

# **TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A): Evaluation of reliability and validity in accordance with COSMIN recommendations.**

Myles C Murphy <sup>1,2</sup>, Fergus McCleary <sup>2</sup>, Dana Hince <sup>3</sup>, Ruth L Chimenti <sup>4</sup>, Paola T Chivers <sup>3,5</sup>, J. Turner Vosseller <sup>6</sup>, Sophia Nimphius <sup>5</sup>, Nonhlanhla Mkumbuzi <sup>7-10</sup>, Peter Malliaras <sup>11</sup>, Nicola Maffuli <sup>12-14</sup>, Robert-Jan De Vos <sup>15</sup>, Ebonie Rio <sup>16-18</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nutrition and Health Innovation Research Institute, School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Western Australia, Australia

<sup>2</sup> School of Health Sciences and Physiotherapy, The University of Notre Dame Australia, Fremantle, Western Australia, Australia

<sup>3</sup> Institute for Health Research, The University of Notre Dame Australia, Fremantle, Western Australia, Australia

<sup>4</sup> Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Science, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, United States of America

<sup>5</sup> School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Western Australia, Australia

<sup>6</sup> Jacksonville Orthopaedic Institute, Jacksonville, Florida, United States of America

<sup>7</sup> Department of Sports, Exercise, and Rehabilitation, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom

<sup>8</sup> Department of Rehabilitation, Midlands State University, Gweru, Zimbabwe

<sup>9</sup> Department of Human Movement Science, Nelson Mandela University, Summerstrand, Gqeberha, South Africa

<sup>10</sup> NtombiSport Pty Ltd, Cape Town, South Africa

<sup>11</sup> School of Primary and Allied Health Care, Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Science, Monash University, Victoria, Australia

<sup>12</sup> Department of Medicine, Surgery and Dentistry, University of Salerno, Baronissi, Salerno, Italy

<sup>13</sup> Faculty of Medicine, School of Pharmacy and Bioengineering, Keele University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

<sup>14</sup> Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Centre for Sports and Exercise Medicine, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

<sup>15</sup> Department of Orthopaedics and Sports Medicine, Erasmus MC University Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

31 <sup>16</sup> La Trobe Sport and Exercise Medicine Research Centre, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria, Australia

32 <sup>17</sup> Victorian Institute of Sport, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

33 <sup>18</sup> The Australian Ballet, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

34

35 **\*Corresponding author:** Dr Myles C Murphy. Nutrition and Health Innovation Research Institute, School of

36 Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Western Australia, Australia Email:

37 [m.murphy@ecu.edu.au](mailto:m.murphy@ecu.edu.au)

38

39

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** Evaluate the construct validity (structural validity and hypothesis-testing), reliability (test-retest reliability, measurement error and internal consistency) and minimal detectable change (MDC) of the 13-item TENDINopathy Severity assessment–Achilles (TENDINS-A).

**Methods:** Participants with Achilles pain completed an online survey: demographics, TENDINS-A, Foot and Ankle Outcome Score (FAOS) and Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Achilles (VISA-A). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) assessed dimensionality. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) assessed structural validity [root-mean-squared error of approximation (RMSEA); Comparative Fit Index (CFI); Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI); Standardised Root Measure Square (SRMS)]. Correlations between TENDINS-A and the FAOS/ VISA-A assessed hypothesis-testing. Intraclass correlation (ICC) assessed test-retest reliability. Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  assessed internal consistency. Standard error of the measurement (SEM) assessed measurement error. A distribution-based approach assessed MDC.

**Results:** Seventy-nine participants (51% female) with a mean (SD) age=42.6 (13.0)years, height=175.0 (11.7)cm and body mass=82.0 (19.1)kg were included. EFA identified three meaningful factors, proposed to be pain, symptoms and function. The best model identified using CFA had adequate structural validity (CFI= 0.959, TLI= 0.947, RMSEA= 0.101, SRMS=0.068) excluded three items from the original TENDINS-A, included three factors (Pain, Symptoms, and Function). TENDINS-A exhibited moderate positive correlation with FAOS ( $\rho=0.598, p<0.001$ ), moderate, negative correlation with VISA-A ( $r=-0.639, p<0.001$ ). Reliability of the TENDINS-A is excellent (ICC=0.930; Cronbach’s  $\alpha=0.808$ ; SEM=6.54 units) and has an MDC of 12 units.

**Conclusions:** Our evaluation of the revised 10-item TENDINS-A has determined it has adequate validity and reliability. Thus, the TENDINS-A can be recommended for immediate use, being the preferred tool over other PROMs to assess disability in Achilles tendinopathy.

## INTRODUCTION

Achilles tendinopathy is characterised by focal Achilles tendon pain accompanied by impaired function with mechanical loading,<sup>1</sup> which is typically managed using exercise rehabilitation.<sup>2,3</sup> Achilles tendinopathy is common in the running population<sup>4</sup> and also prevalent within the general population.<sup>5</sup> People with tendinopathy, expert clinicians and researchers have identified several core health domains as important in tendinopathy, including tendon-related disability.<sup>6</sup> However, multiple different measures to quantify tendon-related disability are used across studies, with no existing consensus.<sup>7,8</sup> In clinical practice measures of tendon-related disability are not commonly used,<sup>9</sup> in part due to inadequate content validity.<sup>10,11</sup> Thus, despite a consensus of it being an important aspect of health,<sup>6</sup> there remains no measure of tendon-related disability that is validated for research or clinical use.

The consensus-based standards for the selection of measurement instruments (COSMIN) guidelines represent international best-practice for the design and appraisal of Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs).<sup>12,13</sup> However, the value of a PROM is not in its availability but in its quality, reflected by its clinometric properties.<sup>14</sup> Valid and reliable PROMs should be used and recommended, but this is not currently possible in Achilles tendinopathy research of the disability domain.<sup>15</sup> Existing PROMs, such as the Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment – Achilles (VISA-A), are recommended in the absence of other tools,<sup>16</sup> but do not satisfy the guidelines set out by COSMIN for the assessment of Achilles tendinopathy, largely because of inadequate content and structural validity.<sup>10,11</sup>

The newly developed TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A) has adequate content validity, being co-designed by people with Achilles tendinopathy, expert clinicians and researchers, to assess ‘disability’ from Achilles tendinopathy.<sup>17</sup> TENDINS-A consists of questions covering sub-domains of pain, symptoms, and function related to Achilles tendinopathy.<sup>17</sup> Whilst the TENDINS-A has sufficient content validity, the structural validity and other measurement properties of this new PROM (e.g., reliability) remain unknown.

