

1 Development of a clinical decision-support tool for Management 2 of Adolescent knee Pain (The MAP-Knee Tool)

3 Authors: Henrik Riel^{1,2,3}, Malene Kjær Bruun^{1,2}, Chris Djurtoft^{1,2}, Martin Bach Jensen², Søren
4 Kaalund⁴, Guido van Leeuwen⁵, Charlotte Overgaard^{1,6}, Ole Rahbek⁷, Michael Skovdal Rathleff^{1,2}

5 6 Affiliations

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

9 2. Center for General Practice at Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.

10 3. Department of Physiotherapy, University College of Northern Denmark, Aalborg, Denmark

11 4. Sports Medicine Center, North Denmark Regional Hospital, Frederikshavn, Denmark

12 5. Department of General Practice, Erasmus MC University Medical Center Rotterdam, Rotterdam,
13 The Netherlands

14 6. Unit for Health Promotion, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark,
15 Esbjerg, Denmark

16 7. Department of Orthopedics, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark

17

18

19 Corresponding author

20 Henrik Riel, PhD, Department of Health Science and Technology, Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg
21 University, Selma Lagerlöfs Vej 249, 9260 Gistrup. E-mail: hriel@dcm.aau.dk. Telephone:
22 +4530201570

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Objective**

26 This study aimed to develop a clinical decision-support tool (The MAP-Knee Tool) to improve the
27 management of adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain.

28

29 **Methods**

30 This multi-step study consisted of five steps ((1-4) initial development and (5) end-user testing with
31 adolescents with or without non-traumatic knee pain and medical doctors). It ended with the first
32 version of the MAP-Knee Tool for the six most common non-traumatic knee pain conditions. The
33 tool includes four components: 1) tool for diagnosing, 2) credible explanations of the diagnoses
34 based on two systematic literature searches and an Argumentative Delphi process with international
35 experts, 3) prognostic factors based on an individual participant data meta-analysis, and 4) option
36 grid including an unbiased presentation of management options based on the available evidence.

37

38 **Results**

39 We included seven children/adolescents (8-15 years old) and seven medical doctors for the end-user
40 testing. All four components were revised accordingly, and the text was condensed as the initial
41 draft was too comprehensive.

42

43 **Conclusion**

44 We developed a clinical decision-support tool for clinicians and adolescents with non-traumatic
45 knee pain to support the consultation in clinical practice.

46

47 **Practice Implications**

48 The tool targets clinicians and adolescents with four components that may decrease diagnostic
49 uncertainty and increase shared decision-making.

50 1. Introduction

51 Shared decision-making in clinical practice is a complex interpersonal and collaborative process
52 where patients and healthcare professionals make informed decisions about managing the patient's
53 health.(1) Ideally, decisions are made collaboratively. Information is presented objectively and non-
54 biased, typically in situations where the personal circumstances of patients and their families play a
55 significant role in decisions.(2,3) However, there is a lack of evidence regarding how to increase
56 shared decision-making among patients and clinicians.(1) One method to facilitate a shared
57 decision-making process is using patient decision aids to support the patients' dialogue with the
58 clinician.(4,5) Decision aids may come in many forms, such as leaflets, videos, or technology-based
59 applications. The common denominator for these aids is that they present the patient with a non-
60 biased and evidence-based overview of different options they may consider and not recommend one
61 over the other.(5,6)

62
63 Patient decision aids can support patients in making informed choices regarding their health
64 condition. However, these aids may also indirectly support clinicians in their work while
65 discussing, e.g. treatment options with patients.(7) (Guldhammer et al. *in press*) Such aids may be
66 especially relevant in conditions with several treatment options available.(4,8) An area with
67 multiple treatment options available is musculoskeletal conditions. These conditions are
68 characterised by numerous treatment options that each come with its own set of benefits and harms
69 and time requirements needed from the patient.

70
71 Annually, 7% of adolescents visit their general practitioner due to musculoskeletal pain.(9)
72 Especially knee and back pain are prevalent among adolescents, with the majority of knee pain in
73 adolescents having a non-traumatic origin.(10–13) More than one in four adolescents having knee
74 pain will receive care in the secondary or tertiary sectors.(14) Adolescent knee pain was historically
75 viewed as a self-limiting condition. Still, it may severely impact health-related quality of life and
76 physical activity, and almost half of adolescents may continue to experience pain into
77 adulthood.(14–16) This emphasises a need for better management for adolescents with knee pain to
78 reduce recovery times. Results from our previous randomised trial showed that high-cost treatment
79 options such as supervised, physiotherapy-led exercises are only slightly more beneficial than
80 patient education (number needed to treat of 11).(17) However, because of insufficient evidence,
81 guideline recommendations are unclear about the clinical selection of patients who are likely to

82 benefit from referral to additional interventions. Furthermore, the current care pathways of
83 adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain are heterogeneous.(18,19) Therefore, resources may be
84 wasted among adolescents with a good prognosis, while adolescents with a poorer prognosis may
85 not receive sufficient care.

