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Learning Objectives

• By the end of this session, the learner will be able to:
  • Choose clinically-relevant tests and measures to enhance clinical decision-making when treating individuals with PFP

Diagnosis of Patellofemoral Pain

• Challenging
  • No gold standard
  • Diagnostic tests – poor accuracy
  • Clusters of tests – no improvement to accuracy
    • Cook 2012, Nunes 2013
  • Diagnosis of exclusion
    • First – rule out all other possible causes of anterior knee pain
      • Cook 2012, Witvrouw 2014, Crossley 2016

Differential Diagnosis: Anterior Knee Pain

• Medical screening: Appropriate for physical therapy?
  • Tumors, fractures, septic arthritis, slipped capital femoral epiphysis, etc.
  • Red flags – Review of Systems
    • OSPRO-ROS
  • Fractures – Ottawa Knee Rule or Pittsburgh Knee Decision Rule
  • Risk factors
  • Key red flags
    • Non-mechanical pain, insidious onset, no improvement in 4 weeks
      • Childs 2008, George 2015, Konan 2013

Differential Diagnosis

• Other musculoskeletal conditions
  • Lumbar spine
  • Hip
  • Knee – meniscus, ligaments, cartilage
  • Patellar or tibial apophysitis
  • Patellar tendinopathy
• Patellar subluxation or dislocation
• Psychosocial issues – yellow flags
  • Noehren 2016

**Symptoms**
• Retropatellar or peripatellar pain
  • Papadopoulos 2015, Crossley 2016
• Functional tasks loading PFJ with flexed knee
  • Squatting
  • Stair ascent or descent
  • Running
  • Sitting with flexed knees
    • Collins 2016

**Provocative Diagnostic Tests**
• Squatting – most accurate
  • LR+ = 1.8, LR- = 0.20
• Stair Climbing
  • LR+ = 1.3-1.7, LR- = 0.1-0.6
• Eccentric Step-down Test
  • LR+ = 2.3, LR- = 0.7
    • Cook 2012, Nunes 2013, Papadopoulos 2015

**Non-provocative Diagnostic Tests**
• Patellar Tilt Test
  • LR+ = 5.4, LR- = 0.6
• Passive Gliding Patella
  • Superior/inferior
    • LR+ = 1.4, LR- = 0.7
  • Medial/lateral
    • LR+ = 1.8, LR- = 0.7
• Lateral Pull (Active Instability Test)
  • LR+ = 249 (?), LR- = 0.8
    • Cook 2012, Nunes 2013, Papadopoulos 2015

**Summary: Diagnosis of Patellofemoral Pain**
• Retropatellar or peripatellar pain
• Rule out other possible causes of anterior knee pain
• Reproduction of anterior knee pain with activities loading the PF joint in a flexed-knee position
  • Squatting, stair ascent/descent, prolonged sitting with flexed knees, etc.
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Proposed Classification System for the Treatment of Individuals with Patellofemoral Pain

A. Overuse/Overload without other Impairment
   • Loss of tissue homeostasis (Post & Dye, 2017)
   • Moderate relationship between self-reported pain and increased patellofemoral joint metabolic activity (Draper et al, 2012)
   • Significant relationship between pain intensity and physical activity level (Briani et al, 2017)
   • Foot kinematics and hip strength are not predictors of injury for individuals who develop patellofemoral pain following a “start-to-run” program (Thijs et al, 2008; Thijs et al, 2011)
   • Summary Points
     – Onset from rapid increase in patellofemoral joint loading without adequate time for tissue recovery
     – Subgroups may not necessarily exhibit other impairments like impaired muscle performance, muscle coordination or mobility
     – Supports the importance of patient education for activity modification (Barton et al, 2015)