## Objective

The objective of this study was to evaluate the construct validity (including structural validity and hypothesis testing), reliability (including test-retest reliability, measurement error and internal consistency) and minimal detectable change of the TENDINS-A.

## Hypotheses

The TENDINS-A will have adequate criteria-based structural validity, demonstrate moderate significant correlations to the VISA-A and Foot and Ankle Outcome Score (FAOS), no correlation to unrelated constructs such as baseline characteristics (e.g., age or body mass index) and excellent reliability.

## **METHODS**

### **Study Design**

Cross-sectional cohort study evaluating the psychometric properties of the TENDINS-A.

### **Participants and setting**

We used a network of clinicians (exercise scientists, general practitioners, orthopaedic surgeons, physiotherapists, podiatrists, rheumatologists and sport and exercise physicians) and Achilles tendon researchers to identify participants with Achilles tendinopathy and provide them with our online survey using Qualtrics. This was accessed via a quick response (QR) code or anonymous web link. Any person over the age of 18 years, who could read the English language, with self-reported Achilles tendinopathy was eligible.

### **Inclusion criteria**

Participants were provided with a pain map with established locations of Achilles tendon symptoms and asked to select all markings that corresponded to their region of pain,<sup>18</sup> which is an accepted method to identify patients with Achilles tendinopathy.<sup>19</sup>

### **Outcome measures**

All outcome measures were completed by participants within a single survey and the survey forced responses to avoid missing data.

#### *Participant characteristics*

Age (years), sex (male/female/intersex), height (cm), body mass (kg), ethnicity, country of residence, languages other than English spoken by the participant (self-reported), whether the participant performed moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA) most days (yes/no), highest level of education, work status and total household income were reported.

#### *TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A)*

The 13-item TENDINS-A was provided to participants as the first PROM within the survey and was scored between 0 and 100, with ‘0’ representing a perfect score (no disability) and ‘100’ representing complete disability.<sup>17</sup> If participants were unable to perform one of the pain-with-loading tests (e.g., single leg hop), they were instructed to leave it blank and a score of ‘10’ was provided.

Participants completed the TENDINS-A prior to the FAOS and the VISA-A. Directly after completing the VISA-A questionnaire, the TENDINS-A was immediately repeated. This ensured the clinical status of participants was unchanged,<sup>20</sup> whilst still allowing for any potential interference effects. Specifically, the participant would be unable to remember responses to the initial TENDINS-A as they have no option to go back in the survey and 50 questions (i.e., the VISA-A and FAOS) separated the initial and then repeated TENDINS-A.

#### *Foot and Ankle Outcome Score*

The 42-item FAOS<sup>21</sup> was performed following the TENDINS-A, with a mean total score calculated for the purposes of this study. A score of '0' represented a perfect score (no disability), with a score of '100' representing complete disability.

#### *Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment – Achilles*

The 8-item VISA-A<sup>22</sup> was performed following the FAOS. The VISA-A is inversely scored when compared to the TENDINS-A and FAOS with a score of '100' represented a perfect score (no disability), and a score of '0' representing complete disability. Where participants selected multiple responses in item 8 (related to how much physical activity can be performed before cessation due to symptoms is required), the lowest score was retained for analysis.

#### **Power calculation**

Study size was informed by the recommendations of the COSMIN risk of bias checklist<sup>12 13</sup> rather than formal power calculations. Questions 1, 2, 5 and 9 are not scored in the TENDINS-A; therefore the PROM was initially considered to have 13 scorable items as one item has five secondary scales.<sup>17</sup> COSMIN guidelines suggest that six-times the number of persons to items is adequate for assessing structural validity using classical test theory,<sup>12</sup> thus the minimum sample size for this study was determined to be 78 persons. We also required all communalities in exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to be >0.3, thus samples of <100 participants are justified.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, a sample of >50 participants is considered adequate for reliability and internal consistency.<sup>12 13</sup>

#### **Statistical analysis**

The different statistical analyses, per each measurement property, are described below. All statistical analyses were performed within IBM SPSS statistics (version 29.0) or IBM SPSS Amos (version 29.0). Where appropriate, confidence intervals are presented, and statistical significance was considered when  $p < 0.05$ .

#### *Dimensionality*

We performed EFA for all scoreable items using SPSS Statistics to assess dimensionality. To proceed to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), we required all communalities to exceed 0.3,<sup>24</sup> required the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy to exceed 0.7<sup>25</sup> and for Bartlett's test of Sphericity to be significant ( $p < 0.01$ ).<sup>26</sup> Factors were eligible for inclusion within EFA where the Eigenvalues exceeded 1.0. The Scree plot was also visually inspected and additional models were performed to include more/ less factors, based on author (MCM) judgement and with the TENDINS-A being proposed to measure three factors related to disability: pain, symptoms and function.<sup>17</sup> A principal axis factoring method was used to determine our initial factor matrix. Factors were considered meaningful when an item loaded at  $\geq 0.4$  for that factor.<sup>27</sup> As 'disability' is a domain that reflects pain, symptoms and function,<sup>6</sup> we hypothesised the TENDINS-A to have three factors identified by EFA.

