# Supplementary material. Search strategy as applied in MEDLINE on Ovid

- 1 randomized controlled trial/ or randomized controlled trial.pt.
- 2 controlled clinical trial.pt.
- 3 randomized.ab.
- 4 placebo.ab.
- 5 randomly.ab
- 6 trial.ab
- 7 randomised.tw
- 8 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
- 9 review/
- 10 'systematic review\$'.mp
- 11 9 or 10
- 128 or 11
- 13 Arthroplasty, Replacement, Knee/
- 14 Knee Prosthesis/
- 15 (arthoplast\$ adj3 knee\$).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
- 16 (knee\$ adj3 replac\$).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
- 17 (knee adj3 implant\$).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]
- 18 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17
- 19 12 and 18

## Supplementary material. All peri-operative interventions with long-term pain or score follow up

#### 1. Pain management

Author	Indication	Common anaesthe	Common anaesthesia			Follow up
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Group 1 (intervention)	Group (interve		Group C (control)	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
FNB single vs No FI	7.7.101110110		1			<u> </u>
Widmer et al. 2012[34] Australia Before 2012 2 surgeons	Elective primary unilateral TKR 27; 28 Median 72.1 (IQR 64.4, 76.5); 69.4 (63.4, 75.5) 44.4%; 44.4%	Premedication 1-3mg i.v. midazolam. Propofol induction and sevoflurane general anaesthetic.  LIA with 200mg ropivacaine and 0.5mg adrenaline in 100ml saline.  PCA 20µg fentanyl at 5-minute intervals on demand until morning POD2. Then, oral oxycodone SR 10mg every 12 hours. Daily COX II inhibitor and paracetamol 1g every 6 hours as tolerated. For breakthrough pain, 5-10mg oxycodone immediate release every 3 hours as needed.  Ultrasound guided FNB with 100mg ropivacaine in 30ml saline Sham setup for FNB. No identification or injection of femoral sheath		1 year No losses to follow up reported Low risk of bias WOMAC pain (high score favourable) at 1 year: FNB and LIA median 2.0 (IQR 0, 2.8); LIA no FNB 1.0 (0, 2.0). p=0.74 No adverse events occurred in either group		
FNB single vs ONB	vs Control			•		
Bergeron et al. 2009[105] Canada 2005-2006 1 centre	Elective primary unilateral TKR 19; 20; 20 Mean 65.1 (SE 2.0); 72 (1.8); 67 (1.3) 79%; 80%; 75%	Intraoperative sedation with iv propofol at discretion of anaesthesiologist. Lumbar spinal anaesthesia with 12mg 0.5% bupivacaine.  Postoperative i.v. PCA with fentanyl 50µg/ml set to deliver 25µg every 5 min as needed.  Celecoxib 100mg and acetaminophen 650mg on arrival in recovery room and every 12 and 6 hrs respectively.  Breakthrough medication with intramuscular ketorolac 10 mg every 4 hrs.		1 year Overall 32 lost to follow up High risk of bias: only 27/59 patients followed up due to resource limitations. No difference in HSS pain at rest or during activity at 1 year between the study groups.		

