

1 The Effectiveness of Using a Clinical Support Tool in
2 Managing Adolescents with Non-Traumatic Knee Pain
3 (MAP-Knee): protocol for a cluster-randomised superiority
4 trial with delayed intervention and embedded realist
5 evaluation

6 **Authors:** Henrik Riel^{1,2,3}, Simon Kristoffer Johansen^{1,3}, Erika Maria Andersen¹, Malene Kjær
7 Bruun³, Niels Henrik Bruun⁴, Chris Djurtoft³, Simon Doessing^{5,6,7}, Tina Heyckendorff-Diebold⁸,
8 Per Hölmich⁹, Martin Bach Jensen³, Søren Kaalund¹⁰, Niels-Christian Kaldau⁹, Tommy Frisgaard
9 Oehlschlaeger^{5,6}, Charlotte Overgaard¹¹, Ole Rahbek¹², Dorthe Brøndum Rasmussen^{13,14}, Susanne
10 Olesen Schaarup¹⁴, Thomas Sørensen¹⁵, Louise Lund Holm Thomsen¹¹, Michael Skovdal
11 Rathleff^{1,3,16}

12

13 **Affiliations:**

- 14 1. Department of Health Science and Technology, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.
15 2. Department of Physiotherapy, University College of Northern Denmark, Aalborg, Denmark.
16 3. Center for General Practice at Aalborg University, Department of Clinical Medicine,
17 Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.
18 4. Research Data and Biostatistics, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark
19 5. Institute of Sports Medicine Copenhagen, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University
20 Hospital Bispebjerg-Frederiksberg, Copenhagen, Denmark.
21 6. Center for Healthy Aging, Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen,
22 Copenhagen, Denmark.
23 7. Section for Sports Traumatology, Department of Orthopedic Surgery, University Hospital
24 Bispebjerg-Frederiksberg Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
25 8. Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Lillebælt Hospital, Vejle, Denmark.
26 9. Sports Orthopedic Research Center Copenhagen (SORC-C), Department of Orthopedic
27 Surgery, Copenhagen University Hospital Amager-Hvidovre, Copenhagen, Denmark.
28 10. Sports Medicine Center, North Denmark Regional Hospital, Frederikshavn, Denmark.

- 29 11. Unit of Health Promotion, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark,
30 Esbjerg, Denmark.
- 31 12. Department of Orthopedics, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark.
- 32 13. Department of Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy, Næstved-Slagelse-Ringsted
33 Hospital, Naestved, Denmark.
- 34 14. Department of Elective Orthopaedics, Naestved Hospital of Zealand, Naestved, Denmark.
- 35 15. Department of Physio- and Occupational Therapy, Lillebaelt Hospital - University Hospital
36 of Southern Denmark, Vejle, Denmark.
- 37 16. Department of Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy, Aalborg University Hospital,
38 Aalborg, Denmark.

39

40 **Corresponding author**

41 Henrik Riel, PhD, Department of Health Science and Technology, Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg
42 University, Selma Lagerlöfs Vej 249, 9260 Gistrup. E-mail: hriel@dcm.aau.dk. Telephone:
43 +4530201570

44

45

46 **Abstract**

47 **Background**

48 Knee pain affects one in three adolescents, which makes it one of the most common pain sites.
49 Guideline recommendations about the clinical selection of patients likely to benefit from
50 interventions are unclear, which leads to treatment heterogeneity and the potential of wasted
51 resources among adolescents with a good prognosis. In contrast, adolescents with a poorer
52 prognosis may not receive sufficient care. A newly developed clinical decision-support tool (The
53 MAP-Knee Tool) intends to support clinicians in engaging with patients and adjusting the
54 clinicians' evidence-based practices to accommodate patient preferences and treatment needs via a
55 shared decision-making process. The aims of this trial are 1) to investigate the effectiveness of
56 using a clinical decision-support tool (The MAP-Knee Tool) compared with usual care in
57 adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain in reducing pain measured by KOOS-Child Pain after 12
58 weeks and 2) to investigate how the intervention worked, for whom, why and under which
59 circumstances applying realist evaluation methodology.

60

61 **Methods**

62 This trial is a cluster-randomised superiority trial with a delayed intervention and a realist
63 evaluation. Six hospital departments start with a usual care period of 4 months before randomly
64 crossing over to using the intervention (The MAP-Knee Tool) after 4, 6, or 8 months, respectively.
65 We will recruit 290 adolescents suffering from non-traumatic knee pain diagnoses who are followed
66 for one year, with the change in KOOS-Child Pain after 12 weeks considered the primary endpoint.
67 Secondary outcomes include 1) Global Rating of Change, 2) EQ-5D-Youth, 3) Anterior Knee Pain
68 Youth, 4) the International Physical Activity Questionnaire short version, and 5) sports
69 participation. The realist evaluation will utilise a prospective, qualitative approach for collecting
70 data needed to develop and test a program theory and identify context-mechanism-outcome
71 configurations essential for understanding how outcomes are achieved within specific contexts.

72

73 **Discussion**

74 This trial focuses on how the initial clinical encounter can be improved to meet the support and
75 management needs of adolescents with chronic knee pain seeking treatment for knee pain in
76 secondary care and investigates how the intervention worked, for whom, why and under which
77 circumstances.

78

79 **Trial registration**

80 Clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05791513). Prospectively registered on March 30th, 2023.

81

82

83

84 **Background**

85 From the age of 5–9 years to the age of 10–14, there is an almost fourfold increase in the years lived
86 with disability as a result of musculoskeletal conditions (1). In Danish primary care, there is an
87 eightfold increase in contacts in our healthcare sector because of knee symptoms between 5–9 and
88 10–19 years of age and approximately half of these adolescents are referred to the secondary care
89 sector (2,3). This makes knee pain one of the most common pain sites experienced by youths and
90 adolescents and can affect their school attendance, participation in hobbies and social activities, and
91 mental health (4–6). The most common non-traumatic knee pain diagnoses are Patellofemoral Pain
92 and Osgood-Schlatter Disease; however, patellar tendinopathy, Sinding-Larsen Johansson, and
93 iliotibial pain syndrome are frequent differential diagnoses.(7–9)

94
95 Knee pain affects one in three adolescents, and around 60 % will seek medical care due to knee pain
96 (10). Data from prospective cohorts show that 40-50% will still experience knee pain and symptoms
97 after 2-5 years (11–13). A cohort study from our group documented that 70% of adolescents with
98 Patellofemoral Pain reduced or stopped participating in sports during a two-year period, and they
99 had significantly worse EQ-5D Index and VAS scores than those without knee pain (12). This
100 underlines the need for effective treatments to prevent long-term disability and physical inactivity.