# *Structural Validity*

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed using SPSS Amos (22) to assess structural validity. We included all three factors (which were identified in the EFA and TENDINS-A content validity study),<sup>17</sup> within the initial model, and then removed variables as needed to achieve the best fit. Items with categorical (yes/ no only) responses were not included within CFA. Models were tested and selected based off the best root-mean-squared error of the approximation (RMSEA) and overall model chi-squared statistics, with a lower chi-squared statistic representing a better model fit. An overall acceptable model would require a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) OR Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) of  $> 0.95$  AND RMSEA of  $< 0.06$  or Standardised Root Measure Square (SRMS) of  $< 0.08$ .<sup>12</sup>

The CFA provided standardised factor loading and error variance per item. Composite reliability of  $> 0.70$  is considered adequate.<sup>28</sup> Composite reliability was calculated using the formula below when  $\lambda$  = standardised factor loading and  $\varepsilon$  = error variance:

$$\text{Composite reliability} = \frac{(\sum \lambda_i)^2}{(\sum \lambda_i)^2 + (\sum \varepsilon_i)}$$

Convergent validity was assessed using the average variance extracted (AVE). An AVE of  $> 0.50$  is considered adequate.<sup>29</sup> The AVE was calculated using the formula below when  $\lambda$  = standardised factor loading and  $\varepsilon$  = error variance:

$$\text{Average variance extracted} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\epsilon_i)}$$

The criteria for adequate structural validity of the final model were:

1. CFI or TLI > 0.95,<sup>12</sup>
2. RMSEA of < 0.06 or SRMS of < 0.08,<sup>12</sup>
3. Composite Reliability > 0.70,<sup>28</sup> and
4. AVE > 0.50.<sup>29</sup>

### *Test-retest reliability*

Test-retest reliability of the TENDINS-A was calculated as a continuous scale. The absolute and relative test-retest reliability (which is a sub-type of reliability and demonstrates how closely someone will generate the same score on a PROM when repeated in a specified timeframe) were determined.<sup>30</sup> Relative test-retest reliability was reported as the intraclass correlation (ICC), with a two-way mixed approach used to assess absolute agreement of a single measure.<sup>31</sup> Absolute test-retest reliability is a sub-type of reliability and demonstrates the degree of uncertainty in a measurement. For example, measurements with more uncertainty will have greater measurement error, hence it is systematic and random error that is not reflective of true change.<sup>31</sup> The standard error of the measurement<sup>32</sup> was calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Standard error of the measurement} = SD_{\text{baseline}} \sqrt{1 - ICC}$$

### *Minimal detectable change*

The Minimal detectable change (MDC) and 95% confidence intervals was calculated using a distribution-based method,<sup>33</sup> using the following equation:

$$\text{Minimal important change} = \frac{SD_{\text{baseline}}}{2}$$

### *Internal consistency*

Internal consistency is a sub-type of reliability that investigates whether different items that measure the same construct give comparable outcomes. The internal consistency for the entire 13-item TENDINS-A was calculated using the average inter-item correlation and a Cronbach's Alpha was reported with a positive rating given for values > 0.7.<sup>12</sup>

### *Convergent and divergent validity*

In addition to the convergent validity assessed using CFA, we also assessed convergent and divergent validity of the TENDINS-A scale using a correlation between scores of the TENDINS-A and another PROM theorised to



measure the same overall core health domain of tendinopathy (disability)<sup>6 15</sup> or unrelated constructs, such as age and BMI (given they are continuous variables that should not be related to tendon-related disability). The TENDINS-A, FAOS and the VISA-A were assessed for normality using visual assessment and the one-sample Kolomogorov-Smirnov Test. For normally distributed data the Pearson's correlation coefficient was used and for non-normally distributed data the non-parametric Spearman rho correlation was used. Correlations were considered very weak (between 0-0.25), weak (0.26-0.49), moderate (0.5-0.69), strong (0.7-0.89) and very strong (0.9-1).

### *Comparison between sub-groups*

Between-group differences for key baseline characteristics [sex (male/ female), MVPA most days (yes/no), multilingual status (yes/ no), and whether tendon loading activities are typically performed daily (yes/no)] were calculated using independent t-tests.

## **RESULTS**

### **Participants**

Seventy-nine (n=79) participants (51% female, 49% male) provided survey data and were included within our analysis with no missing data. Participants had a mean (SD) age of 42.6 (13.0) years, height of 175.0 (11.7) cm and body mass of 82.0 (19.1) kg. Participants were predominantly of 'Australian' ethnicity (79.7%) and were not multi-lingual (64.6%) with those multilingual participants predominantly having English as their first language (53.6%). A significant number of participants reported that they performed MVPA most days (69.6%). Participant education level and employment varied, with most having completed tertiary studies (74.6%) and working full time (63.3%). Income levels ranged from less than \$30,000 Australian Dollars (AUD) (5.1%) to greater than \$200,000 AUD (27.8%), per annum. The activities that aggravated the pain of participants with Achilles tendinopathy varied: walking slow (15.2%), walking fast (44.3%), walking up and down stairs (43.0%), running up and down stairs (46.8%), running slow (60.8%), running fast (54.4%), hopping and jumping (62.0%), and rapidly changing direction while running (44.3%). The complete breakdown of participant characteristics is provided in Appendix A.

### **Uni-dimensionality**

Bartlett's test of Sphericity suggested that the results of our correlation matrix were not random [ $\chi^2(78) = 708$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ]. Our Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (0.811) far exceeded the minimum cut-off of 0.70. Thus, our correlation matrix was appropriate. The extracted communalities (Mean=0.67, SD= 0.16,

Range= 0.18 to 0.93) for all but three items (items 6, 8 and 12) exceeded our cut-off score for CFA inclusion (Appendix B). Principal axis factoring analysis was performed and the initial Eigen values of three factors exceeded 1.0 (see appendix C), explained 67.9% of the total variance and the first factor accounted for >20% of the variability. The three identified factors were included within the Factor Matrix, and associated factor loading per item, are presented within Table 1. However, no items were associated with a loading of >0.4 on Factor Three.

**Table 1. Factor Loading with Principal Axis Factoring Analysis for all items with loading >0.4 (n=79).**


TENDINS- A	Factor One	Factor Two	Factor Three
Item 3	0.412		0.400
Item 4	0.496	0.479	
Item 6			
Item 7		0.644	
Item 8		0.504	
Item 10		0.672	
Item 11	0.614		
Item 12			
Item 13A	0.731		
Item 13B	0.888		
Item 13C	0.915		
Item 13D	0.916		
Item 13E	0.917		

\*blank cells represent loading of <0.4

**Structural Validity** Several Maximum Likelihood Estimates CFA models were trialled, informed by the factor loading from EFA, and subscales from our content validity study to generate our final CFA model. The best model used three factors [a) Pain, b) Symptoms, and c) Function] and eight items (Figure 1). Question 12 was excluded because of poor EFA initial communality, non-meaningful factor loading within EFA and being unable to load onto either of the three factors within CFA. Question 13A and 13B were removed as their exclusion

resulted in substantially improved model fit (Appendix D). The scoring for the remaining 12 questions was amended to maintain a score range from 0 to 100, as presented within Appendix E.

