

Review

Available online at

ScienceDirect

www.sciencedirect.com

Elsevier Masson France



EM consulte www.em-consulte.com

Neuromuscular joint function in knee osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis



Beyza Tayfur^{a,*}, Chedsada Charuphongsa^a, Dylan Morrissey^{a,b}, Stuart Charles Miller^a

^a Sports and Exercise Medicine, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom
^b Physiotherapy Department, Barts Health NHS trust, London E1 4DG, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article History: Received 13 January 2021 Accepted 16 February 2022

Keywords: Knee osteoarthritis Neuromuscular function Quadriceps Muscle Strength Knee joint

ABSTRACT

Background: Neuromuscular alterations are common in people with knee osteoarthritis (KOA). A comprehensive understanding of these alterations is important to enable targeted rehabilitation strategies. Objectives: This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to comprehensively understand the neuromuscular alterations around the knee joint in people with KOA. Methods: Moderate- and high-quality studies based on a modified version of the Downs and Black checklist, comparing neuromuscular function of peri-articular muscles between people with KOA and controls were retrieved from five databases from inception to October 2020. Outcomes included normalized isokinetic strength, muscle size, voluntary activation, cortical and spinal-reflex excitability, and torque-related outcomes. Data were pooled according to structural KOA severity with sensitivity analysis based on sex. Evidence levels are presented in evidence gap maps. Results: A total of 7 high-quality and 22 moderate-quality studies were retained (1146 people with KOA and 1353 age- and sex-matched controls). Studies demonstrated quadriceps and hamstring strength deficits and increased hamstring-to-quadriceps strength ratios across KOA severities. Women presented lower quadriceps strength at early KOA (very limited evidence) and lower voluntary activation at end stage KOA (very limited evidence) as compared with controls, whereas men did not (moderate evidence). People with KOA also demonstrated lower quadriceps force control ability with no change in rapid force production (very limited evidence). Voluntary activation deficits for quadriceps were evident (moderate evidence), with no change in quadriceps cortical excitability (very limited evidence) or soleus spinal reflexes (very limited evidence). No muscle size change was demonstrated except for the vastus medialis (limited evidence). Evidence

dence). No muscle size change was demonstrated except for the vastus medialis (limited evidence). Evidence gaps were found for neural and torque-related measures and differences in hamstring, gastrocnemius, soleus, and popliteus. *Conclusions:* Neuromuscular deficits are evident across different structural KOA severities and are seen in

Conclusions: Neuromuscular deficits are evident across different structural KOA severities and are seen in muscle strength, voluntary activation, muscle size, and force control ability. Women may exhibit these alterations to a greater extent than men.

Prospero registration number: CRD42019160845.

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Introduction

Knee extensor muscle weakness is a risk factor for knee osteoarthritis (KOA) [1] and is commonly observed in people with KOA [2,3]. Therefore, exercise is recommended as first-line treatment for KOA [4], with structured land-based exercises [4,5], knee extensor strengthening exercises [6], and aerobic exercises [6] forming the core of treatment programs. Strengthening of the knee extensors is

E-mail address: b.tayfur@qmul.ac.uk (B. Tayfur).

effective in reducing pain and increasing both quality of life and functional capacity in people with KOA [5].

Although the importance of the knee extensors has been widely studied, less is known about differences from normal in the other muscles controlling the knee joint in people with KOA. It is important to comprehensively understand these neuromuscular alterations to provide targeted exercise strategies, as has been shown in a previous systematic review of hip strength deficits in people with KOA, showing that hip strengthening should be considered in the design of rehabilitation programmes [7]. Specifically for the knee, previous studies have shown strength deficits in quadriceps [2,3], hamstring [3], and gastrocnemius [8] muscles in people with KOA. Alterations are also seen in voluntary activation [9], spinal reflexes [10] and

^{*} Corresponding author at: Sports and Exercise Medicine, Mile End Hospital, First Floor, Bancroft Road, London E1 4DG, United Kingdom.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rehab.2022.101662

^{1877-0657/© 2022} The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

muscle sizes [11], which are likely contributors to the observed strength deficits. Although these alterations suggest the complexity of the neuromuscular alterations in people with KOA, the available evidence needs to be synthesized to comprehensively document these possible changes. Identification of these factors could inform the detail of exercise and treatment prescription in order to focus on parameters such as voluntary activation capacity, rapidity of force production and force control ability rather than only focusing on maximum muscle strength.

Therefore, the aim of the study was to identify neuromuscular alterations in the muscles controlling the knee joint (quadriceps, hamstring, gastrocnemius, soleus, and popliteus) in people with KOA as compared with age- and sex-matched healthy controls. Furthermore, because of sex-related differences in KOA in terms of severity and risks [12] and neuromuscular alterations [13], we aimed to understand whether there are neuromuscular differences between men and women with KOA. The findings will constitute a comprehensive review of neuromuscular alterations around the knee joint, which should inform exercise selection in people with KOA when designing rehabilitation strategies.

Methods

The updated Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines were followed for this systematic review and meta-analysis [14]. The study protocol was registered at PROSPERO (International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews) (CRD42019160845, December 10, 2019).

Search strategy

The following electronic databases were systematically searched with no date restrictions until October 2020: PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, Scopus, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). MeSH terms and text words were included in the search terms. The search strategy was modified for each specific database, with keywords and concepts remaining identical. The main concepts were knee osteoarthritis AND neuromuscular (strength, reflex, activation, electromyography, size) AND lower limb muscles (quadriceps, hamstring, gastrocnemius, soleus, popliteus). Search strategies for all databases are available in Supplementary Material S1. Two reviewers (BT and CC) independently conducted the searches, removed duplicates, screened all abstracts for eligibility and retrieved full-text versions of eligible articles. Disagreements were resolved by a third reviewer (SCM). The reference lists of the included articles and related systematic reviews were searched for additional studies.

Selection criteria

Studies were eligible if they compared the neuromuscular function of the knee joint in participants with KOA to an age- and sexmatched control group. There were no age limitations for inclusion. Studies were included only if participants had KOA with radiographic confirmation, ideally described with Kellgren-Lawrence (KL) grades [15], with all stages of KOA (i.e., early, established and end stage). We excluded studies of people with a history of surgery for KOA (i.e., knee replacement). However, if the study reported data before participants underwent surgery, we included the study and used the baseline pre-surgical data. Data from these studies were pooled in the "end stage KOA" group. We had no restrictions on symptoms; studies of people with or without any knee symptoms/pain were included. We had no restrictions on the cause of KOA (i.e., idiopathic vs posttraumatic). We excluded studies without a control group or comparing the involved limb to the uninvolved limb of participants because of evidence of bilateral neuromuscular changes in unilateral KOA [16]. Radiographic confirmation of not having KOA for the control

group was not a requirement for inclusion. If studies reported radiographic KOA for the control group, it is reported in the characteristics of the included studies. We included cross-sectional or prospective observational studies and interventional studies. Only baseline data from interventional studies were used. We included only studies published in English.

Outcome measures

The neuromuscular outcomes of interest were as follows: bodymass normalized muscle strength as measured by an isokinetic dynamometer or fixed force transducer; torque-related outcomes such as rate of torque development, torque variability or electromechanical delay; muscle size (thickness [cm] or area [cm²]); voluntary activation deficits as measured by central activation ratio or twitch interpolation technique; and spinal reflex excitability or corticomotor excitability as measured by active motor threshold. These outcomes were identified from preliminary literature searches to include all relevant neuromuscular measures.

Data extraction

The study design, participant characteristics (number of participants, age, sex, structural severity, symptoms) and outcome measures (measured muscle groups and outcome) were extracted by 2 reviewers (BT and CC) independently in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Discrepancies were resolved by consultation and checked with a third reviewer (SCM). Group means and standard deviations were extracted for main outcome measures. Corresponding authors were contacted by e-mail to request unreported data or additional details, if the reported data were incomplete.

Methodological quality assessment

A modified version of the Downs and Black checklist [7,17] was used to assess the risk of bias of included studies (Supplementary Material S2). The Downs and Black checklist is a methodological quality assessment tool for both randomised and non-randomised interventional studies with high internal consistency and inter-rater reliability [17]. The modified version contains 15 questions, excluding the questions about randomisation and interventions from the original version. The highest score of the modified version is 16, and thresholds for low, moderate and high quality were accepted as <60% (\le 9), 60-74% (10-11), and >75% (\ge 12), respectively, guided by previous studies [18,19]. Low-quality studies were then excluded because they may cause over- or under-estimation of effect sizes and may distort results, thus leading to incorrect conclusions [20,21]. Two independent reviewers (BT and CC) assessed methodological quality, and disagreements were resolved by discussion and checked with a third reviewer (SCM).

Statistical analysis

Meta-analysis was performed when data from 2 or more studies were suitable to pool based on methodological homogeneity and similarly reported data. Data were pooled as the KOA versus control group and also based on the reported structural severity of KOA as follows: early KOA (KL grade 0–1), established KOA (KL grade 2–3), or end stage KOA (KL grade 4). In the literature, typically, a KL grade of 4 is clustered within the established KOA (KL grade ≥ 2) group. As such, in our analysis, we placed people with a KL grade of 4 in the end stage classification only when they were reported separately in the paper. Also, studies reporting data obtained before total knee replacement surgery were included in the end stage KL grade 4 group. A few studies reported a mix of KL levels (i.e., KL grade 1 or 2), which we included in the early KOA group. For studies sub-grouping people with KOA (i.e., younger vs older) and reporting the data separately, we combined the data for all KOA groups by using Cochrane Review Manager v5.3 (Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, the Cochrane Collaboration, 2014). To achieve the second aim of understanding potential sex-related differences, sensitivity analyses were based on sex when available, by pooling the data for women and men separately and comparing the results. Two further post-hoc sensitivity analyses based on pain and presence of patellofemoral damage were also performed.

Cochrane Review Manager v5.3 was used for the meta-analyses. Standardised mean differences (SMDs; Hedges' adjusted g) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for variables of interest as the difference between the injured leg (KOA group) and healthy control leg (control group). The criteria for pooling the data for the metaanalysis were strict in terms of clinical tests (i.e., only fixed force transducer or isokinetic dynamometer strength tests that were bodymass normalized were included and only similar testing velocities and same contraction types [fast vs slow, eccentric vs concentric vs isometric] were pooled). The clinical population were also carefully selected (i.e., the same KOA structural severities). Therefore, data from different studies were pooled only if they met the pooling criteria. However, because this is a clinical population, there may always be other contributors to the outcome (i.e., pain or other factors that have not been measured). Therefore, random effects models were used for each meta-analysis when data were pooled. Single study results were also reported in forest plots to present data. The magnitude of the pooled SMD was interpreted based on Cohen's criteria, where SMD \geq 0.8 indicated large, 0.5–0.8 moderate, and 0.2–0.5 small effect sizes [22]. Potential publication biases were examined by funnel plots for meta-analyses when ≥ 10 studies were included [21]. Heterogeneity of the pooled data was analysed with I². I² values were interpreted as no heterogeneity ($\leq 25\%$), low heterogeneity (>25%), moderate heterogeneity (>50%), and high heterogeneity (>75%) [23].