86

87 Stratified care based on prognostic factors has been suggested as a possible solution to individualise
88 treatments, as referral to comprehensive rehabilitation may only be needed for some.(20) Yet, for
89 adolescents having non-traumatic knee pain, stratified care based on prognostic factors is currently
90 unavailable. A decision aid including both tools to stratify care and support shared decision-making
91 may help solve some of the practical challenges by supporting both clinicians and patients. This has
92 the potential to minimise unnecessary high-cost referrals and provide higher-value care.

93

94 We recently developed a support tool for diagnosing the most common types of non-traumatic
95 adolescent knee pain.(7) This tool improved the diagnostic accuracy of medical doctors.(7)
96 However, there is currently no tool available to support the entire consultation and shared decision-
97 making process when an adolescent suffering from non-traumatic knee pain presents at clinical
98 practice.

99

100 The purpose of this study was to develop a decision-support tool to support medical doctors,
101 physiotherapists, and adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain in the shared decision-making
102 process during the entire consultation from diagnosis to deciding on the future management strategy
103 of the adolescents' condition.

104

105 2. Material and methods

106 2.1. Study design

107 This multi-step study consisted of five overarching steps (initial development of the components of
108 the tool and end-user testing), which ended with the first version of a tool to support clinicians and
109 adolescents with the most common non-traumatic knee pain conditions (Patellofemoral Pain,
110 Osgood-Schlatter disease, Patellar Tendinopathy, Sinding-Larsen-Johansson, Growth Pain, and
111 Iliotibial Band Syndrome).(7,17,21,22) The tool was developed to live up to the criteria of the
112 International Patient Decision Aids Standard (IPDAS).(23,24). The study was conducted at the

113 Center for General Practice at Aalborg University and the Department of Health Science and
114 Technology, Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg University.


115

116 **2.2. Development process**

117 The tool was designed to support the entire consultation, from diagnosing the condition to deciding
118 on future management. We included four separate components in the MAP-Knee Tool elements: 1)
119 a tool for diagnosing the most common types of non-traumatic knee pain (SMILE), 2) credible
120 explanations of the aetiology and pathogenesis specific to the diagnosis based on multiple methods
121 with iterative design, 3) a presentation of prognostic factors based on an individual participant data
122 meta-analysis(25), and 4) an option grid that presents the users of the tool with pros and cons of
123 commonly used management options based on a systematic literature search of systematic and
124 narrative reviews within non-traumatic adolescent knee pain. The tool was developed in printed
125 form with two pages including SMILE and the prognostic factors for the clinician exclusively and
126 two pages including the credible explanations and the option grid that the clinician should use when
127 talking to the adolescent and for adolescents to bring home after the consultation. To increase
128 readability and comprehension of the text directed at adolescents, we used a readability assessment
129 tool (the Lesbarkeitsindex (LIX)) to limit the number of complex and lengthy words.

130

131 An overarching focus of integrating the four components was to support shared decision-making
132 and base decisions on all three pillars of evidence-based medicine: patient values, clinical expertise,
133 and relevant research.(26) Therefore, the tool should not provide the users with definitive answers
134 simply based on available evidence. The choice of components was based on the natural flow
135 during the consultation, which starts with diagnosing and ends with a decision on the treatment
136 strategy. Before designing the components, a logic model was made inspired by the Implementation
137 Research Logic Model used in implementation research.(27) The authors discussed how each
138 component should affect both adolescents and clinicians, ultimately leading to better treatment and
139 fewer wasted healthcare resources. The logic model underlying the design of the tool can be seen in
140 Figure 1.



141

142

143 2.3. SMILE

144 SMILE is previously validated and described in detail elsewhere,(7) whereas the other components
145 are described below.