**Figure 1. Factor Loading within Confirmatory Factor Analysis**



In the final model, the chi-squared statistic was  $\chi^2(22) = 39.2$ , the CFI was 0.959, the TLI was 0.947, the RMSEA was 0.101 and the SRMS was 0.068, indicating sufficient structural validity. The model was also assumed accurate with CMIN/DF = 1.796, parsimony comparative fit index = 0.753 and parsimony normed fit index = 0.717.

The standardised factor loadings and error variance for the final model are included within Table 2. The correlation between 'Pain' and 'Symptoms' was estimated at 0.642 with significant covariances (Estimate = 4.104, standard error = 1.101 and composite reliability = 3.728,  $p < 0.001$ ). The correlation between 'Pain' and 'Function' was estimated at 0.668 with significant covariances (Estimate = 5.424, standard error = 1.300 and composite reliability = 4.171,  $p < 0.001$ ). The correlation between 'Symptoms' and 'Function' was estimated at

0.275 with significant covariances (Estimate= 2.818, standard error= 1.353 and composite reliability= 2.082, p=0.037).

**Table 2. Standardised Factor Loadings of the TENDINS-A (n=79)**

TENDINS- A	Factor	Standardised Factor Loading	Error Variance
Item 11	Pain	0.643	0.587
Item 3	Pain	0.605	0.634
Item 4	Pain	0.627	0.607
Item 7	Symptoms	0.741	0.451
Item 10	Symptoms	0.855	0.269
Item 13C	Function	0.921	0.152
Item 13D	Function	0.975	0.049
Item 13E	Function	0.967	0.065

*Internal consistency.* For the 8-items assessed using CFA included in TENDINS-A theorised to measure ‘disability’, the internal consistency was 0.842, hence displaying sufficient internal consistency.

*Composite reliability.* For the 8-items assessed using CFA included in TENDINS-A theorised to measure ‘disability’, the composite reliability was 0.934, hence displaying sufficient composite reliability.

*Convergent validity.* For the 8-items assessed using CFA included in TENDINS-A theorised to measure ‘disability’, the AVE was 0.648, hence displaying sufficient convergent validity.

Thus, our final CFA model was capable of determining the contribution of different items in measuring ‘Pain’, ‘Symptoms’ and ‘Function’ and the TENDINS-A has sufficient structural validity. Consequently, the scores for the remaining items were amended to ensure the TENDINS-A retained a maximal score of 100 (40 units for ‘Pain’, 30 units for ‘symptoms’ and 30 units for ‘function’). Questions 6 and 8 were also excluded from CFA

modelling being dichotomous (Yes/No) items but were retained within the complete TENDINS-A in the ‘symptoms’ domain. All subsequent analyses therefore relate to the revised TENDINS-A, presented in Appendix E.

## **Distribution of data**

Whilst data for the TENDINS-A (Kolomogorov-Smirnov test statistic=0.09,  $p=0.097$ ) and the VISA-A (Kolomogorov-Smirnov test statistic= 0.06,  $p=0.200$ ) were normally distributed, the FAOS were not (Kolomogorov-Smirnov test statistic= 0.12,  $p=0.019$ ). The TENDINS-A data had a minimum score of 0 and a maximum score of 100. The mean (SD) of the TENDINS-A was 47.89 (24.71) points, the FAOS was 23.60 (18.63) percent and the VISA was 53.58 (23.96) points. The mean (SD) of the repeated TENDINS-A was 44.34 (24.16) points.

## **Reliability**

### *Intraclass correlation co-efficient*

The 10-item TENDINS-A mixed-effect ICC for absolute agreement of a single measure was ICC= 0.930 (95% CI = 0.881 to 0.959),  $p < 0.001$ .

### *Internal consistency*

The Cronbach’s Alpha for the 10-items of the TENDINS-A was reported as  $\alpha=0.808$ , representing excellent internal consistency.

### *Standard error of the measurement*

The TENDINS- standard error of the measurement was calculated as 6.54 units, indicating a relatively small standard error of the measurement.

## **Minimal detectable change**

The MDC for the 10-item TENDINS-A was calculated as 12.36 (95% CI= 5.46 to 19.25) units of difference, representing 25.6% points of change from a mean TENDINS-A score of 47.89.

## **Convergent validity**

The TENDINS-A exhibited a moderate positive correlation with the FAOS ( $\rho=0.598$ , 95%CI= 0.408 to 0.738,  $p<0.001$ ), and a moderate, negative correlation with the VISA-A ( $r=-0.639$ , 95%CI= -0.764 to -0.467,  $p<0.001$ ).

## **Divergent validity**

The TENDINS-A showed no evidence of a statistically significant association with age ( $p=0.426$ ) or BMI ( $p=0.189$ ).

## **Comparison between sub-groups**

Between-group differences (Table 3) were observed for self-reported MVPA most days, with those performing moderate to vigorous physical activity most days having a lower TENDINS-A score ( $p=0.002$ ) and males reported a lower TENDINS-A score ( $p=0.044$ ). No differences in TENDINS-A score were observed for those performing specific tendon-loading exercise versus those who did not ( $p=0.079$ ), or whether participants were multi-lingual ( $p=0.397$ ). As more males performed MVPA than females in our sample, we performed a *post hoc* linear regression model to assess whether group differences due to sex were a result of higher levels of MVPA in males than females. The model supported this idea, with no association between the TENDINS-A score and sex ( $p=0.061$ ) after adjusting for MVPA [17.7 (95%CI= 6.46 to 28.97) unit increase in TENDINS-A score,  $p=0.002$ ].