Level of evidence

Level of evidence was reported according to the following criteria: strong evidence (multiple high-quality studies that were statistically homogenous); moderate evidence (multiple studies including at least one high-quality study regardless of heterogeneity or from multiple moderate-quality studies that are statistically homogenous); limited evidence (one high-quality study or multiple moderate-quality studies that are statistically heterogeneous); and very limited evidence (one moderate quality) [24].

Evidence gap maps

An evidence gap map was created to summarise the findings and show the level of evidence related to findings arranged by muscle group, measure and stage of KOA. This has the additional benefit of potentially avoiding research waste in areas with strong evidence and guiding future studies to fill the research gaps.

Results

Study selection

The search strategy yielded 14,295 papers after the removal of duplications (Fig. 1). After title and abstract screening, 277 articles were assessed in full text and 74 studies were eligible for quality assessment. After quality assessment, 45 low-quality studies were excluded, which left 7 high-quality [2,3,11,25–28] and 22 moderate-quality [8-10,13,29–46] studies for final inclusion. Details of methodological quality assessment of included studies are in Table 1 and excluded studies are in Supplementary Appendix S3.

Study characteristics

The characteristics and outcome measures of each included study are in Table 2. Study findings were all suitable for meta-analysis or presentation in forest plots and were therefore reported in Figs. 4, 5, 6 or Supplementary Appendix S4. Overall, the included 29 studies comprised measures of 1146 people with KOA and 1353 age- and sex-matched controls. Average participant ages ranged from 45 tp 74 years. Definitions of KOA and control group inclusion criteria were heterogeneous across studies in terms of structural changes within the joint and symptoms. Most studies reported quadriceps muscle strength, and other muscles or other neuromuscular outcomes were measured in only a few studies.

Findings

The overall comparison of the KOA group to controls showed deficits in quadriceps strength (isometric SMD [95% CI] -0.84 [-1.05; -0.62], concentric slow SMD [95% CI] -0.66 [-0.95; -0.38], concentric fast SMD [95% CI] -0.92 [-2.01; 0.16], eccentric slow SMD [95% CI] -0.82 [-1.27; -0.36], eccentric fast SMD [95% CI] -0.64 [-1.28; 0.00]) and quadriceps voluntary activation (SMD [95% CI] -0.65 [-1.12; -0.18]). The KOA and control groups did not differ in quadriceps cortical excitability (SMD [95% CI] 0.02 [-0.62; 0.67]), but torque variability for quadriceps was higher in the KOA than control group (SMD [95% CI] 0.98 [0.32; 1.64]). The 2 groups did not differ in quadriceps rate of torque development (SMD [95% CI] -0.09 [-0.65; 0.48]). The KOA group showed hamstring isometric strength deficits (SMD [95% CI] -0.54 [-0.83; -0.26]), but the KOA and control groups did not differ in hamstring concentric slow strength (SMD [95% CI] -0.45 [-0.96; 0.07]). The KOA group commonly showed gastro-soleus (i.e., plantar flexion) strength deficits for isotonic contractions but no difference from controls in isometrics (isometric SMD [95% CI] -0.51 [-1.11; 0.09], concentric slow SMD [95% CI] -2.05 [-2.69; -1.41], eccentric slow SMD [95% CI] -2.15 [-2.78; -1.52]) or soleus spinal excitability (SMD [95% CI] = 0.72 [-0.15; 1.59]). Muscle thickness was smaller in the KOA than control groups for vastus medialis (SMD [95% CI] -0.96 [-1.80; -0.11]) and vastus lateralis (SMD [95% CI] -0.32 [-0.58; -0.06]), with no difference in rectus femoris (SMD [95% CI] -0.13 [-0.61; 0.36]) or vastus intermedius (SMD [95% CI] -0.16 [-0.46; 0.14]). The 2 groups did not differ in muscle thickness of biceps femoris (SMD [95% CI] -0.14 [-0.94; 0.67]), gastrocnemius (SMD [95% CI] -0.40 [-1.21; 0.41]) or soleus (SMD [95% CI] 0.15 [-0.66; 0.95]). Quadriceps muscle area (cm²) was similar between KOA and control groups (SMD [95% CI] 0.11 [-0.05; 0.27]).

The overall findings (direction, effect size and level of evidence) of all meta-analyses based on structural KOA severities for each outcome measure are summarised in the evidence gap maps (Figs. 2 and 3). We could not identify any publication bias for eligible outcomes (i.e., with > 10 studies in the meta-analysis; quadriceps isometric strength) as measured by funnel plots. All meta-analyses and funnel plots are in Supplementary Appendix S4.

Quadriceps and hamstring strength deficits were common at all structural KOA severities (early, established and end stage), but the magnitude of the effect depended on the contraction type (i.e., isometric, concentric, or eccentric) (Figs. 2, 4 and 5, Supplementary Appendix S4). Effect sizes were higher but not significantly for isometric and concentric quadriceps strength with increasing structural severity (Figs. 2 and 4, Supplementary Appendix S4). People with established KOA exhibited an increased ratio of hamstring to quadriceps strength, with a large effect size (very limited evidence), which suggests that quadriceps strength may be affected more than hamstring strength (Fig. 2).

In addition to reduced peak strength, people with established KOA exhibited higher quadriceps torque variability (expressed as the standard deviation from the target forces during an isometric quadriceps



Fig. 1. Flow diagram of the study selection process. OA, osteoarthritis.

contraction) than controls (very limited evidence). In one study including all KOA severities, quadriceps rate of torque development did not differ from controls (very limited evidence) (Fig. 2, Supplementary Appendix S4). Rate of torque development was measured as the first derivative of the "small, medium and large" force pulses normalized to the maximum voluntary isometric contraction (%MVIC). The highest peak rate of torque development value of these force pulses was used.

For plantar flexion strength (gastrocnemius and soleus), people with early and established KOA exhibited lower strength than controls (very limited evidence), with no difference for people with end stage KOA (limited evidence) (Figs. 3 and 5).

Muscle size was not affected in quadriceps, hamstring, gastrocnemius or soleus muscles (limited to strong evidence), except for vastus medialis (limited evidence), which was lower in people with established KOA (large effect size, limited evidence) than controls (Figs. 2, 3, Supplementary Appendix S4). Muscle thickness was used as a measure of muscle size and measured using 2D B-mode ultrasonography in 3 studies [3,11,47]. Muscle area (cm²) was also used to measure muscle size with a Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry scan and CT scan in one study [2].

Neural function was assessed for quadriceps femoris and soleus muscles only. For quadriceps femoris, people with end stage KOA did not differ from controls in cortical excitability (very limited evidence) and those with established and end stage KOA exhibited lower voluntary activation (moderate evidence) (Figs. 2, 3 and 4, Supplementary Appendix S4). Cortical excitability was assessed by measuring resting motor threshold using transcranial magnetic stimulation of the quadriceps representation at the primary motor cortex in one study [46]. Voluntary activation was measured in 6 studies, using twitch interpolation [9,28,45,46] or central activation ratio [13,34] calculations. The stimulus parameters also differed across these 6 studies. Methodological details can be found in Supplementary Appendix S5. The effects of the measurement method was checked with a sensitivity analysis. Studies using central activation ratio tended to report higher values for the KOA than control group and showed no difference between groups in pooled SMD (-0.22 [-0.58; 0.14]). Conversely, the twitch interpolation method showed a large effect size toward lower voluntary activation levels in the KOA than control group (SMD [95% CI] -0.88 [-1.40; -0.37]).

For soleus, people with KOA showed no difference from controls in spinal excitability (very limited evidence) during walking as measured by the Hoffman reflex/Muscle wave ratio (Fig. 3, Supplementary Appendix S4).

Evidence gaps were notable for most outcomes, with strong evidence for only 2: quadriceps muscle area and isometric hamstring strength in established KOA. Mostly, neural changes and torquerelated outcomes (timing and control) were not investigated. Similarly, gastrocnemius and soleus muscles were measured in only 4 studies, and we found only very limited to limited evidence to make suggestions for these outcomes. Studies reporting hamstring muscle data were mainly limited to isometric strength. No studies were

Table 1

Methodological quality assessment of included studies. A modified Downs and Black scal	e [17] was used	l (header numbers refer to item numl	per in the original scale).
--	-----------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------

Studies\Questions	1	2	3	5	6	7	10	11	12	15	18	20	21	22	25	Total Score	Quality Level
Aily et al. 2019 [25]	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	12	Н
Alkjaer et al. 2015 [10]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	М
Bade et al. 2010 [41]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	М
Baert et al. 2013 [42]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	М
Berger et al. 2011 [43]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	М
Conroy et al. 2012 [2]	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	14	Н
Goncalves et al. 2017 [8]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	М
Hall et al. 2006 [26]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	12	Н
Hortobagyi et al. 2004 [44]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	М
Hurley et al. 1997 [45]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	Μ
Kittelson et al. 2014 [46]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	Μ
Kumar et al. 2013 [29]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	Μ
Kumar et al. 2014 [30]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	Μ
Levinger et al. 2016 [31]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	Μ
Liikavainio et al. 2008 [3]	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	12	Н
Pap et al. 2004 [9]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	Μ
Patsika et al. 2014 [32]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	Μ
Petrella et al. 2017 [33]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	Μ
Petterson et al. 2007 [13]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	М
Ramsey et al. 2007 [34]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	М
Ruhdorfer et al. 2020 [27]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	12	Н
Rutherford et al. 2011 [35]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	11	Μ
Rutherford et al. 2013 [36]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	11	М
Sanchez-Ramirez et al. 2016 [37]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	М
Schmitt and Rudolph 2007 [38]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	М
Serrao et al. 2015 [39]	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10	М
Taniguchi et al. 2015 [11]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	12	Н
van Leeuwen et al. 2017 [28]	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	14	Н
Winters and Rudolph 2014 [40]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	М

H, high quality; M, moderate quality.

found for popliteus neuromuscular outcomes. Details of the evidence gaps are in Figs. 2 and 3.

Sensitivity analysis based on sex

Sensitivity analysis based on sex (women vs men) showed differences for several outcomes. Data were available for quadriceps voluntary activation, quadriceps isometric and concentric strength, hamstring isometric strength and quadriceps muscle (rectus femoris, vastus lateralis, vastus intermedius) thickness. Meta-analyses forest plots are in Fig. 6 and Supplementary Appendix S4.

