

1 **How do we explain painful chronic non-traumatic knee conditions to children and**
2 **adolescents? A multiple-method study to develop credible explanations.**

3 **Authors**

4 Djurtoft C^{1,2,X}, Bruun MK^{1,X}, Riel H^{1,2,3} Hoegh MS², Darlow B⁴, Rathleff MS^{1,2}

5 **Affiliations**

6 1. Center for General Practice at Aalborg University, Denmark.

7 2. Department of Health Science and Technology, Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg University, Denmark.

8 3. Department of Physiotherapy, University College of Northern Denmark, Denmark.

9 4. Department of Primary Health Care and General Practice, University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand.

10 X. Shared first authorship.

11

12 **Institutional Review Board:** Ethics Committee of North Denmark Region. This study was exempt from a
13 full ethical approval by The North Denmark Region Committee on Health Research Ethics due to the non-
14 interventional nature of the study and the data that was collected. Signed informed consent was obtained
15 from all participants during Argumentative Delphi and Think-aloud exercises. All data were stored on a
16 secure fileshare.

17 **Corresponding author:** Michael Skovdal Rathleff, Department of Health Science and Technology, Faculty
18 of Medicine, Aalborg University, Fredrik Bajers Vej 7E, 9220 Aalborg East, Aalborg, Denmark; and Center
19 for General Practice at Aalborg University, Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, E-mail:
20 misr@hst.aau.dk.

21

22 **Pages:** 28.

23 **Tables:** 2.

24 **Figures:** 4.

25 **Word count:** 4299.

26

27 **Abstract**

28

29 **INTRODUCTION** Perceived diagnostic uncertainty can leave adolescents confused about their condition and
30 impede their ability to understand “*what’s wrong with me*”. Our aim is to develop credible explanations
31 (trustworthy and understandable explanation of the condition) for adolescents suffering from chronic non-
32 traumatic knee pain.

33 **METHODS** This multiple-method study integrated findings from a systematic literature search of qualitative
34 studies, an Argumentative Delphi with international experts (n=16) and think-aloud sessions with adolescents
35 (n=7). Experts provided feedback with arguments on how to communicate credible explanations to meet
36 adolescents’ needs. We analyzed feedback using thematic analysis before tailoring explanations to end-users.

37 **RESULTS** We screened 3.239 titles/abstracts and included 16 papers which explored diagnostic uncertainty
38 from adolescents’ and parents’ perspectives. Five themes emerged: (1) Understanding causes and contributors
39 to the pain experience, (2) Feeling stigmatized for having an invisible condition, (3) Having a name for pain,
40 (4) Controllability of pain, and (5) Worried about something being missed. The Argumentative Delphi revealed
41 the following themes: (1) Multidimensional perspective, (2) Tailored to adolescents, (3) Validation and
42 reassurance, and (4) Careful wording. Merging findings from the systematic search and the Delphi revealed
43 three essential domains to address in credible explanations: “What is non-traumatic knee pain and what does
44 it mean?”, “What is causing my knee pain?” and “How do I manage my knee pain?”.

45 **CONCLUSIONS** Six credible explanations for the six most common diagnoses of chronic non-traumatic knee
46 pain were developed. We identified three domains to consider when tailoring credible explanations to
47 adolescents experiencing non-traumatic knee pain.

48 **Word count (Abstract): 248**

49

50

51 **1. Introduction**

52 Chronic musculoskeletal pain (CMP) is recognized as a potential threat to the health of adolescents due to
53 negative effects on physical, psychological, and social domains of life [25,26,32,55]. CMP can affect multiple
54 body parts and areas, with knee pain being the most common site of pain in adolescents [19,55]. In recent
55 years, research has uncovered the importance of how we communicate with people who have pain and the
56 risks associated with many labels that are used for pain complaints [14,18]. However, communicating credible
57 explanations beyond diagnostic labels remains a significant challenge for clinicians [14,46,48]. These issues
58 have resulted in a wave of research agendas, where especially diagnostic uncertainty (*defined as “...subjective*
59 *perception of an inability to provide an accurate explanation of the patient’s health problem”*) has gained a
60 lot of attention lately [3,9,11,52].

61 Perceived diagnostic uncertainty can leave adolescents confused and impedes their ability to understand
62 “*what’s wrong with me*” [23,46,62]. Uncertainty may have a cascading effect of higher anxiety, pain
63 catastrophizing, fear of pain and lower acceptance of self-management recommendations [30,46,62]. The
64 diagnostic process has a high impact on how the diagnosis of CMP is communicated and understood by
65 clinicians, adolescents, and parents [11,43,46,48]. Adolescents and parents often report that they do not
66 understand explanations given by clinicians, why some tests are (or are not) conducted, or the diagnostic label
67 itself [23,43,46]. Diagnostic uncertainty may result in an extended journey through the healthcare system
68 during which both adolescents and their parents are troubled by the feeling of ‘something missing’ [10,46].
69 Consequently, many adolescents experience multiple referrals, searching for the ‘right’ diagnosis and a
70 credible explanation for their pain [10,40,43].

71 Chronic non-traumatic knee pain negatively impacts adolescents’ quality of life, sleep quality, sports
72 participation, and social interactions [19,25,53]. These non-specific conditions are often viewed as self-
73 limiting by clinicians and pain-dismissing statements, such as “*just growing pains*” or “*it’ll go away*”, have
74 been reported [54,62]; Adolescents living with chronic pain may also experience pain-related stigma from
75 family members, and peers [17,64]. In contrast, recent research shows that about 50% of adolescents with knee
76 pain will continue to have pain after two years [53]. Unlike traumatic knee pain, the clinical assessment in

77 non-traumatic knee pain often relies on subjective tests, such as pain provocation or movement-based tests [7].
78 This lack of diagnostic clarity often causes perceived diagnostic uncertainty during the clinical encounter
79 [11,41,46].

80 Lancet Child & Adolescent Health Commission have emphasized fundamental gaps in current management
81 and research for pediatric chronic pain and highlighted that the main goal is to ‘make pain understood’ [14].
82 How patient education can be improved to help individuals become more knowledgeable of their condition
83 was recently ranked as a top research priority in CMP [14,36,51]. To date, no studies have integrated findings
84 from multiple perspectives (i.e., best research evidence, clinical expertise, and lived experience with adolescent
85 knee pain) to develop credible explanations for chronic pain conditions. Therefore, this study aims to develop
86 credible explanations for adolescents suffering from chronic non-traumatic knee pain to encompass for
87 diagnostic uncertainty.

