http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/RVW.18.00150

The following content was supplied by the authors as supporting material and has not been copy-edited or verified by JBJS.

Appendix A – Search strategy

1.	exp Knee Joint/
2.	Knee/
3.	Cartilage, Articular/
4.	(knee* or patellofemoral or tibiofemoral).ti,ab.
5.	(knee and (articular or cartilage* or joint*)).ti,ab.
6.	or/1-5
7.	exp Osteoarthritis/
8.	(osteoarthriti* or arthriti* or OA or degenerat* or deteriorat* or disease* or DJD or lesion* or damage*).ti,ab.
9.	7 or 8
10.	6 and 9
11.	gonarthros#s.ti,ab.
12.	10 or 11
13.	(non?surgical or conservative or pharmacologic* or non?pharmacologic*).ti,ab.
14.	exp Exercise/
15.	(exercise* or (physical adj1 activit*) or (weight adj1 loss) or (weight adj1 reduction)).ti,ab.
16.	exp Physical Therapy Modalities/
17.	Physical Therapy Specialty/
18.	((physical adj1 therap*) or physiotherapy or hydrotherapy or balneotherapy or (aquatic adj1 therapy) or rehab*).ti,ab.
19.	Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation/
20.	(TENS or (transcutaneous adj3 stimulation)).ti,ab.
21.	Ultrasonic Therapy/
22.	((ultrasound or ultrason*) adj3 therap*).ti,ab.
23.	exp Acupuncture Therapy/
24.	acupuncture.ti,ab.
25.	exp Musculoskeletal Manipulations/
26.	((manual adj1 therap*) or (manipulative adj1 therap*)).ti,ab.
27.	Braces/
28.	Foot Orthoses/
29.	(brace* or bracing or orthos#s or insole* or (shoe adj1 insert*)).ti,ab.
30.	exp Glucosamine/
31.	exp Chondroitin/
32.	(glucosamine or chondroitin or nutraceutical* or ((nutritional or dietary) adj1 supplement*)).ti,ab.

33.	Capsaicin/
34.	capsaicin.ti,ab.
35.	exp Anti-Inflammatory Agents, Non-Steroidal/
36.	(NSAID* or (anti?inflammatory adj1 (drug* or agent*))).ti,ab.
37.	exp Analgesics/
38.	Acetaminophen/
39.	(analgesic* or acetaminophen or paracetamol).ti,ab.
40.	Analgesics, Opioid/
41.	opioid*.ti,ab.
42.	Viscosupplementation/
43.	Hyaluronic Acid/
44.	viscosupplement*.ti,ab.
45.	(hyaluron* or HA or IA?HA or hylan*).ti,ab.
46.	Cortisone/
47.	Adrenal Cortex Hormones/
48.	Glucocorticoids/
49.	(cortisone or glucocorticoid* or corticosteroid*).ti,ab.
50.	Platelet-Rich Plasma/
51.	Thrombocyte Rich Plasma/
52.	((platelet* or leu#ocyte* or thrombocyte* or plasma*) adj3 (rich* or enrich*)).ti,ab.
53.	(prp or prf or prgf*).ti,ab.
54.	or/13-53
55.	Exp Guideline/
56.	(guideline or practice guideline).pt.
57.	Meta-Analysis/
58.	meta-analysis.pt.
59.	(guideline* or recommendation* or treatment* or intervention* or management or therap*).ti,ab.
60.	meta?analy*.ti,ab.
61.	(systematic* adj1 review*).ti,ab.
62.	or/55-61
63.	12 and 54 and 62
64.	Exp Animals/ not Humans/
65.	Exp Case Reports/ or exp Case-Control studies/ or exp Cross-Sectional Studies/ or exp Retrospective Studies/ or exp Costs/ or exp Cost Analysis/ or exp Clinical Study/ or exp Multicenter Study/ or exp Congresses/
66.	Observational Study/ or Meeting Abstracts/

67.	(comment or congress* or consensus* or editorial or letter or meeting* or monograph or news* or case reports or clinical trial or multicenter study or meeting abstracts).pt.
68.	or/64-67
69.	63 not 68
70.	Limit 69 to English language
71.	Remove duplicates from 70

Inclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria were: 1) a guideline or meta-analysis that evaluated at least one nonsurgical intervention for knee OA (e.g., acupuncture, analgesics, bracing, intra-articular corticosteroid (IACS) injections, exercise, physical therapy, glucosamine and chondroitin (or other dietary supplements), insoles, intra-articular hyaluronic acid (IAHA) injections, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), opioids, platelet-rich plasma (PRP) injections, pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMF) therapy, serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS), ultrasound (US) therapy, weight loss), 2) referenced an MCID for pain on a continuous scale, 3) the nonsurgical intervention was compared to placebo or control, and 4) a full-text guideline or meta-analysis published in English.