For quadriceps isometric and concentric strength, we found an effect of sex in early KOA (Fig. 6, Supplementary Appendix S4). However, we found no effect of sex in established or end stage KOA for isometric strength; no data were available for concentric strength for comparison for established or end stage KOA. Women presented lower strength at early KOA (very limited evidence) than controls, whereas men showed no difference from controls (moderate evidence) (Fig. 6). The same analysis without any structural severity classifications (i.e., all KOA vs controls) supported these findings because women with KOA showed a greater reduction in strength (SMD [95% CI] -1.11 [-1.62; -0.61]) than men with KOA (SMD [95% CI] -0.74 [-1.18; -0.31]) as compared with age- and sex-matched controls. Quadriceps voluntary activation data were available for end stage KOA and showed that women with KOA had lower voluntary activation than controls (very limited evidence), whereas men did not (very limited evidence) (Fig. 6). We found no differences between the sexes for hamstring strength or quadriceps muscle thickness (Supplementary Appendix S4).

Post-hoc sensitivity analysis based on pain and presence of patellofemoral damage

For studies including both painful and pain-free KOA groups [2,26,27], using only painful KOA or all KOA group data did not change the results to a meaningful extent (Δ effect size <0.03). Five studies did not report pain levels for the included participants

[13,32,38,41,46], and, again, excluding those studies from pooled data did not change the results meaningfully (Δ effect size <0.09). Pain and symptoms information from all included studies, and sensitivity analysis results can be found in Supplementary Appendix S6. Also, patellofemoral osteoarthritis involvement was reported in only 3 studies [8,38,40]. One study reported percentages and grades of patellofemoral OA [8] and 2 studies reported no patellofemoral involvement [38,40]. Sensitivity analysis excluding these studies did not change the results (Δ effect size =0.0).

Post-hoc sensitivity analysis based on study quality

The effect of study quality was checked for available outcomes, isometric quadriceps strength and slow concentric quadriceps strength. We found no differences in data between high-quality and moderate-quality studies when pooled. For isometric quadriceps strength, high-quality studies (SMD [95% CI] -0.94 [-1.34; -0.55]) and moderate-quality studies (SMD [95% CI] -0.77 [-1.03; -0.51]) yielded similar results. For slow concentric quadriceps strength, again, high-quality studies (SMD [95% CI] -0.67 [-1.16; -0.17]) and moderate-quality studies (SMD [95% CI] -0.68[-1.11; -0.26]) showed similar findings.

Discussion

In this systematic review, we aimed to identify neuromuscular alterations in the muscles controlling the knee joint in people with KOA as compared with age- and sex-matched controls. We provide a synthesis of all neuromuscular alterations with evidence levels, juxtaposed with gaps in evidence for which further research is likely required. Studies showed lower quadriceps, hamstring, gastrocnemius and soleus muscle strength (very limited to moderate evidence) in the KOA than control group, which shows the need to target these muscle groups while designing exercise protocols for people with KOA. Voluntary activation deficits were evident for quadriceps femoris muscle (moderate evidence), which suggests neural contribution to muscle weakness in people with KOA. However, we found no

 Table 2

 Characteristics of the included studies and outcome measures reported in each study.

Author/year (study design)	Sample size (men/women)	Age (mean [SD] or median [range])	Structural severity and symptoms	Outcome measures
Aily et al. 2019 [25] Cross-sectional	KOA middle-aged: 20 (10/10) KOA older: 20 (10/10) Control middle-aged: 20 (10/ 10) Control older: 20 (10/10)	KOA middle-aged: 45.3 (2.7) KOA older: 74.3 (2.8) Control middle-aged: 45.2 (3.7) Control older: 74.6 (3.1)	KOA: KL grade 2 and 3, Clinical signs, ACR criteria*, persistent knee pain Control: KL grade 0 and 1, asymptomatic, no previous	Quadriceps muscle thickness, Quadriceps concentric and iso- metric strength
Alkjaer et al. 2015 [10] Cross-sectional	KOA: 11 (0/11) Control: 11 (0/11)	KOA: 69.0 (6.6) Control: 66.1 (4.5)	knee injury KOA: KL grade 1–4, Clinical diagnosis	Soleus Hoffmann reflex
Bade et al. 2010 [41]	KOA: 24 (12/12)	KOA: 65.0 (9.4)	KOA: End stage KOA	Quadriceps isometric strength
Intervention Baert et al. 2013 [42] Cross-sectional	Control: 17 (9/8) Early KOA: 14 (0/14) Established KOA: 12 (0/12) Control: 14 (0/14)	Control: 66.8 (6.5) Early KOA: 65.4 (8.9) Established KOA: 68.3 (6.8) Control: 65.8 (9.9)	Control: No Knee Pain Early KOA: Knee Pain, KL grade 0, 1 or 2– (osteophytes only) Established KOA: KL grade ≥2, Clinical signs, ACR criteria* Control: Asymptomatic, had no history of KOA or other pathology involving any lower extremity joints. KL grade 0 and 1	Quadriceps concentric and iso- metric strength, Hamstring isometric strength
Berger et al. 2011 [43] Cross-sectional	KOA: 8 (4/4) Control: 8 (4/4)	KOA: 61.3 (3.8) Control: 61.8 (5.9)	KOA: Clinical signs, ACR criteria persistent pain and diagnosis by radiographs and symptoms Control: No self-reported his- tory of knee pain	, Quadriceps isometric strength
Conroy et al. 2012 [2] Cross-sectional	KOA pain: 170 (69/101) KOA no pain: 91 (38/53) Control: 334 (140/194)	KOA pain: 74.1 (3.1) KOA no pain: 73.7 (2.9) Control: 73.3 (2.7)	KOA: KL grade ≥2 and knee pain or no knee pain Control: No knee pain, no radiographic KOA	Quadriceps muscle area (cm ²), Quadriceps concentric strength
Goncalves et al. 2017 [8] Cross-sectional	Mild KOA: 22 (12/10) Moderate KOA: 15 (8/7) Control: 15 (8/7)	Mild KOA: 55.9 (6.62) Moderate KOA: 57.6 (6.31) Control: 54.20 (6.30)	KOA: Clinical signs, ACR criteria Mild: KL grade 2, Moderate KL grade 3 Control: Asymptomatic indi- viduals with no radiographic signs of KOA	, Gastrocnemius isometric, con- centric, eccentric strength
Hall et al. 2006 [26] Cross-sectional	Painful KOA: 36 (14/22) No-pain KOA: 23 (7/16) Control: 55 (17/38)	Painful KOA: 68.78 (7.80) No-pain KOA: 69.22 (5.78) Control: 67.49 (8.45)	KOA: KL>2, pain Control: KL grade <2, no pain	Quadriceps isometric strength
Hortobagyi et al. 2004 [44] Cross-sectional	KOA: 20 (5/15)	KOA: 57.5 (7.3)	KOA: KL grade ≥2 and knee pain Control: No pain	Quadriceps torque variability
Hurley et al. 1997 [45] Cross-sectional	KOA: 103 (38/65) Control: 25 (7/18)	Mean (95%CI); KOA: 60.73 (58.7, 62.73) Control: 65.6 (61.66, 69.54)	KOA: ACR criteria", knee pain Control: No history of recur- rent knee pain, no episode of knee pain in the last 12 months	Quadriceps voluntary activation
Kittelson et al. 2014 [46] Cross-sectional	KOA: 17 (8/9) Control: 20 (10/10)	KOA: 63.9 (1.8) Control: 58.3 (2.5)	KOA: Waiting for knee arthro- plasty Control: No current knee pain or history of knee trauma	Quadriceps voluntary activation, corticospinal excitability
Kumar et al. 2013 [29] Cross-sectional	KOA: 16 (8/8) Control: 12 (6/6)	KOA: 65.2 (9.5) Control: 59.5 (10.4)	KOA: KL grade ≥2, ACR criteria* Control: KL grade <1. healthy	Quadriceps isometric strength
Kumar et al. 2014[30] Cross-sectional	KOA: 37 (16/21) Control: 23 (12/11)	KOA: 66.6 (8.4) Control: 62.0 (10.5)	KOA: KL grade ≥2 Control: No history of lower extremity injuries, KOOS pain 99.5 (1.8)	Quadriceps isometric strength
Levinger et al. 2016 [31] Cross-sectional	KOA: 19 (9/10) Control: 10 (3/7)	KOA: 66.1 (1.2) Control: 67.4 (2.4)	KOA: Waiting for knee replace- ment surgery Control: Asymptomatic with no signs of KOA or history of knee pain or injury	Quadriceps isometric strength
Liikavainio et al. 2008 [3] Cross-sectional	KOA: 54 (54/0) Control: 53 (53/0)	KOA: 59.0 (5.3) Control: 59.2 (4.7)	KOA: KL grade 1 to 4, ACR crite- ria* Control: KL grade 0, no KOA according to ACR criteria*	Quadriceps and hamstring iso- metric strength, Muscle thick- ness and area (cm ²) (RF, VL, VI)
Pap et al. 2004 [9] Cross-sectional	KOA: 68 (27/41) Control: 85 (30/55)	KOA: 56.7 (9.5) Control: 58.1 (8.7)	KOA: ACR criteria* Control: No signs of clinical KOA, no history of knee trauma	Quadriceps voluntary activation
Patsika et al. 2014 [32] Cross-sectional	KOA: 12 (0/12) Control: 11 (0/11)	KOA: 60.33 (6.66) Control: 56.54 (5.46)	KOA: KL grade 2 or 3 Control: No pain or injury to the knee or hin	Quadriceps and hamstring con- centric and eccentric strength
Petrella et al. 2017 [33] Cross-sectional	KOA: 20 (20/0) Control: 20 (20/0)	KOA: 52.35 (5.00) Control: 51.40 (8.07)	KOA: KL grade 1 or 2, ACR crite- ria*	Quadriceps isometric, concentric and eccentric strength

(continued)

B. Tayfur, C. Charuphongsa, D. Morrissey et al.

Table 2 (Continued)