146

147 2.4. Credible explanations

148 The credible explanations were developed using an iterative process of three steps, and the
149 complete methods are published elsewhere.(28) This consisted of 1) two systematic searches of
150 qualitative and quantitative literature (see supplementary file xx) that aimed to answer the “*what*
151 *information needs to be included in a credible explanation?*”, 2) a two-round Argumentative
152 Delphi process to explore “*what do expert clinicians consider important in a credible explanation*”
153 among clinicians, researchers, and psychologists, and 3) think-aloud exercises with end-users
154 (children, adolescents, and medical doctors). Based on themes from the synthesis of the qualitative
155 literature search and the Argumentative Delphi process, including 16 international experts, we
156 identified three key domains to consider when tailoring credible explanations to adolescents
157 experiencing chronic non-traumatic knee pain. The three key domains were “What is (*diagnosis*)
158 and what does it mean?”, “What is causing my knee pain” and “How do I manage my knee
159 pain?”.(28)

160

161 2.5. Prognostic factors

162 The prognostic factors component provided the clinician with knowledge regarding five factors
163 associated with long-term pain and functional deficits in adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain.
164 These factors are lower health-related quality of life, daily or weekly knee pain frequency, knee
165 pain duration over 12 months, bilateral knee pain, and female sex.(25) Three prototypes of this
166 component with different text and graphics were developed by a young medical doctor and PhD
167 student and were individually presented to two medical doctors; one general practitioner with 14
168 years of experience and one in training to become a general practitioner. The doctors were asked to
169 provide feedback on the three prototypes during single-person interviews and to decide on which
170 prototype they preferred. Inspired by the method used in future workshops, we asked the doctors to
171 critique the prototypes and formulate ideas for improvement.(29)

172

173 The three prototypes varied in the degree of controlling the clinician's advice to the patient and
174 parents based on the number of prognostic factors present. Prototype 1 did not indicate future
175 management. Prototype 2 gave some degree of guidance on future management strategies,
176 including a horizontal bar with numbers from 0 to 5 to indicate the number of prognostic factors
177 present over colour that shifts from green to red to predict poorer prognosis with an increasing
178 number of present prognostic factors. Prototype 3 clearly directed the clinician toward future
179 management of the condition based on a cut-off of prognostic factors present.

180

181 *2.6. Option grid*

182 The purpose of the option grid was to give adolescents, parents, and medical doctors an unbiased
183 presentation of the pros and cons of different treatment strategies. During the development, we used
184 the steps described by Marrin et al. for creating option grids.(30) We applied the same systematic
185 search strategy as previously used for developing the credible explanations, but this time we only
186 included systematic or narrative reviews that compared one or more treatments for either of the six
187 non-traumatic knee pain conditions. Two researchers screened the titles and abstracts and decided
188 which reviews to include. The most recent reviews within each diagnosis and the inclusion of
189 commonly used treatment strategies were prioritised. As a framework for how to visually present
190 the option grid and the recently asked questions patients may pose, we found inspiration in the work
191 by Barr et al.(31) However, to better mimic a clinical guideline considering our setting, we
192 substituted the row with information regarding costs with a clinical recommendation about what
193 will likely be beneficial under which circumstances. We decided by consensus in the author group

194 which treatment categories to include (i.e., which treatments should have a column of their own and
195 which should be included in the ‘Other treatments’ column). These were further sub-grouped based
196 on whether they would require a referral from the orthopaedic surgeon. We prioritised treatments
197 commonly used in the orthopaedic setting as this is the setting in which the tool's effectiveness will
198 first be investigated and treatments with the best available evidence.

199

200 *2.7. End-user testing*

201 After finalising an initial prototype of the tool and the four components, we performed end-user
202 testing using think-aloud sessions with adolescents having non-traumatic knee pain, adolescents
203 with no history of knee pain, and medical doctors. There was considerable overlap between the
204 tools developed for each diagnosis, so we only used the tool created for Osgood-Schlatter disease
205 during the end-user testing. We applied the feedback to the other diagnoses.

206

207 The end-user testing was conducted face-to-face or online via Microsoft Teams, where all
208 information and consent forms were sent by mail for online participation. As the overarching aim of
209 the credible explanation and option grid components was to facilitate meaningful exchanges of
210 information about adolescents’ health status during consultations, we included children and
211 adolescents with and without knee pain and medical doctors with experience treating adolescents
212 with knee pain.

213

214 Participants were sampled purposefully based on perceived information power (32), with particular
215 attention to Faulkner’s observations on how 5-8 users will identify 85-95% of all usability problems
216 based on the law of diminishing returns (33). We aimed to include at least one child under the age
217 of the target group (<10 years) to ensure the comprehensibility of the text. All participants were
218 initially instructed in the study procedure and then signed informed consent. The parents or legal
219 guardians signed informed consent on behalf of the child and adolescents under 18 years of age.