B. Muscle Performance Deficits
   • Subgroup of individuals with patellofemoral pain exhibit hip and knee weakness that respond favorably to strengthening exercises (Bolgla et al, 2016)
   • Measurement considerations when assessing hip and knee muscle strength
     – Hand-held dynamometry with stabilization straps
- Use of the “make” test
- 3 trial with coefficient of variation less than 10%
- Data expressed as a percent of body mass
- Guidance for identifying muscle weakness (expressed as percent body mass) based on responders from a large-scale randomized controlled trial comparing outcomes for a hip/core- or quadriceps-based rehabilitation program (Ferber et al, 2015; Bolgla et al, 2016)
  - Hip abductors: 38.8% (males) and 32.2% (females)
  - Hip extensors: 27.4% (males) and 22.2% (females)
  - Hip external rotators: 13.0% (males) and 12.0% (females)
  - Knee extensors: 44.9% (males) and 37.4% (females)
- Summary Points
  - Subgroup of individuals with patellofemoral pain with hip and/or knee weakness
  - Hip weakness most likely a result, not a cause, of patellofemoral pain onset (Rathleff et al, 2014; Herbst et al, 2015)
  - Need for ongoing works to identify threshold values to identify hip and knee weakness
  - Identifying hip and knee weakness values will assist in the development and implementation of individually-tailored interventions

C. Muscle Coordination Deficits
- Subgroup of individuals without evident hip and/or knee weakness
- Based on concept of an increased dynamic Q-angle during dynamic tasks (Powers, 2003)
  - Contralateral pelvic drop
  - Hip adduction
  - Hip internal rotation
  - Knee abduction
- Limitations of measuring the frontal plane projection angle during a single-leg squat to identify faulty mechanics (Räisänen et al, 2018)
- Support for the use of the dynamic valgus index that incorporates both the hip and knee frontal plane projection angles (Scholtes & Salsich, 2017)
- Use of mobile devices and apps to quantify the dynamic valgus index (unpublished data from Bolgla et al, 2018)
- Summary Points
  - Commercially-available video cameras can be used to identify patients who exhibit altered hip and/or knee mechanics during a dynamic task (Scholtes & Salsich, 2017; Gwynne & Curran, 2018)
- Dynamic valgus index may provide a more comprehensive assessment of hip and knee kinematics during dynamic tasks
- Evidence supports the ability to improve hip and/or knee kinematics with movement retraining (*Willy et al., 2011; Leibbrandt & Louw, 2018; Salsich et al., 2018*)

D. Mobility Deficits

- **Hypermobility (foot pronation)**
  - Foot Posture Index: score ≥ 6.3 points (*Selfe et al., 2016*)
  - Midfoot Mobility: > 11.25-mm difference in midfoot width from non-weight bearing to weight bearing (*Mills et al., 2012*)
- **Hypomobility (Piva et al., 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muscle Group</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamstring</td>
<td>Straight Leg Raise</td>
<td>Goniometer</td>
<td>79.1° ± 11.5°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadriceps</td>
<td>Prone Knee Flexion</td>
<td>Inclinometer</td>
<td>134.0° ± 11.3°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrocnemius</td>
<td>Ankle Dorsiflexion (<em>knee extended</em>)</td>
<td>Goniometer</td>
<td>7.4° ± 6.0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soleus</td>
<td>Ankle Dorsiflexion (<em>knee flexed</em>)</td>
<td>Goniometer</td>
<td>14.8° ± 4.8°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Hypomobility (Hamstra-Wright et al., 2017)**

  - Iliotibial Band Length 11.6° ± 26.2°
  - Hip External Rotation (*sitting*) 33.4° ± 7.4°
  - Hip Internal Rotation (*sitting*) 36.8° ± 8.0°
  - Non-responders (*Ferber et al., 2015*) to a hip/core or quadriceps exercise program

- **Summary Points**
  - Clinicians should continue to assess foot mobility for those with patellofemoral pain
  - More limited data exist for the extent that reduced flexibility impacts outcomes
  - Ongoing need for works to determine “threshold” values to identify flexibility deficits
  - Future investigations should assess hip range of motion
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Learning Objectives
• By the end of this session, the learner will be able to:
• Explain how factors associated with PFP may contribute to PF OA and describe specific intervention strategies when treating individuals with PF OA

Prevalence of Patellofemoral Pain
• Varies by population
  • Annual prevalence general population: 22.7%
    • Smith 2018
  • Not just a problem for young adults & adolescents
  • PearlDiver Record Database - diagnosis rates
    • PFP: 1.5%-7.3% all patients seeking medical care in USA
    • Diagnosis rates increased with age – to 50-59 years
      • Glaviano 2015