Appendix B - Description of results in the AAOS guideline

Descriptive term	Condition for use:
Clinically significant	Statistically significant and lower CI > MCID
Possibly clinically significant	Statistically significant and CIs contain MCID
Not clinically significant	Statistically significant and upper CI < MCID
True negative	Not statistically significant and upper CI < MCID
Inconclusive	Not statistically significant but CIs contain MCID

CI, confidence interval; MCID, minimum clinically important difference.

http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/RVW.18.00150

Appendix C – Details of the included guidelines and meta-analyses

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Altman et al, 2016 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain	**Databases:** EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** During or after 1995 **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** None **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups at 26 weeks. Conducted subgroup analyses by intervention characteristics. **Software(s) used:** Online Excel tool **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	Unable to assess.
Arrich et al, 2005 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA **Location:** Austria **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** BIOSIS, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** No **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Assessed allocation concealment, degree of blinding, and intention-to-treat analysis **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing outcomes between groups at 2-6, 10-14, 22-30, 44-60 weeks, with meta-regression based on study-level characteristics. Conducted subgroups analysis by intervention characteristics and sensitivity analysis based on trial quality. **Software(s) used:** Not reported	VAS at rest, 2-6 weeks: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW VAS at rest, 10-14 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE VAS at rest, 22-30 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE VAS after exercise, 10-14 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
			Imputations/missing data: When variability was not reported, calculated from p values or confidence interval.	VAS after exercise, 22-30 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
Bannuru et al, 2011 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function, Stiffness	**Databases:** BIOSIS, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, Google Scholar, PubMed/Medline, Web of Science **Conferences:** AAOS, ACR, BSR, EULAR, ILAR, OARSI **Expert opinion:** Study authors, Product manufacturers **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Assessed adequacy of randomization, allocation concealment, and blinding **Analysis:** Bayesian pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups at 2, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24 weeks, with meta-regression based on study-level characteristics. **Software(s) used:** OpenBUGS, R **Imputations/missing data:** Estimated means and variances from median and range, and imputed standard deviation when needed	SMD, 4 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				SMD, 8 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				SMD, 12 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				SMD, 16 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
				SMD, 24 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
Bannuru et al, 2015a **Study type:** Network meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Acetaminophen, Corticosteroids, IAHA, NSAIDs, Placebo	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, Google Scholar, PubMed/Medline, Web of Science **Conferences:** AAOS, ACR, BSR, EULAR, ILAR, OARSI **Expert opinion:** Study authors, Product manufacturers	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Bayesian network meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups at 3 months, with meta-regression based on study-level characteristics. Conducted sensitivity analysis for	Intra-articular placebo, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Oral + topical placebo, WOMAC: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Location: United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain	**Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** clinicaltrials.gov, United States FDA	**Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	differential versus nondifferential placebo effects. **Software(s) used:** OpenBUGS **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	Topical placebo, WOMAC: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
Bannuru et al, 2015b **Study type:** Network meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Acetaminophen, Celecoxib, Corticosteroid, Diclofenac, IAHA, Ibuprofen, Naproxen, Placebo **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function, Stiffness	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, Google Scholar, PubMed/Medline, Web of Science **Conferences:** AAOS, ACR, BSR, EULAR, ILAR, OARSI **Expert opinion:** Study authors, Product manufacturers **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** clinicaltrials.gov, United States FDA	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Bayesian network meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups at 3 months, with meta-regression based on study-level characteristics. Conducted sensitivity analysis by type of outcome scale. **Software(s) used:** OpenBUGS **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	Acetaminophen, WOMAC: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE Celecoxib, WOMAC: ⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH Diclofenac, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Corticosteroid, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW IAHA, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Intra-articular placebo, WOMAC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW Ibuprofen, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Naproxen, WOMAC: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
Bjordal et al, 2004 **Study type:** Meta-analysis	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** Yes, but not specified	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups	WOMAC/VAS, 2-13 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Treatment(s) evaluated: NSAIDs **Location:** Norway **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Expert opinion:** Clinical experts **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Language restriction:** English, German, Scandinavian **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** ACR criteria and/or radiographic evidence **Min. symptom duration:** 3 months **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	at 2-13 weeks. Conducted subgroup analyses by treatment duration, type of outcome scale, and patients with flare up of symptoms. **Software(s) used:** Comprehensive Meta-analysis **Imputations/missing data:** If variance data not reported, calculated using sample size and other data such as p-values, t values, standard errors, or confidence intervals.	
Bjordal et al, 2007 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Acupuncture, Low level laser therapy, PEMF, Static magnets, TENS, Ultrasound **Location:** Norway **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain	**Databases:** CINAHL, Cochrane Library, DARE, EMBASE, INAHTA, NGC, NICE, PEDro, PRODIGY Guidance, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** World Confederation of Physical Therapy, Wold Association of Laser therapy **Expert opinion:** Yes, but not specified **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English, German, Scandinavian **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** ACR criteria and/or radiographic evidence **Min. symptom duration:** 3 months **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing changed from baseline scores between groups within 4 weeks and at 1-12 weeks post-treatment. Conducted subgroup analyses based on baseline pain, methodological quality, dosage, procedural recommendations, and funding sources. **Software(s) used:** Review Manager **Imputations/missing data:** If standard deviation not reported, re-calculated algebraically from the trial data of sample size and other variance data such as p-	Electro-acupuncture, VAS, 4 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH Low level laser therapy, VAS, 4 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Manual acupuncture, VAS, 4 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE PEMF, VAS, 4 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH Static magnets, VAS, 4 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
			values, t- values, standard errors, or confidence intervals.	TENS, VAS, 4 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
Brien et al, 2011 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Dietary supplements (dimethyl sulfoxide, methylsulfonylmethane) **Location:** United Kingdom **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain	**Databases:** AMED, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, National Library for Health, PubMed/Medline, Scopus **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** No **Clinical trials registries:** clinicaltrials.gov, controlled-trials.com, actr.org.au, umin.ac.jp/ctr	**Study design:** Quasi-RCT, RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups at end of treatment. **Software(s) used:** Not reported **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	VAS: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
Christensen et al, 2007 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Weight loss **Location:** Denmark **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline, Scopus, Web of Science **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups, with meta-regression. **Software(s) used:** Review Manager, SAS **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
Colen et al, 2012 **Study type:** Meta-analysis	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No	**Quality scale:** None **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups	VAS: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Treatment(s) evaluated: IAHA **Location:** Belgium, the Netherlands **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain	**Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Language restriction:** Included any paper that could be translated by the authors **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	at 3 months. Conducted a subgroup analysis by IAHA brand. **Software(s) used:** Review Manager **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	
Corbett et al, 2013 **Study type:** Network meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Acupuncture, Aerobic exercise, Balneotherapy, Braces, Heat treatment, Ice/cooling treatment, Insoles, Interferential therapy, Laser/light therapy, Manual therapy, Muscle-strengthening, Neuromuscular electrical stimulation, PEMF, Pulsed electrical stimulation, Static magnets, Tai Chi, TENS, Weight loss	**Databases:** Not reported **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** Yes, but not specified	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** Excluded trials that included patients with varus/valgus malalignment **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** ≥ 55 years **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Bayesian network meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups at end of treatment and 3 months. Conducted sensitivity analyses based on study-level characteristics. **Software(s) used:** WinBUGS **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	Acupuncture, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Aerobic exercise, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Balneotherapy, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Braces, WOMAC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW Heat treatment, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Ice/cooling treatment, WOMAC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW Insoles, WOMAC:

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Location: United Kingdom **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain				⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Interferential therapy, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Laser/light therapy, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Manual therapy, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Static magnets, WOMAC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
				Tai Chi, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Neuromuscular electrical stimulation, WOMAC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
				PEMF, WOMAC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
				TENS, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Pulsed electrical stimulation, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
				Sham acupuncture, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
				Weight loss, WOMAC: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
Dai et al, 2017 **Study type:** Cochrane review **Treatment(s) evaluated:** PRP, HA **Location:** Australia, Canada, the Netherlands **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** Pubmed, Embase, Scopus, Cochrane Library **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** ACR Diagnostic criteria **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Pairwise random effects meta-analysis comparing pain and function at 6 and 12 months **Software(s) used:** Review Manager **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	PRP, WOMAC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
Fransen et al, 2015 **Study type:** Cochrane review **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Exercise interventions **Location:** Australia, Canada, the Netherlands **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PEDro, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** clinicaltrials.gov, World Health Organization	**Study design:** Quasi-RCT, RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups at end of treatment, and at 2-6 and > 6 months. Conducted subgroup analyses based on intervention characteristics and sensitivity analyses based on study-level characteristics.	VAS: ⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
		Other: No	**Software(s) used:** Review Manager **Imputations/missing data:** Reported no missing data.	
Health Quality Ontario, 2005 **Study type:** Health technology assessment **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA (Hylan G-F 20/Synvisc) **Location:** Canada **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, INAHTA, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** No **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** Economic evaluation, Meta-analysis, Non-RCT, RCT, Systematic Review **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** During or after 1966 **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** None **Software(s) used:** Not applicable **Imputations/missing data:** Not applicable	VAS, 1-4 weeks: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
Jevsevar et al, 2015 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function, Stiffness	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PEDro, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** ≥ 30 patients per arm **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** ≥ 4 weeks **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Assessed type of control intervention, allocation concealment, blinding, intention-to-treat analysis, investigator bias **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing scores between groups at 26 weeks, with meta-regression. Conducted a subgroup analysis by intervention characteristics. **Software(s) used:** Stata **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Jevsevar et al, 2013 (AAOS) **Study type:** Guideline **Treatment(s) evaluated:** All available therapies **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function, Stiffness, Composite score (WOMAC)	**Databases:** CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/MEDLINE **Conferences:** None **Expert opinion:** None **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** None	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** During or after 1966 **Language restriction:** English **Specific outcome measures:** **Min. sample size:** ≥ 30 patients per arm **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** ≥ 4 weeks **Study quality:** Excluded studies determined to have "very limited evidence strength" **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** Only validated "paper-and-pencil" outcome measures or those identified a priori by the work group as "critical"**;** excluded studies in which there was heterogeneity in patient characteristics or outcomes at baseline and authors did not statistically adjust for these differences	**Quality scale:** 20-item questionnaire **Analysis:** Bayesian network meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between treatments for continuous outcomes. **Software(s) used:** WinBUGS **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported.	Acupuncture, WOMAC/VAS, 4-26 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE Corticosteroid, WOMAC/VAS: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE Glucosamine, WOMAC: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE Chondroitin sulfate, VAS: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE IAHA. WOMAC: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
Jevsevar et al, 2018 **Study type:** Network meta-analysis	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** Search conducted in 2015 **Language restriction:** English	**Quality scale:** Modified Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Bayesian network meta-analysis comparing change	Acetaminophen, SMD: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE Celecoxib, SMD:

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Treatment(s) evaluated: Acetaminophen, Celecoxib, Corticosteroid, Diclofenac, IAHA, Ibuprofen, Naproxen, PRP, Oral Placebo, IA Placebo **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Min. sample size:** 30 per arm **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** 28 days **Study quality:** Studies assessed using appraisal criteria: randomization, allocation concealment, blinding, completeness of outcome data, selective reporting, and the presence of other biases such as conflicts of interest or industry funding, confounding factors or treatments, lack of intention-to-treat analysis when applicable, and significant differences in baseline measurements. Only articles fitting the best available evidence criteria were considered for each comparison. **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	from baseline scores between groups at 4 weeks. **Software(s) used:** OpenBUGS **Imputations/missing data:** No	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH Diclofenac, SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Corticosteroid, SMD: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE IAHA, SMD: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE Ibuprofen, SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Naproxen, SMD: ⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH PRP, SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
McCarthy et al, 2006 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** PEMF **Location:** United Kingdom	**Databases:** AMED, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, HealthSTAR, PEDro, PubMed/Medline, SPORTDiscus **Conferences:** Yes, but not specified	**Study design:** Non-RCT, RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** During or after 1996 **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups immediately post-treatment. **Software(s) used:** Not reported **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Outcome(s) evaluated: Pain, Function	**Expert opinion:** Yes, but not specified **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** Outcome measures must have been validated		
Moyer et al, 2015 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Valgus bracing **Location:** Canada **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline, Scopus, Science Direct, Web of Knowledge **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups at longest follow-up. Conducted subgroup analyses based on intervention characteristics and risk of bias, and sensitivity analyses based on study-level characteristics. **Software(s) used:** Comprehensive Meta-analysis **Imputations/missing data:** Used p-value if missing standard deviation.	SMD: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
NICE 2014 **Study type:** Guideline **Treatment(s) evaluated:** All available therapies **Location:** United Kingdom **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function,	**Databases:** AMED, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** Non-RCT, Observational, RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups. Conducted subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses by study time points and risk of bias. **Software(s) used:** Review Manager	Unable to assess.