220

221 All included participants partook in a usability testing of the MAP-Knee Tool based upon the
222 ‘think-aloud approach’ (34). The think-aloud approach was chosen because it focuses on using
223 simulation to gain insights into participants’ interpretations, interactions, reasoning, and latent
224 challenges related to artefact use (35) and using this knowledge to optimise the design. We
225 introduced the complete MAP-Knee Tool to the medical doctors and the credible explanations and

226 option grid to the adolescents. However, doctors' input regarding credible explanations and the
227 option grid was only used to assess the set-up and layout. Comprehension and content were left to
228 the adolescents. Participants were instructed to verbalise thoughts as they occurred while
229 completing the assigned task and say whatever came to their minds as they went through the MAP-
230 Knee Tool. The researcher would then explore key reflections to identify any misunderstanding or
231 confusion of relevant items and domains. Participants were encouraged to speak constantly as if
232 they were alone in the room and were informed that the researcher would remind them to keep
233 talking should they fall silent.(34) This process was conducted to identify any inconsistencies in the
234 participants' perception of the items compared to what they were intended to capture (e.g., shared
235 decision-making and diagnostic uncertainty). In addition, this allowed the identification of
236 difficulties in understanding phrases or concepts.

237

238 All interviews were recorded and transcribed (non-verbatim). For three reasons, we chose non-
239 verbatim. First, we wanted to make sure that there were no comprehension problems; second, we
240 did not plan to do an in-depth thematic analysis as this would not be needed to identify difficulties
241 in the understanding of the tool; and third, we thought that cutting out all extraneous speech would
242 make the transcript easier to read and more helpful so that we could implement the suggestions
243 made by our participants.(36)

244

245 3. Results

246 We included seven Danish children and adolescents aged between 8 and 15 years (three in Session
247 1 and four in Session 2) and seven medical doctors (three general practitioners, three doctors
248 working in general practice or at the orthopaedic department as part of their clinical education
249 programme, one orthopaedic surgeon) (four in Session 1 and three in Session 2) for the end-user
250 testing. One adolescent in each session suffered from non-traumatic knee pain.

251

252 3.1. SMILE

253 As SMILE had previously been validated, no significant changes were made to the content. During
254 the end-user testing, we discovered two misspellings we corrected. To not exclude any sub-groups
255 of patients, we changed the word 'athletes' found in the box concerning Sinding-Larsen-Johansson
256 to 'children and adolescents'. To make the English and Danish versions more consistent, we

257 removed the word ‘pain-free’ from the description of the swelling that could indicate inflammatory
258 arthritis or infection.

259

260 *3.2. Prognostic factors*

261 Prototype 2 was the preferred prototype by both medical doctors during the initial presentation of
262 the three prototypes. They suggested the addition of overlapping brackets below the coloured
263 horizontal bar to indicate either a more conservative management with a lower number of
264 prognostic factors or the consideration of referral to rehabilitation with more prognostic factors. The
265 overlap of the brackets could support clinicians in considering their clinical reasoning rather than
266 simply basing their recommendation of management on a cut-off of the number of prognostic
267 factors present, which was used in Prototype 3.

268

269 Most suggested changes during the end-user testing were related to the graphical presentation, not
270 the content. The medical doctors would prefer that the factors were listed on top of each other rather
271 than side by side and that there would be a single arrow below the bar instead of the overlapping
272 brackets. This arrow should have text to explain that more factors would be associated with a poorer
273 prognosis and that more extensive treatment should be considered. They would also prefer to have a
274 text box explaining how to evaluate health-related quality of life in a patient. Therefore, we
275 included a text box with questions the clinician should ask themselves regarding the physical,
276 mental, and social limitations that their patient experiences.

277

278 *3.3. Option grid*

279 We designed the option grid based on information from 20 systematic or narrative reviews (see
280 supplementary file 1) (Osgood-Schlatter disease: n=5, growth pain: n=5, patellar tendinopathy: n=3,
281 patellofemoral pain: n=3, iliotibial band syndrome: n=3, and Sinding-Larsen-Johansson: n=1).
282 Treatments were divided into 1) Watch and wait, 2) Information about knee pain and how to self-
283 manage, 3) Physical activity or exercise, and 4) Passive treatments. After the first draft had been
284 presented to the participants during the end-user testing, we limited the text as it was too elaborate.
285 The medical doctors suggested that ‘Watch and wait’ should be changed to ‘Wait and see’ as this
286 was the term used in everyday practice despite the approach including more than simply waiting.
287 The treatments should be listed in an order that reflects how comprehensive they are. ‘Passive
288 treatments’ should be changed to ‘Other treatments’ as the word ‘passive’ could be interpreted as

289 something negative. Lastly, implementing colour-divided boxes was important to make the table
290 more manageable.