**Table 3. Between group differences in TENDINS-A score.**

		Mean (SD), range	Mean Difference (SED)	Test statistic (Independent t- test)	p-value
Moderate to vigorous physical activity most days	Yes (n=55)	37.69 (23.08), 0-91	-18.81 (5.91)	-3.18	0.002*
	No (n=24)	56.50 (26.54), 5-98			
Sex	Male (n=39)	37.56 (23.27), 5-98	-11.54 (5.63)	-2.048	0.044*
	Female (n=40)	49.10 (26.64), 0-91			
Tendon-loading exercise performed most days	Yes (n=43)	38.79 (22.35), 5-86	-10.13 (5.69)	-1.779	0.079
	No (n=36)	48.92 (28.23), 0-98			
Multilingual	Yes (n=28)	48.79 (23.57), 5-91	8.34 (5.97)	1.396	0.167

	No (n=51)	40.45 (26.32), 0-98			
--	-----------	------------------------	--	--	--

316

Abbreviations: SD= standard deviation; SED= standard error of difference; n= number; range= min to max

\*  $p < 0.05$

## DISCUSSION

The present investigation evaluated the construct validity (consisting of structural validity and hypothesis testing), as well as reliability (consisting of internal consistency, test-retest reliability and measurement error) of the TENDINS-A. The 10-item TENDINS-A, proposed to provide an overall measure of ‘disability’, demonstrated sufficient construct validity for three factors (pain; symptoms; function) and reliability, supporting its use in clinical and research settings. Furthermore, with normally distributed scores, there was no evidence of floor or ceiling effects within the sample. The TENDINS-A is also likely to be meaningful to people with a lived experience of Achilles tendinopathy, as the research team included such individuals to inform its development.<sup>17</sup>

All continuous variables of the TENDINS-A, after the removal of item 12, 13A and 13B, were able to load onto one of three factors: pain, symptoms or function. The core health domain of ‘disability’ is defined as the “composite scores of a mix of patient-rated pain and disability due to the pain, usually relating to tendon-specific activities/tasks,” and included in tools such as the VISA-A.<sup>6 15</sup> Thus, the TENDINS-A is proposed to measure the overall composite of disability, using scores from items related to ‘pain’, ‘symptoms’ and ‘function’.

The reliability of the TENDINS-A is excellent ( $ICC > 0.90$ ). We opted to assess test-retest reliability on a single day as tendinopathy pain and symptoms are known to fluctuate daily.<sup>20</sup> The internal consistency of the TENDINS-A was also excellent ( $\alpha > 0.80$ ), ensuring all items were being scored consistently. The terminology surrounding the MDC, minimal important change and minimal clinically important difference (MCID) is confusing and for the purposes of discussion we have included all available comparisons. We calculated the minimal detectable change (MDC=12.4 units) of the TENDINS-A using a distribution-based method. This is larger than the MDC for the VISA-A, which is reported as between 7.8 to 8.2.<sup>34</sup> A study using an anchor-based method in the VISA-A reported the MCID as 14 units,<sup>35</sup> which is comparable to our estimated measure. Another study using the VISA-A estimated the MCID to be 6.5 units, however this was estimated from a selective

sample of 15 participants with insertional Achilles tendinopathy, which may also explain the smaller MCID.<sup>36</sup>

To characterize the magnitude of change on the TENDINS-A that is meaningful to individuals with Achilles tendinopathy, future longitudinal studies are needed to estimate the minimal clinically-important difference (MCID).

The TENDINS-A demonstrated moderate correlations to both the VISA-A and FAOS, which is expected given they are proposed to measure the same overall health domain of disability.<sup>15</sup> We did not expect strong correlations to the VISA-A or FAOS given the limitations of the VISA-A,<sup>10 11 14</sup> which we theorised would extend to the FAOS as it is also lacking content validity. We expected the TENDINS-A was likely to be superior as it adhered to the guidelines set out by COSMIN for the development of an outcome measure. The lack of a strong correlation can also result from the absence of a gold standard outcome measure for disability.

Alternatively, we theorised the TENDINS-A should not have been associated with baseline characteristics such as age or BMI, and this was confirmed by our analysis. This differs to the VISA-A, whose total score is significantly associated with age and BMI,<sup>37</sup> reflecting a problem for previous studies using the VISA-A that did not adjust for age or BMI within the statistical analysis.

None of our specified sub-groups (sex, being multilingual, MVPA most days, tendon-loading exercise most days) showed a floor or ceiling effect. Performing MVPA most days was associated with a lower TENDINS-A score, as expected. This is most likely a consequence of the numerous health benefits of physical activity.<sup>38</sup> Alternatively, the inactive group may undertake less tendon-specific loading exercise and aggravate the Achilles less. However, this seems unlikely, as performing tendon-loading activity was also assessed and no significant effect detected.

## Limitations

The sample for this study, whilst diverse in some aspects, was heavily reliant on participants living in Australia. While other PROMS for Achilles tendinopathy showed acceptable cross-cultural validity in other languages,<sup>39 40</sup> future research on cross-cultural adaptation of the TENDINS-A is needed.

Self-report may have resulted in a misdiagnosis of Achilles tendinopathy. However in this study, we enhanced diagnostic accuracy by implementing a standardized pain map<sup>18</sup>. A prior investigation demonstrated a 93% concordance between patient-reported Achilles tendinopathy when using a pain map and diagnoses made by a



physician.<sup>19</sup> These findings suggest that, in the majority of cases, self-reported Achilles tendinopathy aligns with the clinical diagnosis.

Finally, further details related to medical co-morbidities and medication usage<sup>41</sup> would have allowed analysis of their influence on total score and would be recommended in future research trials.

## **CONCLUSION**

Our evaluation of the revised 10-item TENDINS-A has determined it has adequate construct validity and reliability. These findings, and previously established content validity, ensure that the TENDINS-A can be recommended for immediate use in both research and clinical practice, being the preferred tool over the VISA-A and FAOS to assess disability in individuals with Achilles tendinopathy.