88 **2. Method**

89 This multiple-method study was conducted through an iterative process, utilizing qualitative and quantitative
90 methods (Figure 1). There were three steps: 1) two systematic literature searches, both aiming to answer, “*what*
91 *information needs to be included in a credible explanation?*”, 2) An argumentative Delphi process to explore
92 “*what do expert clinicians consider important in a credible explanation?*” and 3) think-aloud exercises (user
93 testing) with adolescents to explore end-user perspective and ensure that the explanations being developed
94 were in alignment of their needs and appear credible.

95 ****INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE****

96 **2.1. Step 1 – Two systematic literature searches**

97 The evidence synthesis was based on data from two independent systematic literature searches in MEDLINE
98 (via PubMed) in March 2022. The initial search (Search One) included papers of adolescents’ and parents’
99 information needs for understanding chronic primary musculoskeletal pain [49]; subsequently, a search

100 (Search Two) was conducted to explore the etiology of non-traumatic knee pain among adolescents. Full
101 description of both systematic searches and search strategies is available in *Appendix 1*.

102 **2.1.1. Development of credible explanations – From evidence synthesis to explanation.**

103 Using data collected from the two systematic searches (themes identified in the qualitative synthesis and
104 synthesis of knee pain etiology) we created the first draft of a credible explanation for six of the most common
105 non-traumatic knee pain conditions (Growth pain, Iliotibial Band Syndrome, Osgood Schlatter, Patellar
106 Tendinopathy, Patellofemoral Pain, and Sinding-Larsson-Johansson) [21]. Existing wordings from leaflets and
107 articles aimed at both the target population and adults were used as inspiration to build the first draft (Broad
108 search on Google and Google scholar as well as leaflets known to the author group). The explanations were
109 written in second person using lay language in a conversational style e.g., "your pain is most likely..." to enhance
110 relatability for the adolescents. Any disagreements were resolved by discussion among the authors. The
111 explanations were similar in terms of content with some minor diagnosis-specific alterations; for pragmatic
112 reasons, we decided to only use the explanation of Osgood-Schlatter disease and applied all changes to the rest
113 of the diagnoses afterwards.

114 **2.2. Step 2 – Argumentative Delphi.**

115 We conducted a two-round Delphi survey procedure to gain input from experts in CMP and further explore
116 and develop key domains of importance to include in a credible explanation (*Appendix 2*). The Delphi survey
117 was piloted on two participants outside the author group to ensure readability, usability, and functionality
118 [13].

119 **2.2.1. Recruitment of experts in musculoskeletal pain.**

120 We defined experts in musculoskeletal pain as being healthcare professionals (+5 years of clinical experience)
121 currently working with adolescents (defined by the World Health Organization as the second decade of life,
122 10-19 years old [59]) experiencing musculoskeletal pain and/or working in the field of CMP research.
123 International experts were recruited through multimodal recruitment strategy: personal networks (e.g., email)
124 and advertisement on social media (*Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter*). The social media post had a survey-link

125 to REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture), used as initial registration for experts interested in
126 participating in the survey “*development of credible explanations*” (Appendix 3).

127 Experts were first asked to complete demographic data (nationality, profession, years of clinical experience,
128 area of expertise, and current occupation) and were then asked to select their diagnosis of expertise (multiple
129 options were allowed). We aimed for a minimum of 15 experts from different healthcare professions (e.g.,
130 psychologists, physiotherapists, medical doctors, etc.) to ensure comprehensive and diverse opinions, reduce
131 selection bias and allow for potential dropouts [50,63].

132 2.2.2. *Survey procedure and data analyses: Argumentative Delphi.*

133 Experts were sub-grouped into their self-reported area of expertise and received a link to the credible
134 explanation for these conditions (e.g., Osgood-Schlatter disease and Patellofemoral Pain) via a REDCap
135 survey. Experts only received credible explanations for diagnoses within their field of expertise and a
136 maximum of two diagnoses each. First, experts were asked to read and rate the overall impression of the
137 credible explanation. We used a five-point Likert scale (*Strongly disagree to Strongly agree*) for three
138 questions to measure the degree of perceived diagnostic uncertainty adapted from Pincus et al (Appendix 4)
139 [52]. Secondly, experts were asked to suggest changes to the credible explanations in a downloadable
140 Microsoft Word-document and provide arguments and reasons for their suggestions. Any changes without
141 reasons were not considered.

142 After the completion of Round One, all arguments and reasons (e.g., “*Important to emphasize how validation*
143 *is key*”) were collated and analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis in accordance with Braun and Clarke’s
144 six phases [4,5]. CD and MKB read and reread all feedback and arguments to familiarize themselves with the
145 data before independently coding arguments and reasons to identify themes. Potential themes were noted in a
146 coding list and subjected to iterative review. Refined themes were generated iteratively in accordance with the
147 phases in reflexive thematic analysis. We chose not to rank arguments (as is common with Delphi processes)
148 or use computerized methods, but to evaluate arguments equally using qualitative thematic analysis, allowing
149 for a deeper understanding of our data [20,58,63]. We merged themes from qualitative literature search and
150 Round One of the Delphi to ensure all essential perspectives were included in our model of the final domains.

151 These domains were used as subheadings to re-structure the revised drafts of the credible explanations (second
152 draft) for Round Two of the Delphi. The whole data analysis and revised version underwent review during a
153 meeting in the author group that aimed to reach consensus on changes, revisions, and structure of the revised
154 (second) draft. After the group meeting, the revised six explanations were sent out to all authors for final
155 approval.

156 Round Two used the same procedure as described in Round One and aimed to collect feedback and ratings on
157 the second draft of the credible explanations and provide stability of results (i.e., Likert-rating did not decrease)
158 [20]. Experts were asked to rate the overall impression of the second draft of the credible explanation, using
159 the same Likert scale as the first round and further provide additional feedback in the survey comment section;
160 we aimed for a response rate of $\geq 80\%$ [63]. A two-week deadline was chosen to ensure participants had enough
161 time to attend and at the same time short enough to maintain their interest and minimize attrition [50,63].
162 Reminders were sent out twice (after week one and week two) if no response was received.