		FNB with stimulator. 20ml 0.5% bupivacaine with 1/200,000 epinephrine.	ONB with stimulator. 20ml 0.5% bupivacaine with 1/200,000 epinephrine.	No injection but inguinal area prepared, and sham block performed behind drapes.	No long-term complications attributable to anaesthetic regimen
FNB continuous lov	v dose vs FNB contin	uous high dose vs No	o FNB		•
Shum et al. 2009[106] Singapore Before 2009 1 hospital	Unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 20 (17 received treatment); 20 (18 received treatment); 20 Mean 66.7 (SD 8.4); 65.4 (8.4); 67.8 (5.5) 88%; 72%; 80%	bupivacaine. Intraop increments of 0.5mg Intravenous PCA mo	nduced with 2-3ml hy erative sedation with land properties of the continuous for the cont	midazolam in demand bolus	2 years 16.4% of patients who received intervention lost to follow up Unclear risk of bias due to differences in OKS and weight at baseline, and limited methodological details.  No separate pain outcome but mean OKS slightly more favourable in group with no FNB, 18.2 (SD 3.7) compared with combined FNB groups, 19.8 (5.4) but this was not significant.  No complications attributable to use of FNB
SNB injection vs SN	IB continuous vs con	trol	1		
Wegener et al. 2013[44] The Netherlands 2008-2010 1 centre	Unilateral TKR 29; 30; 30 (90 randomised) Median 65 (range 43-81); 66 (43-83); 62 (50-79) 62%; 70%; 73%	Lorazepam 1mg 2 ho before surgery. FNB dose 20 ml levobupin a continuous infusion General anaesthesia infusion and remifent with 2-3 µg/ml at 0.1 changed to patient colockout; basal rate 6 needed. Postoperativ times daily. Diclofena daily. Tramadol 100n Morphine pain relief	with stimulating cath racaine 0.375% and a fevobupivacaine induced with 3-5 µg/kg/min ar 0.25 µg/kg/min. Postontrolled FNB, 5ml boml/hr. i.v. morphine are 50mg or tramadoling before removal of	eter: loading after 45 minutes 0.125% 10 ml/hr. /ml propofol nd maintained toperatively, FNB blus, 30-minute administered if etaminophen 1g 4 50mg 3 times	12 months 2;7;5 lost to follow up Low risk of bias Median WOMAC pain scores at 12 months: SNB injection 80 (range 25- 100), SNB continuous 90 (55-100) and PCA only 90 (35-100), p=0.81. No difference between groups in VAS pain at rest (p=0.90) or during mobilisation (p=0.43). No information on adverse events.

General anaesthesia	a vs FNB single vs FN	Group Fs: SNB single injection. SNB loading dose of 20 ml levobupivacaine 0.375%.	Group FCS: SNB continuous infusion. SNB loading dose of 20 ml levobupivacaine 0.375%. Continuous infusion of levobupivacaine 0.125% 10 ml/hr started 45 mins after catheter placement. SNB maintained for 36 hours postoperatively (10 ml/hr).	Group F: No SNB. PCA via femoral nerve catheter	
Gao et al. 2017[35] China 2014-2015 1 centre	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 50; 50; 50 Mean 65.8 (SD 6.7); 66.4 (7.4); 67.6 (6.3) 81%; 80%; 76%	Pre-operative and post-operative celecoxib 0.2g twice daily.  100ml intra-operative LIA with ropivacaine 200mg and epinephrine 0.25 mg.  General anaesthesia  Ultrasound guided FNB 5g/l ropivacaine 20ml plus 0.1mg epinephrine and SNB 5g/l ropivacaine 20ml plus 0.1mg epinephrine and SNB 5g/l ropivacaine 20ml plus 0.1mg epinephrine and SNB 5g/l ropivacaine 20ml plus 0.1mg epinephrine		6 months 2; 1; 0 Low risk of bias Mean HSS at 6 months: 87.1 (SD 6.9); 87.4 (7.3); 88.5 (6.7). No significant difference. Nausea and vomiting: 4; 2; 1, urinary retention: 3; 1; 2.	
	d vs No LIA/ placebo				
Wylde et al. 2015 [45] UK	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis	(20ml 0.25% bupiva Intra-operative anal	nulator and/ or ultraso caine). Spinal or gen gesia provided by titr morphine if necessa	eral anaesthetic. ation of i.v.	6 and 12 months 24;19 at 12 months (including those who did not receive treatment)