Author/year (study design)	Sample size (men/women)	Age (mean [SD] or median [range])	Structural severity and symptoms	Outcome measures
Petterson et al. 2007 [13] Cross-sectional	KOA: 44 (19/25) Control: 44 (19/25)	KOA: 62.3 (6.8) Control: 61.3 (7.7)	Control: KL grade 0, no signs or symptoms of KOA, no his- tory of knee pain or trauma to lower limbs KOA: Waiting for knee arthro- plasty Control: Healthy with no his- tory of diagnosed knee abnormality	Quadriceps voluntary activation and isometric strength
Ramsey et al. 2007 [34] Intervention	KOA: 15 (9/6) Control: 15 (9/6)	KOA Men: 51.3 (6.4) KOA Women: 49.3 (7.9) Control Men: 52.0 (5.2) Control Women: 47.5 (5.6)	KOA: KL grade ≥2, ACR criteria* Control: No knee pain or radiographic KOA	Quadriceps voluntary activation and isometric strength
Ruhdorfer et al. 2020 [27] Prospective cohort	KOA: 81 (44/37) Control: 337 (180/157)	KOA Men: 61.8 (7.3) KOA Women: 65.5 (7.8) Control Men: 62.4 (9.4) Control Women: 62.9 (8.7)	KOA: KL grade ≥2, no pain at baseline, 1- and 2-year follow- ups and pain at 3- and 4-year follow-ups Control: KL grade <2, no pain at baseline and 1,2,3,4-year follow-ups	Quadriceps and hamstring iso- metric strength
Rutherford et al. 2011 [35] Cross-sectional	KOA: 15 (10/5) Control: 16 (8/8)	KOA: 61 (9) Control: 56 (6)	KOA: Waiting for knee arthro- plasty Control: Asymptomatic	Quadriceps, hamstring and gas- trocnemius isometric strength
Rutherford et al. 2013 [36] Cross-sectional Sanchez-Ramirez et al. 2016 [37] Cross-sectional	KOA: 11 (6/5) Control: 35 (16/19) Early KOA: 14 (0/14) Established KOA: 19 (0/19) Control: 14 (0/14)	KOA: 59 (8) Control: 56 (6) Early KOA: 70.4 (4.6) Established KOA: 68.37 (6.7) Control: 68.0 (3.9)	KOA: ACR criteria*, KL grade 4 Control: Asymptomatic Early KOA: KL grade 0 or 1 on radiography Established KOA: KL grade ≥2, ACR criteria* Control: No history of knee symptoms, KL 0	Quadriceps, hamstring and gas- trocnemius isometric strength Quadriceps and hamstring iso- metric and concentric strength
Schmitt and Rudolph 2007 [38] Cross-sectional	KOA: 28 (14/14) Control: 26 (13/13)	KOA: 60.4 (39–78) Control: 58.5 (38–76)	KOA: KL grade ≥2 Control: No history of knee pain or lower limb injury, KL 0 or 1	Quadriceps isometric strength
Serrao et al. 2015 [39] Cross-sectional	KOA: 22 (22/0) Control: 18 (18/0)	KOA: 52 (8.1) Control: 51.86 (6.47)	KOA: ACR criteria [*] , KL grade 1 or 2 Control: No history of knee pain or lower limb injury, KL grade 0	Quadriceps concentric and eccentric strength
Taniguchi et al. 2015 [11] Cross-sectional	KOA: 8 (0/8) Control: 23 (0/23)	KOA: 62.3 (6.5) Control: 60.7 (7.9)	KOA: KL grade 2 Control: No history of knee pain	Quadriceps isometric strength, muscle thickness (RF, VM, VL, VI, BF, GAST, SOL)
van Leeuwen et al. 2017 [28] Cross-sectional	KOA: 31 (17/14) Control: 29 (14/15)	KOA: 70.0 (5.8) Control: 69.1 (4.6)	KOA: KL grade ≥2, No pain/ symptoms Control: KL grade 0 or 1, No pain/symptoms	Quadriceps voluntary activation
Winters and Rudolph 2014 [40] Cross-sectional	KOA: 26 (14/12) Control: 23 (12/11)	KOA: 65.3 (7.8) Control: 63.09 (7.66)	KOA: KL grade ≥2, or KL grade 1 and knee pain Control: Healthy	Quadriceps rate of torque development

ACR, American College of Rheumatology; BF, biceps femoris; GAST, gastrocnemius; KL, Kellgren-Lawrence; KOA, knee osteoarthritis; KOOS, Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score; RF, rectus femoris; SOL, soleus; VI, vastus intermedius; VL, vastus lateralis; VM, vastus medialis.

* ACR criteria: KL score≥2, pain, clinical features (e.g., crepitus, morning stiffness and bony enlargement of the knee) [74,75].

cortical or spinal excitability differences between KOA and control groups (very limited evidence) but rather selective atrophy of vastus medialis (limited evidence) and vastus lateralis (strong evidence), with no changes in muscle size (thickness or area) of other muscles (limited to moderate evidence). Finally, studies showed increased quadriceps torque variability, meaning less ability to control force production, in the KOA group. KOA and control groups did not differ in quadriceps rate of torque development.

Strength is important to maintain function, including daily life activities such as walking and stair climbing, and preventing injuries (i.e., falls). People with KOA commonly report deficits in these functional tasks [48,49]. Our results indicate that people with KOA experience muscle weakness around their knee joints, which effects multiple muscles at a range of structural KOA severity and may result in a vicious cycle of increasing pain and difficulty performing activities of daily living [50]. Although most strength tests included in this study were performed using isokinetic dynamometers, a simple, clinically applicable manual strength test has been shown to predict knee cartilage loss over 3 years [51]. Therefore, clinicians can easily include quantified strength tests in their clinical examination to better inform exercise selection. Exercise has been shown to improve pain and physical function in people with KOA [5,52], even in severe cases [53]. Hence, increased muscle strength may be the mechanism explaining the positive correlation between exercise and KOA symptom relief [54]. Exercise is also safe and low cost for people with KOA [55] and can therefore be implemented in treatment because most of these people have strength deficits in peri-articular muscles as compared with age- and sex-matched controls. Although recommended, exercise is still underutilized in this group [56]. Thus, referral to exercise therapy should be encouraged.

Women are at greater risk of KOA than men and experience greater severity [12]. Previous studies reported conflicting findings of the effect of sex on the relation between muscle function and KOA. Earlier studies suggested that reduced muscle strength may be a risk

						Early KOA (KL 1-2)	E	stablished KOA (KL ≥2)	End Stage KOA (KL 4)
		Cortical	excita	bility					\leftarrow
	eural	Spinal e	excitab	ility					
	ž	Volunta	ry activ	vation				Ļ	L
		Muscle	area (cm²)		\leftrightarrow		\leftrightarrow	\leftrightarrow
	ize	Muscle	thickn	ess – rect	us femoris (cm)	\leftrightarrow		\leftarrow	\leftarrow
s	cle s	Muscle	thickn	ess – vas	tus medialis (cm)			Ψç	
nori	Mus	Muscle	thickn	ess – vas	tus lateralis (cm)	\leftrightarrow		↔	\leftrightarrow
s Fei		Muscle	thickn	ess – vas	tus intermedius (cm)	\leftarrow		\leftarrow	\leftrightarrow
icep		Isometr	c strei	ngth		\leftrightarrow		Ļ	+
uadr	£	Concen	tric str	ength (Sl	ow)	Ţ		➡	
ā	engt	Concen	tric str	ength (Fa	st)	\leftrightarrow		🕈 o	
	Sti	Eccentr	ic strei	ngth (Slov	v)	+	3	·	
		Eccentr	ic strei	ngth (Fas	t)	\leftarrow	3		
		Rate of	torque	e developi	nent			\leftrightarrow	
	iminç and ontro	Electror	necha	nical dela	у				
	ι	Torque	variab	ility				1	
	-	Cortical	excita	bility					
	leura	Spinal e	excitab	ility					
	2	Volunta	ry activ	vation					
	Θ	Muscle	area (cm²)					
	e siz	Muscle	thickn	ess – bice	eps femoris (cm)			↔ ♀	
	luscl	Muscle	thickn	ess – sen	nitendinosus (cm)				
6	2	Muscle	thickn	ess – sen	nimembranosus (cm)				
strin		Isometr	c strei	ngth		Ļ		1 I	➡
lam		Concen	tric str	ength (Sl	ow)	\longleftrightarrow	Ŷ	↔ ♀	
-	ngth	Concen	tric str	ength (Fa	st)				
	Stre	Eccentr	ic strei	ngth (Slov	v)				
		Eccentr	ic strei	ngth (Fas	t)				
		Hamstri	ng:qua	adriceps r	atio			f q	
	jo jo	Rate of	torque	e developi	nent				
	Fimin and contr	Electror	necha	nical dela	у				
		Torque	variab	ility					
Strong evidence No effect SMD					No effect SMI	D<0.2	ç	Poole	ed data from nen participants
Mod	erate evide	nce		11	Small effect size SI	MD=0.2-0.5	-	Poole	d data from
Limit	ted evidenc	e		tl	Moderate effect size	SMD=0.5-0.8	0	only me	en participants
Very	limited evi	dence						If \bigcirc or \bigcirc is n pooled data is fr	ot reported, the om both men and
No e	evidence			TT	Large effect size	SMD>0.8		women p	articipants

Fig. 2. Findings and literature gap map for quadriceps and hamstring neuromuscular outcomes ordered from central to peripheral. Data are pooled according to the structural severity as per Kellgren-Lawrence (KL) grades [15]. Colours represent the evidence level [24] and directions represent knee osteoarthritis (KOA) group data as compared with the control, with the effect size magnitude shown by the arrow thickness. SMD, standardised mean difference.

factor specifically for women [57]; however, pooling data from different studies did not identify any difference between men and women and revealed that strength deficits are KOA development risk factors for both men and women [1]. Our sensitivity analysis showed that women exhibit quadriceps strength deficits at early stages of KOA, whereas men do not. Pooled data from all KOA severities also showed similar findings, with women exhibiting these deficits to a greater extent than men as compared with their sex-matched controls. Sexspecific associations between muscle weakness and KOA progression have been previously reported, with women experiencing muscle strength deficits showing increased risk of disease progression [58]. Previous studies also reported that knee extensor and knee flexor

					Early KOA (KL 1-2)	Est	tablished KOA (KL ≥2)	End Stage KOA (KL 4)
	ы П	Cortical excita	bility					
	Veura	Spinal excitab	ility					
ius	-	Voluntary acti	vation					
nem	scle	Muscle area (cm²)					
stroc	Mus siz	Muscle thickn	ess (cm)				↔ Ç	
Ga	pu -	Rate of torque	e developn	nent				
	ontro	Electromecha	nical delay	/				
	Tir	Torque variab	ility					
	_	Cortical excita	bility					
	leura	Spinal excitab	ility				\leftrightarrow	ę
	2	Voluntary acti	vation					
sne	scle	Muscle area (cm²)					
Sole	Mus siz	Muscle thickn	ess (cm)				↔ ç	
	I	Rate of torque	e developn	nent				
	ontro	Electromecha	nical delay	/				
	μL	Torque variab	ility					
S	-	Isometric stre	ngth		Ļ		\leftrightarrow	\leftrightarrow
emiu leus	exior Jth	Concentric str	ength (Slo	w)	•		₽	
irocn d so	ntar fl strenç	Concentric str	ength (Fas	st)	_		_	
Gast an	Plan	Eccentric stre	ngth (Slow	/)	+		+	
		Eccentric stre	ngth (Fast)				
liteus	All	All outcomes						
Рор	outo							
Stror	ng evidenc	e	\leftrightarrow	No effect S	MD<0.2	Ŷ	Pooled	data from
Mode	erate evide	ence	11	Small effect size	SMD=0.2-0.5	7	Pooled	data from
Limit	ed evidend	ce	t1	Moderate effect siz	e SMD=0.5-0.8	9	only men	participants
Very	limited evi	idence				$f \circ r = 0.5 \cdot 0.6$ If $\circ r \circ r = 0.5 \cdot 0.6$ is not reported, the		
No evidence				Large effect siz			women pa	rticipants

Fig. 3. Findings and literature gap map for gastrocnemius, soleus, and popliteus neuromuscular outcomes ordered from central to peripheral. Data are pooled according to the structural severity as per Kellgren-Lawrence (KL) grades [15]. Colours represent the evidence level [24] and directions represents knee osteoarthritis (KOA) group data as compared with the control, with the effect size magnitude shown by the arrow thickness. SMD, standardised mean difference.

strength deficits predict knee replacement in the subsequent 2 years in women but not men, independent of radiographic severity [59]. Overall, these findings suggest that muscle strength may play an important role in KOA, especially for women at earlier disease stages, and therefore potentially merit particular targeting strategies.