163 **2.3. Step 3 – Think-aloud exercises (User testing)**

164 In the last step, we used an iterative design consisting of user testing, feedback, input from the author group,
165 and regular revisions, as recommended for the think-aloud method [8,27]. First, the credible explanations were
166 translated into Danish to fit participants' first language. Two bilingual (*English/Danish*) research assistants
167 outside the author group made translations on all explanations independently of each other. Subsequently, we
168 incorporated both translations to finish the third draft of the credible explanations before starting think-aloud
169 exercises.

170 **2.3.1. End user involvement**

171 Participants were recruited by purposive sampling using the authors' social network. The think-aloud method
172 was chosen because it utilizes simulation to learn about end-users' perceptions, interactions, reasoning, and
173 latent difficulties connected to artifact use, and then applies this knowledge to improve the design [8,35]. The
174 interview guide was pilot tested internally in the author group prior to the first interview [31]. We planned two
175 separate sessions including adolescents (at least three in each session to ensure a variety of thoughts as
176 recommended) with and without non-traumatic knee pain and ages ranging from 8-17 years [8,27]. With

177 specific emphasis to Faulkner's observations on how 5-8 users will detect 85-95% of all usability problems
178 based on the law of diminishing returns, participants were intentionally recruited according on perceived
179 information power [16,37]. We chose to include the perspectives from one participant younger than the target
180 group (<10 years old) based on the assumption that input from lower reading levels would enhance
181 comprehension for older participants as well. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire: sex, age,
182 current knee pain (yes/no) and knee pain duration. Think-aloud exercises were conducted face to face and
183 performed by MKB (Audio recording with Dictaphone, *Olympus VN-711PC*) or online via Microsoft Teams
184 (video recording) and transcribed non-verbatim for meaning retention as described by Kvale and Brinkmann
185 [33]. We chose non-verbatim for three reasons. First, our aim was to identify comprehension issues only;
186 second, we did not intent to conduct an in-depth thematic analysis and third, we considered the exclusion of
187 all unnecessary speech would make the transcript more informative for us to implement the suggestions
188 provided by our participants [22]. Participants were instructed to verbalize thoughts as they occurred and say
189 whatever came to mind as they read the credible explanation. The researcher reminded the participants to keep
190 talking if they fell silent. The aim was to identify any discrepancies between the participants' perception of the
191 text compared and the intended meaning. Field notes were collected and then updated by reviewing the video
192 recordings after the interview to capture missing points.

193 **2.3.2. Data analysis – Iterative revisions**

194 All changes were based on notes and non-verbatim transcriptions. After Session One, revisions were made on
195 a group meeting in the author group based on participants' input during interviews (e.g., confusing phrases, or
196 suggestions for improvement), before starting Session Two. The same procedure was used for the second
197 session. We continued this iterative process until input for revisions were at a minimum, as recommendations
198 prescribe [8,27].

199 **2.4. Statistical analysis**

200 All data from Argumentative Delphi were exported from the REDCap survey and through Microsoft Excel.
201 Descriptive summaries for the Argumentative Delphi were reported for participant demographic
202 characteristics, response rates for each survey round, and withdrawals. Data from think-aloud exercises

203 underwent the same procedure. Results from five-point Likert scale were ranked in Microsoft Excel and
204 visually interpreted; this allowed us to measure the experts perceived diagnostic uncertainty of the credible
205 explanations between revisions.

206 **3. Results**

207 **3.1. Two systematic literature searches**

208 **3.1.1. Search One: Systematic search of qualitative studies**

209 The systematic search of qualitative studies (Search One) yielded 3.239 papers. After screening the titles and
210 abstracts, 26 papers underwent full-text review; we included 16 papers (*Appendix 5*). We organized concepts
211 through abstraction into five themes: (1) Understanding causes and contributors to pain experience
212 [12,17,24,29,30,32,39,43,45,46,60,64], (2) Feeling stigmatized for having an invisible condition
213 [12,17,29,32,39,42,46,60,64], (3) Having a name for pain [6,29,42,43,46,60,61,64], (4) Controllability of pain
214 [24,30,32,45,61,64], and (5) Worried about something being missed [6,39,43,46] (*Appendix 6*). Six studies
215 included parents, with no new themes identified by this group alone [6,29,42,43,46,64].

216 **3.1.2. Search Two: Systematic search of etiology for non-traumatic knee pain.**

217 The systematic search of etiology for non-traumatic knee pain (Search Two) yielded 2.934 papers. After
218 screening the titles and abstracts, 112 underwent full-text review; we included 64 papers that described the
219 etiology and/or pathogenesis of non-traumatic knee pain (*Appendix 5*).

220 **3.2. Argumentative Delphi - Expert review.**

221 The Argumentative Delphi was conducted over two rounds between April 2022 and June 2022. Thirty-two
222 participants signed up for taking part in the survey. Of these, 18 responded in the first round and 16 responded
223 in the second round (*89% response rate*). Two participants did not respond after inclusion and provided no
224 reason for withdrawal. Therefore, 16 participants took part in this Argumentative Delphi survey (Table 1).
225 Participants' clinical experience ranged from 5 to 15+ years, with most >10 years. Seven countries were
226 represented: Denmark (n=5), Turkey (n=4), United Kingdom (n=3), Canada (n=1), Ireland (n=1), Netherlands
227 (n=1), Spain (n=1).

228

229 ****INSERT TABLE 1 HERE: LEGEND: Characteristics of experts: Argumentative Delphi****

230 **3.2.1. Survey: Argumentative Delphi.**

231 Responses from Delphi Round One were collated and analyzed, from which 4 themes and 14 sub-themes
232 emerged. Themes included: (1) Multidimensional perspective, (2) Tailored to adolescents, (3) Validation and
233 reassurance, and (4) Careful wording (Figure 2).

234 ****INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE****

235 **3.2.2. Survey Expert ratings of the credible explanations.**

236 According to ratings measured on the Likert scale, we found a positive difference (visual interpretation) in the
237 degree of experts perceived diagnostic uncertainty between Round One and Round Two. Across all three
238 questions, 7 out of 18 experts rated either 'agree' or 'strongly agree' in Round One and 13 out of 16 experts
239 rated either 'agree' or 'strongly agree' in Round Two.

