

1 **Multivariate Profiling of Physical Resilience in Older Adults After Total Knee**

2 **Replacement Surgery**

3 Qian-Li Xue, PhD;<sup>1,2</sup> Thomas Laskow, MD;<sup>1</sup> Mallak K. Alzahrani, MS;<sup>1,2</sup> Ravi Varadhan,  
4 PhD;<sup>3,2</sup> Jeremy D. Walston;<sup>1,2</sup> Jennifer A. Schrack, PhD;<sup>2,4</sup> Anne B. Newman, MD;<sup>5</sup> Frederick  
5 Sieber, MD;<sup>\*6</sup> and Karen Bandeen-Roche, PhD<sup>\*7,2</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Medicine Division of Geriatric Medicine and Gerontology, School of Medicine,  
7 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

8 <sup>2</sup>Center on Aging and Health, Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Baltimore, MD, USA

9 <sup>3</sup>Department of Oncology Division of Quantitative Sciences, the Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive  
10 Cancer Center, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, MD, USA

11 <sup>4</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore,  
12 MD, USA

13 <sup>5</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, PA,  
14 USA.

15 <sup>6</sup>Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins  
16 University, Baltimore, MD, USA

17 <sup>7</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD,  
18 USA

19 (\*) These authors share senior authorship

20 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:** Qian-Li Xue, 2024 E. Monument Street, Suite 2-700,  
21 Baltimore, MD 21205. E-mail: [qxue1@jhu.edu](mailto:qxue1@jhu.edu)

22

23 Manuscript word count: 2990

24 **Abstract**

25 **IMPORTANCE** As individuals age, they often face a variety of health challenges. Physical  
26 resilience indicates how well a person can cope with and recover from physical challenges,  
27 which is crucial for maintaining independence and quality of life in older age.

28  
29 **OBJECTIVE** To develop a multivariate phenotype of physical resilience based on individual  
30 recovery dynamics before and after a clinical stressor.

31  
32 **DESIGN, SETTING, AND PARTICIPANTS** This observational study included 112  
33 individuals aged 60 and older who underwent elective total knee replacement for degenerative  
34 joint disease between December 2, 2019, and January 4, 2023. Physical function was assessed  
35 before surgery and at 1, 6, and 12 months post-surgery to characterize resilience trajectories.

36  
37 **EXPOSURE** Elective total knee replacement surgery for degenerative joint disease.

38  
39 **MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES** A multivariate resilience phenotype was derived from  
40 physical function trajectories assessed using the Short Physical Performance Battery, the  
41 Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale-Physical Subscale, the KOOS Quality of Life, and the SF36-  
42 Physical Component Score. This phenotype was validated against surrogate markers (i.e., frailty,  
43 self-reported health) and determinants (e.g., the Charlson Comorbidity Index) of recovery  
44 potential (aka resilience capacity).

45

46 **RESULTS** The study identified distinct resilience profiles across four measures: 4 profiles for  
47 the Short Physical Performance Battery and the KOOS Quality of Life, 3 each for the Pittsburgh  
48 Fatigability Scale-Physical Subscale and the SF36-Physical Component Score, showing varied  
49 baseline levels and/or change rates over 12 months. By combining and analyzing resilience  
50 profiles across measures, two distinct groups emerged: 35.7% classified as non-resilient and 64.3%  
51 as resilient. The non-resilient group had a higher prevalence of frailty (35.0% vs. 9.7%,  $p<0.01$ ),  
52 poor or fair self-reported health (45.0% vs. 5.6%,  $p<0.01$ ), and a moderate/severe comorbidity  
53 burden (Charlson Comorbidity Index  $>2$ ; 27.5% vs. 11.1%,  $p=0.06$ ).

54  
55 **CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE** The distinct recovery trajectories observed after the  
56 surgery indicated varying resilience levels that were not fully explained by baseline status. This  
57 research underscores the importance of resilience in surgical recovery and could pave the way  
58 for better patient care by focusing on individual resilience capacities and shifting the focus from  
59 managing health conditions to promoting recovery and overall well-being.

60

61 **Key Points**

62 **Question:** Can recovery trajectories of physical function following total knee replacement

63 surgery serve as indicators of resilience to physical stressors?

64

65 **Findings:** An observational study of adults aged 60+ undergoing elective total knee replacement

66 surgery found distinct 12-month recovery paths, with 35.7% classified as non-resilient and 64.3%

67 as resilient, independent of pre-surgery health or fitness.

68

69 **Meaning:** This finding suggests that resilience is measurable and may require dynamic testing,

70 rather than just relying on baseline health, to assess recovery potential.