101
102 There are several management strategies for adolescents suffering from knee pain. These range
103 from minimal support, including patient education and leaflets regarding self-management, to
104 specialised supervised exercise therapy (14–17). Because of insufficient evidence, guideline
105 recommendations about the clinical selection of patients likely to benefit from referral to additional
106 interventions are unclear, which leads to treatment heterogeneity (3,11). Therefore, resources may
107 be wasted among adolescents with a good prognosis, while adolescents with a poorer prognosis
108 may not receive sufficient care. Patient decision aids can support clinicians in engaging with
109 patients and adjusting their evidence-based practices to accommodate patient preferences and
110 treatment needs via a shared decision-making process. Such aids may be especially relevant in
111 conditions with several treatment options available and thus may improve care for adolescents
112 suffering from non-traumatic knee pain.(18–20)

113
114 We recently developed a clinical decision-support tool intending to support shared decision-making
115 between adolescents, medical doctors, and parents. The development included systematic literature

116 searches, an Argumentative Delphi process, and end-user involvement (21), ultimately leading to
117 the MAP-Knee Tool (22), which clinicians may use during consultation with adolescents with non-
118 traumatic knee pain. The tool is intended to support the entire consultation, from diagnosing the
119 condition and explaining the condition to providing information regarding possible management
120 options. The feasibility of using the tool in a clinical setting has been established (Bruun et al. *in*
121 *preparation*), but whether the MAP-Knee Tool is associated with improved long-term outcomes
122 among adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain compared to usual care is unknown.

123

124 The overall aims of this trial are 1) to investigate the effectiveness of using our novel clinical
125 decision-support tool compared with usual care in adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain in
126 reducing pain measured by KOOS-Child Pain after 12 weeks and 2) to investigate how the
127 intervention worked, for whom, why and under which circumstances using a qualitative realist
128 evaluation (23). We hypothesise that adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain who have been
129 consulting a clinician who uses the MAP-Knee Tool will be superior in self-reported recovery and
130 physical function after 12 weeks compared to adolescents who have been consulting a clinician not
131 using the MAP-Knee Tool.

132

133 **Methods**

134 **Design and setting**

135 The trial is designed as a cluster-randomised superiority trial with a delayed intervention and a
136 realist evaluation component (23). All hospitals start with a control period of 4 months before
137 randomly crossing over to using the intervention after 4, 6, or 8 months. The trial is conducted
138 across six hospital departments in Denmark (Aalborg University Hospital, Amager-Hvidovre
139 Hospital, Bispebjerg Hospital, North Denmark Regional Hospital Frederikshavn, Næstved Hospital,
140 and Vejle Hospital). Future reporting of the trial will follow CONSORT guidelines for reporting
141 non-pharmacologic treatments (24). Reporting of this protocol follows the SPIRIT statement (25).
142 The trial was planned in accordance with the PREPARE Trial guide (26). Before the inclusion of
143 the first participant, the trial was registered on clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05791513), and the trial was
144 approved by the Ethics Committee of the North Denmark Region (N-20220043).

145

146 The design of the realist evaluation was anchored in the realist evaluation circle to facilitate theory
147 generation, which included formulating an initial theory of how the intervention brings about

148 change, generating hypotheses about essential mechanisms and processes, collection and analysis of
149 empirical data and program theory testing (23,27). The realist evaluation will involve several data
150 collections conducted before, during and after the stepped wedge trial to support theory gleaning,
151 refinement and consolidation (28). Data will be collected via document analysis, realist interviews
152 with researchers who developed the MAP-Knee Tool, clinicians who will be implementers of the
153 MAP-Knee Tool and adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain who received treatments with the
154 MAP-Knee Tool. The data will be analysed prospectively using the linked coding approach by
155 Jackson and Kolla (29) to identify context-mechanism-outcome (CMO) strings within the coded
156 texts and Gilmore et al.'s (30) memo-coding technique to extract CMO configurations from our data
157 and inform the refinement and consolidation of the intervention program theory (23,31). The
158 program theory will synthesise insights from the document and realist interviews with insights from
159 the quantitative data collected at the 12-week follow-up (27,32) and evaluated by clinicians using
160 Mukumbang et al.'s (33) approach for including program theory segments during realist interviews
161 to obtain feedback and consolidate program theories and context-mechanism-outcome
162 configurations.

163

164 Adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain will be recruited when they arrive at one of the six
165 hospitals due to a referral from their general practitioner. In contrast, clinicians and adolescents with
166 non-traumatic knee pain for the realist evaluation will be included prospectively based on
167 information power before, during and after the initiation of the MAP-Knee trial (34). Thus,
168 recruitment is based on the natural flow of patients with non-traumatic knee pain seen at the
169 hospital and the availability of clinicians who have used the MAP-Knee Tool in their treatment of
170 adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain. Adolescents will only attend the baseline examination at
171 the hospital, whereas a link to questionnaires is emailed to them for the 12-week and 52-week
172 follow-ups using REDCap (Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA). They may have additional
173 appointments at the hospital during the trial, depending on the treatment plan, but they will not
174 answer questionnaires during these clinical encounters.

175

176 **Roles and responsibilities**

177 The project manager is an experienced physiotherapist who coordinates the trial. When potential
178 participants arrive at the hospital, they are informed about the trial by either a project nurse or
179 project secretary. This person collects written informed consent from participants and their

180 parents/legal guardians if the participant is under the age of 18 years and collects data using
181 questionnaires. After this, the participant is seen by a clinician (orthopaedic surgeon,
182 physiotherapist, rheumatologist, general practitioner). The type of clinician varies from one hospital
183 to another due to differences in how each hospital is organised. The realist analysis will be led by a
184 researcher with a background in Information Science and extensive experience in planning and
185 conducting qualitative studies with youths with chronic pain and healthcare providers, supported by
186 experts in conducting realist evaluations in healthcare settings. He is supervised by experts in
187 conducting realist evaluations (CO and LLH).

188

189 **Eligibility criteria**

190 The inclusion criteria for the adolescents are: 1) having been referred to a hospital due to non-
191 traumatic knee pain and 2) being aged between 10 and 19 years. Exclusion criteria: 1) knee pain
192 with a traumatic origin or 2) lack of ability to cooperate. Any orthopaedic or similar hospital
193 department in Denmark to which adolescents suffering from non-traumatic knee pain may be
194 referred was eligible for participation. Any medical doctor or physiotherapist employed at either of
195 the study sites who regularly sees adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain is eligible to participate
196 in the trial. The inclusion criteria for the researchers participating in the realist evaluation were: 1)
197 having participated in the conceptualisation, development or testing of the MAP-Knee Tool, or 2)
198 any of the relevant sub-studies, or 3) planning of the MAP-Knee Trial. Finally, the inclusion criteria
199 for clinicians included in the realist evaluation were 1) being a healthcare provider (e.g.,
200 physiotherapist, orthopaedic surgeon, rheumatologist) who is 2) employed at one of the study sites,
201 and 3) either had or was likely to use the MAP-Knee Tool when treating adolescents with non-
202 specific knee pain.