240 **3.3. Key domains to tailor explanations - Merging themes into domains.**

241 We developed three key domains to consider when tailoring credible explanations to adolescents
242 experiencing non-traumatic knee pain. The three key domains were “*What is (diagnosis) and what does it*
243 *mean?*”, “*What is causing my knee pain*” and “*How do I manage my knee pain?*” (Figure 3).

244 ****INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE****

245 **3.4. User testing: Think-aloud exercises - adolescents with/without knee pain.**

246 We included seven participants (two with knee pain) aged between 8 to 15 years (Table 2). Interview
247 duration ranged between 18 and 45 min (mean duration = 29 min). We included three adolescents for the
248 first session, and four adolescents in Session Two (one with knee pain in each round).

249 ****INSERT TABLE 2 HERE: LEGEND: Adolescent demographics: Think-aloud exercises****

250 The main issues were improper language (medical terms), phrasings that were not understood and long
251 sentences, which allowed ad-hoc corrections [8,27]. Overall, most changes were made in Session One. In

252 Session Two, the reasons for changes were generally the same as in Session One, but the number of
253 comprehension problems was significantly reduced (*Appendix 7*). During Session Two, most participants
254 expressed great reading flow and changes were at a minimum and required little to no extra mental effort to
255 navigate through the explanations. Participants with current knee pain highlighted the relatable content, such
256 as worrying about pain as important and matched their own lived experience.

257 **3.5. Credible explanations for adolescent’s chronic non-traumatic knee pain**

258 We developed six credible explanations for the six most common chronic non-traumatic knee pain diagnoses
259 (Growth pain, Iliotibial Band Syndrome Osgood Schlatter, Patellar Tendinopathy, Patellofemoral Pain, and
260 Sinding-Larsson-Johansson) in English and Danish (*Appendix 8*). The credible explanation for Patellofemoral
261 Pain is visually illustrated in the patient leaflet version (Figure 4).

262 ****INSERT FIGURE 4 HERE****

263 **4. Discussion**

264 This multiple-method study developed credible explanations for the six most common diagnoses of
265 adolescents’ chronic non-traumatic knee pain by integrating perspectives from best research evidence, clinical
266 expertise, and end-users. Through this process, we identified three key domains to consider when tailoring
267 credible explanations for these individuals: “*What is (diagnosis) and what does it mean?*”, “*What is causing*
268 *my knee pain*” and “*How do I manage my knee pain?*”. These domains extend the current knowledge and may
269 provide a knowledge-mobilization framework to inform the design for future credible explanations in the
270 context of pediatric CMP.

271 **4.1. Explanations of findings**

272 The three key domains all concerned adolescents’ understanding of CMP and ways to manage it, which is
273 consistent with a recent Delphi that explored expert’s opinions on the key messages needed when
274 communicating with young children [65]. Wallwork et al. found that understanding ‘how pain works’,
275 reassurance, normalizing pain, validation and communicating that the child can have some control over the

276 pain are important messages [65]. Their findings highlight the multidimensional nature of CMP, which was
277 also a central theme among our experts. This strengthens the evidence for these domains as the two studies
278 with different methods both identified similar content. Our study further extends previous findings through a
279 deeper understanding of these themes, such as: “*An explanation is more than a label*” or “*Needs to be short*”.

280 There is an on-going debate about diagnostic labels, their meaning, their clinical value, and their usefulness
281 [18,38,52]. This study suggest that diagnostic labels may have a significant value in the form of external
282 validation; The diagnostic label justified the experience of pain, and even provided societal acceptance, which
283 (sometimes) was a key starting point for acceptance and facilitated the process towards recovery [29,43,46,61].
284 Our results from the literature search suggest that diagnostic labels are needed, but the associated explanation
285 is important to add meaning to the label and thereby reduce diagnostic uncertainty and feel validated
286 [17,32,46,64].

287 An underlying trend in themes identified during our literature search was adolescents' desire for an increased
288 understanding of what pain is. This desire aligns with the goal of ‘*making pain understood*’ and indicates that
289 illness perceptions are highly influential in the experience and management of adolescent’s CMP [14,24,30].
290 Khanom et al. found that adolescents’ interpretations and management of pain are directly influenced by how
291 they understand their pain condition [32]. In addition, these findings were supported by Joslin et al.’s finding
292 that understanding the causes and contributors to pain was a key moment that helped move adolescents towards
293 to recovery after treatment for CMP [30]. Results from our study align with previous studies among adolescents
294 and young adults with non-traumatic knee pain suggesting functional theories about knee pain (*i.e., individual*
295 *perception of ‘why do I have pain?’*) are a strong driver of behavior. This highlights that individuals’ negative
296 interpretations can result in counter-productive choices [28,56].

297 Clinicians’ inability to communicate and explain the cause for pain was a strong theme in the included
298 qualitative studies; Our literature search showed that adolescents express difficulties with the meaning of the
299 diagnosis and what pain is, illustrating the significant opportunity to improve existing patient education
300 strategies [39,46,61]. Clinicians were commonly described to use heterogeneous terminologies and

301 explanations that did not fit with adolescents existing beliefs (i.e., perception of the cause of the pain and
302 expected management) [39,46,60]. Heterogeneous and non-person-centered pain terminologies were
303 highlighted as a core issue for children and adolescents' that impaired their ability to understand their pain
304 [14,34]. Our findings concerning the role of diagnostic uncertainty in the qualitative studies shed light on a
305 challenging area for clinicians, as it emphasizes the importance of clear communication between clinicians,
306 adolescents, and their parents [34,44,46]. Caution will be required to ensure that CMP explanations do not
307 become more heterogenous as clinicians move from simple biomedical interpretations of pain to a broader and
308 more nuanced biopsychosocial perspective that incorporates pain complexity and reasons for persistence
309 [1,2,64]. Lee et al. found a range of effective and ineffective communication approaches among adolescents
310 suffering from CMP conditions; similar to our study, they emphasized the importance of providing clear and
311 tailored pain management advice for each individual [34]. Together with our results, this highlights the
312 tremendous impact these mixed messages provided by clinicians have; we found adolescents reported their
313 anxiousness was amplified, due to varying explanations and advice from clinicians [39,60]. Through the Delphi
314 process, experts endorsed the importance of validating the pain and paying attention to *psychological*
315 *perspectives* of pain and *individual contributing factors*, which greatly emphasized CMP as a multidimensional
316 and personal experience.