291

292 4. Discussion and Conclusion

293 4.1. Discussion

294 We systematically developed a decision support tool for the six most common non-traumatic knee
295 pains in adolescents. The development included both systematic literature searches, an
296 Argumentative Delphi process, and end-user involvement, which ultimately led to the MAP-Knee
297 Tool, which clinicians may use during the consultation with adolescents having non-traumatic knee
298 pain.

299

300 Despite the seminal work by The International Patient Decision Aid Standards (IPDAS)
301 Collaboration in 2003, there are still problems with the quality and biases in patient decision
302 aids.(3,5) Despite the recommended use of checklists, some patient decision aids are still biased
303 towards low-value care and are not based on the best available evidence.(3) We followed the
304 guidance from IPDAS and Elwyn et al. to produce a trustworthy tool that may improve customised
305 care. We did this by following the three steps (evidence synthesis, patient experience, and patient-
306 facing tool production).(37) Furthermore, we paid particular attention to including the most recent
307 scientific evidence and presenting the pros and cons of different treatment strategies without
308 recommending one treatment over another.

309 One of the aims of our tool was to decrease diagnostic uncertainty.(38) Adolescents may become
310 confused and have difficulties understanding their condition if they sense diagnostic uncertainty
311 among the clinician or do not understand the information provided.(39–42) From our experiences
312 with the MAP-Knee Tool, we learned that developing targeted patient information is complex as
313 explanations must be individualised and generalisable. To overcome this, we advise clinicians to
314 use the tool as a guide and support tool but also include phrases and explanations tailored to each
315 individual adolescent. However, to facilitate implementation in clinical practice where consultations
316 need to be kept to a short time frame, the use of the MAP-Knee Tool must not extend the
317 consultation time. Therefore, using standardised phrasings that the tool provides may ensure that the
318 clinician covers important domains without using more time than they usually would during a
319 consultation.

320

321 We were limited due to the lack of high-quality trials to support advice and the effectiveness of
322 treatment strategies.(43) Despite our best efforts to include only high-quality evidence, we were
323 limited by the number of randomised trials and systematic reviews conducted on non-traumatic
324 adolescent knee pain. For example, we were only able to include a single narrative review
325 concerning Sinding-Larsen-Johansson, whereas we included five systematic and narrative reviews
326 concerning Osgood-Schlatter disease. Future improvement of the option grid of the MAP-Knee
327 Tool would require a stronger research foundation. The MAP-Knee Tool should be a constantly
328 evolving tool by making revisions when relevant research regarding treatment strategies has been
329 conducted. Similar efforts have been made by performing living systematic reviews in
330 Patellofemoral Pain and Achilles Tendinopathy that provide an up-to-date overview of evidence-
331 based treatments.(44,45) For now, the MAP-Knee Tool is a physical tool, but to ease future
332 revisions, it may be preferable to convert it into an online version. Still, it would be important also
333 to use written materials such as a leaflet adolescents may bring home with them as such has been
334 shown to assist patients with chronic pain in reconceptualising pain and reducing pain
335 catastrophising.(46) Therefore, the MAP-Knee Tool should not be considered a tool that is only
336 being used during the consultation but as a tool that extends beyond the clinical setting by using the
337 leaflet. This can further substantiate the decrease in diagnostic uncertainty and the increased feeling
338 of being validated as per the logic model.

339 The study has limitations. First, we only used the MAP-Knee Tool for Osgood-Schlatter disease
340 during the end-user testing to limit time consumption. Despite the many commonalities between the
341 tools developed for the different diagnoses, there may be some readability issues within the other
342 tools that we did not capture. Second, the ability to present the pros and cons of the treatment
343 strategies in the option grid relies on the scientific evidence available, which is generally inadequate
344 for some of the diagnoses. Third, although the Argumentative Delphi process was conducted with
345 international experts, we do not know how the tool will work in different social and cultural
346 contexts as it was developed and user-tested in Denmark. Furthermore, we decided by consensus
347 how to sub-group the treatment strategies, which may have inadvertently biased the presentation
348 towards exercise-focused and not passive treatment strategies due to the research on exercise, which
349 we have primarily in our group. Nevertheless, we were aware of this and did what we could to be as
350 objective as possible.