## REFERENCES

1. Scott A, Squier K, Alfredson H, et al. ICON 2019: International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium Consensus: Clinical Terminology. *British journal of sports medicine* 2020;54(5):260-62. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-100885
2. Murphy M, Travers MJ, Gibson W, et al. The rate of improvement of pain and function in mid-portion Achilles tendinopathy with loading protocols: A Systematic Review and Longitudinal Meta-Analysis. *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)* 2018;48(8):1875-91. doi: 10.1007/s40279-018-0932-2.
3. Murphy MC, Travers MJ, Chivers P, et al. Efficacy of heavy eccentric calf training for treating mid-portion Achilles tendinopathy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *British journal of sports medicine* 2019;53(17):1070-77. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2018-099934
4. Lopes AD, Hespanhol LC, Yeung SS, et al. What are the Main Running-Related Musculoskeletal Injuries? *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)* 2012;42(10):891-905. doi: 10.1007/bf03262301
5. Albers IS, Zwerver J, Diercks RL, et al. Incidence and prevalence of lower extremity tendinopathy in a Dutch general practice population: a cross sectional study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2016;17(1):16. doi: 10.1186/s12891-016-0885-2
6. Vicenzino B, de Vos R-J, Alfredson H, et al. ICON 2019—International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium Consensus: There are nine core health-related domains for tendinopathy (CORE DOMAINS): Delphi study of healthcare professionals and patients. *British journal of sports medicine* 2019;54(8):444-51. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-100894
7. Murphy M, Rio E, Debenham J, et al. Evaluating the progress of mid-portion Achilles Tendinopathy during rehabilitation. A Review of Outcome Measures for muscle structure and function, tendon structure and neural and pain associated mechanisms. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 2018;13(3):537-51.
8. Murphy M, Rio E, Debenham J, et al. Evaluating the progress of mid-portion Achilles Tendinopathy during rehabilitation. A Review of Outcome Measures for Self- Reported Pain and Function. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 2018;13(2):283-92. doi: 10.26603/ijsp20180283
9. Murphy M, Debenham J, Bulsara C, et al. Assessment and monitoring of Achilles Tendinopathy in clinical practice: A qualitative descriptive exploration of the barrier's clinicians face. *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2022;ePub ahead of print
10. Korakakis V, Kotsifaki A, Stefanakis M, et al. Evaluating lower limb tendinopathy with Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment (VISA) questionnaires: a systematic review shows very-low-quality evidence for their content and structural validity-part I. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2021;29(9):2749-64. doi: 10.1007/s00167-021-06598-5 [published Online First: 20210521]
11. Korakakis V, Whiteley R, Kotsifaki A, et al. A systematic review evaluating the clinimetric properties of the Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment (VISA) questionnaires for lower limb tendinopathy shows moderate to high-quality evidence for sufficient reliability, validity and responsiveness—part II. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2021 doi: 10.1007/s00167-021-06557-0
12. Gagnier JJ, Lai J, Mokkink LB, et al. COSMIN reporting guideline for studies on measurement properties of patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res* 2021;30(8):2197-218. doi: 10.1007/s11136-021-02822-4 [published Online First: 20210405]
13. Terwee CB, Prinsen CAC, Chiarotto A, et al. COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of patient-reported outcome measures: a Delphi study. *Qual Life Res* 2018;27(5):1159-70. doi: 10.1007/s11136-018-1829-0 [published Online First: 20180317]
14. Korakakis V, Whiteley R, Kotsifaki A, et al. Tendinopathy VISAs have expired—is it time for outcome renewals? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2021 doi: 10.1007/s00167-021-06596-7
15. Grävare Silbernagel K, Malliaras P, de Vos R-J, et al. ICON 2020—International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium Consensus: A Systematic Review of Outcome Measures Reported in Clinical Trials of Achilles Tendinopathy. *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)* 2021 doi: 10.1007/s40279-021-01588-6
16. Murphy MC. Exercise rehabilitation for mid-portion Achilles tendinopathy: a critique of evidence and assumptions (PhD Academy Award). *British journal of sports medicine* 2022 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2022-106024 [published Online First: 20221124]
17. Murphy MC, Newsham-West RJ, Cook J, et al. TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A): Development and Content Validity assessment of a new Patient-Reported Outcome Measure for Achilles Tendinopathy. . *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy* 2023;Epub Ahead of Print
18. Rio EK, Rabusin C, Munteanu S, et al. Where is your pain? Pain location on loading is different to palpation, imaging and recall location: a study of Achilles tendinopathy research participants. . *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy* 2023;Under Review

19. Sleeswijk Visser TSO, van Es EM, Meuffels DE, et al. Standardized pain mapping for diagnosing Achilles tendinopathy. *Journal of science and medicine in sport* 2022;25(3):204-08. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2021.10.010 [published Online First: 20211021]
20. Tavakkoli Oskouei S, Malliaras P, Hill KD, et al. Evaluating daily physical activity and biomechanical measures using wearable technology in people with Achilles tendinopathy: A descriptive exploratory study. *Musculoskeletal science & practice* 2022;58:102534. doi: 10.1016/j.msksp.2022.102534 [published Online First: 20220222]
21. Golightly YM, Devellis RF, Nelson AE, et al. Psychometric properties of the foot and ankle outcome score in a community-based study of adults with and without osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2014;66(3):395-403. doi: 10.1002/acr.22162
22. Robinson JM, Cook JL, Purdam C, et al. The VISA-A questionnaire: a valid and reliable index of the clinical severity of Achilles tendinopathy. *British journal of sports medicine* 2001;35(5):335-41. [published Online First: 2001/10/02]
23. MacCallum RC, Widaman KF, Zhang S, et al. Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods* 1999;4(1):84-99. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84
24. Child D. The essentials of factor analysis: A&C Black 2006.
25. Kaiser HF. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika* 1974;39(1):31-36. doi: 10.1007/BF02291575
26. Bartlett MS. A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various  $\chi^2$  Approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)* 1954;16(2):296-98.
27. Stevens JP. Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences: Routledge 2012.
28. Psychometric theory : Nunnally and Bernstein, 3rd edition; 2007.
29. Bagozzi RP, Yi Y. On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 1988;16(1):74-94. doi: 10.1007/BF02723327
30. Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Patrick DL, et al. The COSMIN study reached international consensus on taxonomy, terminology, and definitions of measurement properties for health-related patient-reported outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2010;63(7):737-45. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.02.006
31. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *J Chiropr Med* 2016;15(2):155-63. doi: 10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012 [published Online First: 20160331]
32. de Vet HCW, Terwee CB, Mokkink LB, et al. Measurement in Medicine: A Practical Guide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2011.
33. Mouelhi Y, Jouve E, Castelli C, et al. How is the minimal clinically important difference established in health-related quality of life instruments? Review of anchors and methods. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2020;18(1):136. doi: 10.1186/s12955-020-01344-w [published Online First: 20200512]
34. Challoumas D, Zouvani A, Creavin K, et al. Determining minimal important differences for patient-reported outcome measures in shoulder, lateral elbow, patellar and Achilles tendinopathies using distribution-based methods. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2023;24(1):158. doi: 10.1186/s12891-023-06261-9 [published Online First: 20230302]
35. Lagas IF, van der Vlist AC, van Oosterom RF, et al. Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Achilles (VISA-A) Questionnaire-Minimal Clinically Important Difference for Active People With Midportion Achilles Tendinopathy: A Prospective Cohort Study. *The Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy* 2021;51(10):510-16. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2021.10040
36. McCormack J, Underwood F, Slaven E, et al. The minimum clinically important difference on the VISA-A and LEFS for patients with insertional Achilles tendinopathy. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 2015;10(5):639-44.
37. Travers N, Murphy MC, Wand B, et al. Does the Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment – Achilles assess disability in people with Achilles tendinopathy: a Rasch Measurement Theory analysis. *Under Review* 2023
38. Warburton DE, Nicol CW, Bredin SS. Health benefits of physical activity: the evidence. *CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne* 2006;174(6):801-9. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.051351
39. Tu X, Tu Z, Lin W, et al. The Victorian Sports Assessment Institute-Achilles Tendinopathy Questionnaire (VISA-A): Chinese cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric validation. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2022;20(1):111. doi: 10.1186/s12955-022-02025-6 [published Online First: 20220723]
40. Bahari M, Hadadi M, Vosoughi AR, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation, reliability and validity of the Persian version of the Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Achilles questionnaire (VISA-A). *Disability and rehabilitation* 2022;44(6):983-91. doi: 10.1080/09638288.2020.1781268 [published Online First: 20200714]
41. Rio EK, Mc Auliffe S, Kuipers I, et al. ICON PART-T 2019–International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium Consensus: recommended standards for reporting participant characteristics in