## 71 **Introduction**

72 Resilience is an individual's ability to adapt, recover, and return to equilibrium at molecular,  
73 cellular, system, organ, or organism level after experiencing a significant adversity or stress<sup>1</sup>  
74 This paper focused on physical stressors, and therefore, "physical" resilience.<sup>2</sup> We further posit  
75 that resilience differs from robustness (or resistance) in that the former refers to "bouncing back"  
76 following a stressor to retain "essential identity and function",<sup>3</sup> whereas the latter pertains to the  
77 ability to withstand stressors . For example, the rate and degree of recovery from an invasive  
78 surgery illustrates resilience, whereas humoral immunity to avoid symptomatic viral/bacterial  
79 infections exemplifies robustness. This distinction helps focus resilience on the characterization  
80 of response dynamics following the stressor.

81 Different approaches have been proposed to characterize physical resilience phenotypes,  
82 which can be broadly divided into two main types. The first type views resilience as a state that  
83 can be ascertained cross-sectionally at a specific point in time, using instruments such as the  
84 Physical Resilience Scale.<sup>2</sup> The second type defines physical resilience as a dynamical entity  
85 based on the change observed before and after a stressor, necessitating an assessment prior to the  
86 stressor. We further divide the second type into two subtypes. The first subtype quantifies  
87 resilience by assessing either the absolute or percentage change from the pre-stressor baseline,  
88 within a designated post-stressor time window that holds clinical importance.<sup>4</sup> This approach is  
89 suitable for examining the immediate dynamics of stress-response. For example, monitoring the  
90 initial few weeks following an organ transplant is critical to assessing the risk of acute rejection  
91 and longer-term survival and making an accurate prognosis. The second subtype focuses on risk  
92 profiling based on individual recovery trajectories, emphasizing longer term rather than  
93 immediate dynamics. This approach includes methods that generate either quantitative

94 summaries of resilience (e.g., recovery differential)<sup>5</sup> or qualitative resilience profiles (e.g., high  
95 vs. low resilience)<sup>6</sup>.

96       Choosing among the different approaches depends on the context in which they are used  
97 and the study design and data availability. The cross-sectional post-stressor ascertainment  
98 approach is suitable for situations involving an unpredictable stressor, such as a hip fracture,  
99 where assessing pre-stressor status is usually infeasible and self-recall may be unreliable.  
100 Conversely, the trajectory approach is more appropriate for predictable stressors such as elective  
101 surgery, where it is possible to evaluate pre-stressor status. In terms of trajectory summary, the  
102 quantitative approach offers granularity, precision, and statistical power but requires advanced  
103 modeling techniques and can be complex to interpret in clinical settings. On the other hand,  
104 qualitative profiles, although easier to communicate and supportive of clinical decision-making,  
105 may involve complex computing algorithms and risk misclassification and reduced statistical  
106 power.

107       This study used data from one of the three substudies of the Study of Physical Resilience  
108 and Aging (SPRING)--RESilience in TOtal knee REplacement (RESTORE).<sup>7</sup> We aimed to  
109 develop a multivariate phenotype of physical resilience for adults 60 and older undergoing  
110 elective total knee replacement (TKR) surgery for degenerative joint disease, based on their  
111 individual recovery dynamics before and after the surgical stressor. The primary utility of this  
112 phenotype is to provide a study outcome for validating measures of pre-stressor physical  
113 resilience capacity and its determinants (Figure 1). Additionally, it could serve as a prognostic  
114 tool for identifying vulnerable patients who may require special attention and interventions post-  
115 surgery in order to minimize adverse outcomes.

116

## 117 **Methods**

### 118 Study Population

119 SPRING was an observational study aimed at developing a framework to identify clinically  
120 relevant signatures of resilience in older adults facing physical stressors.<sup>7</sup> Within SPRING, the  
121 RESilience in TOveral knee REplacement (RESTORE) substudy focused on characterizing older  
122 adults undergoing elective TKR surgery (eMethods 1). Extensive measurements were collected  
123 on a total of 112 older adults aged 60 years or older before, during, and after the surgical  
124 procedure to understand the impact of this stressor. This study was observational and did not  
125 influence surgical decisions.

126

### 127 Clinical Assessments

128 Two baseline visits and follow-ups at 1, 6 & 12 months were used to assess resilience and  
129 related measures (eFigure 1). The resilience phenotype was derived from four measures the  
130 RESTORE team deemed particularly relevant for TKR resilience: the Short Physical  
131 Performance Battery (SPPB),<sup>8</sup> the Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale – Physical Subscale (PFS),<sup>9</sup> the  
132 Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score Quality of Life subscale (KOOS-QOL),<sup>10</sup> and the  
133 physical component summary (PCS) of the SF-36 questionnaire.<sup>11</sup> The SPPB assesses lower  
134 extremity function in older adults by evaluating their performance in three tasks simulating daily  
135 activities: balancing, standing from a chair, and walking, yielding a score from 0 to 12 with  
136 higher scores indicating better physical performance. The PFS is a self-administered 10-item  
137 questionnaire assessing perceived physical and mental fatigability related to fixed-intensity and  
138 duration activities, scored on a scale of 0 to 50 (reversed here, with higher scores indicating less  
139 fatigue). The KOOS-QOL measures the impact of knee injury or osteoarthritis on quality of life,

140 transformed to a 0–100 scale with higher scores indicating better knee-related quality of life. The  
141 PCS of the SF-36 provides an overall view of perceived physical functioning based on a  
142 weighted sum of eight subscale scores and standardized to have a mean of 50 and a standard  
143 deviation of 10, with higher scores indicating better physical health.