351 One of the study's main strengths is its systematic approach and use of end-user testing to ensure
352 that the tool included relevant content and that the explanations and phrasings were understandable,
353 readable, and matched the health literacy of the target group. Another strength is that we included
354 clinicians and researchers with different backgrounds (e.g., medical doctors, psychologists, and
355 physiotherapists) in the Argumentative Delphi process and medical doctors from various settings in
356 the end-user testing. This may help the future implementation of the tool across different sectors as
357 clinicians may find it valuable and meaningful regardless of which sector they are working in. This
358 could ultimately lead to a higher degree of consistency within the clinical pathway for adolescents,
359 which has recently been highlighted as being important by Ecclestone et al..(47)

360

361

362 4.2. Conclusion

363 Through a multi-step iterative process including systematic literature searches, an Argumentative
364 Delphi process with international experts, and end-user testing, we developed a decision support
365 tool for clinicians and adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain to support the entire consultation in
366 clinical practice.

367

368 4.3. Practice Implications

369 The MAP-Knee Tool can potentially support clinicians and adolescents with non-traumatic knee
370 pain in the clinical setting and ultimately lead to improved long-term outcomes for adolescents. The
371 tool targets clinicians and adolescents with four components that may decrease diagnostic
372 uncertainty and increase shared decision-making. Before future implementation of the tool in
373 clinical practice, it is important first to investigate its feasibility in the clinical setting and then
374 investigate if using the MAP-Knee Tool is more effective than usual practice in improving
375 outcomes.

376

377 References

- 378 1. Légaré F, Adepédjou R, Stacey D, Turcotte S, Kryworuchko J, Graham ID, et al.
379 Interventions for increasing the use of shared decision making by healthcare professionals.
380 Cochrane database Syst Rev. 2018 19;CD006732.
- 381 2. Elwyn G, Durand MA, Song J, Aarts J, Barr PJ, Berger Z, et al. A three-talk model for
382 shared decision making: multistage consultation process. *Brit Med J*. 2017 6;359:4891.
- 383 3. Zadro JR, Traeger AC, Décary S, O’Keeffe M. Problem with patient decision aids. Vol. 26,
384 *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine*. 2021. p. 180–3.
- 385 4. Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis K, Barry MJ, Bennett CL, Eden KB, et al. Decision aids for
386 people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;
387 12.
- 388 5. Joseph-Williams N, Newcombe R, Politi M, Durand MA, Sivell S, Stacey D, et al. Toward
389 minimum standards for certifying patient decision aids: A modified delphi consensus
390 process. *Med Decis Mak*. 2014 20;34(6):699–710.
- 391 6. Bowen E, Nayfe R, Milburn N, Mayo H, Reid MC, Fraenkel L, et al. Do Decision Aids
392 Benefit Patients with Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain? A Systematic Review. *Pain Med*. 2020
393 1;21(5):951–69.
- 394 7. Guldhammer C, Holden S, Sørensen ME, Olesen JL, Jensen MB, Rathleff MS. Development
395 and validation of the Sorting non-trauMatIc adoLescent knEe pain (SMILE) tool – a
396 development and initial validation study. *Pediatr Rheumatol*. 2021 6;19(1):110.
- 397 8. van der Horst DEM, Garvelink MM, Bos WJW, Stiggelbout AM, Pieterse AH. For which
398 decisions is Shared Decision Making considered appropriate? – A systematic review. *Patient*
399 *Educ Couns*. 2023 1;106:3–16.
- 400 9. Tan A, Strauss VY, Protheroe J, Dunn KM. Epidemiology of paediatric presentations with
401 musculoskeletal problems in primary care. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2018 6;19(1).
- 402 10. Dissing KB, Hestbæk L, Hartvigsen J, Williams C, Kamper S, Boyle E, et al. Spinal pain in
403 Danish school children – how often and how long? The CHAMPS Study-DK. *BMC*
404 *Musculoskelet Disord*. 2017 27;18(1).
- 405 11. Junge T, Runge L, Juul-Kristensen B, Wedderkopp N. Risk factors for knee injuries in
406 children 8 to 15 years: The CHAMPS study DK. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2016 1;48(4):655–
407 62.
- 408 12. Kamada M, Abe T, Kitayuguchi J, Imamura F, Lee IM, Kadowaki M, et al. Dose–response