Muscle size is an important aspect of neuromuscular function, and previous studies of people with a knee injury history showed that muscle size may explain strength deficits [60]. Therefore, changes in muscle size in people with KOA can be expected because they also present muscle strength impairments around their knee joint. However, our results showed that overall quadriceps femoris muscle size either as muscle area (cm²) or muscle thickness (cm) was no different from controls. Limited evidence showed vastus medialis atrophy in the KOA group (i.e., decreased muscle thickness as measured by ultrasonography) with a large effect size (SMD [95% CI] -0.96 [-1.80; -0.11]). Although vastus lateralis atrophy was not evident across different structural severities when all data were pooled as KOA versus controls, vastus lateralis atrophy was also seen, with a small effect size (SMD [95% CI] -0.32 [-0.58; -0.06]). This finding was in relation to the low number of studies for each structural severity. Different devices were used for measuring muscle thickness or area, mainly ultrasonography but also Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry scan and CT scan. Studies using different systems reported similar results, so the findings were not likely dependant on the measurement method. For calf and hamstring muscles, limited evidence showed no change in muscle size (measured as thickness [cm]).

The vastus medialis is seen as an important dynamic medial stabilizer of the patellofemoral joint, and its isolated atrophy is variably reported in other painful knee conditions such as patellofemoral pain syndrome [61]. The reason for muscle-specific greater atrophy in the Quadriceps

		Mean	KOA SD	Total	Mean	Control SD	Total	g Weight	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
	Early KOA	moun	00	Total	moun	00	Total	morgin	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	
	Baert [42]	1 25	04	14	1 72	0 44	14	21%	-1 09 [-1 89 -0 28]	_ _
	Liikavainio [3]	2 44	0.83	12	2.65	0.55	53	28%	-0.34 [-0.97.0.29]	
	Potrolla [33]	203 11	40.83	20	196.24	42.84	20	28%	0.16 [-0.46: 0.78]	_ _
	Sanchez-Bamirez [3	71 1 28	10.00	14	1 43	-2.04	14	23%	-0.46 [-1.21.0.29]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	1 1.20	0.2	60	1.45	0.4	101	100%	-0.39 [-0.88: 0.10]	•
	Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.12: Ch	$i^2 = 5.92$	df = 3	(n = 0.12)	$ ^{2} = 49\%$. , .	-
	Test for overall effec	t: Z = 1.56	(p = 0.12	2)	(p = 0112)	, 1070				
	Established KOA									
	Aily [25]	151.15	55.916	40	212.35	60.894	40	11%	-1.04 [-1.51; -0.57]	
_	Baert [42]	1.1	0.3	12	1.72	0.44	14	5%	-1.57 [-2.47; -0.67]	
ŧ	Berger [43]	1.47	0.43	8	1.87	0.49	8	4%	-0.82 [-1.85; 0.21]	· · · ·
ĉ	Hall [26]	0.2595	0.083	59	0.38	0.1	55	12%	-1.31 [-1.71: -0.90]	
E	Kumar [29]	22.4	9.008	16	26	11,4894	12	7%	-0.34 [-1.10: 0.41]	
ŝ	Kumar [30]	20.9	7.2	37	25.4	10.1	23	10%	-0.53 [-1.06; 0.00]	
Ĕ	Liikavainio [3]	2.1506	0.7066	34	2.65	0.55	53	12%	-0.80 [-1.25: -0.36]	
let	Buhdorfer [27]	1.3081	0.2917	81	1.4731	0.3853	337	16%	-0.45 [-0.69: -0.20]	
5	Sanchez-Bamirez [3	71 1.3	0.3	19	1.43	0.4	14	7%	-0.37 [-1.06: 0.33]	
<u>ö</u>	Schmitt [38]	7.8	2,4758	28	10.14	3.4414	26	10%	-0.77 [-1.33: -0.22]	
S	Taniquchi [11]	1.6	0.38	8	21	0.6	23	6%	-0.88 [-1.72:-0.04]	
<u>e</u>	Subtotal (95% CI)	110	0.00	342		0.0	605	100%	-0.79 [-1.02; -0.55]	•
uadri	Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	= 0.07; Ch t: Z = 6.50	i ² = 20.82 (p < 0.00	2, df = 0001)	10 (p = 0.0	02); l ² = 52	2%			
a	End Stage KOA									
	Bade [41]	13	0.5	24	21	0.5	17	16%	-1 57 [-2 29: -0 85]	
	Levinger [31]	5	1 7436	19	72	2 846	10	13%	-0.98 [-1.80: -0.17]	_ _
	Liikavainio [3]	1.55	0.68	8	2.65	0.55	53	13%	-1.92 [-2.74: -1.09]	_ _
	Petterson [13]	21 7909	7 6301	44	31 2545	8 1844	44	26%	-1 19 [-1 64: -0 73]	
	Butherford [35]	1	0.3	15	1 4	0.4	16	15%	-1 10 [-1 86: -0.33]	
	Rutherford [36]	1 24	0.51	11	1 48	0 44	35	17%	-0.52 [-1.20: 0.17]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	1.21	0.01	121	1.10	0.11	175	100%	-1.19 [-1.55; -0.83]	•
	Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.07; Ch	$i^2 = 8.07$,	df = 5	(p = 0.15)	; l² = 38%				
		ι. Z = 0.54	(p < 0.00	JUUT)						
	Established KOA	72 5	28 3975	102	93	2 4226	25	26%	-0.80 [-1.240.35]	
-	Pan [9]	70.8	16	68	80.3	2.4220	85	207%	-1.51 [-1.87: -1.15]	
ē	Rameov [34]	0.037	0.052	15	0.033	aan n	15	27/0	0.07 [-0.65: 0.78]	
/at	van Leeuwen [28]	75.97	14 94	31	81.86	10 71	29	25%	-0.44 [-0.96: 0.07]	
Ğ	Subtotal (95% CI)	10.01	14.54	217	01.00	10.71	154	100%	-0.71 [-1.36; -0.07]	◆
ıtary a	Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	= 0.36; Ch t: Z = 2.17	i ² = 20.97 (p = 0.03	7, df = 3)	3 (p = 0.00	001); l² = 8	86%			
<u>l</u>	End Stage KOA									
\$	Kittelson [46]	0.83	0 1649	17	0 92	0 0894	20	29%	-0.68 [-1.350.01]	_ _
	Petterson [13] Subtotal (95% CI)	0.8845	0.1081	44 61	0.9141	0.0706	44 64	71% 100%	-0.32 [-0.74; 0.10] -0.42 [-0.78; -0.07]	→
	Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.79,	df = 1	(p = 0.37)	; l² = 0%				
	Test for overall effec	t: Z = 2.33	(p = 0.02	2)						
										-2 -1 0 1 2

Fig. 4. Forest plots of quadriceps isometric strength and voluntary activation. KOA, knee osteoarthritis.

vastus medialis is currently unknown, with several suggestions in circulation. One is biomechanical factors such as varus or valgus malalignment affecting patellar movements in KOA [62]. Although the cause-effect direction is unknown, this change in patella mechanics may be associated with an imbalance of the vastus medialis and vastus lateralis [61]. Biomechanical measurements were not the focus in our study; therefore, we can only speculate about their effects on the outcomes we found. Future studies may investigate this specific vastus lateralis and greater vastus medialis atrophy and its relation to patellar movement and knee biomechanics. Another explanation could be reflex inhibition of vastus medialis due to pain, which was an outcome in our study, but no studies could be identified for the quadriceps femoris muscle. The vastus medialis cross-sectional area was also found associated with pain and protective of knee cartilage in the subsequent 2 years in people with KOA [63]. However, the findings of vastus medialis atrophy in our study was based on limited evidence; therefore, future studies are needed to substantiate these findings and hypotheses. Also, we did not include muscle quality measurements (i.e., intermuscular fat percentage) in our search strategy and therefore no results. Although muscle area is not different, fat content and therefore quality of the muscles might be affected in people with KOA [2]. Hence, future research in this area should consider including muscle quality measurements as well as muscle size measurements such as muscle thickness or area.

Understanding the mechanisms behind muscle weakness is important, so we explored possible alterations of cortical and spinal pathways. Mainly, voluntary activation deficits in quadriceps were present in established and end stage KOA, but we found no studies for early KOA or other muscles. Voluntary activation deficits, also known as arthrogenic muscle inhibition, are an inability to fully activate muscles, therefore limiting force production [64]. Our findings indicate these deficits contribute to the quadriceps-femoris musclestrength deficits we identified in people with KOA. Different methodologies and variability in applied stimuli are a challenge when pooling data from different studies and understanding voluntary activation levels. The studies we included used 2 different calculation methods: twitch interpolation [9,28,45,46] or central activation ratio [13,34]. Of note, when checking for the effects of measurement method, we found that studies using a central activation ratio tended to report higher values for the KOA than control group and showed no difference between groups in pooled SMD (-0.22 [-0.58; 0.14]. Conversely, the twitch interpolation method conferred a large effect size toward lower voluntary activation levels in the KOA group (SMD [95% CI] -0.88 [-1.40; -0.37]). Therefore, the findings could be technique-dependant, and future research should aim to understand these differences between the 2 approaches.