203

204 **Interventions**

205 Before crossover occurs at the hospital, the adolescents will be diagnosed and treated as usual at the
206 treating clinician's discretion. Based on our previous research on the usual care pathway, this will
207 be heterogeneous and include advice to wait and see, imaging (most often MRI and x-ray), or a
208 rehabilitation plan for treatment within the municipality setting (3,11).

209

210 After crossing over to using the MAP-Knee Tool, the treating clinician will use the MAP-Knee Tool
211 together with the adolescent. The tool was designed to support the entire consultation, from

212 diagnosing the condition (Patellofemoral Pain, Osgood-Schlatter, Sinding-Larsen-Johansson,
213 growth pain, patellar tendinopathy, or iliotibial band syndrome) to deciding on future management.
214 The MAP-Knee Tool includes four separate components: 1) a tool for diagnosing the most common
215 types of non-traumatic knee pain (SMILE) (35), 2) credible explanations of the aetiology and
216 pathogenesis specific to the diagnosis based on multiple methods with an iterative design, 3) a
217 presentation of prognostic factors based on an individual participant data meta-analysis(36), and 4)
218 an option grid that presents the users of the tool with pros and cons of commonly used management
219 options, derived from a systematic literature search of systematic and narrative reviews within non-
220 traumatic adolescent knee pain. An overarching focus of all components was to support shared
221 decision-making and base decisions on all three pillars of evidence-based medicine: patient values,
222 clinical expertise, and relevant research.(37) Therefore, the tool should not provide clinicians using
223 the MAP-Knee Tool with definitive answers simply based on the available evidence. After the
224 initial prototype of the tool, including all four components, had been made, we performed end-user
225 testing using think-aloud sessions with adolescents suffering from non-traumatic knee pain,
226 adolescents with no history of knee pain, and medical doctors.(22)

227

228 Before the start of crossover, there will be a 2-week transition period for training the clinicians in
229 using the support tool in their clinical practice. The clinicians will participate in a 1-hour training
230 session with the project manager, where they will be educated on using the MAP-Knee Tool. After
231 this session, they will be asked to use the tool for one week in clinical practice, and a follow-up
232 session will be held where they can share their experiences with using the tool and ask the project
233 manager questions. Then, the clinicians can use the MAP-Knee Tool for another week before the
234 patients seen with the tool are included in the trial. The patients seen during the 2-week transition
235 period will not be included in the trial. To improve long-term adherence to using the tool, there will
236 be a booster session similar to the follow-up after the first week in the transition period after four
237 weeks.

238

239 The research activities related to the realist evaluation will run in parallel with the activities of the
240 MAP-Knee Trial while moving from the initial theory-gleaning phase and formulating preliminary
241 program theories to phase 2, which entailed the data collection during the crossover of hospital
242 department 1 and 2 (23). The realist evaluation will utilise a prospective, qualitative approach for
243 collecting the qualitative data needed to develop and test a program theory and identify context-
244 mechanism-outcome configurations (23), delineating the micro, meso, and macro-level barriers and

245 facilitators for archiving positive health outcomes from interventions with the MAP-Knee Tool
246 (38).

247

248 **Documentation analysis**

249 All available documents (protocols, logic models, pre-preprints, peer-reviewed studies) will be
250 collected, categorised, and analysed through a realist thematic analysis approach by Wiltshire and
251 Ronkainen (39) using NVivo 14 coding software to identify thematic patterns across texts and using
252 this insight to glean the underlying causal mechanisms which researchers envisioned would
253 facilitate behavioural change and tool acceptance during the conceptualisation and design of the
254 MAP-Knee Tool.

255

256 **Realist interviews**

257 We will conduct realist interviews with relevant stakeholders using the principles for planning and
258 conducting realist interviews by Manzanos (28) and Mukumbang et al. (31) to maintain theoretical
259 awareness during initial theory gleaning and subsequent theory testing interviews. Theory-gleaning
260 interviews with the researchers behind the MAP-Knee Tool will be conducted before the first
261 departments cross over, using an interview guide with open and probing questions informed by the
262 document analysis. Additionally, one realist interview will be conducted with a clinician
263 (physiotherapist, orthopaedic surgeon, rheumatologist) during the time of the crossover to identify
264 the clinicians' expectations, thoughts, needs, and contextual challenges related to using the MAP-
265 Knee tool when treating adolescents with non-specific knee pain. The theory-gleaning interviews
266 will inform the initial program theory (IPT). The initial theory will be tested and expanded during
267 the intervention with the MAP-Knee tool. The testing will be conducted through (n=3) realist
268 interviews with clinicians (physiotherapists, orthopaedic surgeons, rheumatologists) per department,
269 and (n=6-8) adolescents with knee pain, who received treatment with the MAP-Knee Tool across
270 the timespan of the intervention. By exploring how clinicians and adolescents with non-traumatic
271 knee pain experienced the MAP-Knee Tool facilitated the treatment of non-traumatic knee pain, we
272 will test, revise and expand the initial program theory and identify the CMO configurations present
273 within the use situation.

274

275 To ensure the integrity of the contents of the program theory and the identified CMO
276 configurations, the program theory will be tested and validated through realist interviews with

277 selected clinicians from each department using the program theory to test and consolidate findings
278 (33). The realist interviews will test, revise, and finalise the program theory to ensure no significant
279 points are missed during the data collection and analysis. This will ensure the program theory's
280 relevance, scalability, and transferability and validate the identified CMO configurations.

281

282 **Randomisation**

283 Hospitals are randomly allocated to start the interventional period after 4, 6, or 8 months,
284 respectively, using a random list generator (www.random.org). The project manager generated the
285 list and will inform the hospitals when they should cross over as late as possible but no later than
286 one month before the crossover.

287

288 **Variables**

289 *Descriptives*

290 During baseline, we will collect the following data: age, height, weight, location (unilateral or
291 bilateral) and duration of the knee pain, pain frequency, pain intensity during the week prior to
292 baseline measured on a 0 to 10 Numerical Rating Scale (0=no pain, 10= worst pain imaginable),
293 and pain medication use. At each follow-up, adolescents will be asked which treatment they have
294 received and which clinicians they may have consulted.

295

296 *Primary outcome*

297 The primary outcome will be change in KOOS-Child pain subscale (40) from baseline to the 12-
298 week follow-up. KOOS-Child consists of 39 items divided into five subscales (Pain, Symptoms,
299 Activities of Daily Living, Sport/Recreation, and Quality of Life) ranging from 0 to 100, with 100
300 being optimum, and we use a Danish translation of the questionnaire. This questionnaire has been
301 found to have good psychometric properties and is recommended for children and adolescents
302 suffering from knee disorders.(40) The questionnaire will be completed at baseline and the 12-week
303 and 52-week follow-ups.