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Stiffness, OMERACT-OARSI, PGA, QoL		**Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Imputations/missing data:** In cases where standard deviations were not reported, the standard error was calculated if the p-values or 95% confidence intervals were reported. If these statistical measures were not available then the methods described in section 16.1.3 of the Cochrane Handbook 'Missing standard deviations' were applied as the last resort.	
Richette et al, 2015 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA **Location:** Belgium, France **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** Yes **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** Yes	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** Only included studies with a low risk of bias **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Assessed adequacy of randomization, allocation concealment, and blinding **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups at 3 months. **Software(s) used:** R, Meta package **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported.	SMD, 12 weeks: ⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH
Rutjes et al, 2009 **Study type:** Cochrane review **Treatment(s) evaluated:** TENS **Location:** Switzerland	**Databases:** CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PEDro, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** Yes, but not specified **Expert opinion:** Content experts and trialists	**Study design:** Quasi-RCT, RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups at the end of the treatment period, with meta-regression. Conducted subgroup analyses based on	SMD, 4 weeks: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Outcome(s) evaluated: Pain, Function	**Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** Yes, but not specified	**Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	study-level and intervention characteristics. **Software(s) used:** Review Manager, Stata **Imputations/missing data:** Approximated means and measures of dispersion from figures in reports. If effect sizes could not be calculated, contacted authors for additional data.	
Rutjes et al, 2010 **Study type:** Cochrane review **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Ultrasound **Location:** Switzerland **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PEDro, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** Yes, but not specified **Expert opinion:** Content experts and trialists **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** Yes, but not specified	**Study design:** Quasi-RCT, RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups at the end of the treatment period. Conducted subgroup analyses based on study-level and intervention characteristics. **Software(s) used:** Review Manager, Stata **Imputations/missing data:** Used other available parameters to estimate effect size and variability.	SMD, 2-8 weeks: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
Rutjes et al, 2012 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA **Location:** Switzerland	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** Yes, but not specified **Expert opinion:** Yes, but not specified **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes	**Study design:** Quasi-RCT, RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No	**Quality scale:** Assessed concealment of allocation, blinding of patients, use of a sham control, blinded outcome assessment, and intention-to-treat analyses **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute	SMD: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Outcome(s) evaluated: Pain, Function	**Clinical trials registries:** Yes, but not specified	**Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	scores between groups at 3 months, with meta-regression. Conducted subgroups analyses based on study-level and intervention characteristics. **Software(s) used:** Stata **Imputations/missing data:** Used other available parameters to estimate effect size and variability.	
Schneider et al, 2012 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Dietary supplement (chondroitin sulfate) **Location:** France, Switzerland **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function, OMERACT-OARSI	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** Yes **Expert opinion:** Yes **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** Yes	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Yes **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** No **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** 3 months **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores and OMERACT-OARSI rates between groups at 3-6 months. **Software(s) used:** Easy MA **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported.	VAS: ⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE
Strand et al, 2015 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** IAHA **Location:** United States	**Databases:** EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing absolute scores between groups at 4-13 and 14-26 weeks. Conducted subgroup analyses by study time points, patient characteristics,	SMD, 4-13 weeks: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Outcome(s) evaluated: Pain, Function		**Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** Only included trials evaluating United States-approved products	sample size, and Jadad score, and sensitivity analysis by removing one study at a time. **Software(s) used:** Comprehensive Meta-analysis **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	SMD, 14-26 weeks: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
Wang et al, 2012 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Physical therapy interventions - Aerobic exercise, Aquatic exercise, Diathermy, Education program, Electrical stimulation, Massage, Orthotics, PEMF, Proprioception exercise, Strengthening exercise, Tai chi, Taping, Ultrasonography **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function, QoL	**Databases:** AMED, Cochrane Library, Health and Psychosocial Instruments, PEDro, PubMed/Medline, Scirus, **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** clinicaltrials.gov	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** During or after 1970 **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing scores between groups at < 6, 6-13, 14-26, and > 26 weeks, with meta-regression by study-level characteristics. Conducted subgroup analyses by patient. characteristics and type of outcome scale. **Software(s) used:** Stata **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	Aerobic exercise, SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Electrical stimulation, SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Strength exercises, SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW Ultrasound, SMD: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
Wang et al, 2015 **Study type:** Meta-analysis	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EBSCO, EMBASE, Google Scholar, PubMed/Medline, Science Direct **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No	**Quality scale:** Jadad score **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups. Conducted subgroup analyses by patient characteristics.	Likert scale: ⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
Treatment(s) evaluated: Duloxetine (SNRI) **Location:** China **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function, PGA	**Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** clinicaltrials.gov	**Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** 3 months **Age restriction:** ≥ 40 years **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** Excluded trials with insufficient data	**Software(s) used:** Review Manager **Imputations/missing data:** Excluded trials with insufficient data.	
Warden et al, 2008 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Bracing, Patellar taping **Location:** United States **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain	**Databases:** CINAHL, EBM Reviews, Expanded Academic ASAP, PEDro, PubMed/Medline, SPORTSDiscus, Web of Knowledge **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** Quasi-RCT, RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** During or after 1980 **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No	**Quality scale:** PEDro scale **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing scores between groups immediately post-treatment and at 3-12 weeks. Conducted sensitivity analyses by removing trials when heterogeneity was present and study time points. **Software(s) used:** Review Manager **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	VAS: ⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
Xu et al, 2017 **Study type:** Meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** PRP, IA-HA, IA placebo **Location:** China **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** Medline, Embase, EBM reviews, Cochrane Library **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** No	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** No **Publication date restriction:** During or after 1980 **Language restriction:** English, Chinese **Min. sample size:** at least 30 participants **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No	**Quality scale:** PEDro scale **Analysis:** Pairwise meta-analysis comparing PRP to HA, and PRP to IA-placebo **Software(s) used:** Review Manager **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	PRP WOMAC or IKDC: ⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW

Study Details	Search Details	Inclusion Criteria	Quality Assessment and Statistics	Quality of Evidence for Pain Assessments (GRADE)
		Min. symptom duration: No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** No		
Zeng et al, 2015 **Study type:** Network meta-analysis **Treatment(s) evaluated:** Celecoxib, Chondroitin, Glucosamine, Glucosamine plus Chondroitin **Location:** China **Outcome(s) evaluated:** Pain, Function	**Databases:** Cochrane Library, EMBASE, PubMed/Medline **Conferences:** No **Expert opinion:** No **Reference list of relevant studies:** Yes **Clinical trials registries:** clinicaltrials.gov, World Health Organization	**Study design:** RCT **Conference abstracts:** Not reported **Publication date restriction:** No **Language restriction:** English **Min. sample size:** No **Specific OA diagnostic criteria:** No **Min. symptom duration:** No **Age restriction:** No **Min. follow-up:** No **Study quality:** No **BMI criteria:** No **Other:** <20% loss to follow-up	**Quality scale:** Cochrane Risk of Bias **Analysis:** Bayesian network meta-analysis comparing change from baseline scores between groups at the last follow-up time point. Conducted sensitivity analyses by study-level characteristics. **Software(s) used:** WinBUGS, R, Stata **Imputations/missing data:** Not reported	Unable to assess.

AAOS, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons; ACR, American College of Rheumatology; AMED, Allied and Complimentary Medicine Database; BSR, British Society for Rheumatology; BIOSIS, Biosciences Information Service; BMI, body mass index; CINAHL, The Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature; DARE, Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects; EMBASE, Excerpta Medica Database; EULAR, European League Against Rheumatism; FDA, Food and Drug Administration; IAHA, intra-articular hyaluronic acid; ILAR, International League of Associations for Rheumatology; INAHTA, International Network of Agencies for Health Technology Assessment; MEDLINE, Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online; NGC, National Guideline Clearinghouse; NICE, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; NSAID, Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug; OARSI, Osteoarthritis Research Society International; PEDro, Physiotherapy Evidence Database; PubMed, Public/Publisher MEDLINE; PEMF, pulsed electromagnetic field; PGA, patient global assessment; QoL, quality of life; RCT, randomized clinical trial; SAS, Statistical Analysis System; SMD, standardized mean difference; TENS, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation; VAS, visual analog scale; WOMAC, Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index.