317 Research in pediatric chronic pain has increased in recent years; however, studies have requested translation
318 and mobilization of findings into real-world practice [14,34,47]. We aimed to develop credible explanations
319 to be used as patient material and mobilize evidence-based knowledge into practice to improve information
320 consistency and meaning regarding pain terminologies. Our findings highlight the (potential) value of
321 involving end-users when creating patient materials; we made substantial changes based on the think-aloud
322 exercises. This emphasized that clinicians' language must be adapted to adolescents' level to ensure correct
323 interpretation of health information [14,15,34]. Reis et al developed a comic book with the purpose of
324 providing validated pain education for children; although their work included involving of end-users, they still
325 found that over a quarter of included children did not feel satisfied with the content and almost a fifth did not
326 feel it helped them understand pain [57]. A plausible explanation for this may be the non-specific nature of

327 many CMP conditions and individual aspects of managing this condition; This may illustrate the subjective
328 differences and preferences clinicians face in everyday practice. The three domains identified, and final
329 explanations are generic and not tailored to every individual's beliefs. Therefore, they should not be treated as
330 a checklist or one size fits all, but rather as a framework for clinicians to establish common issues related to
331 reducing diagnostic uncertainty, as these domains might capture important information when managing these
332 young individuals. Adolescents with knee pain are not diagnostic categories, but rather individuals
333 experiencing a health challenge, each with their own story, history, and goals, where preferences in
334 communication might be varying according to developmental level and age [15]. Communication (and
335 explanations) should reflect this individuality.

336 **4.2. Clinical implications.**

337 This study identified key domains that may be addressed to reduce diagnostic uncertainty. Our results clearly
338 indicate that simply naming an adolescent's pain condition is not the end goal, and clinicians should work to
339 build meaning and understanding around these diagnoses for each person. Based on the qualitative studies,
340 adolescents emphasized that communication skills among clinicians, such as good listening, reassurance and
341 acknowledgement of the pain's existence have a positive influence on feeling validated [12,30,39,46]. We urge
342 clinicians to ensure terminology is appropriate and consistent to prevent mixed messages; Clinicians may
343 address adolescents' own perceptions of why they experience pain and explore perceived management for their
344 pain, as this information might provide valuable clinical knowledge for successful rehabilitation.

345 **4.3. Future research.**

346 Our study may set the first step for a *proof-of-concept method* of knowledge mobilization in the development
347 of credible explanations for painful conditions; this framework will ensure a variety of opinions are included
348 in the developmental process. We hope this can lead to a more systematic and consistent way of developing
349 patient-centered credible explanations of pain conditions in the future. The effectiveness of using our credible
350 explanations should be tested in the future to establish if they lead to superior outcomes among adolescents
351 with non-traumatic knee pain. An important priority for future research is to further explore concepts and

352 domains related to diagnostic uncertainty to enhance understanding of this phenomenon; this may provide
353 promising opportunities to develop new patient education strategies for these young individuals.

354 **4.4. *Strengths and limitations.***

355 Strengths of our study include the engagement with end-users and the employment of a multi-method strategy.
356 Another strength was the development of this iterative process with multiple revisions and adaptations to meet
357 adolescents' needs. Our study also has certain limitations. First, only one database was used for our systematic
358 searches; relevant papers may not have been included. Second, we included experts with a range of professions
359 and the majority were physiotherapists (n=12). This may bias the opinions and views in the Argumentative
360 Delphi to this profession. Third, a limitation of using an argumentative Delphi is the risk of unclear and
361 unrelated arguments, which made it difficult to interpret the specific reason for the changes [20,63]. Fourth,
362 only one of the six explanations was tested by end-users. Finally, only two participants had knee pain; it cannot
363 be ruled out that some valuable information may have been lost during this process.

364 **5. Conclusion**

365 This multiple-method study provided six credible explanations for the six most common diagnoses of chronic
366 non-traumatic knee pain. We identified three essential domains for clinicians to consider when tailoring
367 credible explanations to adolescents experiencing non-traumatic knee pain. These results could inform the
368 design for future credible explanations in the context of pediatric chronic pain.

369

370 **Acknowledgements:**

371 All authors would like to thank Kristian Damgaard Lyng for helpful discussions during the development of the
372 REDCap survey.

373 **Financial disclosure and conflict of interest:**

374 This work is funded by the TrygFonden ID: 118547. MSH has received support from non-industrial
375 professional, private, and scientific bodies (reimbursement of travel costs and speaker fees) for lectures on
376 pain, and he receives book royalties from Gyldendal, Munksgaard Denmark, FADL, and Muusmann
377 publications. Otherwise, none of the authors declare conflicts of interest.