304

305 *Secondary outcomes*

306 Secondary outcomes include: 1) Global Rating of Change (GROC), 2) EQ-5D-Youth, 3) Anterior
307 Knee Pain Youth (AKP-Youth), 4) the International Physical Activity Questionnaire short version
308 (IPAQ), and 5) sports participation.

309

310 We will use the GROC to measure the participants' self-reported recovery on a 7-point Likert scale
311 ranging from "much improved" to "much worse". Participants are categorised as improved if they
312 rate themselves as "much improved" or "improved" (category 6-7) and categorised as not improved
313 if they rate themselves from "slightly improved" to "much worse" (category 1-5). Health-related
314 quality of life will be estimated by the EQ-5D-Youth questionnaire, an adapted version of the EQ-
315 5D used in an adult population. Yet, it still consists of the same five subscales, which are mobility,
316 self-care, usual activities, pain and discomfort, and anxiety and depression.(41) We will use our
317 newly developed questionnaire (AKP-Youth) as a secondary measure of condition severity. The
318 AKP-Youth contains 23 items that are divided into four overarching domains of impact: symptoms,
319 limitations in physical activity, limitations in social activities, and emotional impact of pain.
320 Changes in physical activity level will be measured by the IPAQ. A Danish translation of the
321 original questionnaire will be used. The IPAQ is the most used questionnaire for measuring physical
322 activity and consists of 9 items that provide information on the time spent performing vigorous and
323 moderate activities, the time spent walking, and the time spent sedentary during the past week. The
324 IPAQ estimates the total weekly physical activity measured in MET minutes per week and the total
325 minutes spent sitting.(42,43) Change in sports participation will be explored using a questionnaire
326 in which participants are asked whether they have participated in leisure sports activities, type of
327 sports activities and weekly frequency. All questionnaires will be completed at baseline and at the
328 12-week and 52-week follow-ups. The GROC is only being answered during the 12-week and 52-
329 week follow-ups.

330

331 **Adverse events**

332 The participants will be able to report any adverse events to the primary investigator when they
333 occur by phone, SMS, or e-mail. Adverse events will be graded 1 to 5 according to the Common
334 Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events v4.03 (44). A medical doctor will assess and grade the
335 adverse event. Participants will not be withdrawn from the trial due to an adverse event. If a
336 participant experiences an adverse event and requests withdrawal from the study, data until the
337 adverse event occurred will be included in the analyses. The project manager will report any
338 incidents to the sponsor as quickly as possible and no later than 15 days after the participant reports
339 the event. Sponsor will report any severe adverse events (grade 3-5) to the Ethics Committee of
340 North Denmark Region no later than seven days after being informed.

341

342 **Sample size**

343 *Trial*

344 The trial is powered to detect a between-group difference of at least 10 points on the KOOS-Child
345 questionnaire pain subscale scale (0 to 100) (40). Based on a standard deviation of 22 points, type I
346 error $\alpha = 0.05$ and power = 0.90, a conservative estimate of four steps and an intraclass correlation
347 coefficient = 0.01, we will need at least 240 participants (20 per step per cluster). We will increase
348 the sample size to 290 participants across the six clusters to account for a larger outcome variance.

349

350 *Realist Evaluation*

351 Participants for the realist evaluation will be selected progressively based on an ongoing assessment
352 of participants' knowledge power (34) and how their experiences and knowledge inform the theory-
353 gleaning, testing and consolidation phases of the realist evaluation (45). We anticipate that 15-20
354 clinician interviews and 4-8 interviews with adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain treated with
355 the MAP-Knee Tool will be sufficient to inform the development, testing and consolidation of a
356 program theory and ensure data completeness throughout the project.

357

358 **Statistical analyses**

359 All statistical analyses will be performed according to a pre-established analysis plan by a
360 statistician. This plan is written with the statistician and will be published on the Aalborg University
361 website before the inclusion of the last participant. Stata ver. 18 will be used as statistical software.
362 We will use Q-Q plots and histograms to assess data distribution. The primary intention-to-treat
363 analysis will investigate the between-group difference in KOOS-Child pain at the 12-week follow-
364 up using a linear mixed effects model with the participant as random effect. The baseline value,
365 time (12 and 52 weeks), group allocation (using or not using MAP-Knee Tool) and term for the
366 interaction between time and group will be treated as fixed-effect variables. We will apply the same
367 model for the other continuous outcomes. The relative risk (RR) will be calculated for the
368 dichotomised GROG to determine the probability of being improved after 12 and 52 weeks. The
369 number needed to treat will be calculated as 1/risk difference.

370

371 **Qualitative data analysis**

372 The data collected from the realist interviews with researchers, clinicians, stakeholders, and
373 adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain will be collected, stored, and analysed prospectively
374 using Gilmore et al.'s (30) memo-coding technique for extracting CMO configurations from
375 qualitative data. The memo-coding technique was selected because it focuses on extracting CMO
376 configurations and incorporating them into a program theory through a five-step process, which
377 included data preparation, CMO configuration extraction, program theory development, refinement,
378 and synthesis across multiple data collections. The data analysis will be conducted using NVivo 14
379 to sort and organise the data. The linked coding approach by Jackson and Kolla (29) will be used to
380 identify CMO strings within the raw data before using the memo-coding technique to derive CMO
381 configurations from the data. By adopting the memo-coding technique for organising and
382 synthesising our data, we obtain a foundation for bridging the gap between identifying 'empirical
383 themes', exploring 'co-occurring phenomena' within the data and extracting the 'structures and
384 mechanisms' which generate the actual phenomena present within the use situation and informing
385 our program theory (30,33).

386

387 The analysis will be conducted in steps by two researchers (SKJ; EMA) and involve the uptake and
388 multiple datatypes (document, researcher, clinician, clinical staff, adolescents) to inform the
389 ongoing development of the program theory (23,27,32). The data preparation and transcription will
390 be conducted using Whisper 1.1 (Open AI, San Francisco, CA, USA) AI transcription software and
391 ExpressScribe software v. 7.01 (NCH Software, Canberra, Australia) to check and resolve
392 transcription errors within the data before analysis. The text files from the document-, researcher-,
393 clinician and validation interviews will be uploaded and analysed sequentially using NVivo 14
394 analysis using the following steps.