Notably, sensitivity analysis showed that women present quadriceps voluntary activation deficits at end stage KOA, whereas men do

Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine 66 (2023) 101662

			KOA			Control			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
-	Early KOA	Mean	50	Total	Mean	50	Total	weight	IV, Random, 95% (1 IV, Random, 95% CI
	Early KOA	0.6215	0 0000	26	0.79	0.01	14	200/	0.65 [1.20, 0.01]	
	Baert [42]	1.01	0.2293	10	1.25	0.21	14 52	32%	-0.65 [-1.32; 0.01]	
	Sanchez-Bamirez [37]	0.6455	0.54	33	0.76	0.20	14	33%	-0.12 [-0.74, 0.51]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	0.0455	0.1509	71	0.70	0.1	81	100%	-0.52 [-0.94; -0.10]	•
ength	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z	.03; Chi² = . = 2.42 (p	= 2.54, df = 0.02)	= 2 (p	= 0.28);	l ² = 21%				
str	Established KOA									
<u>io</u>	Liikavainio [3]	1.1103	0.3754	34	1.25	0.28	53	21%	-0.43 [-0.87; 0.00]	
et	Ruhdorfer [27]	0.5549	0.1489	81	0.6135	0.1815	337	69%	-0.33 [-0.58; -0.09]	-
ŭ	Sanchez-Ramirez [37] Subtotal (95% CI)	0.6455	0.1509	33 148	0.76	0.1	14 404	10% 100%	-0.82 [-1.46; -0.17] -0.40 [-0.60; -0.20]	•
ring is	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z	.00; Chi² = = 3.89 (p	= 1.89, df < 0.0001	= 2 (p)	= 0.39);	l ² = 0%				
nsti	End Stage KOA									
lan	Liikavainio [3]	0.82	0.42	8	1.25	0.28	53	32%	-1 41 [-2 20: -0.63]	_
–	Rutherford [35]	0.5	0.2	15	0.7	0.2	16	33%	-0.97 [-1.72; -0.22]	
	Rutherford [36]	0.59	0.27	11	0.64	0.26	35	35%	-0.19 [-0.87; 0.49]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	00.063		34	0.001	12 050/	104	100%	-0.84 [-1.55; -0.12]	
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.28 (p	= 0.02)	= 2 (p	= 0.06);	12 = 00%				
	Early KOA									_
s	Goncalves [8] Subtotal (95% CI)	58.67	5.4	22 22	62.98	6.7	15 15	100% 100 %	-0.71 [-1.39; -0.03] -0.71 [-1.39; -0.03]	-
d solei ngth	Heterogeneity: Not appl Test for overall effect: Z	icable = 2.05 (p	= 0.04)							
an	Established KOA									
nius ric st	Goncalves [8] Subtotal (95% CI)	64.52	7.2	15 15	62.98	6.7	15 15	100% 100%	0.22 [-0.50; 0.93] 0.22 [-0.50; 0.93]	
rocner somet	Heterogeneity: Not appl Test for overall effect: Z	icable = 0.59 (p	= 0.56)							
ast	End Stage KOA									
G							16	100/	-1 30 [-2 08: -0 51]	
	Rutherford [35]	0.7	0.3	15	1.1	0.3	10	40 /0	-1.00 -2.00, -0.01	
	Rutherford [35] Rutherford [36] Subtotal (95% CI)	0.7 0.97	0.3 0.34	15 11 26	1.08	0.35	35 51	52% 100%	-0.31 [-0.99; 0.37] -0.78 [-1.75; 0.18]	
	Rutherford [35] Rutherford [36] Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z	0.7 0.97 .35; Chi² = . = 1.59 (p	0.3 0.34 = 3.47, df = 0.11)	15 11 26 = 1 (p	1.1 1.08 = 0.06);	0.3 0.35 I ² = 71%	35 51	52% 100%	-0.31 [-0.99; 0.37] -0.78 [-1.75; 0.18]	-
	Rutherford [35] Rutherford [36] Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: Z	0.7 0.97 .35; Chi² = . = 1.59 (p	0.3 0.34 = 3.47, df = 0.11)	15 11 26 = 1 (p	1.1 1.08 = 0.06);	0.3 0.35 I ² = 71%	35 51	52% 100%	-0.31 [-0.99; 0.37] -0.78 [-1.75; 0.18]	

Fig. 5. Forest plots of hamstring and gastrocnemius-soleus isometric strength. KOA, knee osteoarthritis.

not, albeit with very limited evidence. This finding further suggests that women may be experiencing neuromuscular deficits to a greater degree than men, with involvement of corticospinal pathways; however, repeat studies are needed to increase the evidence level. Despite a marked evidence gap for cortical and spinal excitability outcomes, the very limited evidence available showed no change in quadriceps cortical excitability or soleus spinal reflexes. Because of methodological variation and dependency on high-cost devices, it is not easy to measure these outcomes in clinical practice. In the research context, more consistent and repeatable methodologies should be used for comparisons across studies. Recently, corticospinal adaptations have been found correlated with muscle strength and self-reported knee function satisfaction after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction [65]. Also, spinal reflexes may increase as a compensatory mechanism to maintain muscle function when needed in sudden movements, such as protection against falls in people with KOA [10]. Hence, future high-quality studies investigating cortical and spinal excitability of peri-articular muscles are needed to confirm these findings.

In addition to alterations in strength, we identified alterations in other torque-related outcomes. Overall, we found increased quadriceps torque variability and no change in quadriceps femoris rate of torque development. However, there was only very limited evidence to suggest these outcomes. No studies were found for electromechanical delay, which is an important indicator of the speed of force generation and transmission [66,67]. We found no studies that measured these torque-related outcomes in other muscles.

Torque variability of the quadriceps femoris was increased in people with KOA, with very limited evidence, which suggests that these people may have impairments in their ability to control the muscle force they are producing. Precise control of movement is important for knee function, and impairments may alter knee joint loading, suggested to be a contributing factor for cartilage degeneration [68]. Previous studies showed that a training protocol including controlled muscle contractions with low load may improve muscle force control in older adults [69]. Future studies may include torque variability measurements of the muscles controlling the knee joint in people with KOA to understand the changes better and also test its clinical relevance.

Rate of torgue development is an important part of functionality because it represents how fast a person can generate muscle force [70]. Previous studies of knee-injured populations showed that even when muscle strength recovers, rate of torque development may still be reduced [71]. Importantly, rapid force production may be more relevant to daily life activities than maximum strength because most of these activities require a quick muscle response [70]. It is even more important for older adults because it is correlated with balance [72] and fall history [73]. We found no change in rate of torque development; however, this observation was based on very limited evidence, so future studies are needed on rate of torque development in people with KOA. Different methodological approaches to the calculation of rate of torque development have been reported, with different time points (early vs late) and processing methods (MVIC normalized vs not) used. Standardization of methods and reporting should inform synthesis of the changes observed in people with KOA.

There are several common limitations in the literature reviewed in our study. First, a high level of selection bias may be present in the included studies because the studies did not report participant selection procedures clearly (Table 1). Included participants are highly likely to have more symptoms; therefore, the results may be inflated

	M	KOA) Fotal Mea	Control	Weight	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
	Early KOA women				weight	IV, Handolli, 3578 Of	
	Baert [42] 1 Subtotal (95% CI)	.25 0.4	14 1.72 14	2 0.44 14 14	100% 100%	-1.09 [-1.89; -0.28] -1.09 [-1.89; -0.28]	-
	Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect	pplicable t: Z = 2.65 (p	= 0.008)				
	Early KOA men						
	Liikavainio [3] 2 Petrella [33] 203 Subtotal (95% CI)	2.44 0.83 3.11 40.83	12 2.65 20 196.24 32	0.55 53 42.84 20 73	49% 51% 100%	-0.34 [-0.97; 0.29] 0.16 [-0.46; 0.78] -0.09 [-0.58; 0.40]	- -
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	= 0.02; Chi² = t: Z = 0.35 (p	= 1.24, df = = 0.73)	1 (p = 0.27); l ²	2 = 19%		
	Established KOA w	omen					
strength	Baert [42] Ruhdorfer [27] 1 Taniguchi [11] Subtotal (95% CI)	1.1 0.3 .08 0.2099 1.6 0.38	12 1.72 37 1.19 8 2.1 57	2 0.44 14 0 0.1903 157 0.6 23 194	24% 49% 26% 100%	-1.57 [-2.47; -0.67] -0.56 [-0.93; -0.20] -0.88 [-1.72; -0.04] -0.89 [-1.46; -0.32]	
metric	Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	= 0.14; Chi² = t: Z = 3.06 (p	= 4.27, df = = 0.002)	2 (p = 0.12); l4	2 = 53%		
riceps iso	Established KOA m Liikavainio [3] 2.1 Ruhdorfer [27] Subtotal (95% CI)	ien 506 0.7066 1.5 0.1974	34 2.65 44 1.72 78	0.55 53 0.3399 180 233	36% 64% 100%	-0.80 [-1.25; -0.36] -0.69 [-1.03; -0.36] -0.73 [-1.00: -0.46]	- -
Quad	Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	= 0.00; Chi² = t: Z = 5.34 (p	= 0.16, df = < 0.00001)	1 (p = 0.69); l ²	$2^{2} = 0\%$		•
	End Stage KOA wo	men					_
	Petterson [13] 17 Subtotal (95% CI)	7.49 5.14	25 27.8 25	6.7 25 25	100% 100%	-1.70 [-2.35; -1.05] -1.70 [-2.35; -1.05]	-
	Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effec	pplicable t: Z = 5.09 (p	< 0.00001)				
	End Stage KOA me	n					
	Liikavainio [3] 1 Petterson [13] 27 Subtotal (95% CI)	.55 0.68 7.45 6.66	8 2.65 19 35.8 27	0.55 53 7.89 19 72	46% 54% 100%	-1.92 [-2.74; -1.09] -1.12 [-1.81; -0.43] -1.48 [-2.26; -0.71]	
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	= 0.17; Chi² = t: Z = 3.74 (p	= 2.11, df = = 0.0002)	1 (p = 0.15); l ^a	2 = 53%		
	End Stage KOA wo	men					_
ation	Petterson [13] 0 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.85 0.12	25 0.94 25	0.05 25 25	100% 100%	-0.96 [-1.55; -0.38] -0.96 [-1.55; -0.38]	-
active	Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effec	pplicable t: Z = 3.21 (p	= 0.001)				
tary	End Stage KOA me	n					_
volunt	Petterson [13] 0 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.93 0.07	19 0.88 19	8 0.08 19 19	100% 100%	0.65 [0.00; 1.31] 0.65 [0.00; 1.31]	-
-	Test for overall effec	t: Z = 1.95 (p	= 0.05)				
						_	-2 -1 0 1 2 Lower in KOA Higher in KOA

Fig. 6. Sensitivity analysis based on sex for quadriceps isometric strength and voluntary activation. KOA, knee osteoarthritis.

toward more alterations in the KOA than control group. However, because the target population is mainly symptomatic people, they may better represent the people who need optimized rehabilitation programmes. Future studies should better report the participant selection process. Second, we did not perform a separate analysis for the excluded studies, which were low quality according to our quality assessment. However, we know that low-quality studies may cause over- or underestimation of effect sizes and may distort results, thus leading to incorrect conclusions [20,21]. Hence, we believe that excluding low-quality studies actually improved the confidence level in our result (i.e., making suggestions with the evidence level or showing an evidence gap).