378

379

380 **REFERENCES**

381

- 382 [1] Bean DJ, Dryland A, Rashid U, Tuck NL. The Determinants and Effects of Chronic Pain Stigma: A
383 Mixed Methods Study and the Development of a Model. *J Pain* 2022.
- 384 [2] Betsch TA, Gorodzinsky AY, Finley GA, Sangster M, Chorney J. What's in a Name? Health Care
385 Providers' Perceptions of Pediatric Pain Patients Based on Diagnostic Labels. *Clin J Pain* 2017;33:694–
386 698.
- 387 [3] Bhise V, Rajan SS, Sittig DF, Morgan RO, Chaudhary P, Singh H. Defining and Measuring Diagnostic
388 Uncertainty in Medicine: A Systematic Review. *J Gen Intern Med* 2018;33:103–115.
- 389 [4] Braun V, Clarke V. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qual Res Sport Exerc Health*
390 2019;11:589–597.
- 391 [5] Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006;3:77–101.
- 392 [6] Brodwall A, Glavin K, Lagerløv P. Parents' experience when their child has chronic abdominal pain:
393 a qualitative study in Norway. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e021066.
- 394 [7] Brukner P, Khan K. Brukner & Khan's clinical sports medicine: injuries. 5th Ed. North Ryde, N.S.W.:
395 McGraw-Hill Education (Australia), 2017.
- 396 [8] Burbach B, Barnason S, Thompson SA. Using "Think Aloud" to Capture Clinical Reasoning during
397 Patient Simulation. 2015;12:1–7.
- 398 [9] Cox CL, Miller BM, Kuhn I, Fritz Z. Diagnostic uncertainty in primary care: what is known about its
399 communication, and what are the associated ethical issues? *Fam Pract* 2021;38:654–668.
- 400 [10] Cucchiaro G, Schwartz J, Hutchason A, Ornelas B. Chronic Pain in Children: A Look at the Referral
401 Process to a Pediatric Pain Clinic. *Int J Pediatr* 2017;2017:8769402.
- 402 [11] Dahm MR, Cattnach W, Williams M, Basseal JM, Gleason K, Crock C. Communication of Diagnostic
403 Uncertainty in Primary Care and Its Impact on Patient Experience: an Integrative Systematic Review.
404 *J Gen Intern Med* 2022.
- 405 [12] Dell'Api M, Rennick JE, Rosmus C. Childhood chronic pain and health care professional interactions:
406 shaping the chronic pain experiences of children. *J Child Health Care* 2007;11:269–86.
- 407 [13] Dillman DA. Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method--2007 Update with new Internet,
408 visual, and mixed-mode guide. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- 409 [14] Eccleston C, Fisher E, Howard RF, Slater RC, Forgeron P, Palermo TM, Birnie KA, Anderson BJ,
410 Chambers CT, Crombez G, Ljungman G, Jordan I, Jordan Z, Roberts C, Schechter NL, Sieberg CB,
411 Tibboel D, Walker SM, Wilkinson D, Wood C. Delivering transformative action in paediatric pain: a
412 Lancet Child & Adolescent Health Commission. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2020.
- 413 [15] Emerson ND, Bursch B. Communicating with Youth about Pain: Developmental Considerations.
414 *Children (Basel)* 2020;7.
- 415 [16] Faulkner L. Beyond the five-user assumption: Benefits of increased sample sizes in usability testing.
416 *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* 2003;35:379–383.

- 417 [17] Fegran L, Johannessen B, Ludvigsen MS, Westergren T, Høie M, Slettebø Å, Rohde G, Helseth S,
418 Haraldstad K. Experiences of a non-clinical set of adolescents and young adults living with persistent
419 pain: a qualitative metasynthesis. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e043776.
- 420 [18] Friedman DJ, Tulloh L, Khan KM. Peeling off musculoskeletal labels: sticks and stones may break my
421 bones, but diagnostic labels can hamstring me forever. *Br J Sports Med* 2021;55:1184.
- 422 [19] Fuglkjær S, Dissing KB, Hestbæk L. Prevalence and incidence of musculoskeletal extremity complaints
423 in children and adolescents. A systematic review. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2017;18:418.
- 424 [20] Gheorghiu R, Andreescu L, Curaj A. Dynamic argumentative Delphi: Lessons learned from two large-
425 scale foresight exercises. Contribution to the 5th International Conference on Future-Oriented
426 Technology Analysis (FTA)–Engage today to shape tomorrow, Brüssel.2014. pp. 27–28.
- 427 [21] Gulddammer C, Holden S, Sørensen ME, Olesen JL, Jensen MB, Rathleff MS. Development and
428 validation of the Sorting non-traumatic adolescent knee pain (SMILE) tool – a development and initial
429 validation study. *Pediatric Rheumatology* 2021;19:110.
- 430 [22] Halcomb EJ, Davidson PM. Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary? *Appl Nurs*
431 *Res* 2006;19:38–42.
- 432 [23] Heffernan M, Wilson C, Keating K, McCarthy K. “Why Isn’t It Going Away?”: A Qualitative
433 Exploration of Worry and Pain Experiences in Adolescents with Chronic Pain. *Pain Medicine*
434 2021;22:459–469.
- 435 [24] Heffernan M, Wilson C, Keating K, McCarthy K. “Why Isn’t It Going Away?”: A Qualitative
436 Exploration of Worry and Pain Experiences in Adolescents with Chronic Pain. *Pain Med* 2021;22:459–
437 469.
- 438 [25] Holden S, Kasza J, Winters M, van Middelkoop M, Rathleff MS, Group AKH. Prognostic factors for
439 adolescent knee pain: an individual participant data meta-analysis of 1281 patients. *Pain* 2021;162.
- 440 [26] Holden S, Rathleff MS, Roos EM, Jensen MB, Pourbordbari N, Graven-Nielsen T. Pain patterns during
441 adolescence can be grouped into four pain classes with distinct profiles: A study on a population based
442 cohort of 2953 adolescents. *European Journal of Pain* 2018;22:793–799.
- 443 [27] Jaspers MWM, Steen T, Bos C van den, Geenen M. The think aloud method: a guide to user interface
444 design. *Int J Med Inform* 2004;73:781–795.
- 445 [28] Johansen SK, Holden S, Pourbordbari N, Jensen MB, Thomsen JL, Rathleff MS. PAINSTORIES:
446 Exploring the Temporal Developments in the Challenges, Barriers, and Self-Management Needs of
447 Adolescents with Longstanding Knee Pain: A Qualitative, Retrospective Interview Study with Young
448 Adults Experiencing Knee Pain Since Adolescence. *J Pain* 2022;23:577–594.
- 449 [29] Jordan AL, Eccleston C, Osborn M. Being a parent of the adolescent with complex chronic pain: an
450 interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Eur J Pain* 2007;11:49–56.
- 451 [30] Joslin R, Donovan-Hall M, Roberts L. Exploring the Outcomes That Matter Most to Young People
452 Treated for Chronic Pain: A Qualitative Study. *Children (Basel)* 2021;8.
- 453 [31] Kallio H, Pietilä A-M, Johnson M, Kangasniemi M. Systematic methodological review: developing a
454 framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *J Adv Nurs* 2016;72:2954–2965.