Appendix D - GRADE summary

GRADE Quality of Evidence	Number of Outcomes (% within intervention type)
Nonpharmacological Interventions	**46**
High	5 (10.9)
Moderate	6 (13.0)
Low	27 (58.7)
Very Low	8 (17.4)
Intra-articular Interventions	**29**
High	1 (3.4)
Moderate	10 (34.5)
Low	10 (34.5)
Very Low	8 (27.6)
Oral Pharmacological Interventions	**12**
High	2 (16.7)
Moderate	5 (41.7)
Low	5 (41.7)
Very Low	0 (0.0)
Total	**87**
High	8 (9.2)
Moderate	21 (24.1)
Low	42 (48.3)
Very Low	16 (18.4)

REFERENCES

1. NICE. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Osteoarthritis: care and management. 2014.
2. Altman RD, Bedi A, Karlsson J, Sancheti P, Schemitsch E. Product Differences in Intra-articular Hyaluronic Acids for Osteoarthritis of the Knee. American Journal of Sports Medicine. 2015;17:17.
3. Jevsevar D, Donnelly P, Brown GA, Cummins DS. Viscosupplementation for Osteoarthritis of the Knee: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2015;97(24):2047-2060.
4. Trojian TH, Concoff AL, Joy SM, Hatzenbuehler JR, Saulsberry WJ, Coleman CI. AMSSM scientific statement concerning viscosupplementation injections for knee osteoarthritis: importance for individual patient outcomes. British Journal of Sports Medicine. 2016;50(2):84-92.
5. Loew L, Brosseau L, Wells GA, et al. Ottawa panel evidence-based clinical practice guidelines for aerobic walking programs in the management of osteoarthritis. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2012;93(7):1269-1285.
6. Wang SY, Olson-Kellogg B, Shamliyan TA, Choi JY, Ramakrishnan R, Kane RL. Physical therapy interventions for knee pain secondary to osteoarthritis: a systematic review. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2012;157(9):632-644.
7. Jevsevar DS, Brown GA, Jones DL, et al. The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons evidence-based guideline on: treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee, 2nd edition. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2013;95(20):1885-1886.
8. Lawrence RC, Felson DT, Helmick CG, et al. Estimates of the prevalence of arthritis and other rheumatic conditions in the United States. Part II. Arthritis Rheum. 2008;58(1):26-35.
9. Losina E, Weinstein AM, Reichmann WM, et al. Lifetime risk and age at diagnosis of symptomatic knee osteoarthritis in the US. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2013;65(5):703-711.
10. Puig-Junoy J, Ruiz Zamora A. Socio-economic costs of osteoarthritis: a systematic review of cost-of-illness studies. Semin Arthritis Rheum. 2015;44(5):531-541.
11. McCarthy CJ, Callaghan MJ, Oldham JA. Pulsed electromagnetic energy treatment offers no clinical benefit in reducing the pain of knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders. 2006;7:51.
12. Health Quality O. Intra-articular viscosupplementation with hylan g-f 20 to treat osteoarthritis of the knee: an evidence-based analysis. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser. 2005;5(10):1-66.
13. Jordan KM, Arden NK, Doherty M, et al. EULAR Recommendations 2003: an evidence based approach to the management of knee osteoarthritis: Report of a Task Force of the Standing Committee for International Clinical Studies Including Therapeutic Trials (ESCISIT). Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases. 2003;62(12):1145-1155.
14. Wang ZY, Shi SY, Li SJ, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Duloxetine on Osteoarthritis Knee Pain: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Pain Medicine. 2015;16(7):1373-1385.

15. Altman RD, Schemitsch E, Bedi A. Assessment of clinical practice guideline methodology for the treatment of knee osteoarthritis with intra-articular hyaluronic acid. Semin Arthritis Rheum. 2015;45(2):132-139.
16. Moyer RF, Birmingham TB, Bryant DM, Giffin JR, Marriott KA, Leitch KM. Valgus bracing for knee osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2015;67(4):493-501.
17. Zeng C, Wei J, Li H, et al. Effectiveness and safety of Glucosamine, chondroitin, the two in combination, or celecoxib in the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. Sci. 2015;5:16827.
18. Jaeschke R, Singer J, Guyatt GH. Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the minimal clinically important difference. Controlled clinical trials. 1989;10(4):407-415.
19. Devji T, Guyatt GH, Lytvyn L, et al. Application of minimal important differences in degenerative knee disease outcomes: a systematic review and case study to inform BMJ Rapid Recommendations. BMJ Open. 2017;7(5):e015587.
20. Neumann I, Santesso N, Akl EA, et al. A guide for health professionals to interpret and use recommendations in guidelines developed with the GRADE approach. J Clin Epidemiol. 2016;72:45-55.
21. Guyatt G, Gutterman D, Baumann MH, et al. Grading strength of recommendations and quality of evidence in clinical guidelines: report from an american college of chest physicians task force. Chest. 2006;129(1):174-181.
22. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol. 2011;64(4):383-394.
23. Alhazzani W, Guyatt G. An overview of the GRADE approach and a peek at the future. Med J Aust. 2018;209(7):291-292.
24. Salanti G, Del Giovane C, Chaimani A, Caldwell DM, Higgins JP. Evaluating the quality of evidence from a network meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2014;9(7):e99682.
25. Juhl C, Lund H, Roos EM, 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;2012:136245.
26. Higgins JPT GS. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011.
27. Stark PB, Tenorio L. A Primer of Frequentist and Bayesian Inference in Inverse Problems. In: Large-Scale Inverse Problems and Quantification of Uncertainty. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2010:9-32.
28. Nelson AE, Allen KD, Golightly YM, Goode AP, Jordan JM. A systematic review of recommendations and guidelines for the management of osteoarthritis: The chronic osteoarthritis management initiative of the U.S. bone and joint initiative. Semin Arthritis Rheum. 2014;43(6):701-712.
29. Arrich J, Piribauer F, Mad P, Schmid D, Klaushofer K, Mullner M. Intra-articular hyaluronic acid for the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee: systematic review and meta-analysis. CMAJ Canadian Medical Association Journal. 2005;172(8):1039-1043.