2009-2012 1 centre	157; 159 (143; 137 received treatment) Mean 69.5 (SD 9.4); 68.7 (7.9) 52%; 54%	paracetamol 30 minutes befor Immediately post-operative 40 PCA with morphine 1mg/ml, 1 minute lock-out. If necessary 10.2mg/kg as rescue analgesia from pain specialist nurse. Ora hours and ibuprofen 400mg evolonger needed, oral codeine phours, tramadol 50-100mg evolo-20mg as rescue analgesia	Low risk of bias At 12 months WOMAC pain score (0-100) in LIA group median 90 (IQR 30), Control 85 (35); ITT-CC linear regression coefficient 3.83 (95%CI - 0.83, 8.49), p=0.107. At 6 months WOMAC pain score ITT-CC linear regression coefficient 4.10 (95%CI - 0.22, 8.43), p=0.063. Mean differences lower than MCID of 8-	
		60ml intra-operative LIA with 0.25% bupivacaine and 1/200,000 adrenaline injected into the posterior capsule, medial and lateral capsule, fascia and muscle, and subcutaneous tissues.	No treatment other than standard care	9[77]. Superficial and deep wound infection rate in LIA group 3.2% and 1.9% in control group, p=0.500. No differences in serious adverse events between groups
Williams et al. 2013[51] Canada Before 2013 1 centre, 2 surgeons	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 35; 32 (26; 25 received treatment) Mean 66 (SD 9.7); 67 (12.5) 58%; 60%	Sedation with i.v. midazolam and propofol. Intraoperative LIA loading dose of 20ml 0.25% bupivacaine/ epinephrine injection, 10ml into medial and lateral subcutaneous tissue around the incision and 10ml intra-articular after closure. Infiltrate delivered by pain pump into lateral recess of intra-articular space. Spinal anaesthetic with 10-15 mg of 0.75% or 0.5% plain bupivacaine and 20µg fentanyl. Postoperative morphine PCA. 7.5mg i.v ketorolac preoperatively plus 15mg every 6 hours postoperatively for 48 hours, then oral ketorolac 10mg every 6 hours for 2 days. Gabapentin 600mg given preoperatively plus 300mg		6 and 12 months 3;1 of those who received treatment Low risk of bias Mean VAS pain score at 6 months 1.2 (SD 1.3); 1.2 (1.2). p=0.836. At 12 months 0.9 (1.2); 1.0 (1.1). p=0.767 No short-term differences in adverse events except control patients more likely to be drowsy at 48 hrs. Long- term adverse events not reported.
Niemeläinen et al. 2014[47] Finland	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis	Oral paracetamol 1g given 1 h anaesthesia with 15mg bupiva After surgery oral paracetamo	12 months 1; 4 Low risk of bias	
2011-2012	30; 30 (27; 29 received treatment)	meloxicam (15mg) every 24 h PCA with oxycodone 2mg, loc	ours.	No pain measure separate from OKS. Weak evidence of more favourable

1 hospital	Mean 65 (SD 4.9); 64 (6.7)	Rescue levobupivacaine medic epidural catheter	OKS (0-48) in the LIA group at 12 months, mean difference -2.7 (95%	
	56%; 48%	Intra-operative periarticular LIA of 100ml saline with levobupivacaine (150mg) mixed with ketorolac (30mg) and adrenaline (0.5mg).	Intra-operative periarticular LIA of 100ml saline	CI -5.48, 0.07). Difference lower than MCID of 4.0[78]. Infection: 0; 0. Severe pain treated with epidural analgesia: 0; 3. Nausea: 1; 1
Motififard et al. 2017[49] Iran 2014-2015 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 60; 60 Mean 66.4 (6.4); 64.5 (6.0) 86.0%; 94.3%	Spinal anaesthesia.  No FNB or SNB.  Pain medication provided as remeloxicam (15 mg daily), celector acetaminophen (1g every 8 hours), ketorolac (30 mg slowdose max), and morphine (5–1)  Peri-articular injection, 15 minutes before incision, of 100ml saline containing 50 mg bupivacaine hydrochloride 0.5%, 1 ml morphine sulphate 10 mg/ml, 300 µg epinephrine (1:1000) and 30 mg ketorolac	oxib (400 mg daily), urs), tramadol (50 mg every VIV every 8 hours, with a 4-	6 months 3; 7 Low risk of bias No separate pain measure. Weak evidence for improved KSS (0-200) in LIA group at 6 months, mean 115.55 (SD 15.506); 101.40 (16.117). P=0.07. Difference of 14.15 greater than MCID of 12.3[79]. Difference was significant at 6 weeks, p<0.001. No complications related to TKR or LIA. Low back pain (1; 2), stroke (0; 1), CHF (1; 0)
McDonald et al. 2016[52] UK 2010-2011 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 113; 109 received common spinal anaesthesia (121; 121 randomised) Median 68 (IQR 62, 72); 67 (62, 73) 59%; 55%	Oral premedication with 10-20r ranatidine, 10mg dexamethaso paracetamol.  Spinal anaesthesia  Intra-articular and subcutaneous infiltration during surgery of 200 ml of 2mg/ml ropivacaine without adrenalin or additives.  Catheter inserted, and 20 ml infiltrate injected following wound closure. Further boluses of 40 ml 2 mg/ml ropivacaine via infusion pump 4 hours after leaving theatre and morning of POD1. Two		12 months 9; 11 of those receiving treatments Low risk of bias No separate pain outcome. Mean OKS at 12 months: median 41 (IQR 35, 44); 41 (34;44). P=0.915 Suspected infection 2; 1. MI 0; 1. GI bleed 1; 0. renal failure 1; 0. Died 2; 0)