Patellofemoral Osteoarthritis: Imaging
• Osteoarthritis – multifactorial disease
  • Cartilage, subchondral bone, synovial tissue, joint capsule, muscle
  • Knee: medial TF, lateral TF, PF
• Radiographic findings
  • Joint space narrowing, osteophytes
• MRI
  • Abnormal cartilage morphology, bone marrow lesions
    • Hart 2017

Patellofemoral Osteoarthritis
• Possible long-term result of PFP
  • PFP and PF OA – possible continuum
    • Lack of longitudinal studies
    • One retrospective review – persons undergoing PFJ arthroplasty
      • Crossley 2014, Thomas 2010, Utting 2005
  • PFP – frequent persistent symptoms – up to 20 years
    • Nimon 1998
• Similar symptoms, impairments, functional limitations
  • Crossley 2016

**Patellofemoral Osteoarthritis (cont.)**
• Highly prevalent in adults
  • 38% (population-based)
  • 43% (symptom-based)
    • Hart 2017
• Anterior knee pain – stair climbing
  • Min-no pain – level ambulation
    • van Middelkoop 2018
• Significant cause of disability
  • Stair ascent & descent, sit-to-stand, car & bathtub transfers
    • Hoglund 2015, van Middelkoop 2018

**Muscle and Static Alignment Factors Associated with PF OA**
• Proximal muscle weakness:
  • Quadriceps
  • Hip abd, hip ER, hip ext
    • Hoglund 2014, Stefanik 2011, van Middelkoop 2018
• LE static malalignment
  • Elahi 2000, Cahue 2004

**Biomechanics Associated with PF OA**
• Faulty dynamic mechanics: inconsistent
  • Sit-to-stand: dynamic genu valgus
    • Hoglund 2014
• Gait: conflicting
  • No differences
    • Crossley 2012, Pohl 2013
  • Inc. anterior pelvic tilt
    • Crossley 2018
  • Late stance – inc. contralateral pelvic drop, dec. hip extension & inc. hip adduction
    • Crossley 2018
• Stair descent: inc. anterior pelvic tilt
  • Fok 2013

**How should we treat the patient with PF OA?**
• Limited evidence
• Patellar taping or bracing
• Multimodal approach
• Two trials
  • Hip abductor strengthening, VMO retraining, jt mobilization, patellar taping
    • van Middelkoop 2018
• Foot orthoses – prefab orthosis (6°varus wedge) and flat insole – dec. knee pain in stepdown test
  • Collins 2017
**Pilot Study: Exercise Intervention**
- Principles for treating patients with PFP: hip focus → hip + knee
  - Core/trunk strengthening + neuromuscular reeducation
    - Hoglund 2018

**PF OA: Exercise Focus (Hoglund 2018)**
- 6 weeks, 2x/week + home program
- Hip focus + abdominal strengthening/stabilization – lying
  - Decreased PFJ stress
- progressed to standing hip, knee, pelvic/trunk stabilization
  - Neuromuscular reeducation
  - Functional ex: sit-to-stand

**PF OA Exercise Intervention Results -1**

**PF OA Exercise Intervention Results -2**

**Patient-Reported Outcome Measure for PF OA**
- Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS)
  - Valid, reliable, and responsive for knee OA, focal cartilage lesions, meniscal tear, ACL tear, postsurgical
  - MDC: older pts 20 pts per subscale, younger pts 14.3 – 19.6 pts
    - Collins 2016
- KOOS-PF
  - Smallest detectable change: 16 pts
  - Minimal important change: 14.2 pts
    - Crossley 2018

**PF OA Physical Performance Measures**
- Recommended core set of PPM for pts with knee and hip OA (OARSI):
  - 30” Chair Stand Test
  - 40 meter Fast Paced Walk
  - Stair-climb Test
- Additional recommended PPM
  - TUG
    - PF OA participants – longer time vs controls
      - Hoglund 2015
  - 6-minute Walk Test
    - Dobson 2017
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