144

145 According to the SPRING conceptual framework (Figure 1),<sup>7</sup> surrogates and determinants of  
146 physical resilience were used to assess the convergent validity of the resilience phenotype.  
147 Frailty (surrogate) was assessed using the physical frailty phenotype,<sup>12</sup> based on five criteria  
148 including unintentional weight loss (10 pounds or more in the past year), weakness (measured by  
149 reduced grip strength), poor endurance and energy (self-reported exhaustion or low energy  
150 levels), slowness (slow walking speed over 4 meters), and low physical activity (based on self-  
151 reported activity). Frailty and pre-frailty were determined by the presence of three or more, and  
152 one or two of these criteria, respectively. Self-reported overall health (surrogate) based on self-  
153 perception was assessed by self-report on a 5-point scale excellent, very good, good, fair, and  
154 poor. Disease burden (determinant) was measured by the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI).  
155 Comorbidity severity was graded as none (CCI=0), mild (CCI=1-2), moderate (CCI=3-4), and  
156 severe (CCI ≥5).<sup>13</sup>

157

## 158 Statistical Analyses

159 We summarized the baseline characteristics for the study sample and compared them based on  
160 the overall resilience status using two-sample t-tests with unequal variances for continuous  
161 factors and Fisher’s exact tests for categorical factors. To develop resilience phenotypes using  
162 data from pre-surgery baseline and follow-ups at 1-, 6-, and 12-months post-surgery, we



163 employed a two-stage latent variable model: a first-stage latent profile analysis (LPA),<sup>14,15</sup>  
164 followed by a second-stage latent class analysis (LCA).<sup>14</sup> The LPA was applied separately to  
165 each of the four phenotypic measures to capture distinct temporal trajectory profiles. In the  
166 second stage, the LCA aggregated these trajectory profiles across measures to derive a summary  
167 phenotype, distinguishing resilience from non-resilience (eMethods 2). Next, we assessed the  
168 convergent validity of the resilience phenotypes by analyzing their associations with the  
169 surrogates and determinant of resilience capacity identified above. MPLUS (version 8.10) was  
170 used to fit the latent variable model, and other analyses used Stata/SE 18.0.

171

## 172 **Results**

173 Of the 112 participants in this study, the mean age was 70 years; 38% were Black and 59% were  
174 White. The group was predominantly female (66%) and had more than a high school education  
175 (62.5%), and nearly half (49%) were married. The mean BMI was 32. Regarding health status,  
176 19% and 58% were frail and pre-frail, respectively; 38% reported excellent or very good health,  
177 and 22% reported fair or poor health. Additionally, 27% and 17% had mild and moderate/severe  
178 comorbidity burden based on CCI (Table 1).

179

180 For all four phenotypic measures except KOOS-QOL, the majority of recovery occurred between  
181 one and six months post-surgery, while KOOS-QOL showed continued improvement through 12  
182 months (Figure 2). The latent profile model identified four trajectory classes based on SPPB  
183 scores at baseline and during follow-ups (Figure 3A). Two classes represented the lowest (9.8%)  
184 and highest (35.7%) mean SPPB scores at baseline, both improving over time. The other two  
185 classes had similar intermediate baseline scores but showed differing trends over time: one with

186 a stable SPPB trajectory (17.9%) and the other with an improving trajectory (36.6%). We  
187 identified three trajectory classes for PFS, primarily differentiated by varying levels of baseline  
188 physical fatigability (Figure 3B): low (23.2%), medium (63.4%), and high (13.4%). All classes  
189 showed improvements from one month to six months post-surgery. The analysis of KOOS-QOL  
190 scores over time identified four trajectory classes, all showing improvement (Figure 3C). The  
191 group with the lowest baseline mean score saw a moderate increase from baseline to 1 month,  
192 then plateaued (4.5%). The two classes with medium baseline scores exhibited steady growth  
193 until six months; one continued to rise (17.0%), while the other stabilized (22.3%). The largest  
194 group, with the highest baseline mean score, demonstrated consistent improvement throughout  
195 the 12 months (56.3%). Three trajectory classes for PCS were identified, each improving over  
196 time (Figure 3D). Two classes, one with the lowest baseline mean score (22.3%) and the other  
197 with the highest (34.8%), showed similar trends, with improvements noted between 1 and 6  
198 months. The third class, featuring a similar baseline mean score as the lowest baseline class,  
199 demonstrated steady improvement from baseline to six months, accounting for 42.9% of the  
200 sample (eTable 1). The sensitivity analysis that treated the phenotypic measures as ordinal latent  
201 class indicators showed similar patterns (eFigure 2).