tendinopathy research (PART-T). *British journal of sports medicine* 2019;54(11):627-30. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-100957

## Appendix A. Summary of participant characteristics (n=79)

Variable	Variable (sub variable)	n (%)
Sex	Male	39 (49.4)
	Female	40 (50.1)
	Intersex	0 (0.0)
Geographical location	Australia	63 (79.7)
	Netherlands	10 (12.7)
	United Kingdom	3 (3.8)
	United States of America	2 (2.5)
	Italy	1 (1.3)
Multilingual	Yes	28 (35.4)
	No	51 (64.6)
English first language (for those persons multi-lingual)	Yes	15 (53.6)
	No	13 (46.4)
Ethnicity	Australian	47 (59.5)
	European	20 (25.3)
	Asian	2 (2.6)
	Indian	2 (2.5)
	North American	2 (3.6)
	New Zealander	1 (1.3)
	Other	4 (5.1)
	Decline to answer	1 (1.3)
Physical activity	MVPA most days	55 (69.6)
	No MVPA most days	24 (30.4)
Education	Less than high school	3 (3.8)
	High school graduate	10 (12.7)
	Bachelor's degree	34 (43.0)
	Master's degree	20 (25.3)
	Doctoral degree	7 (8.9)
	Professional degree (JD, MD)	5 (6.3)
Employment	Full time	50 (63.3)
	Part time	15 (19.0)
	Home maker	1 (1.3)
	Student	7 (8.9)
	Retired	3 (3.8)
	Other	2 (2.5)
Annual Income	Less than 30,000 AUD	4 (5.1)
	30,000 – 49,999 AUD	3 (3.8)
	50,000 – 79,999 AUD	7 (8.9)
	80,000 – 99,999 AUD	9 (11.4)
	100,000- 149,999 AUD	19 (24.1)
	150,000 – 199,999 AUD	12 (15.2)
	Greater than 200,000 AUD	22 (27.8)
	Declined to answer	3 (3.8)
Activities aggravating pain and symptoms from the TENDINS-A	Walking (slow)	12 (15.2)
	Walking (fast)	35 (44.3)
	Walking up and down stairs	34 (43.0)
	Running up and down stairs	37 (46.8)
	Running slow (jogging)	48 (60.8)
	Running fast (sprinting)	43 (54.4)
	Hopping and jumping	49 (62.0)
	Rapidly changing direction while running	35 (44.3)
Activities typically performed in everyday life from the TENDINS-A	Walking (slow)	65 (82.2)
	Walking (fast)	60 (75.9)
	Walking up and down stairs	62 (78.4)

	Running up and down stairs*	20 (25.3)
	Running slow (jogging)*	36 (45.6)
	Running fast (sprinting)*	21 (26.6)
	Hopping and jumping*	24 (30.4)
	Rapidly changing direction while running*	21 (26.6)

\*Regarded as tendon loading activities


Abbreviations: n= number; %= percentage; MVPA= moderate to vigorous physical activity; JD= Juris Doctor; MD= medical doctor; AUD= Australian Dollars; TENDINS-A= Tendinopathy Severity Assessment – Achilles.

## Appendix B. Communalities for Exploratory Factor Analysis

TENDINS- A	Initial Communality
Item 3	0.329
Item 4	0.433
Item 6	0.274*
Item 7	0.517
Item 8	0.297*
Item 10	0.582
Item 11	0.453
Item 12	0.179*
Item 13A	0.761
Item 13B	0.890
Item 13C	0.887
Item 13D	0.932
Item 13E	0.923

*\*Initial communality did not exceed 0.3.*

## Appendix C. Scree plot for principal axis factoring analysis





#### Appendix D. Improvement in Model Fit following the exclusion of items 12, 13A and 13B

	Model including all items	Model excluding items 12, 13A and 13B
<b>Comparative Fit Index</b>	0.741	0.959
<b>Tucker-Lewis Index</b>	0.729	0.947
<b>Root-mean-squared error of the approximation</b>	0.189	0.101
<b>Standardised Root Measure Square</b>	0.1420	0.068

## Appendix E. TENDINopathy Severity assessment – Achilles (TENDINS-A)

This survey will ask you a number of questions about your Achilles tendon pain and symptoms. For the purposes of this survey, aggravating activities mean any activities that result in pain or symptoms, during or after their completion. For example, if you have pain during running it would be aggravating. Similarly, if you are stiff/tight/restricted the morning following fast walking this would also be aggravating. Your responses to question one and two will also be used as anchor points for the rest of the survey so please refer back to them as needed.