30. Bannuru RR, McAlindon TE, Sullivan MC, Wong JB, Kent DM, Schmid CH. Effectiveness and Implications of Alternative Placebo Treatments: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-analysis of Osteoarthritis Trials. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2015;163(5):365-372.
31. Bannuru RR, Natov NS, Dasi UR, Schmid CH, McAlindon TE. Therapeutic trajectory following intra-articular hyaluronic acid injection in knee osteoarthritis--meta-analysis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2011;19(6):611-619.
32. Bannuru RR, Schmid CH, Kent DM, Vaysbrot EE, Wong JB, McAlindon TE. Comparative effectiveness of pharmacologic interventions for knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2015;162(1):46-54.
33. Bjordal JM, Johnson MI, Lopes-Martins RA, Bogen B, Chow R, Ljunggren AE. Short-term efficacy of physical interventions in osteoarthritic knee pain. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised placebo-controlled trials. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders. 2007;8:51.
34. Bjordal JM, Ljunggren AE, Klovning A, Slordal L. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, including cyclo-oxygenase-2 inhibitors, in osteoarthritic knee pain: meta-analysis of randomised placebo controlled trials. Bmj. 2004;329(7478):1317.
35. Brien S, Prescott P, Lewith G. Meta-analysis of the related nutritional supplements dimethyl sulfoxide and methylsulfonylmethane in the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med. 2011;2011:528403.
36. Christensen R, Bartels EM, Astrup A, Bliddal H. Effect of weight reduction in obese patients diagnosed with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases. 2007;66(4):433-439.
37. Colen S, van den Bekerom MP, Mulier M, Haverkamp D. Hyaluronic acid in the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis with emphasis on the efficacy of different products. Biodrugs. 2012;26(4):257-268.
38. Corbett MS, Rice SJ, Madurasinghe V, et al. Acupuncture and other physical treatments for the relief of pain due to osteoarthritis of the knee: network meta-analysis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2013;21(9):1290-1298.
39. Fransen M, McConnell S, Harmer AR, Van der Esch M, Simic M, Bennell KL. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the knee. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2015;1:CD004376.
40. Juhl C, Christensen R, Roos EM, Zhang W, Lund H. Impact of exercise type and dose on pain and disability in knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-regression analysis of randomized controlled trials. Arthritis rheumatol. 2014;66(3):622-636.
41. Juni P, Hari R, Rutjes AW, et al. Intra-articular corticosteroid for knee osteoarthritis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2015;10:CD005328.
42. Manheimer E, Cheng K, Linde K, et al. Acupuncture for peripheral joint osteoarthritis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2010(1):CD001977.