202  
203 Latent class analysis of the four phenotypic measures identified two trajectory summary classes  
204 characterized by high (64.3%) and low (35.7%) resilience. Figure 4 compares phenotypic  
205 trajectory profile prevalence for resilient versus non-resilient individuals. There is one panel per  
206 measure: Each shows the percentages for each trajectory profile, progressing from the least  
207 favorable on the left to the most favorable on the right, comparing the resilient and non-resilient

208 summary classes. Across all measures, individuals in the resilient group demonstrated more  
209 favorable trajectory patterns compared to those in the non-resilient group.  
210  
211 Frailty was associated with low resilience, with 67%, 31%, and 23% frail, prefrail, and robust of  
212 individuals exhibiting a low resilience trajectory ( $p=0.004$ ). Conversely, better self-reported  
213 health was associated with greater resilience, with 86%, and 67% of those in excellent/very good,  
214 and good health classified as having high resilience, compared to 18% of those in fair/poor  
215 health ( $p<0.001$ ). These associations remained significant after adjusting for age, race, obesity,  
216 and disease burden. Specifically, frailty reduced the odds of high resilience by 79.3% (95%  
217 confidence interval (CI), 5.6-95.5%;  $p=0.042$ ) compared to being robust, while excellent/very  
218 good health and good health increased the odds (Odds ratio (OR)=19.4, 95% CI, 4.0-92.8;  
219  $p<0.001$  and OR=10.1, 95% CI, 2.5-41.1;  $p=0.001$ ), compared to poor/fair health. Greater  
220 disease burden was associated with lower resilience, with 58% of those with moderate/severe  
221 disease burden classified as having low resilience, compared to 37% and 29% for those with  
222 mild or no burden ( $p=0.064$ ). After adjusting for age, race, and obesity, moderate/severe disease  
223 burden was associated with 72% lower odds of high resilience compared to no burden (95% CI,  
224 12.5-91.0%;  $p=0.029$ ).

225

## 226 **Discussion**

227 In this observational study, we tracked the trajectories of physical function, beginning shortly  
228 before and continuing for twelve months after TKR. We identified distinct patterns, indicating  
229 varying resilience levels not fully explained by baseline status. The consistency across measures  
230 supports the concept of an overall physical resilience phenotype. Strong correlations between

231 this resilience phenotype and both physical frailty and self-reported health, surrogates of  
232 resilience capacity, further validated its relevance to the intended measurement target.

233

234 In recent decades, studies have sought to better characterize recovery trajectories in individuals  
235 undergoing TKR. Some focused on the natural history and expected clinical course, while others  
236 examined early recovery to predict long-term outcomes. Our work aligns with the former  
237 approach but differs in two key ways: we broadened resilience measures beyond knee pain and  
238 dysfunction to include whole-body function, and we defined resilience at the whole-person level  
239 by analyzing trajectories across multiple functional measures. Our findings are consistent with  
240 others, showing that most improvement occurs within the first six months post-TKR.<sup>16-22</sup>

241 Additionally, we identified subsets of older adults with similar pre-TKR function but diverging  
242 trajectories, highlighting variability in resilience.<sup>23-25</sup> The close alignment between overall  
243 resilience status and measure-specific resilience profiles supports the concept of an underlying  
244 resilience capacity influencing recovery across domains. This lays the foundation for future  
245 research into the biological underpinnings of physical resilience, particularly the integrity of the  
246 stress response system dynamics,<sup>7</sup> with the goal of developing interventions to enhance  
247 resilience capacity in older adults before physical stressors occur.

248

249 Various approaches have been used to model between-person heterogeneity in resilience  
250 trajectories. They can be broadly classified into three categories: growth curve models,<sup>26</sup> growth  
251 mixture models,<sup>27</sup> and latent variable models. For example, random effects (aka multilevel)  
252 models assume a parametric form for trajectories, with parameters such as time slope and  
253 acceleration varying continuously across individuals, as seen in the “Expected Recovery

254 Differential Approach.”<sup>5</sup> Growth mixture models, in contrast, identify distinct subgroups with  
255 different trajectory patterns, sharing a common form but varying in baseline function and rates of  
256 change.<sup>5</sup> We opted for LPA due to its flexibility in capturing trajectory patterns  
257 nonparametrically, followed by LCA to summarize patterns across measures. While this model  
258 provides qualitative insights into trajectory patterns, it doesn't quantify recovery levels or  
259 intervention effectiveness. Instead, it is valuable for hypothesis testing concerning determinants  
260 of physical resilience and for validating the construct of pre-stressor resilience capacity.

261  
262 Definitions of physical resilience vary in the literature. For example, Resnick et al. defined it as  
263 the ability to “overcome physical challenges encountered by a physically stressful event.”<sup>2</sup> In  
264 contrast, Whitson et al. viewed it as “a characteristic at the whole person level which determines  
265 an individual’s ability to resist functional decline or recover physical health following a  
266 stressor.”<sup>1</sup> The former focuses on the physical nature of the stressor, while the latter addresses  
267 physical health as the main domain of interest. We adopted the first perspective, recognizing that  
268 stressors, physical or not, exert their influence through a complex interplay of biological,  
269 psychosocial, environmental, and behavioral factors. Focusing solely to physical health may  
270 oversimplify this impact, overlooking roles of social, psychological, and recent health events in  
271 physical function.<sup>28</sup> Defining physical resilience by the nature of the stressor allows  
272 consideration of multiple factors – physical, psychological, environmental, and societal – when  
273 designing interventions to improve outcomes for older adults with low resilience or promote  
274 resilience against physical challenges.