Structural severity and pain definitions differed greatly across studies, thus causing heterogeneity when grouping people. We pooled our data according to structural severity (KL grades); however, most of the studies defined KOA severities and control groups somewhat differently (Table 2). Therefore, it should be noted that these differences in definitions caused variability in the pooled data, thus leading to some uncertainty in the boundaries between the classifications of KOA severity. Pain or patellofemoral damage were not in the inclusion criteria for this review, so we performed a posthoc sensitivity analysis to determine whether it had an effect on the outcome and could not identify any effects based on available evidence. However, future studies should include pain measurements because it may be a confounding factor in the measurement of muscle strength.

Although it was not possible to analyse the effect of age due to similar age groups across the included studies, one study investigating the effect of age [47] showed that people with KOA had similar changes (i.e., lower strength) as ageing. Therefore, future studies may consider including age as a confounding factor for neuromuscular function measurements.

Conclusions

Our study identified major neuromuscular alterations around the knee joint in people with KOA, including strength, muscle size, neural changes and other torque-related outcomes (i.e., rate of torque development, torque variability), which facilitates the clinical recognition of these changes. We also provide an important evidence gap map, which will be a useful guide for future studies. Overall, we found deficits in maximum force capacity of muscles as well as force control. Most studies focused on the quadriceps femoris, with more evidence gaps remaining for other muscles (i.e., hamstring, gastrocnemii and soleus). Changes in muscle size were evidenced for only the vastus medialis and lateralis, with muscle size of the other quadriceps femoris heads, hamstrings or calf muscles remaining unaffected. Neural changes were poorly investigated, leaving a huge evidence gap and opportunity for future studies.

Enhancing functional outcome in people with KOA is important, so interventions that assess neuromuscular deficits in clinical examination and implement targeted individualised exercise programmes could be developed and tested for people with KOA. Implementing exercise with carefully chosen features (i.e., not only targeting improved maximum strength but also force control ability or rate of force development) may provide better outcomes, but further laboratory and interventional studies are needed to strengthen the evidence and inform robust clinical recommendations. Repeated measures of neuromuscular function would be a potential tool to understand interventions. The subsequent effects on outcomes for people with KOA would be the key impact markers that ultimately determine the value of neuromuscular measures in people with KOA.

Funding

Postgraduate studies of Ms Beyza Tayfur were sponsored by the Turkish Ministry of National Education. The sponsors had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Availability of data and material

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author (BT).

Authors' contributions

Conception and design of the study: BT, DM and SCM; screening of the articles, data extraction, methodological quality ratings and data analysis: BT and CC; first drafting of the manuscript: BT; critical revision of the manuscript: DM and SCM. BT: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis. All authors approved the version to be published.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None declared.

Supplementary materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:10.1016/j.rehab.2022.101662.

References

- Øiestad BEE, Juhl CBB, Eitzen I, Thorlund JBB. Knee extensor muscle weakness is a risk factor for development of knee osteoarthritis. A systematic review and metaanalysis. Osteoarthr Cartil 2015;23:171–7. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2014.10.008.
- [2] Conroy MB, Kwoh CK, Krishnan E, Nevitt MC, Boudreau R, Carbone LD, et al. Muscle strength, mass, and quality in older men and women with knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Care Res 2012;64:15–21. doi: 10.1002/acr.20588.
- [3] Liikavainio T, Lyytinen T, Tyrväinen E, Sipilä S, Arokoski JP. Physical function and properties of quadriceps femoris muscle in men with knee osteoarthritis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89:2185–94. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2008.04.012.

- [4] Bannuru RR, Osani MC, Vaysbrot EE, Arden NK, Bennell K, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA, et al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis. Osteoarthr Cartil 2019;27:1578–89. doi: 10.1016/j. joca.2019.06.011.
- [5] Fransen M, Mcconnell S, Harmer AR, Van Der Esch M, Simic M, Bennell KL, et al. Exercise for osteoarthritis of the knee: a Cochrane systematic review. Br J Sport Med 2015;49:1554–7. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095424.
- [6] Juhl C, Christensen R, Roos EM, Zhang W, Lund H. Impact of exercise type and dose on pain and disability in knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and metaregression analysis of randomized controlled trials. Arthritis Rheumatol 2014;66:622–36. doi: 10.1002/art.38290.
- [7] Deasy M, Leahy E, Semciw AI. Hip strength deficits in people with symptomatic knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review with meta-analysis. J Orthop Sport Phys Ther 2016;46:629–39. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2016.6618.
- [8] Gonçalves GH, Sendín FA, da Silva Serrão PRM, Selistre LFA, Petrella M, Carvalho C, et al. Ankle strength impairments associated with knee osteoarthritis. Clin Biomech 2017;46:33–9. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2017.05.002.
- [9] Pap G, Machner A, Awiszus F. Strength and voluntary activation of the quadriceps femoris muscle at different severities of osteoarthritic knee joint damage. J Orthop Res 2004;22:96–103. doi: 10.1016/S0736-0266(03)00128-1.
- [10] Alkjaer T, Raffalt PC, Dalsgaard H, Simonsen EB, Petersen NC, Bliddal H, et al. Gait variability and motor control in people with knee osteoarthritis. Gait Posture 2015;42:479–84. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.07.063.
- [11] Taniguchi M, Fukumoto Y, Kobayashi M, Kawasaki T, Maegawa S, Ibuki S, et al. Quantity and quality of the lower extremity muscles in women with knee osteoarthritis. Ultrasound Med Biol 2015;41:2567–74. doi: 10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2015.05.014.
- [12] Srikanth VK, Fryer JL, Zhai G, Winzenberg TM, Hosmer D, Jones G. A meta-analysis of sex differences prevalence, incidence and severity of osteoarthritis. Osteoarthr Cartil 2005;13:769–81. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2005.04.014.
- [13] Petterson SC, Raisis L, Bodenstab A, Snyder-Mackler L. Disease-specific gender differences among total knee arthroplasty candidates. J Bone Jt Surg 2007;89:2327– 33. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.F.01144.
- [14] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372. doi: 10.1136/BMJ.N71.
- [15] Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of osteo-arthrosis. Ann Rheum Dis 1957;16:494–502. doi: 10.1136/ard.16.4.494.
- [16] Steidle-Kloc E, Wirth W, Glass NA, Ruhdorfer A, Cotofana S, Eckstein F, et al. Is pain in one knee associated with isometric muscle strength in the contralateral limb? Data from the osteoarthritis initiative. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2015;94:792–803. doi: 10.1097/PHM.0000000000262.
- [17] Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. J Epidemiol Community Health 1998;52:377–84. doi: 10.1136/jech.52.6.377.
- [18] Munn J, Sullivan SJ, Schneiders AG. Evidence of sensorimotor deficits in functional ankle instability: a systematic review with meta-analysis. J Sci Med Sport 2010;13:2–12. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2009.03.004.
- [19] Hart HF, Culvenor AG, Collins NJ, Ackland DC, Cowan SM, Machotka Z, et al. Knee kinematics and joint moments during gait following anterior cruciate ligament econstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med 2016;50:597–612. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094797.
- [20] Zhang Z, Xu X, Ni H. Small studies may overestimate the effect sizes in critical care meta-analyses: a meta-epidemiological study. Crit Care 2013;17:R2. doi: 10.1186/cc11919.
- [21] Sterne JA, Egger M, Smith GD. Systematic reviews in health care: investigating and dealing with publication and other biases in meta-analysis. BMJ 2001;323:101-5. doi: 10.1136/bmj.323.7304.101.
- [22] Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. 2nd ed. Academic press; 2013.
- [23] Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003;327:557–60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557.
- [24] van Tulder M, Furlan A, Bombardier C, Bouter L, Editorial Board of the Cochrane Collaboration Back Review Group. Updated method guidelines for systematic reviews in the cochrane collaboration back review group. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2003;28:1290–9. doi: 10.1097/01.BRS.0000065484.95996.AF.
- [25] Aily JB, de Noronha M, de Almeida AC, Pedroso MG, Maciel JG, Mattiello-Sverzut AC, et al. Evaluation of vastus lateralis architecture and strength of knee extensors in middle-aged and older individuals with knee osteoarthritis. Clin Rheumatol 2019;38:2603–11. doi: 10.1007/s10067-019-04539-9.
- [26] Hall MC, Mockett SP, Doherty M. Relative impact of radiographic osteoarthritis and pain on quadriceps strength, proprioception, static postural sway and lower limb function. Ann Rheum Dis 2006;65:865–70. doi: 10.1136/ard.2005.043653.
- [27] Ruhdorfer A, Wirth W, Culvenor AG, Eckstein F. Reduction in thigh muscle strength occurs concurrently but does not seem to precede incident knee pain in women: data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative cohort. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2020;99:33–40. doi: 10.1097/PHM.000000000001271.
- [28] Van Leeuwen DM, Van De Bunt F, De Ruiter CJ, Van Schoor NM, Deeg DJH, Emanuel KS. Functioning without cartilage: older people with radiographic knee osteoarthritis who self-report no functional limitations do score lower on a performance battery. J Aging Phys Act 2017;25:570–5. doi: 10.1123/japa.2016-0112.
- [29] Kumar D, Manal KT, Rudolph KS. Knee joint loading during gait in healthy controls and individuals with knee osteoarthritis. Osteoarthr Cartil 2013;21:298– 305. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2012.11.008.