- 409 relationship between sports activity and musculoskeletal pain in adolescents. *Pain*. 2016
410 1;157(6):1339.
- 411 13. Rathleff MS, Roos EM, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S. High prevalence of daily and multi-site
412 pain – a cross-sectional population-based study among 3000 Danish adolescents. *BMC*
413 *Pediatr*. 2013 19;13(1):191.
- 414 14. Rathleff MS, Holden S, Straszek CL, Olesen JL, Jensen MB, Roos EM. Five-year prognosis
415 and impact of adolescent knee pain: a prospective population-based cohort study of 504
416 adolescents in Denmark. *BMJ Open*. 2019 1;9(5):24113.
- 417 15. Guldhammer C, Rathleff MS, Jensen HP, Holden S. Long-term Prognosis and Impact of
418 Osgood-Schlatter Disease 4 Years After Diagnosis: A Retrospective Study. *Orthop J Sport*
419 *Med*. 2019 1;7(10).
- 420 16. Rathleff MS, Rathleff CR, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S, Roos EM, Crossley K, et al. Is Knee
421 Pain During Adolescence a Self-limiting Condition?: Prognosis of Patellofemoral Pain and
422 Other Types of Knee Pain. *Am J Sports Med*. 2016 1;44(5):1165–71.
- 423 17. Rathleff MS, Roos EM, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S. Exercise during school hours when added
424 to patient education improves outcome for 2 years in adolescent patellofemoral pain: a
425 cluster randomised trial. *Br J Sports Med*. 2014;49(6):406–12.
- 426 18. Rathleff MS, Vicenzino B, Middelkoop M, Graven-Nielsen T, van Linschoten R, Hölmich P,
427 et al. Patellofemoral Pain in Adolescence and Adulthood: Same Same, but Different? *Sports*
428 *Med*. 2015;45(11):1489–95.
- 429 19. Skovdal Rathleff M, Rams Rathleff C, Lykkegaard Olesen J, Roos EM, Rasmussen S,
430 Andreucci A, et al. Care-seeking behaviour of adolescents with patellofemoral pain: a
431 retrospective cohort study. *F1000Research* 2022 11161. 2022 9;11:161.
- 432 20. Hill JC, Dunn KM, Lewis M, Mullis R, Main CJ, Foster NE, et al. A primary care back pain
433 screening tool: Identifying patient subgroups for initial treatment. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2008
434 15;59(5):632–41.
- 435 21. Patel DR, Villalobos A. Evaluation and management of knee pain in young athletes: overuse
436 injuries of the knee. *Transl Pediatr*. 2017 1;6(3):19098–198.
- 437 22. Barber Foss KD, Myer GD, Chen SS, Hewett TE. Expected Prevalence From the Differential
438 Diagnosis of Anterior Knee Pain in Adolescent Female Athletes During Preparticipation
439 Screening. *J Athl Train*. 2012 1;47(5):519–24.
- 440 23. Coulter A, Stilwell D, Kryworuchko J, Mullen PD, Ng CJ, Van Der Weijden T. A systematic

- 441 development process for patient decision aids. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2013
442 29;13(Suppl 2):S2.
- 443 24. Elwyn G, O'Connor A, Stacey D, Volk R, Edwards A, Coulter A, et al. Developing a quality
444 criteria framework for patient decision aids: online international Delphi consensus process.
445 *BMJ Br Med J.* 2006 26;333(7565):417.
- 446 25. Holden S, Kasza J, Winters M, van Middelkoop M, Rathleff MS. Prognostic factors for
447 adolescent knee pain: an individual participant data meta-analysis of 1281 patients. *Pain.*
448 2021;162(6):1597–607.
- 449 26. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WMC, Gray JAM, Haynes RB, Richardson WS. Evidence based
450 medicine: what it is and what it isn't. 1996. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2007 13;455(7023):3–5.
- 451 27. Smith JD, Li DH, Rafferty MR. The Implementation Research Logic Model: a method for
452 planning, executing, reporting, and synthesizing implementation projects. *Implement Sci.*
453 2020 25;15(1).
- 454 28. Djurtoft C, Bruun M, Riel H, Hoegh M, Darlow B, Rathleff M. How do we explain painful
455 chronic non-traumatic knee conditions to children and adolescents? A multiple-method study
456 to develop credible explanations. *medRxiv.* 2022 17;2022.12.15.22283510.
- 457 29. Vidal RV V. The Future Workshop: Democratic problem solving. *Econ Anal Work Pap.*
458 2006;5(4).
- 459 30. Marrin K, Brain K, Cpsychol P, Durand M-A, Bmedsci AE, Mphil M, et al. Fast and frugal
460 tools for shared decision-making: how to develop Option Grids. *Eur J Pers Centered Healthc.*
461 2013 11;1(1):240–5.
- 462 31. Barr PJ, Forcino RC, Dannenberg MD, Mishra M, Turner E, Zisman-Ilani Y, et al.
463 Healthcare Options for People Experiencing Depression (HOPE*D): the development and
464 pilot testing of an encounter-based decision aid for use in primary care. *BMJ Open.* 2019
465 1;9(4):e025375.
- 466 32. Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies. *Qual*
467 *Health Res.* 2016 10;26(13):1753–60.
- 468 33. Faulkner L. Beyond the five-user assumption: Benefits of increased sample sizes in usability
469 testing. *Behav Res Methods, Instruments, Comput* 2003 353. 2003;35(3):379–83.
- 470 34. Lundgrén-Laine H, Salanterä S. Think-Aloud Technique and Protocol Analysis in Clinical
471 Decision-Making Research. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732309354278>. 2009 3;20(4):565–
472 75.