275

276 In selecting measures of physical resilience, several key criteria were considered to ensure both  
277 scientific robustness and clinical relevance. Physical function measures were prioritized due to  
278 their proven importance in maintaining independence and quality of life in older adults.<sup>29-31</sup>  
279 Sensitivity to stress-related changes, including recovery potential, was also crucial.<sup>32</sup> A balance  
280 was sought between general and condition-specific measures. In our study, we used both broad  
281 indicators of overall health (e.g., PCS) and knee-specific metrics (e.g., KOOS-QOL) for a  
282 comprehensive view of resilience beyond just knee mobility.<sup>33</sup> To minimize confounding, we  
283 chose measures less influenced by lifestyle factors (e.g., physical activity levels) unrelated to  
284 health.<sup>34</sup> Specificity was key, especially for stressor-specific resilience, as reflected in the  
285 inclusion of KOOS-QOL and SPPB. The measures also needed to demonstrate variability at  
286 baseline and over time to capture meaningful differences, as seen in the diverging trajectories in  
287 Figure 3. Both self-reports and objective performance measures were included to capture a full  
288 understanding of physical capabilities.<sup>35</sup> Discrepancies between these could offer valuable  
289 insights into cognitive impairments, social influences, or compensatory mechanisms. Lastly,  
290 practical aspects such as feasibility and cost-effectiveness were considered, especially for  
291 measures sensitive to short-term dynamics within six months post-stressor.<sup>36</sup> The focus on short-  
292 term outcomes was balanced with the need to predict longer-term clinical endpoints. In summary,  
293 these criteria establish a robust framework for assessing physical resilience in both clinical and  
294 research settings.

295  
296 The study has several strengths. First, the comprehensive assessment of function before and after  
297 a common clinical stressor provides a rare glimpse into the dynamics of impact and recovery in a  
298 real-world scenario. Second, the use of latent variable models generated both measure-specific

299 and aggregate resilience phenotypes while accounting for measurement error in the phenotypic  
300 measures. Third, these phenotypes provide necessary means to validate the construct of  
301 resilience capacity and its determinants – central goals of the SPRING study. However, the study  
302 also limitations. The limited sample size necessitated more restrictive assumptions in the LPA  
303 such as fixing the variance of SPPB and KOOS-QOL across latent classes,<sup>37</sup> potentially biasing  
304 class assignment.<sup>38</sup> Nonetheless, the observed individual-specific trajectories aligned reasonably  
305 with classification ( see eFigures 3-6). Additionally, the low prevalence of certain classes, such  
306 as the 4.5% in the “low” resilience class for KOOS-QOL, may be unreliable. Sensitivity testing  
307 by merging this class with the adjacent “medium” resilience class reclassified four subjects as  
308 non-resilient but did not alter the status of those initially classified as low resilience. Third,  
309 resilience phenotypes may be context-specific. While appropriate for the RESTORE study, these  
310 measures might not suit other settings with high complication rates, like bone marrow transplants  
311 This underscores the need to tailor resilience definitions for different contexts, though the  
312 fundamental principles concerning phenotypic measures and modeling approach remain  
313 applicable. Finally, the focus on physical function limits generalizability beyond physical health,  
314 but this was intentional, given the nature of the stressor and the minimal observed impact (data  
315 not shown). Additionally, SPRING’s framework considers psychological well-being a  
316 determinant, not an indicator, of physical resilience.

317  
318 In summary, our study revealed distinct recovery paths, showcasing various levels of resilience,  
319 which were not solely determined by pre-surgery fitness or health. This suggests that pre-stressor  
320 resilience capacity, a hypothesized key driver of recovery, may not be adequately captured by  
321 pre-stressor static function measures. Instead, resilience capacity reflects the integrity of

322 interconnected physiological systems governing the stress-response that is crucial to recovery.<sup>7</sup>

323 This research highlights the importance of resilience in surgical recovery and could lead to

324 improved patient care by focusing on individual resilience capacities. Future research into the

325 factors contributing to resilience capacity in older adults could transform healthcare by shifting

326 from merely managing symptoms and prolonging life to promoting recovery and improving

327 quality of life for older adults.

328

329



- 330 Figure 1. Conceptual Framework for Physical Resilience.
- 331 Figure 2. Marginal distribution of resilience phenotype measures by time in month.
- 332 Figure 3. Patterns of phenotypic trajectories derived from latent profile analysis using  
333 continuous latent class indicators.
- 334 Figure 4. Trajectory profile composition by measure: progression from least to most  
335 favorable outcomes, comparing resilient and non-resilient classes.

