recommend against the use of	LOW	
Conditionally recommend against the use of lateral	Low	(П/K)
and modial wordened insolate for patients with his and/or	LOW	
		(П/К)
Conditionally recommend the use of acupuncture in	Low (hin): low (knee)	27 (H/K)
notionts with OA		27 (17/1X) 36 (H)
Other physical modalities	v GI Y 10 W	1 30 (11)
Conditionally recommend the use of thermal	Low	30 (山/ഹ)
interventions (locally applied best or cold) for patients		30 (H/K)
with him knee and/or hand $\Omega \Delta$		32 (H)
with hip, thee and/or hand $OA$ .		JZ (11)

Conditionally recommend the use of paraffin for	Low	31 (H)
patients with hand OA.		
Conditionally recommend the use of radiofrequency	Moderate	102
ablation for patients with knee OA.		(H/K)
Conditionally recommend against the use of	Low	34 (H/K)
massage therapy for management of OA.		
Conditionally recommend against the use of manual	Low	35 (H/K)
therapy with exercise over exercise alone in the	Low	38 (H/K)
management of OA.		
Conditionally recommend against the use of	Very low	13 (H)
iontophoresis in patients with 1st carpometacarpal joint	Very low	24 (H)
OA.	Very low	45 (H)
Conditionally recommend against the use of pulsed	Low	33 (H/K)
vibration therapy in patients with knee OA.		
Strongly recommend against the use of	Low	32 (H/K)
transcutaneous electrical stimulation (TENS) in all		
patients with OA.		

Abbreviations: (H/K), Hip/Knee; (H) Hand

Table 4. PICOs and level of evidence for pharmacologic recommendations for the management of osteoarthritis (OA) of the hand, knee and hip.

RECOMMENDATION	LEVEL OF EVIDENCE	PICO #
Topical preparations		•
Strongly recommend the use of topical NSAIDs in	Moderate	96 (H/K)
patients with knee OA.	Low	98 (H/K)
Conditionally recommend the use of topical NSAIDs	Low	11 (H)
in patients with hand OA.	Very low	22 (H)
Conditionally recommend the use of topical capsaicin	Moderate	97 (H/K)
in patients with knee OA.	Very low	99 (H/K)
	Very low	101
		(H/K)
Conditionally recommend against the use of topical	Very low	12 (H)
capsaicin in patients with hand OA.	Very low	23 (H)
	Very low	28 (H)
Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs		
Strongly recommend the use of NSAIDs in all patients	Moderate	56 (H/K)
with OA.	Low	76 (H/K)
	Moderate	1 (H)
Intra-articular corticosteroid injections		
Strongly recommend the use of intra-articular	Low	39 (H/K)
corticosteroid injections in patients with knee or hip OA.	Very low	40 (H/K)
	Low	46 (H/K)
	Moderate	54 (H/K)
	Very low	55 (H/K)
Conditionally recommend the use of intra-articular	Low	25 (H)
corticosteroid injections in patients with hand OA.	Very low	44 (H)
Strongly recommend guidance with imaging for	Low	109
injection into hip joints.		(H/K)
Conditionally recommend intra-articular corticosteroid	Low	46 (H/K)
injection, in OA generally, over other forms of intra-	Moderate	47 (H/K)
articular injection, including hyaluronic acid	Moderate	51 (H/K)
preparations.		
Acetaminophen		
Conditionally recommend the use of acetaminophen	Low	57 (H/K)
in patients with OA.	Very low	2 (H)
	Very low	14 (H)
Duloxetine	1	
Conditionally recommend the use of duloxetine in	Moderate	59 (H/K)
patients with knee OA.	Very low	78 (H/K)
Opioids	1	
Conditionally recommend the use of tramadol in	Moderate	62 (H/K)
patients with OA.	Low	81 (H/K)
	Very low	95 (H/K)
	Very low	8 (H)

	Very low	19 (H)
	Very low	27 (H)
Conditionally recommend against the use of non-	Low	63 (H/K)
tramadol opioids in patients with OA.	Very low	82 (H/K)
	Very low	7 (H)
	Very low	18 (H)
Colchicine		
Conditionally recommend against the use of	Very low	67 (H/K)
colchicine in patients with OA.	Very low	86 (H/K)
Fish oil		
Conditionally recommend against the use of fish oil	Moderate	72 (H/K)
in patients with OA.	Very low	91 (H/K)
Vitamin D		
Conditionally recommend against the use of vitamin	Low	71 (H/K)
D in patients with OA.	Very low	90 (H/K)
Bisphosphonates		
Strongly recommend against the use of	Moderate	58 (H/K)
bisphosphonates in patients with OA.	Very low	77 (H/K)
	Very low	3 (H)
Glucosamine and chondroitin sulfate		
Strongly recommend against the use of glucosamine	Moderate	68 (H/K)
in patients with OA.	Low	87 (H/K)
	Very low	4 (H) ′
	Very low	15 (H)
Strongly recommend against the use of chondroitin	Moderate	69 (H/K)
sulfate in patients with knee OA, as are combination	Moderate	70 (H/K)
products that include glucosamine and chondroitin	Moderate	88 (H/K)
sulfate.	Moderate	89 (H/K)
	Very low	6 (H)
Conditionally recommend the use of chondroitin	Low	5 (H)
sulfate in patients with hand OA.	Very low	16 (H)
Hydroxychloroquine	· · ·	•
Strongly recommend against the use of	Moderate	40 (H)
hydroxychloroquine in patients with OA.		
Methotrexate		
Strongly recommend against the use of methotrexate	Very low	66 (H/K)
in patients with OA.	Very low	85 (H/K)
	Very low	42 (H)
Other intra-articular agents		
Conditionally recommend against the use of intra-	Low	41 (H/K)
articular hyaluronic acid injections in patients with knee	Moderate	47 (H/K)
and 1 <sup>st</sup> CMC OA.	Very low	26 (H)
	Low	29 (H)
Strongly recommend against the use of intra-articular	Low	46 (H/K)
hyaluronic acid injections in patients with hip OA.		

Conditionally recommend against the use of intra-	Very low	45 (H/K)
articular botulinum toxin in patients with OA.	Moderate	51 (H/K)
Conditionally recommend against the use of	Low	44 (H/K)
prolotherapy in patients with OA.	Very low	50 (H/K)
Strongly recommend against the use of platelet-rich	Low	42 (H/K)
plasma in patients with OA.	Low	48 (H/K)
Strongly recommend against the use of stem-cell	Low	43 (H/K)
injections in patients with OA.	Very low	49 (H/K)
Biologic agents		
Strongly recommend against the use of tumor	Very low	74 (H/K)
necrosis factor (TNF) inhibitors and interleukin-1 (IL-1)	Low	75 (H/K)
receptor antagonists in patients with OA.	Very low	93 (H/K)
	Very low	94 (H/K)
	Very low	41 (H)
	Very low	43 (H)

Abbreviations: (H/K), Hip/Knee; (H) Hand