395

396 The initial transcription of interview data will be undertaken using the Whisper 1.1 tool. The AI-
397 transcribed files will be checked manually by a researcher using ExpressScribe 7.05 transcription
398 software to ensure transcript integrity. Before the analysis, the preliminary CMOs from the initial
399 program theories (IPT) gleaned during the document analysis were entered as nodes within NVivo
400 14. During the data coding, potential CMOs will be identified via the linked coding approach and
401 added to an existing node (IPT) or a new node linked to an existing node (30). All nodes with
402 encoded data will be reviewed and subjected to interpretation using linked memos to summarise the
403 contents, extract CMO configurations and identify their internal relationships. From this, the

404 extracted CMO configurations will be organised hierarchically, using the child nodes to evaluate,
405 support, refute, revise, and expand the IPTs through a memo writeup process. The revised IPTs and
406 CMO configurations from each analysis will be integrated within a logic model (33) to inform the
407 formulation of a program theory as the analysis progresses, to identify the change mechanisms
408 acting as barriers and facilitators for supporting patient education, stratification and shared decision-
409 making when using the MAP-Knee Tool in complex treatment settings.

410

411 **Validation interviews**

412 The contents of the program theory and identified CMO configurations will be tested and subjected
413 to evaluation through realist interviews with selected clinicians from each department who had used
414 the MAP-Knee Tool when treating adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain. The validation
415 interviews will combine principles from realist interviewing using selected parts of the program
416 theory to inform discussions (31) to solicit participants' feedback and suggestions for optimising the
417 program theory and CMO configurations to reflect their experiences by using the MAP-Knee Tool,
418 and the individual and contextual barriers and facilitators for supporting patient education,
419 stratification, and shared decision-making.

420

421 **Data monitoring and quality assurance**

422 All data will be stored electronically and handled according to the General Data Protection
423 Regulation. Data safety may be overseen unannounced by the Danish Data Protection Agency.
424 Participant data will be stored in REDCap, whereas data processor agreements, collaboration
425 agreements between the project group and hospitals, and protocols will be stored on a secure server
426 at Aalborg University. Data collection instruments have been developed in REDCap to prevent data
427 entry errors so that required data must be included or an error will be displayed. Validation of each
428 field has been chosen (e.g., if the data format does not appear to be a date in the field 'Date', an
429 error is displayed). Data are checked once per week by the project manager to ensure no missing
430 data, and participants and/or their parents are contacted if they do not respond to the questionnaires
431 sent to them for the 12-week and 52-week follow-ups. All data will be kept for ten years after the
432 trial is completed per the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity.

433

434 **Discussion**

435 **Moving from “what we prescribe” to “how it is delivered”**

436 Previous trials to support adolescents with chronic knee pain have focused on what clinicians
437 should deliver (e.g., exercise, orthoses, taping or load management (14,16,17,46,47)). This trial
438 focuses on how the initial clinical encounter and clinicians' decision-making can be improved to
439 meet the support and management needs of adolescents with chronic knee pain seeking treatment
440 for knee pain in secondary care. Previous studies have highlighted how adolescents' formation of
441 self-management strategies does not occur within a vacuum (48) and how the lack of validation
442 from HCPs, peers and parents, uncertainty about the severity of the condition, excessive use of
443 diagnostic imaging and 'watchful waiting' without explanations may negatively influence
444 adolescents' formation of strategies for mastering their knee pain (49–52). Contrarily, patients
445 highlight how validation from clinicians, a name, and an explanation for why their knee pain
446 emerged enabled adolescents to adjust their pain beliefs and commence the work related to
447 accepting and exploring how to self-manage their knee pain in everyday situations (52). Studies
448 from other domains have described how informed parents can help facilitate adolescents' transition
449 into self-management by providing comfort, management instructions, problem-solving assistance
450 and engaging with external actors (teachers, trainers, etc.) (53,54), adolescents with knee pain and
451 parents described how they needed different types of information from HCPs to undertake this task
452 (51). Whereas shared decision-making has been highlighted as a viable method for merging
453 evidence-based treatments and patients' desired outcomes when prescribing treatments in clinical
454 settings (55), the question of how patient education is delivered to enable adolescents and parents to
455 engage in an informed negotiation of roles and management tasks is unexplored (56). Thus, we
456 anticipate that the inclusion of the MAP-Knee Tool can help shift the clinicians' focus from simply
457 prescribing treatments to how treatments and patient education can be delivered to make it
458 'actionable' for adolescents with knee pain by visualising the clinicians' decision-making process,
459 similar to what Star (57) describes within their boundary object—ensuring that clinicians
460 understand how the MAP-Knee Tool is not a treatment in itself but rather a tool for merging their
461 existing clinical expertise with patient-centred care principles via a systematised approach.

462

463 **A tool that can be refined when new evidence emerges**

464 The MAP-Knee Tool should not be viewed as a static tool but as a tool that can be updated when
465 new evidence emerges. This will ensure that clinicians have information regarding best practice
466 readily available to them. Therefore, it may be preferable to convert the tool into an online version
467 in the future. The current physical form of the tool is not seen as crucial as it is merely a delivery

468 vehicle of the content, which is the fundamental aspect of the MAP-Knee Tool. Yet, using a leaflet
469 can extend the clinical encounter, and the use of written materials has been found to aid patients
470 with chronic pain conditions in reducing pain catastrophising.(58)

471

472 **Limitations of the trial design**

473 An important potential limitation of the trial is the nature of the design in which recruitment relies
474 on the natural flow of patients referred to the hospitals. This does not allow adjusting the
475 recruitment strategy if the expected recruitment rate is unmet. Based on our past experiences when
476 recruiting adolescents with non-traumatic knee pain, the recruitment rate required to achieve the
477 sample size was feasible. However, due to a lower-than-expected recruitment rate during the first
478 two months of recruitment, we had to postpone the first crossover from after two months to after
479 four months of using usual care. To balance the periods of all hospitals using usual care with all
480 hospitals using The MAP-Knee Tool, we also extended the period after the last crossover from two
481 to four months. Due to the learning curve when starting to use the tool, it may be challenging for
482 clinicians to become confident in using it if the recruitment rate is not somewhat consistent. This
483 could potentially limit the implementation. Another challenge that could hamper recruitment is the
484 fact that the ethics committee did not approve only obtaining informed consent from a single
485 parent/legal guardian. Therefore, we must obtain retrospective informed consent from the other
486 parent in cases where only one parent attends the clinical examination at the hospital. If the other
487 parent cannot be contacted or does not want to sign the informed consent form, the participant will
488 need to be excluded.