336 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study sample.**

Characteristic	All (N=112)	Non-Resilient (n=40)	Resilient (n=72)	P Value <sup>a</sup>
Age, mean (SD), year	69.5 (6.9)	69.4 (6.6)	69.6 (7.1)	0.906
Sex, n (%)				0.513
Female	74 (66)	28 (38)	46 (62)	
Male	38 (34)	12 (32)	26 (68)	
Race, n (%)				0.008
White	66 (59)	16 (24)	50 (76)	
Black	42 (38)	23 (55)	19 (45)	
Other	4 (4)	1 (25)	3 (75)	
Education (grades completed), n (%)				0.704
<12	8 (7)	3 (38)	5 (63)	
12	34 (30)	14 (41)	20 (59)	
>12	70 (63)	23 (33)	47 (67)	
Family Income (US dollar), n (%)				0.093
<\$25K	9 (8)	5 (56)	4 (44)	
≥\$25K, <50K	13 (12)	4 (31)	9 (69)	
≥50K, <100K	22 (20)	11 (50)	11 (50)	
≥100K	39 (35)	8 (21)	31 (80)	
Unknown	29 (26)	12 (41)	17 (59)	
Marital status, n (%)				0.540
Married	55 (49)	17 (31)	38 (69)	
Not married	33 (30)	14 (42)	19 (58)	
Widowed	24 (21)	9 (38)	15 (63)	
Body Mass Index: mean (SD)	32.1 (5)	33.5 (5)	31.1 (6)	0.030
Charlson Comorbidity Index, n (%)				0.064
None	63 (56)	18 (29)	45 (71)	
Mild	30 (27)	11 (37)	19 (63)	
Moderate/Severe	19 (17)	11 (58)	8 (42)	
Physical Frailty, n (%)				0.004
Robust	26 (23)	6 (23)	20 (77)	
Pre-frail	65 (58)	20 (31)	45 (69)	
Frail	21 (19)	14 (67)	7 (33)	
Self-Reported Health, n (%)				<0.001
Excellent/Very Good	42 (38)	6 (14)	36 (86)	
Good	48 (43)	16 (33)	32 (67)	
Fair/Poor	22 (20)	18 (82)	4 (18)	

337 <sup>a</sup>Two-sample t-test with unequal variances for continuous variables and Pearson chi-square test for categorical variables

338 **REFERENCES**

339

340 1. Whitson HE, Duan-Porter W, Schmader KE, Morey MC, Cohen HJ, Colon-Emeric CS.

341 Physical resilience in older adults: systematic review and development of an emerging construct.

342 J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2016 Apr;71(4):489-95. doi: [10.1093/gerona/glv202](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glv202)

343 2. Resnick B, Galik E, Dorsey S, Scheve A, Gutkin S. Reliability and validity testing of the

344 physical resilience measure. Gerontologist. 2011 Oct;51(5):643-52. DOI: [10.1093/geront/gnr016](https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnr016)

345 3. Varadhan R, Walston JD, Bandeen-Roche K. Can a link be found between physical

346 resilience and frailty in older adults by studying dynamical systems? J Am Geriatr Soc. 2018

347 Aug;66(8):1455-1458. doi: [10.1111/jgs.15409](https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.15409)

348 4. Laskow T, Zhu J, Buta B, et al. Risk factors for nonresilient outcomes in older adults

349 after total knee replacement. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2022 Sep 1;77(9):1915-1922.

350 doi:[10.1093/gerona/glab257](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glab257)

351 5. Colon-Emeric C, Pieper CF, Schmader KE, et al. Two approaches to classifying and

352 quantifying physical resilience in longitudinal data. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2020 Mar

353 9;75(4):731-738. doi: [10.1093/gerona/glz097](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glz097)

354 6. Colon-Emeric C, Whitson HE, Pieper CF, et al. Resiliency groups following hip fracture

355 in older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2019 Dec;67(12):2519-2527. doi: [10.1111/jgs.16152](https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16152)

356 7. Walston J, Varadhan R, Xue QL, et al. A Study of Physical Resilience and Aging

357 (SPRING): Conceptual framework, rationale, and study design. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2023

358 Aug;71(8):2393-2405. doi: [10.1111/jgs.18483](https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.18483)

359 8. Guralnik JM, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L, et al. A short physical performance battery

360 assessing lower-extremity function - association with self-reported disability and prediction of