- 455 [32] Khanom S, McDonagh JE, Briggs M, Bakir E, McBeth J. Adolescents' experiences of fluctuating pain
456 in musculoskeletal disorders: a qualitative systematic review and thematic synthesis. *BMC*
457 *Musculoskelet Disord* 2020;21:645.
- 458 [33] Kvale S, Brinkmann S. Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing. 3. edition.
459 Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2015.
- 460 [34] Lee RR, Mountain D, Connelly M, Palermo TM, Peters S, Cordingley L, McDonagh JE. "That's what
461 makes me better": Investigating children and adolescents' experiences of pain communication with
462 healthcare professionals in paediatric rheumatology. *European Journal of Pain* 2022;n/a.
- 463 [35] Lundgrén-Laine H, Salanterä S. Think-Aloud Technique and Protocol Analysis in Clinical Decision-
464 Making Research. *Qual Health Res* 2009;20:565–575.
- 465 [36] Lyng KD, Larsen JB, Birnie KA, Stinson J, Hoegh MS, Palsson TS, Olesen AE, Arendt-Nielsen L,
466 Ehlers LH, Fonager K, Jensen MB, Würtzen H, Poulin PA, Handberg G, Ziegler C, Møller LB, Olsen
467 J, Heise L, Rathleff MS. Participatory research: a Priority Setting Partnership for chronic
468 musculoskeletal pain in Denmark. 2022.
- 469 [37] Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by
470 Information Power. *Qual Health Res* 2015;26:1753–1760.
- 471 [38] McKoane A, Sherman DK. Diagnostic uncertainty in patients, parents, and physicians: a compensatory
472 control theory perspective. *Health Psychol Rev* 2022:1–17.
- 473 [39] Meldrum ML, Tsao JC-I, Zeltzer LK. "I can't be what I want to be": children's narratives of chronic
474 pain experiences and treatment outcomes. *Pain Med* 2009;10:1018–34.
- 475 [40] Meyer AND, Giardina TD, Khanna A, Bhise V, Singhal GR, Street Jr. RL, Singh H. Pediatric clinician
476 perspectives on communicating diagnostic uncertainty. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*
477 2019;31:G107–G112.
- 478 [41] Michaleff ZA, Campbell P, Protheroe J, Rajani A, Dunn KM. Consultation patterns of children and
479 adolescents with knee pain in UK general practice: analysis of medical records. *BMC Musculoskelet*
480 *Disord* 2017;18:239.
- 481 [42] Moulin V, Akre C, Rodondi P-Y, Ambresin A-E, Suris J-C. A qualitative study of adolescents with
482 medically unexplained symptoms and their parents. Part 1: Experiences and impact on daily life. *J*
483 *Adolesc* 2015;45:307–16.
- 484 [43] Moulin V, Akre C, Rodondi P-Y, Ambresin A-E, Suris J-C. A qualitative study of adolescents with
485 medically unexplained symptoms and their parents. Part 2: How is healthcare perceived? *J Adolesc*
486 2015;45:317–26.
- 487 [44] Moulin V, Akre C, Rodondi P-Y, Ambresin A-E, Suris J-C. A qualitative study of adolescents with
488 medically unexplained symptoms and their parents. Part 2: How is healthcare perceived? *J Adolesc*
489 2015;45:317–26.
- 490 [45] Neto M, Andias R, Silva AG. Pain Neuroscience Education and Exercise for Neck Pain: A Focus Group
491 Study on Adolescents' Views. *Pediatr Phys Ther* 2018;30:196–201.
- 492 [46] Neville A, Jordan A, Beveridge JK, Pincus T, Noel M. Diagnostic Uncertainty in Youth With Chronic
493 Pain and Their Parents. *J Pain* 2019;20:1080–1090.

- 494 [47] Neville A, Jordan A, Beveridge JK, Pincus T, Noel M. Diagnostic Uncertainty in Youth With Chronic
495 Pain and Their Parents. *J Pain* 2019;20:1080–1090.
- 496 [48] Neville A, Noel M, Clinch J, Pincus T, Jordan A. ‘Drawing a line in the sand’: Physician diagnostic
497 uncertainty in paediatric chronic pain. *European Journal of Pain* 2021;25:430–441.
- 498 [49] Nicholas M, Vlaeyen JWS, Rief W, Barke A, Aziz Q, Benoliel R, Cohen M, Evers S, Giamberardino
499 MA, Goebel A, Korwisi B, Perrot S, Svensson P, Wang S-J, Treede R-D, IASP Taskforce for the
500 Classification of Chronic Pain. The IASP classification of chronic pain for ICD-11: chronic primary
501 pain. *Pain* 2019;160:28–37.
- 502 [50] Okoli C, Pawlowski SD. The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design considerations and
503 applications. *Information & Management* 2004;42:15–29.
- 504 [51] Paskins Z, Farmer CE, Manning F, Andersson DA, Barlow T, Bishop FL, Brown CA, Clark A, Clark
505 EM, Dulake D, Gulati M, le Maitre CL, Jones RK, Loughlin J, Mason DJ, McCarron M, Millar NL,
506 Pandit H, Peat G, Richardson SM, Salt EJ, Taylor EJ, Troeberg L, Wilcox RK, Wise E, Wilkinson C,
507 Watt FE. Research priorities to reduce the impact of musculoskeletal disorders: a priority setting
508 exercise with the child health and nutrition research initiative method. *Lancet Rheumatol* 2022.
- 509 [52] Pincus T, Noel M, Jordan A, Serbic D. Perceived diagnostic uncertainty in pediatric chronic pain. *Pain*
510 2018;159.
- 511 [53] Rathleff MS, Holden S, Straszek CL, Olesen JL, Jensen MB, Roos EM. Five-year prognosis and impact
512 of adolescent knee pain: a prospective population-based cohort study of 504 adolescents in Denmark.
513 *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e024113.
- 514 [54] Rathleff MS, Rathleff CR, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S, Roos EM. Is Knee Pain During Adolescence a
515 Self-limiting Condition?: Prognosis of Patellofemoral Pain and Other Types of Knee Pain. *Am J Sports*
516 *Med* 2016;44:1165–1171.
- 517 [55] Rathleff MS, Roos EM, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S. High prevalence of daily and multi-site pain – a
518 cross-sectional population-based study among 3000 Danish adolescents. *BMC Pediatr* 2013;13:191.
- 519 [56] Rathleff MS, Winiarski L, Krommes K, Graven-Nielsen T, Hölmich P, Olesen JL, Holden S, Thorborg
520 K. Pain, Sports Participation, and Physical Function in Adolescents With Patellofemoral Pain and
521 Osgood-Schlatter Disease: A Matched Cross-sectional Study. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical*
522 *Therapy* 2020;50:149–157.
- 523 [57] Reis F, Palermo TM, Acalantis L, Nogueira LC, Meziat-Filho N, Louw A, Ickmans K. “A journey to
524 learn about pain”: the development and validation of a comic book about pain neuroscience education
525 for children. *Braz J Phys Ther* 2022;26:100348.
- 526 [58] Seker SE. Computerized Argument Delphi Technique. *IEEE Access* 2015;3:368–380.
- 527 [59] Singh JA, Siddiqi M, Parameshwar P, Chandra-Mouli V. World Health Organization Guidance on
528 Ethical Considerations in Planning and Reviewing Research Studies on Sexual and Reproductive
529 Health in Adolescents. *J Adolesc Health* 2019;64:427–429.
- 530 [60] Sørensen K, Christiansen B. Adolescents’ experience of complex persistent pain. *Scand J Pain*
531 2017;15:106–112.
- 532 [61] Szwimer R, Widjaja M, Ingelmo P, Hovey RB. A Phenomenological Exploration of the Personal
533 Implications of Female Adolescents Living With Chronic Pain. *J Pediatr Health Care* n.d.;34:470–477.