489

490 **Moving from clinical trials to understanding “how and why things work”**

491 While multiple studies have explored implementing decision-making tools to support the cultivation
492 of patient-centred and collaborative care approaches in primary and secondary care settings (59–
493 62), these studies commonly focus on measuring the effects of interventions. This is problematic,
494 as studies from implementation science highlight how care settings are complex, dynamic, and
495 adaptive systems (63) and how introducing a tool for, e.g. optimising HCP workflows, may ripple
496 into other domains and influence the tasks, roles, division of labour and community and cultural
497 aspects within care setting (64,65). Furthermore, introducing tools may also have unforeseen
498 impacts on workflows, collaborations, and communications within the organisations, resulting in
499 implementers having to use extra resources to find workarounds when using the tool (66). Thus, the

500 historical and traditional focus on exploring the effect of interventions has resulted in a dearth of
501 knowledge on how future treatment and supporting tools should be modelled to support their
502 meaningful integration into complex treatment settings. This is also true in Danish secondary care.
503 By adopting a realist perspective on the testing and evaluating the MAP-Knee Tool, an optic is
504 obtained that enables us to transcend the scope of the clinical trial and explore how, why, and which
505 circumstances result in the outcomes of the MAP-Knee Trial (23). Furthermore, by adapting the
506 view of interventions as programs as described by Pawson and Tilley (23), the qualitative and
507 quantitative data collected during the intervention with the MAP-Knee Tool can be synthesised to
508 identify the causal powers influencing the implementation of the tool on a micro, meso, and macro
509 level. By identifying the different context mechanisms activated by the MAP-Knee Tool
510 intervention, visualised within a program theory, the study has the potential to extract novel, general
511 insights on why some interventions fail and for whom, while others succeed, of high relevance for
512 future studies in secondary care.

513 References

- 514 1. Murray CJ, Richards MA, Newton JN, Fenton KA, Anderson HR, Atkinson C, et al. UK
515 health performance: findings of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet*.
516 2013;381(9871):997–1020.
- 517 2. Bjerrum L, Ertmann RK, Jarbøl DE, Jensen MB, Kristensen JK, Maagaard R. *Almen*
518 *medicin*. 1st ed. Hunsbæk S, editor. Munksgaard; 2014.
- 519 3. Skovdal Rathleff M, Rams Rathleff C, Lykkegaard Olesen J, Roos EM, Rasmussen S,
520 Andreucci A, et al. Care-seeking behaviour of adolescents with patellofemoral pain: a
521 retrospective cohort study. *F1000Research* 2022 11:161 [Internet]. 2022 Feb 9 [cited 2022
522 Sep 15];11:161. Available from: <https://f1000research.com/articles/11-161>
- 523 4. Brattberg G. Do pain problems in young school children persist into early adulthood? A 13-
524 year follow-up. *European Journal of Pain*. 2004 Jun 1;8(3):187–99.
- 525 5. Incledon E, O'Connor M, Giallo R, Chalkiadis GA, Palermo TM. Child and Family
526 Antecedents of Pain During the Transition to Adolescence: A Longitudinal Population-Based
527 Study. *J Pain*. 2016 Nov 1;17(11):1174–82.
- 528 6. Fuss S, Pagé MG, Katz J. Persistent pain in a community-based sample of children and
529 adolescents: Sex differences in psychological constructs. *Pain Research & Management* □:
530 *The Journal of the Canadian Pain Society*. 2011;16(5):303.
- 531 7. Patel DR, Villalobos A. Evaluation and management of knee pain in young athletes: overuse
532 injuries of the knee. *Transl Pediatr*. 2017 Jul 1;6(3):19098–198.
- 533 8. Barber Foss KD, Myer GD, Chen SS, Hewett TE. Expected Prevalence From the Differential
534 Diagnosis of Anterior Knee Pain in Adolescent Female Athletes During Preparticipation
535 Screening. *J Athl Train*. 2012 Sep 1;47(5):519–24.
- 536 9. Stracciolini A, Casciano R, Levey Friedman H, Stein CJ, Meehan WP, Micheli LJ. Pediatric
537 Sports Injuries. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546514522393>. 2014 Feb 24;42(4):965–72.
- 538 10. Rathleff MS, Roos EM, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S. High prevalence of daily and multi-site
539 pain – a cross-sectional population-based study among 3000 Danish adolescents. *BMC*
540 *Pediatr*. 2013 Nov 19;13(1):191.
- 541 11. Rathleff MS, Skuldbøl SK, Rasch MNB, Roos EM, Rasmussen S, Olesen JL. Care-seeking
542 behaviour of adolescents with knee pain: a population-based study among 504 adolescents.
543 *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2013;14:225.
- 544 12. Rathleff MS, Rathleff CR, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S, Roos EM, Crossley K, et al. Is Knee
545 Pain During Adolescence a Self-limiting Condition?: Prognosis of Patellofemoral Pain and
546 Other Types of Knee Pain. *Am J Sports Med*. 2016 May 1;44(5):1165–71.
- 547 13. Rathleff MS, Holden S, Straszek CL, Olesen JL, Jensen MB, Roos EM. Five-year prognosis
548 and impact of adolescent knee pain: a prospective population-based cohort study of 504
549 adolescents in Denmark. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2019 May 1 [cited 2022 Mar 25];9(5):24113.
550 Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC6549701/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31444441/)
- 551 14. Rathleff MS, Roos EM, Olesen JL, Rasmussen S. Exercise during school hours when added
552 to patient education improves outcome for 2 years in adolescent patellofemoral pain: a
553 cluster randomised trial. *Br J Sports Med*. 2014;49(6):406–12.
- 554 15. Rathleff MS, Rathleff CR, Holden S, Thorborg K, Olesen JL. Exercise therapy, patient
555 education, and patellar taping in the treatment of adolescents with patellofemoral pain: a
556 prospective pilot study with 6 months follow-up. *Pilot Feasibility Stud* [Internet]. 2018 Apr
557 25 [cited 2022 Jun 1];4(1). Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC5899375/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31444441/)
- 558 16. Rathleff MS, Graven-Nielsen T, Hölmich P, Winiarski L, Krommes K, Holden S, et al.
559 Activity Modification and Load Management of Adolescents With Patellofemoral Pain: A