- 361 mortality and nursing-home admission. *J Gerontol.* 1994 Mar;49(2):M85-94. doi:  
362 [10.1093/geronj/49.2.m85](https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/49.2.m85)
- 363 9. Glynn NW, Santanasto AJ, Simonsick EM, et al. The Pittsburgh Fatigability scale for  
364 older adults: development and validation. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2015 Jan;63(1):130-5. doi:  
365 [10.1111/jgs.13191](https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.13191)
- 366 10. Roos EM, Lohmander LS. The Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS):  
367 from joint injury to osteoarthritis. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2003 Nov 3;1:64. doi:  
368 [10.1186/1477-7525-1-64](https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-1-64)
- 369 11. Taft C, Karlsson J, Sullivan M. Do SF-36 summary component scores accurately  
370 summarize subscale scores? *Qual Life Res.* 2001;10(5):395-404. doi: [10.1023/a:1012552211996](https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1012552211996)
- 371 12. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, et al. Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype.  
372 *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2001 Mar;56(3):M146-56. doi: [10.1093/gerona/56.3.m146](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/56.3.m146)
- 373 13. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying  
374 prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis.*  
375 1987;40(5):373-83. doi: [10.1016/0021-9681\(87\)90171-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9681(87)90171-8)
- 376 14. Lazarsfeld PF, Henry NW. *Latent Structure Analysis.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin;  
377 1968.
- 378 15. Bartholomew DJ. *Latent variable models and factor analysis.* London: Griffin; 1987.
- 379 16. Kennedy DM, Stratford PW, Riddle DL, Hanna SE, Gollish JD. Assessing recovery and  
380 establishing prognosis following total knee arthroplasty. *Phys Ther.* 2008 Jan;88(1):22-32. doi:  
381 [10.2522/ptj.20070051](https://doi.org/10.2522/ptj.20070051)

- 382 17. Fortin PR, Penrod JR, Clarke AE, et al. Timing of total joint replacement affects clinical  
383 outcomes among patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2002  
384 Dec;46(12):3327-30. doi: [10.1002/art.10631](https://doi.org/10.1002/art.10631)
- 385 18. Naylor JM, Harmer AR, Heard RC, Harris IA. Patterns of recovery following knee and  
386 hip replacement in an Australian cohort. *Aust Health Rev.* 2009 Feb;33(1):124-35. doi:  
387 [10.1071/ah090124](https://doi.org/10.1071/ah090124)
- 388 19. Wylde V, Penfold C, Rose A, Blom AW. Variability in long-term pain and function  
389 trajectories after total knee replacement: A cohort study. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res.* 2019  
390 Nov;105(7):1345-1350. doi: [10.1016/j.otsr.2019.08.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otsr.2019.08.014)
- 391 20. Brander VA, Stulberg SD, Adams AD, et al. Predicting total knee replacement pain: a  
392 prospective, observational study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2003 Nov;(416):27-36. doi:  
393 [10.1097/01.blo.0000092983.12414.e9](https://doi.org/10.1097/01.blo.0000092983.12414.e9)
- 394 21. Nilsson AK, Toksvig-Larsen S, Roos EM. A 5 year prospective study of patient-  
395 relevant outcomes after total knee replacement. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2009 May;17(5):601-6.  
396 doi: [10.1016/j.joca.2008.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2008.11.007)
- 397 22. Lenguerrand E, Wylde V, Gooberman-Hill R, et al. Trajectories of Pain and Function  
398 after Primary Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: The ADAPT Cohort Study. *PLoS One.* 2016 Feb  
399 12;11(2):e0149306. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0149306](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149306)
- 400 23. Golinelli D, Grassi A, Sanmarchi F, et al. Identifying patient subgroups with different  
401 trends of patient-reported outcomes (PROMs) after elective knee arthroplasty. *BMC*  
402 *Musculoskelet Disord.* 2023 Jun 3;24(1):453. doi: [10.1186/s12891-023-06373-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12891-023-06373-2)

- 403 24. Page MG, Katz J, Romero Escobar EM, et al. Distinguishing problematic from  
404 nonproblematic postsurgical pain: a pain trajectory analysis after total knee arthroplasty. *Pain*.  
405 2015 Mar;156(3):460-468. doi: [10.1097/01.j.pain.0000460327.10515.2d](https://doi.org/10.1097/01.j.pain.0000460327.10515.2d)
- 406 25. Dowsey MM, Smith AJ, Choong PFM. Latent Class Growth Analysis predicts long term  
407 pain and function trajectories in total knee arthroplasty: a study of 689 patients. *Osteoarthritis*  
408 *Cartilage*. 2015 Dec;23(12):2141-2149. doi: [10.1016/j.joca.2015.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2015.07.005)
- 409 26. Raudenbush SW, Bryk AS. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis*  
410 *Methods* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2002.
- 411 27. Reinecke J, Seddig D. Growth mixture models in longitudinal research. *AStA Adv Stat*  
412 *Anal*. 2011; 95:415–434. doi: [10.1007/s10182-011-0171-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10182-011-0171-4)
- 413 28. Daltroy LH, Larson MG, Eaton HM, Phillips CB, Liang MH. Discrepancies between  
414 self-reported and observed physical function in the elderly: the influence of response shift and  
415 other factors. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999 Jun;48(11):1549-61. doi: [10.1016/s0277-9536\(99\)00048-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(99)00048-9)
- 416 29. Guralnik JM, Ferrucci L, Simonsick EM, Salive ME, Wallace RB. Lower-extremity  
417 function in persons over the age of 70 years as a predictor of subsequent disability. *N Engl J Med*.  
418 1995 Mar 2;332(9):556-61. doi: [10.1056/NEJM199503023320902](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199503023320902)
- 419 30. Studenski S, Perera S, Patel K, et al. Gait speed and survival in older adults. *JAMA*. 2011  
420 Jan 5;305(1):50-8. doi: [10.1001/jama.2010.1923](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2010.1923)
- 421 31. Cesari M, Kritchevsky SB, Newman AB, et al. Added value of physical performance  
422 measures in predicting adverse health-related events: results from the Health, Aging And Body  
423 Composition Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2009 Feb;57(2):251-9. doi: [10.1111/j.1532-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008.02126.x)  
424 [5415.2008.02126.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008.02126.x)