- [30] Kumar D, Swanik C, Reisman DS, Rudolph KS. Individuals with medial knee osteoarthritis show neuromuscular adaptation when perturbed during walking despite functional and structural impairments. J Appl Physiol 2014;116:13–23. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00244.2013.
- [31] Levinger P, Caldow MK, Bartlett JR, Peake JM, Smith C, Cameron-Smith D, et al. The level of FoxO1 and IL-15 in skeletal muscle, serum and synovial fluid in people with knee osteoarthritis: a case control study. Osteoporos Int 2016;27:2137– 43. doi: 10.1007/s00198-015-3473-7.
- [32] Patsika G, Kellis E, Kofotolis N, Salonikidis K, Amiridis IG. Synergetic and antagonist muscle strength and activity in women with knee osteoarthritis. J Geriatr Phys Ther 2014;37:17–23. doi: 10.1519/JPT.0b013e31828fccc1.
- [33] Petrella M, Gramani-Say K, Serrão PRMS, Lessi GC, Barela JA, Carvalho RP, et al. Measuring postural control during mini-squat posture in men with early knee osteoarthritis. Hum Mov Sci 2017;52:108–16. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2017.01.011.
- [34] Ramsey DK, Snyder-Mackler L, Lewek M, Newcomb W, Rudolph KS. Effect of anatomic realignment on muscle function during gait in patients with medial compartment knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Rheum 2007;57:389–97. doi: 10.1002/art.22608.
- [35] Rutherford DJ, Hubley-Kozey CL, Stanish WD, Dunbar MJ. Neuromuscular alterations exist with knee osteoarthritis presence and severity despite walking velocity similarities. Clin Biomech 2011;26:377–83. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2010.11.018.
- [36] Rutherford DJ, Hubley-Kozey CL, Stanish WD. Changes in knee joint muscle activation patterns during walking associated with increased structural severity in knee osteoarthritis. J Electromyogr Kinesiol 2013;23:704–11. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2013.01.003.
- [37] Sanchez-Ramirez DC, Malfait B, Baert I, van der Leeden M, van Dieën J, Lems WF, et al. Biomechanical and neuromuscular adaptations during the landing phase of a stepping-down task in patients with early or established knee osteoarthritis. Knee 2016;23:367–75. doi: 10.1016/j.knee.2016.02.002.
- [38] Schmitt LC, Rudolph KS. Influences on knee movement strategies during walking in persons with medial knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Care Res 2007;57:1018–26. doi: 10.1002/art.22889.
- [39] Serrão PRMS, Vasilceac FA, Gramani-Say K, Lessi GC, Oliveira AB, Reiff RBM, et al. Men with early degrees of knee osteoarthritis present functional and morphological impairments of the quadriceps femoris muscle. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2015;94:70–81. doi: 10.1097/PHM.00000000000143.
- [40] Winters JD, Rudolph KS. Quadriceps rate of force development affects gait and function in people with knee osteoarthritis. Eur J Appl Physiol 2014;114:273–84. doi: 10.1007/s00421-013-2759-8.
- [41] Bade MJ, Kohrt WM, Stevens-Lapsley JE. Outcomes before and after total knee arthroplasty compared to healthy adults. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 2010;40:559–67. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2010.3317.
- [42] Baert IAC, Jonkers I, Staes F, Luyten FP, Truijen S, Verschueren SMP. Gait characteristics and lower limb muscle strength in women with early and established knee osteoarthritis. Clin Biomech 2013;28:40–7. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2012.10.007.
- [43] Berger MJ, Chess DG, Doherty TJ. Vastus medialis motor unit properties in knee osteoarthritis. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2011;12:199. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-12-199.
- [44] Hortobágyi T, Garry J, Holbert D, Devita P. Aberrations in the control of quadriceps muscle force in patients with knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken) 2004;51:562–9. doi: 10.1002/art.20545.
- [45] Hurley MV, Scott DL, Rees J, Newham DJ. Sensorimotor changes and functional performance in patients with knee osteoarthritis. Ann Rheum Dis 1997;56:641– 8. doi: 10.1136/ard.56.11.641.
- [46] Kittelson AJ, Thomas AC, Kluger BM, Stevens-Lapsley JE. Corticospinal and intracortical excitability of the quadriceps in patients with knee osteoarthritis. Exp Brain Res 2014;232:3991–9. doi: 10.1007/s00221-014-4079-6.
- [47] Aily JB, de Noronha M, de Almeida AC, Pedroso MG, Maciel JG, Mattiello-Sverzut AC, et al. Evaluation of vastus lateralis architecture and strength of knee extensors in middle-aged and older individuals with knee osteoarthritis. Clin Rheumatol 2019;38:2603–11. doi: 10.1007/s10067-019-04539-9.
- [48] Levinger P, Menz HB, Wee E, Feller JA, Bartlett JR, Bergman NR. Physiological risk factors for falls in people with knee osteoarthritis before and early after knee replacement surgery. Knee Surgery, Sport Traumatol Arthrosc 2011;19:1082–9. doi: 10.1007/s00167-010-1325-8.
- [49] Tsonga T, Michalopoulou M, Malliou P, Godolias G, Kapetanakis S, Gkasdaris G, et al. Analyzing the history of falls in patients with severe knee osteoarthritis. CiOS Clin Orthop Surg 2015;7:449–56. doi: 10.4055/cios.2015.7.4.449.
- [50] Luc-Harkey BA, Safran-Norton CE, Mandl LA, Katz JN, Losina E. Associations among knee muscle strength, structural damage, and pain and mobility in individuals with osteoarthritis and symptomatic meniscal tear. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2018;19:258. doi: 10.1186/s12891-018-2182-8.
- [51] Chin C, Sayre EC, Guermazi A, Nicolaou S, Esdaile JM, Kopec J, et al. Quadriceps weakness and risk of knee cartilage loss seen on magnetic resonance imaging in a population-based cohort with knee pain. J Rheumatol 2019;46:198–203. doi: 10.3899/jrheum.170875.
- [52] Li Y, Su Y, Chen S, Zhang Y, Zhang Z, Liu C, et al. The effects of resistance exercise in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Rehabil 2016;30:947–59. doi: 10.1177/0269215515610039.

- [53] Ageberg E, Nilsdotter A, Kosek E, Roos EM. Effects of neuromuscular training (NEMEX-TJR) on patient-reported outcomes and physical function in severe primary hip or knee osteoarthritis: a controlled before-and-after study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2013;14. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-14-232.
- [54] Runhaar J, Luijsterburg P, Dekker J, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA. Identifying potential working mechanisms behind the positive effects of exercise therapy on pain and function in osteoarthritis; a systematic review. Osteoarthr Cartil 2015;23:1071– 82. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2014.12.027.
- [55] Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen M, Arendt-Nielsen L, Rasmussen S, Simonsen O, et al. Cost-effectiveness of 12 weeks of supervised treatment compared to written advice in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a secondary analysis of the 2-year outcome from a randomized trial. Osteoarthr Cartil 2020;28:907–16. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2020.03.009.
- [56] Hagen KB, Smedslund G, Østerås N, Jamtvedt G. Quality of community-based osteoarthritis care: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arthritis Care Res 2016;68:1443–52. doi: 10.1002/acr.22891.
- [57] Slemenda C, Heilman D, Brandt K, Katz B, Mazzuca S, Braunstein E, et al. Reduced quadriceps strength relative to body weight: a risk factor for knee osteoarthritis in women? Arthritis Rheum 1998;41.
- [58] Culvenor AG, Ruhdorfer A, Juhl C, Eckstein F, Elin Øiestad B. Knee extensor strength and risk of structural, symptomatic, and functional decline in knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arthritis Care Res 2017;69:649–58. doi: 10.1002/acr.23005.
- [59] Culvenor AG, Wirth W, Ruhdorfer A, Eckstein F. Thigh muscle strength predicts knee replacement risk independent of radiographic disease and pain in women: data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Arthritis Rheumatol 2016;68:1145–55. doi: 10.1002/art.39540.
- [60] Thomas AC, Wojtys EM, Brandon C, Palmieri-Smith RM. Muscle atrophy contributes to quadriceps weakness after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. J Sci Med Sport 2016;19:7–11. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2014.12.009.
- [61] Pattyn E, Verdonk P, Steyaert A, Vanden Bossche L, Van den Broecke W, Thijs Y, et al. Vastus medialis obliquus atrophy: does it exist in patellofemoral pain syndrome? Am J Sports Med 2011;39:1450–5. doi: 10.1177/0363546511401183.
- [62] McWalter EJ, Cibere J, MacIntyre NJ, Nicolaou S, Schulzer M, Wilson DR. Relationship between varus-valgus alignment and patellar kinematics in individuals with knee osteoarthritis. J Bone Jt Surgery-American Vol 2007;89:2723–31. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.F.01016.
- [63] Wang Y, Wluka AE, Berry PA, Siew T, Teichtahl AJ, Urquhart DM, et al. Increase in vastus medialis cross-sectional area is associated with reduced pain, cartilage loss, and joint replacement risk in knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Rheum 2012;64:3917–25. doi: 10.1002/art.34681.
- [64] Hopkins JT, Ingersoll CD. Arthrogenic muscle inhibition: a limiting factor in joint rehabilitation. J Sport Rehabil 2000;9:135–59. doi: 10.1123/jsr.9.2.135.
- [65] Bodkin SG, Norte GE, Hart JM. Corticospinal excitability can discriminate quadriceps strength indicative of knee function after ACL-reconstruction. Scand J Med Sci Sport 2019;29:716–24. doi: 10.1111/sms.13394.
- [66] Andersen LL, Aagaard P. Influence of maximal muscle strength and intrinsic muscle contractile properties on contractile rate of force development. Eur J Appl Physiol 2006;96:46–52. doi: 10.1007/s00421-005-0070-z.
- [67] Kaneko F, Onari K, Kawaguchi K, Tsukisaka K, Roy SH. Electromechanical delay after ACL reconstruction: an innovative method for investigating central and peripheral contributions. J Orthop Sport Phys Ther 2002;32:158–65. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2002.32.4.158.
- [68] Andriacchi TP, Favre J. The nature of in vivo mechanical signals that influence cartilage health and progression to knee osteoarthritis. Curr Rheumatol Rep 2014;16:463. doi: 10.1007/s11926-014-0463-2.
- [69] Kobayashi H, Koyama Y, Enoka RM, Suzuki S. A unique form of light-load training improves steadiness and performance on some functional tasks in older adults. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2014;24:98–110. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01460.x.
- [70] Aagaard P, Simonsen EB, Andersen JL, Magnusson P, Dyhre-Poulsen P. Increased rate of force development and neural drive of human skeletal muscle following resistance training. J Appl Physiol 2002;93:1318–26. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00283.2002.
- [71] Angelozzi M, Madama M, Corsica C, Calvisi V, Properzi G, McCaw ST, et al. Rate of force development as an adjunctive outcome measure for return-to-sport decisions after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. J Orthop Sport Phys Ther 2012;42:772–80. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2012.3780.
- [72] Izquierdo M, Aguado X, Gonzalez R, López JL, Häkkinen K. Maximal and explosive force production capacity and balance performance in men of different ages. Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol 1999;79:260–7. doi: 10.1007/s004210050504.
- [73] Bento PCB, Pereira G, Ugrinowitsch C, Rodacki ALF. Peak torque and rate of torque development in elderly with and without fall history. Clin Biomech 2010;25:450– 4. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2010.02.002.
- [74] Peat G, Thomas E, Duncan R, Wood L, Hay E, Croft P. Clinical classification criteria for knee osteoarthritis: performance in the general population and primary care. Ann Rheum Dis 2006;65:1363–7. doi: 10.1136/ard.2006.051482.
- [75] Altman R, Asch E, Bloch D, Bole G, Borenstein D, Brandt K, et al. Development of criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis: classification of osteoarthritis of the knee. Arthritis Rheum 1986;29:1039–49. doi: 10.1002/ art.1780290816.