- 560 Prospective Intervention Study Including 151 Adolescents. *American Journal of Sports*
561 *Medicine*. 2019 Jun 1;47(7):1629–37.
- 562 17. Rathleff MS, Winiarski L, Krommes K, Graven-Nielsen T, Hölmich P, Olesen JL, et al.
563 Activity Modification and Knee Strengthening for Osgood-Schlatter Disease: A Prospective
564 Cohort Study. *Orthop J Sports Med*. 2020 Apr 1;8(4).
- 565 18. Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis K, Barry MJ, Bennett CL, Eden KB, et al. Decision aids for
566 people facing health treatment or screening decisions. Vol. 2017, *Cochrane Database of*
567 *Systematic Reviews*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. and the Cochrane Library; 2017.
- 568 19. van der Horst DEM, Garvelink MM, Bos WJW, Stiggelbout AM, Pieterse AH. For which
569 decisions is Shared Decision Making considered appropriate? – A systematic review. *Patient*
570 *Educ Couns*. 2023 Jan 1;106:3–16.
- 571 20. Zadro JR, Traeger AC, Décary S, O’Keeffe M. Problem with patient decision aids. Vol. 26,
572 *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine*. [London]: BMJ Publishing Group,; 2021. p. 180–3.
- 573 21. Djurtoft C, Bruun MK, Riel H, Hoegh MS, Darlow B, Rathleff MS. How do we explain
574 painful non-traumatic knee conditions to adolescents? A multiple-method study to develop
575 credible explanations. *European Journal of Pain*. 2023;00:1.
- 576 22. Riel H, Bruun MK, Djurtoft C, Jensen MB, Kaalund S, Leeuwen G van, et al. Development
577 of a clinical decision-support tool for Management of Adolescent knee Pain (The MAP-Knee
578 Tool). *medRxiv*. 2023 Jan 12;2023.01.11.23284426.
- 579 23. Pawson R, Tilley N. An Introduction to Scientific Realist Evaluation. In: *Evaluation for the*
580 *21st Century: A Handbook* [Internet]. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320
581 United States: SAGE Publications, Inc.; 1997 [cited 2022 May 19]. p. 405–18. Available
582 from: <https://methods.sagepub.com/book/evaluation-for-the-21st-century/n29.xml>
- 583 24. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of
584 interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and
585 guide. *BMJ*. 2014 Mar 7;348(mar07 3):g1687–g1687.
- 586 25. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gøtzsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin J a, et al. SPIRIT 2013
587 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. *BMJ*. 2013;346:e7586.
- 588 26. Bandholm T, Christensen R, Thorborg K, Treweek S, Henriksen M. Preparing for what the
589 reporting checklists will not tell you: the PREPARE Trial guide for planning clinical research
590 to avoid research waste. *Br J Sports Med*. 2017 Sep 7;bjsports-2017-097527.
- 591 27. F Kazi MA, to Mansoor F Kazi CA. Realist Evaluation for Practice. *The British Journal of*
592 *Social Work*. 2003 Sep 1;33(6):803–18.
- 593 28. Manzano A. The craft of interviewing in realist evaluation. *Evaluation*. 2016 Jul
594 1;22(3):342–60.
- 595 29. Jackson SF, Kolla G. A New Realistic Evaluation Analysis Method.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214012440030> [Internet]. 2012 Mar 16 [cited 2024 Mar
597 21];33(3):339–49. Available from:
598 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1098214012440030>
- 599 30. Gilmore B, McAuliffe E, Power J, Vallières F. Data Analysis and Synthesis Within a Realist
600 Evaluation: Toward More Transparent Methodological Approaches. *Int J Qual Methods*
601 [Internet]. 2019 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Mar 21];18. Available from:
602 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1609406919859754>
- 603 31. Mukumbang FC, Marchal B, Van Belle S, van Wyk B. Using the realist interview approach
604 to maintain theoretical awareness in realist studies. *Qualitative Research*. 2019 Oct
605 23;20(4):485–515.

- 606 32. Ebenso B, Manzano A, Uzochukwu B, Etiaba E, Huss R, Ensor T, et al. Dealing with context
607 in logic model development: Reflections from a realist evaluation of a community health
608 worker programme in Nigeria. *Eval Program Plann.* 2019 Apr 1;73:97.
- 609 33. Mukumbang FC, Marchal B, Van Belle S, van Wyk B. Using the realist interview approach
610 to maintain theoretical awareness in realist studies. *Qualitative Research [Internet].* 2019 Oct
611 23;20(4):485–515. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794119881985>
- 612 34. Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies. *Qual
613 Health Res [Internet].* 2016 Nov 10 [cited 2018 Apr 30];26(13):1753–60. Available from:
614 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1049732315617444>
- 615 35. Guldhammer C, Holden S, Sørensen ME, Olesen JL, Jensen MB, Rathleff MS. Development
616 and validation of the Sorting non-trauma adolescent knee pain (SMILE) tool – a
617 development and initial validation study. *Pediatric Rheumatology.* 2021 Dec 6;19(1):110.
- 618 36. Holden S, Kasza J, Winters M, van Middelkoop M, Rathleff MS. Prognostic factors for
619 adolescent knee pain: an individual participant data meta-analysis of 1281 patients. *Pain.*
620 2021 Jun;162(6):1597–607.
- 621 37. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WMC, Gray JAM, Haynes RB, Richardson WS. Evidence based
622 medicine: what it is and what it isn't. 1996. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2007 Jan
623 13;455(7023):3–5.
- 624 38. Tracing genres through organizations: a sociocultural approach to information design.
625 Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press; 2003. xi, 246 s. (Acting with technology).
- 626 39. Wiltshire G, Ronkainen N. A realist approach to thematic analysis: making sense of
627 qualitative data through experiential, inferential and dispositional themes. *J Crit Realism
628 [Internet].* 2021 Mar 15;20(2):159–80. Available from:
629 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767430.2021.1894909>
- 630 40. Örtqvist M, Iversen MD, Janarv PM, Broström EW, Roos EM. Psychometric properties of
631 the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score for Children (KOOS-Child) in children
632 with knee disorders. *Br J Sports Med.* 2014 Oct 1;48(19):1437–46.
- 633 41. Wille N, Badia X, Bonsel G, Burström K, Cavrini G, Devlin N, et al. Development of the
634 EQ-5D-Y: a child-friendly version of the EQ-5D. *Quality of Life Research.* 2010
635 Aug;19(6):875.
- 636 42. van Poppel MNM, Chinapaw MJM, Mokkink LB, van Mechelen W, Terwee CB. Physical
637 Activity Questionnaires for Adults. *Sports Medicine.* 2010 Jul;40(7):565–600.
- 638 43. Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjöström M, Bauman AE, Booth ML, Ainsworth BE, et al.
639 International physical activity questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. *Med Sci
640 Sports Exerc.* 2003 Aug;35(8):1381–95.
- 641 44. Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (v4.03). U.S. Department of Health and
642 Human Services; 2010.
- 643 45. Manzano A. The craft of interviewing in realist evaluation. *Evaluation [Internet].* 2016 Jul 1
644 [cited 2024 Feb 5];22(3):342–60. Available from:
645 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1356389016638615>
- 646 46. Willy RW, Högglund LT, Barton CJ, Bolgla LA, Scalzitti DA, Logerstedt DS, et al.
647 Patellofemoral pain clinical practice guidelines linked to the international classification of
648 functioning, disability and health from the academy of orthopaedic physical therapy of the
649 American physical therapy association. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy.*
650 2019 Sep 1;49(9):CPG1–95.
- 651 47. Collins NJ, Barton CJ, Van Middelkoop M, Callaghan MJ, Rathleff MS, Vicenzino BT, et al.
652 2018 Consensus statement on exercise therapy and physical interventions (orthoses, taping
653 and manual therapy) to treat patellofemoral pain: recommendations from the 5th