- 425 32. Gijzel SMW, Whitson HE, van de Leemput IA, et al. Resilience in clinical care: getting a  
426 grip on the recovery potential of older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2019 Dec;67(12):2650-2657.  
427 doi: [10.1111/jgs.16149](https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16149)
- 428 33. Jones CA, Beaupre LA, Johnston DW, Suarez-Almazor ME. Total joint arthroplasties:  
429 current concepts of patient outcomes after surgery. *Rheum Dis Clin North Am.* 2007  
430 Feb;33(1):71-86. doi: [10.1016/j.rdc.2006.12.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rdc.2006.12.008)
- 431 34. King AC, Rejeski WJ, Buchner DM. Physical activity interventions targeting older adults.  
432 A critical review and recommendations. *Am J Prev Med.* 1998 Nov;15(4):316-33. doi:  
433 [10.1016/s0749-3797\(98\)00085-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-3797(98)00085-3)
- 434 35. Reuben DB, Seeman TE, Keeler E, et al. Refining the categorization of physical  
435 functional status: the added value of combining self-reported and performance-based measures. *J*  
436 *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2004 Oct;59(10):1056-61. doi: [10.1093/gerona/59.10.m1056](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/59.10.m1056)
- 437 36. Hefford C, Abbott JH, Baxter GD, Arnold R. Outcome measurement in clinical practice:  
438 practical and theoretical issues for health related quality of life (HRQOL) questionnaires. *Phys*  
439 *Ther Rev.* 2011;16(3):155-167. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1179/1743288X11Y.0000000004>
- 440 37. Morin AJS, Maïano C, Nagengast B, Marsh HW, Morizot J, Janosz M. General growth  
441 mixture analysis of adolescents' developmental trajectories of anxiety: the impact of untested  
442 invariance assumptions on substantive interpretations. *Struct Equ Modeling.* 2011;18(4):613-648.  
443 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2011.607714>
- 444 38. Sijbrandij JJ, Hoekstra T, Almansa J, Peeters M, Bultmann U, Reijneveld SA. Variance  
445 constraints strongly influenced model performance in growth mixture modeling: a simulation  
446 and empirical study. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* Nov 12 2020;20(1). doi:  
447 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-01154-0>

448 **Acknowledgment**

449 **Funding/Support:** This study was supported by research grant under UH3AG056933 from  
450 the National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health, United States of America.

451 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funding source had no role in the design and conduct of  
452 the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation,  
453 review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

454 **Conflict of Interest**

455 None.

456 **Author Contributions**

457 Q-L. X.: conception and design, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the  
458 article, final approval of the version to be published; T.L., J.O., J.A.S, A.B.N.: interpretation  
459 of data, revising the article for important intellectual content, final approval of the version to  
460 be published; M.K.Z.: analysis and interpretation of data, final approval of the version to be  
461 published; R.V., J.D.W., F.S., K.B-R: conception and design, interpretation of data, revising  
462 the article for important intellectual content, final approval of the version to be published.

463 **Data Access, Responsibility, and Analysis**

464 Dr. Qian-Li Xue had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the  
465 integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

466



467 **Data Sharing Statement**

468 **Data**

469 **Data available:** Yes

470 **Data types:** Deidentified participant data, data dictionary

471 **How to access data:** The datasets generated and/or analyzed during this study are not publicly  
472 available to protect participant confidentiality. However, they can be obtained from the  
473 corresponding author upon reasonable request.

474 **When available:** With publication

475

476 **Supporting Documents**

477 **Document types:** None

478

479 **Additional Information**


480 **Who can access the data:** Researchers whose proposed use of the data has been approved.

481 **Types of analyses:** Secondary analyses.


482 **Mechanisms of data availability:** Data will be made available without investigator support  
483 upon approval of a proposal and execution of a signed data access agreement.

484


**Figure 1. Conceptual Framework for Physical Resilience.**



**Figure 2. Marginal distribution of resilience phenotype measures by time in month.**



**Figure 3. Patterns of phenotypic trajectories derived from latent profile analysis using continuous latent class indicators.**



**Figure 4. Trajectory profile composition by measure: progression from least to most favorable outcomes, comparing resilient and non-resilient classes.**