- 473 35. Burbach B, Barnason S, Thompson SA. Using “Think Aloud” to capture clinical reasoning
474 during patient simulation. *Int J Nurs Educ Scholarsh*. 2015 1;12(1):1–7.
- 475 36. Halcomb EJ, Davidson PM. Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary?
476 *Appl Nurs Res*. 2006 1;19(1):38–42.
- 477 37. Elwyn G, Quinlan C, Mulley A, Agoritsas T, Vandvik PO, Guyatt G. Trustworthy guidelines
478 – excellent; customized care tools – even better. *BMC Med*. 2015 1;13(1):EE.
- 479 38. Neville A, Noel M, Clinch J, Pincus T, Jordan A. ‘Drawing a line in the sand’: Physician
480 diagnostic uncertainty in paediatric chronic pain. *Eur J Pain*. 2021 1;25(2):430–41.
- 481 39. Tanna V, Heathcote LC, Heirich MS, Rush G, Neville A, Noel M, et al. Something Else
482 Going On? Diagnostic Uncertainty in Children with Chronic Pain and Their Parents. *Child*
483 2020, Vol 7, Page 165. 2020 4;7(10):165.
- 484 40. Heffernan M, Wilson C, Keating K, McCarthy K. “Why Isn’t It Going Away?”: A
485 Qualitative Exploration of Worry and Pain Experiences in Adolescents with Chronic Pain.
486 *Pain Med*. 2021 23;22(2):459–69.
- 487 41. Neville A, Jordan A, Beveridge JK, Pincus T, Noel M. Diagnostic Uncertainty in Youth With
488 Chronic Pain and Their Parents. *J Pain*. 2019 1;20(9):1080–90.
- 489 42. Andreucci A, Skovdal Rathleff M, Ørskov Reuther F, Hussein M, Rahimzai S, Linnemann
490 TD, et al. “I had already tried that before going to the doctor” – exploring adolescents’ with
491 knee pain perspectives on ‘wait and see’ as a management strategy in primary care; a study
492 with brief semi-structured qualitative interviews. *Scand J Pain*. 2022 24;0(0).
- 493 43. Birnie KA, Ouellette C, Do Amaral T, Stinson JN. Mapping the evidence and gaps of
494 interventions for pediatric chronic pain to inform policy, research, and practice: A systematic
495 review and quality assessment of systematic reviews. *Can J Pain = Rev Can la douleur*.
496 2020;4(1):129.
- 497 44. Winters M, Holden S, Lura CB, Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Vicenzino BT, et al. Comparative
498 effectiveness of treatments for patellofemoral pain: a living systematic review with network
499 meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2021 1;55(7):369.
- 500 45. van der Vlist AC, Winters M, Weir A, Ardern CL, Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, et al. Which
501 treatment is most effective for patients with Achilles tendinopathy? A living systematic
502 review with network meta-analysis of 29 randomised controlled trials. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020
503 10;bjsports-2019-101872.
- 504 46. Gallagher L, McAuley J, Moseley GL. A randomized-controlled trial of using a book of

505 metaphors to reconceptualize pain and decrease catastrophizing in people with chronic pain.
506 Clin J Pain. 2013;29(1):20–5.
507 47. Eccleston C, Fisher E, Howard RF, Slater R, Forgeron P, Palermo TM, et al. Delivering
508 transformative action in paediatric pain: a Lancet Child & Adolescent Health
509 Commission. Lancet Child Adolesc Heal. 2021 1;5(1):47–87.
510
511

512 **Legends**

513 Figure 1: Logic model of the four components of the MAP-Knee Tool with their proposed
514 mechanisms and outcomes.