- 534 [62] Tanna V, Heathcote LC, Heirich MS, Rush G, Neville A, Noel M, Pate JW, Simons LE. Something
535 Else Going On? Diagnostic Uncertainty in Children with Chronic Pain and Their Parents. *Children*
536 2020;7.
- 537 [63] Trevelyan EG, Robinson PN. Delphi methodology in health research: how to do it? *Eur J Integr Med*
538 2015;7:423–428.
- 539 [64] Wakefield EO, Belamkar V, Litt MD, Puhl RM, Zempsky WT. “There’s Nothing Wrong With You”:
540 Pain-Related Stigma in Adolescents With Chronic Pain. *J Pediatr Psychol* 2022;47:456–468.
- 541 [65] Wallwork SB, Noel M, Moseley GL. Communicating with children about “everyday” pain and injury:
542 A Delphi study. *Eur J Pain* 2022;26:1863–1872.
- 543
- 544
- 545

546 **FIGURE LEGENDS.**

547 **Fig.1 Multiple-method study design: Iterative process.**




548

549

550

551 **Fig.2 Themes and sub-themes identified from the Argumentative Delphi.**




552

553

554

555 **Fig.3. Merging themes from literature search and Argumentative Delphi into domains.**



556

557

558

559 **Fig.4. Credible explanation (Patellofemoral Pain). Only Danish versions have been revised based on**
560 **end-user perspectives (Think-aloud exercises). Therefore, the English version of the credible**
561 **explanations are our translations exclusively.**

1. What is Patellofemoral Pain and what does it mean?

- Patellofemoral Pain is the experience of pain in one or more places around your knee (often at the front) and can lead to you feeling a lot of pain in that area. About 1 in 14 (6-7%) adolescents your age have Patellofemoral Pain.
- You may feel that your pain changes from day to day, or perhaps even during the day. This is normal and is not a sign of damage to your knee, even though it can be very painful.
- If we perform a scan (for example x-ray) of your knee, it might not look the same as the knee of someone who does not have pain. This is not always related to how much pain you feel and does not change how you should manage your knee pain.
- When you receive the diagnosis of Patellofemoral Pain, the healthcare professional is certain that there is not any serious damage in your knee, and nothing has been missed. Further examinations are not needed to confirm the diagnosis or determine the treatment.

2. What is causing my knee pain?

- Children and adolescents who are active in sports are more likely to have Patellofemoral Pain.
- It can be hard to find the exact reason why you have Patellofemoral Pain because it is rarely caused by a single event or movement. The balance between activity and rest seems to play an important role.
- How much pain you feel depends on several things that do not always relate directly to your knee. These could be your mood and thoughts or how you use your knee when feeling pain.
- Some might worry about their knee pain. Things like running, jumping, and walking on stairs might be painful and some might wonder "should I stop?" or "am I making things worse?". Worrying about pain, being afraid of hurting your knee, and worrying about how the future will be, can make everything feel worse.



3. How do I manage my knee pain?

- Understand which things affect your pain will help you choose the right treatment for you and help you to control how much pain you feel.
- Most children with Patellofemoral Pain feel that their lives change because their knee hurts. Changes might include how much sport they can take part in. Luckily, you can learn to be physically active even though you have Patellofemoral Pain. In fact, physical activity is good for you in many ways.
- Your body and knee will respond best to small changes in activity. Finding a balance between physical activity and rest may be a good place to start when you have knee pain. It is completely normal to feel more pain sometimes when you are trying to find the right balance.

562

563 **TABLES: CAPTIONS AND LEGENDS**

564 **Table 1. Characteristics of experts: Argumentative Delphi.**

Experts included	(n=16)
Sex	
Male	(n=9)
Female	(n=7)
Profession	
Physiotherapist	(n=9)
Medical doctor	(n=5)
Psychologist	(n=1)
Academic researcher	(n=1)
Clinical experience	
5-10	(n=3) 21,4%
11-15	(n=4) 28,6%
15+	(n=7) 50,0%
Missing	(n=2) 12,5%
Working status	
In research/academia and don't see patients on a regular basis.	(n=2) 12,5%
In clinical practice seeing patients on a regular basis.	(n=5) 31,3%
I share my time between clinical practice and research.	(n=9) 56,3%
Average number of MSK patients/month	
0	(n=1) 7,1%
1-5	(n=3) 21,4%
6-10	(n=4) 28,6%
11-15	(n=2) 14,3%
15+	(n=4) 28,6%
Academic level	
Bachelor's degree	(n=2) 12,5%
Master's degree	(n=9) 56,25%
PhD	(n=4) 25,0%
Other	(n=1) 6,3%
Academic research experience	
0-4	(n=1) 9,1%
5-10	(n=3) 27,3%
11-15	(n=4) 36,4%
15+	(n=3) 27,3%
No academic experience	(n=2) 12,5%
Diagnosis expertise (Multiple options for each expert)	

Growth Pain	(n=4)
Osgood-Schlatter	(n=5)
Patellofemoral Pain	(n=7)
Patellar Tendinopathy	(n=6)
Sinding-Larsen-Johansson	(n=6)
Iliotibial Tract Syndrome	(n=1)

565

566

567 **Table 2. Adolescent demographics: Think-aloud exercises.**

Participants	(n=7)
Sex	
Female	(n=3)
Male	(n=4)
Age	
8 years	(n=1)
10 years	(n=2)
13 years	(n=1)
15 years	(n=3)
Current non-traumatic knee pain	
Yes	(n=2)
No	(n=5)
Knee pain duration	
Age range (Years)	1 to 1,5

568