- 654 International Patellofemoral Pain Research Retreat, Gold Coast, Australia, 2017. *Br J Sports*
655 *Med.* 2018 Sep 1;52(18):1170–8.
- 656 48. Modi AC, Pai AL, Hommel KA, Hood KK, Cortina S, Hilliard ME, et al. Pediatric Self-
657 management: A Framework for Research, Practice, and Policy. *Pediatrics* [Internet]. 2012
658 Feb [cited 2024 Mar 21];129(2):e473. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC9923567/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23567/)
- 659 49. Glaviano NR, Holden S, Bazett-Jones DM, Singe SM, Rathleff MS. Living well (or not) with
660 patellofemoral pain: A qualitative study. *Physical Therapy in Sport.* 2022 Jul 1;56:1–7.
- 661 50. Andreucci A, Rathleff MS, Reuther FØ, Hussein M, Rahimzai S, Linnemann TD, et al. “I
662 had already tried that before going to the doctor” – exploring adolescents’ with knee pain
663 perspectives on ‘wait and see’ as a management strategy in primary care; a study with brief
664 semi-structured qualitative interviews. *Scand J Pain* [Internet]. 2023 Apr 1 [cited 2024 Mar
665 21];23(2):341–52. Available from: [https://www-degruyter-](https://www-degruyter-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/document/doi/10.1515/sjpain-2022-0038/html)
666 [com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/document/doi/10.1515/sjpain-2022-0038/html](https://www-degruyter-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/document/doi/10.1515/sjpain-2022-0038/html)
- 667 51. Johansen SK, Kanstrup AM, Haseli K, Stenmo VH, Thomsen JL, Rathleff MS. Exploring
668 User Visions for Modeling mHealth Apps Toward Supporting Patient-Parent-Clinician
669 Collaboration and Shared Decision-making When Treating Adolescent Knee Pain in General
670 Practice: Workshop Study. *JMIR Hum Factors* [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 21];10(4).
671 Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC10182461/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/4182461/)
- 672 52. Johansen SK, Holden S, Pourbordbari N, Jensen MB, Thomsen JL, Rathleff MS.
673 PAINSTORIES – Exploring the Temporal Developments in the Challenges, Barriers, and
674 Self-Management Needs of Adolescents with Longstanding Knee Pain: A Qualitative,
675 Retrospective Interview Study with Young Adults Experiencing Knee Pain Since
676 Adolescence. *J Pain.* 2022 Apr 1;23(4):577–94.
- 677 53. Leonard BJ, Garwick A, Adwan JZ. Adolescents’ Perceptions of Parental Roles and
678 Involvement in Diabetes Management. *J Pediatr Nurs.* 2005 Dec 1;20(6):405–14.
- 679 54. Cha YJ, Saxena A, Wou A, Lee J, Newman MW, Park SY. Transitioning Toward
680 Independence: Enhancing Collaborative Self-Management of Children with Type 1 Diabetes.
681 *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings* [Internet]. 2022 Apr 29
682 [cited 2024 Mar 21]; Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3491102.3502055>
- 683 55. Elwyn G, Frosch D, Thomson R, Joseph-Williams N, Lloyd A, Kinnersley P, et al. Shared
684 Decision Making: A Model for Clinical Practice. *J Gen Intern Med* [Internet]. 2012 Oct
685 [cited 2024 Mar 21];27(10):1361. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC3445676/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3445676/)
- 686 56. Sandman L. The concept of negotiation in shared decision making. *Health Care Analysis*
687 [Internet]. 2009 Sep 7 [cited 2024 Mar 21];17(3):236–43. Available from: [https://link-](https://link-springer-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/article/10.1007/s10728-008-0103-y)
688 [springer-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/article/10.1007/s10728-008-0103-y](https://link-springer-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/article/10.1007/s10728-008-0103-y)
- 689 57. Star SL. This is Not a Boundary Object: Reflections on the Origin of a Concept. *Sci Technol*
690 *Human Values* [Internet]. 2010;35(5):601–17. Available from:
691 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25746386>
- 692 58. Gallagher L, McAuley J, Moseley GL. A randomized-controlled trial of using a book of
693 metaphors to reconceptualize pain and decrease catastrophizing in people with chronic pain.
694 *Clinical Journal of Pain.* 2013 Jan;29(1):20–5.
- 695 59. Alsulamy N, Lee A, Thokala P, Alessa T. What Influences the Implementation of Shared
696 Decision Making: An Umbrella Review. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2020 Dec 1;103(12):2400–7.
- 697 60. Boland L, Graham ID, Légaré F, Lewis K, Jull J, Shephard A, et al. Barriers and facilitators
698 of pediatric shared decision-making: a systematic review. *Implement Sci* [Internet]. 2019 Jan
699 18 [cited 2024 Mar 25];14(1). Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC6339273/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/6339273/)

- 700 61. Légaré F, Ratté S, Gravel K, Graham ID. Barriers and facilitators to implementing shared
701 decision-making in clinical practice: Update of a systematic review of health professionals'
702 perceptions. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2008 Dec 1;73(3):526–35.
- 703 62. Grenfell J, Soundy A. People's Experience of Shared Decision Making in Musculoskeletal
704 Physiotherapy: A Systematic Review and Thematic Synthesis. *Behavioral Sciences*
705 [Internet]. 2022 Jan 1 [cited 2024 Mar 25];12(1). Available from:
706 /pmc/articles/PMC8773142/
- 707 63. Ellis B. Complexity in practice: understanding primary care as a complex adaptive system. *J*
708 *Innov Health Inform* [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2024 Mar 21];18(2):135. Available from:
709 [https://openurl.ebsco.com/contentitem/doi:10.14236%2Fjhi.v18i2.763](https://openurl.ebsco.com/contentitem/doi:10.14236%2Fjhi.v18i2.763?sid=ebsco:plink:crawler&id=ebsco:doi:10.14236%2Fjhi.v18i2.763)
710 er&id=ebsco:doi:10.14236%2Fjhi.v18i2.763
- 711 64. Bardram J, Doryab A. Activity analysis: Applying activity theory to analyze complex work in
712 hospitals. *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work,*
713 *CSCW* [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2024 Mar 21];455–64. Available from:
714 <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/1958824.1958895>
- 715 65. Engstrom Y. Activity theory as a framework for analyzing and redesigning work.
716 *Ergonomics* [Internet]. 2000 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Mar 21];43(7):960–74. Available from:
717 <https://www-tandfonline-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/doi/abs/10.1080/001401300409143>
- 718 66. Spinuzzi Clay. *Tracing genres through organizations*. Vol. 1. Mit Press; 2003.
719