43. Manheimer E, Linde K, Lao L, Bouter LM, Berman BM. Meta-analysis: acupuncture for osteoarthritis of the knee. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2007;146(12):868-877.
44. Richette P, Chevalier X, Ea HK, et al. Hyaluronan for knee osteoarthritis: an updated meta-analysis of trials with low risk of bias. RMD Open. 2015;1(1):e000071.
45. Rutjes AW, Juni P, da Costa BR, Trelle S, Nuesch E, Reichenbach S. Viscosupplementation for osteoarthritis of the knee: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2012;157(3):180-191.
46. Rutjes AW, Nuesch E, Sterchi R, Juni P. Therapeutic ultrasound for osteoarthritis of the knee or hip. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2010(1):CD003132.
47. Rutjes AW, Nuesch E, Sterchi R, et al. Transcutaneous electrostimulation for osteoarthritis of the knee. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2009(4):CD002823.
48. Schneider H, Maheu E, Cucherat M. Symptom-modifying effect of chondroitin sulfate in knee osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis of randomized placebo-controlled trials performed with structum(). Open Rheumatol J. 2012;6:183-189.
49. Strand V, McIntyre LF, Beach WR, Miller LE, Block JE. Safety and efficacy of US-approved viscosupplements for knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, saline-controlled trials. J Pain Res. 2015;8:217-228.
50. Warden SJ, Hinman RS, Watson MA, Jr., Avin KG, Bialocerkowski AE, Crossley KM. Patellar taping and bracing for the treatment of chronic knee pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arthritis Rheum. 2008;59(1):73-83.
51. Jevsevar DS, Shores PB, Mullen K, Schulte DM, Brown GA, Cummins DS. Mixed Treatment Comparisons for Nonsurgical Treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis: A Network Meta-analysis. J Am Acad Orthop Surg. 2018;26(9):325-336.
52. Xu Z, Luo J, Huang X, Wang B, Zhang J, Zhou A. Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma in Pain and Self-Report Function in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Best-Evidence Synthesis. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. 2017;96(11):793-800.
53. Dai WL, Zhou AG, Zhang H, Zhang J. Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma in the Treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis: A Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Arthroscopy. 2017;33(3):659-670.e651.
54. Bellamy N, Kirwan J, Boers M, et al. Recommendations for a core set of outcome measures for future phase III clinical trials in knee, hip, and hand osteoarthritis. Consensus development at OMERACT III. J Rheumatol. 1997;24(4):799-802.
55. Pham T, van der Heijde D, Altman RD, et al. OMERACT-OARSI initiative: Osteoarthritis Research Society International set of responder criteria for osteoarthritis clinical trials revisited. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2004;12(5):389-399.
56. J. C. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
57. Norman GR, Sloan JA, Wyrwich KW. Interpretation of changes in health-related quality of life: the remarkable universality of half a standard deviation. Med Care. 2003;41(5):582-592.
58. Crossley KM, Bennell KL, Cowan SM, Green S. Analysis of outcome measures for persons with patellofemoral pain: which are reliable and valid? Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2004;85(5):815-822.

59. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Wyrwich KW, et al. Interpreting the clinical importance of treatment outcomes in chronic pain clinical trials: IMMPACT recommendations. The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society. 2008;9(2):105-121.
60. Ehrich EW, Davies GM, Watson DJ, Bolognese JA, Seidenberg BC, Bellamy N. Minimal perceptible clinical improvement with the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities osteoarthritis index questionnaire and global assessments in patients with osteoarthritis. J Rheumatol. 2000;27(11):2635-2641.
61. Salaffi F, Stancati A, Silvestri CA, Ciapetti A, Grassi W. Minimal clinically important changes in chronic musculoskeletal pain intensity measured on a numerical rating scale. European journal of pain (London, England). 2004;8(4):283-291.
62. Tashjian RZ, Deloach J, Porucznik CA, Powell AP. Minimal clinically important differences (MCID) and patient acceptable symptomatic state (PASS) for visual analog scales (VAS) measuring pain in patients treated for rotator cuff disease. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2009;18(6):927-932.
63. Todd KH, Funk KG, Funk JP, Bonacci R. Clinical significance of reported changes in pain severity. Annals of emergency medicine. 1996;27(4):485-489.
64. Angst F, Aeschlimann A, Michel BA, Stucki G. Minimal clinically important rehabilitation effects in patients with osteoarthritis of the lower extremities. J Rheumatol. 2002;29(1):131-138.
65. Angst F, Aeschlimann A, Stucki G. Smallest detectable and minimal clinically important differences of rehabilitation intervention with their implications for required sample sizes using WOMAC and SF-36 quality of life measurement instruments in patients with osteoarthritis of the lower extremities. Arthritis Rheum. 2001;45(4):384-391.
66. Tubach F, Ravaud P, Baron G, et al. Evaluation of clinically relevant changes in patient reported outcomes in knee and hip osteoarthritis: the minimal clinically important improvement. Ann Rheum Dis. 2005;64(1):29-33.
67. Bannuru RR, Vaysbrot EE, McIntyre LF. Did the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons osteoarthritis guidelines miss the mark? Arthroscopy. 2014;30(1):86-89.
68. Farrar JT, Young JP, Jr., LaMoreaux L, Werth JL, Poole RM. Clinical importance of changes in chronic pain intensity measured on an 11-point numerical pain rating scale. Pain. 2001;94(2):149-158.
69. Gerlinger C, Schumacher U, Faustmann T, Colligs A, Schmitz H, Seitz C. Defining a minimal clinically important difference for endometriosis-associated pelvic pain measured on a visual analog scale: analyses of two placebo-controlled, randomized trials. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2010;8:138.
70. Lee JS, Hobden E, Stiell IG, Wells GA. Clinically important change in the visual analog scale after adequate pain control. Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine. 2003;10(10):1128-1130.
71. Rowbotham MC. What is a "clinically meaningful" reduction in pain? Pain. 2001;94(2):131-132.

72. Wells GA, Tugwell P, Kraag GR, Baker PR, Groh J, Redelmeier DA. Minimum important difference between patients with rheumatoid arthritis: the patient's perspective. J Rheumatol. 1993;20(3):557-560.
73. King MT. A point of minimal important difference (MID): a critique of terminology and methods. Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research. 2011;11(2):171-184.
74. Brozek JL, Guyatt GH, Schunemann HJ. How a well-grounded minimal important difference can enhance transparency of labelling claims and improve interpretation of a patient reported outcome measure. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2006;4:69.
(NICE) NIfHaCE. Osteoarthritis: care and management. 2014.