### UNSCORED SECTION

- A. Please select as many of the following, if any, activities aggravate your Achilles tendon pain or symptoms? For example, if you get pain running, but not walking you would select running but not walking. [Not scored]
  - ☐ Walking (slow)
  - ☐ Walking (fast)
  - ☐ Walking up and down stairs
  - ☐ Running up and down stairs
  - ☐ Running slow (jogging)
  - ☐ Running fast (sprinting)
  - ☐ Hopping and jumping
  - ☐ Rapidly changing direction while running
  - ☐ Other
- B. Please select as many of the following activities you typically perform as a part of everyday life? For example, if you usually walk or jog but do not perform sprinting you would select walking and jogging but not sprinting. [Not scored]
  - ☐ Walking (slow)
  - ☐ Walking (fast)
  - ☐ Walking up and down stairs
  - ☐ Running up and down stairs
  - ☐ Running slow (jogging)
  - ☐ Running fast (sprinting)
  - ☐ Hopping and jumping
  - ☐ Rapidly changing direction while running
  - ☐ Other
- C. If you perform the most aggravating activity from QUESTION (A) for your Achilles region PAIN (not stiffness) please record the following timepoint when your PAIN will be its worst.
  - ☐ Beginning or during the aggravating activity
  - ☐ Within two hours of stopping the aggravating activity
  - ☐ Within two to six hours of stopping the aggravating activity
  - ☐ Upon waking up the day following the aggravating activity
- D. If you perform the activities from QUESTION (A) that aggravate your Achilles region STIFFNESS / TIGHTNESS / RESTRICTION please record the following timepoint when your STIFFNESS / TIGHTNESS / RESTRICTION will be its worst.
  - ☐ Beginning or during the aggravating activity
  - ☐ Within two hours of stopping the aggravating activity
  - ☐ Within two to six hours of stopping the aggravating activity
  - ☐ Upon waking up the day following the aggravating activity
- E. If you were currently made to perform the most painful/ symptom aggravating activity you recorded as being able to perform within everyday life within QUESTION (B) how long could you perform the activity before having to cease it due to your Achilles region pain/ symptoms?
  - ☐ I would not have to cease my activity due to Achilles region pain/ symptoms
  - ☐ Greater than 30 minutes
  - ☐ Between 15 to 30 minutes
  - ☐ Less than 15 minutes

## **SCORED SECTION**

### **PAIN**

1. How much have you had to change your current level of aggravating activities from QUESTION (A) in the unscored section since the onset of your Achilles region pain and symptoms?
  - ☐ I am currently performing my previous physical activity at a higher level than before my Achilles pain/symptoms [0]
  - ☐ I am currently performing my previous physical activity at the same level as before my Achilles pain/symptoms [0]
  - ☐ I am currently performing my previous physical activity at a lower level than before my Achilles pain/symptoms [10]
  - ☐ I am currently no longer able to perform any previous physical activity due to my Achilles pain/symptoms [20]

**In this entire section we are interested in the PAIN, and not other symptoms such as stiffness/tightness/restriction, you get within the Achilles region.**

2. When you are performing aggravating activities, does your Achilles region pain:
  - ☐ Improve (warm-up) [0]
  - ☐ Improve (warm-up) and then return while still performing your aggravated activity [3]
  - ☐ Stay the same [6]
  - ☐ Does not improve and gets worse the longer you perform the aggravating activity [10]
3. Does your Achilles region get painful once you have cooled down or rested following completion of the aggravating activities from QUESTION (A) in the unscored section?
  - ☐ No, I do not have any pain after I have cooled down or rested. [0]
  - ☐ Yes, I have pain after I have cooled down or rested and it lasts less than 15 minutes [3]
  - ☐ Yes, I have pain after I have cooled down or rested and it lasts between 15 to 30 minutes [6]
  - ☐ Yes, I have pain after I have cooled down or rested and it lasts greater than 30 minutes [10]

**PAIN SCORE: \_\_\_\_/40**

### **SYMPTOMS**







**In this entire section we are interested in the STIFFNESS/TIGHTNESS/RESTRICTION, and not pain, you get within the Achilles region.**

4. Do you typically have stiffness/tightness/restriction in your Achilles region upon getting out of bed after waking from sleep?
  - ☐ Yes [5]
  - ☐ No [0]
5. On average over the previous week, how long does your stiffness/tightness/restriction last upon waking up?
  - ☐ Less than 5 minutes [0]
  - ☐ 5-10 minutes [3]
  - ☐ 11-20 minutes [6]
  - ☐ Longer than 20 minutes [10]
6. Is your Achilles region stiffness/tightness/restriction upon waking worse the day after you perform the aggravating activities from QUESTION (A) in the unscored section?
  - ☐ Yes [5]
  - ☐ No [0]
7. After sitting for a prolonged period of time (two or more hours), if you then had to perform the aggravating activities from QUESTION (A) in the unscored section, how long would your Achilles take to loosen-up/warm-up?
  - ☐ Less than 5 minutes [0]
  - ☐ 5-10 minutes [3]
  - ☐ 11-20 minutes [6]
  - ☐ Longer than 20 minutes [10]

**SYMPTOMS SCORE: \_\_\_\_/30**

## PHYSICAL FUNCTION

These movements relate to the questions below.

Movement	Start position	End Position
Please perform five continuous repetitions of a SINGLE leg heel raise (going up onto your toes) from the floor on your painful/ most-painful leg		
Please perform five continuous repetitions of a DOUBLE leg jump from the floor		
Please perform five continuous repetitions of a SINGLE leg hop from the floor on your painful/ most-painful leg		

For the following questions, please report your pain on a scale from 0 to 10, where zero is no pain and ten is the worst pain imaginable. If you are unable to complete the activity, leave the question blank. Images are provided to assist with positioning.

8. When standing upright with knee fully straight, please perform five continuous repetitions of a SINGLE leg heel raise (going up onto your toes) from the floor on your painful/ most-painful leg and report the severity of your pain [0-10]
9. When standing upright with knees fully straight, please perform five continuous repetitions of a DOUBLE leg jump from the floor and report the severity of your pain [0-10]
10. When standing upright with knee fully straight, please perform five continuous repetitions of a SINGLE leg hop from the floor on your painful/ most-painful leg and report the severity of your pain [0-10]

PHYSICAL FUNCTION SCORE: \_\_\_\_/30

TOTAL SCORE: \_\_\_\_/100