		additional top ups of 40 ml 2mg/ml ropivacaine were prescribed if required.		
Celecoxib vs placeb	0			
Meunier et al. 2007[54] Sweden 2004-2005 1 centre	Elective primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 25; 25 (24; 20 received treatment) Mean 68 (SD 6.3); 69 (7.7) 71%; 40%	Spinal anaesthesia with bupiva midazolam or propofol sedation preoperatively and then with traday during hospital stay. Ketob subcutaneous) on demand. Paused as required after discharg Oral celecoxib 200mg 1 hour preoperatively and twice daily for 3 weeks	n if needed. Paracetamol 1 g amadol 50-100 mg 4 times a emidone (2.5-5mg i.v. or racetamol and tramadol	12 months No losses to follow up after surgery reported Low risk of bias No effect of celecoxib on VAS or KOOS pain at 1 year. DVT: 0; 1. Deep infection: 0; 0.
Ketamine vs placebo	0		·	L
Perrin and Purcell2009 [107] Australia Before 2009 1 centre (pilot study)	Elective unilateral TKR 16 (5; 7 completed study per protocol) Mean 65.6 (SD 10.2); 60.3 (11.9) 40%; 43%	morphine. General anaesthesia. After surgery 1.5g paracetamol and then 750mg every 4 hours; PCA with morphine 2mg boluses with 10-minute lockout; morphine rescue 2.5mg intravenously as required; and rescue oral ibuprofen 800mg.  Ketamine 0.5mg/kg bolus followed by 4µg/kg/min infusion. Commenced before surgical incision and continued until wound bandaged or syringe		6 months 3 protocol breaches and 1 patient with uncontrolled pain. High risk of bias due to non-ITT reporting and recruitment difficulties 2/5 ketamine group had mild/moderate pain on the WOMAC pain scale at 26 weeks or failed to improve compared with 5/7 controls.  1 adverse psycho-mimetic effect not attributed to intervention or control treatment
Ketamine vs Nefopa				
Aveline et al. 2014[55] France 2005 1 centre	Elective primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 25; 25; 25 Mean 73 (SD 9); 72 (9); 70 (7) 67%; 60%; 63%	General anaesthesia induced with 1.5-2mg/kg propofol, 1µ/kg remifentanil and a single bolus of cisatracurium 0.15mg/kg. Remifentanil infusion at 0.15µg/k/min until skin closure. Anaesthesia maintained with sevoflurane 0.9-1.2% with 50% nitrogen in oxygen. 20 mins before skin closure, 0.15mg/kg i.v. morphine bolus and 0.625mg droperidol. PCA with morphine hydrochloride 1 mg i.v. bolus with 7-min lockout. On arrival in recovery room, 3 mg i.v. morphine boluses at 5 minute intervals.		6 and 12 months 3; 1; 2 Low risk of bias Median DN4 at 12 months: 1 (IQR 1, 2); 1 (0, 1); 2 (1, 3). p=0.02 for difference between ketamine and placebo groups. Number of patients with VAS pain on movement score

		0.2mg/kg nefopam administered over 20 min before incision; 2mg/ml nefopam continuous infusion at 120µg/kg/hr until end of surgery and 60µg/kg/hr for 48 hours	0.2mg/kg ketamine administered 20 min befor incision; 2mg ketamine continuous infusion at 120µg/kg/hr end of surge and 60µg/kg for 48 hours	re g/ml until ery g/hr	Saline administered over 20 minutes before incision; saline continuous infusion until second post- operative day	≥40mm at 12 months by group: nefopam (3/22, 13.7%), ketamine (3/24, 12.5%), and placebo group (6/23, 26.1%). Ketamine reduced DN4 pain (p=0.02) compared with placebo. At 12 months only 7/69 patients had DN4≥4 indicative of neuropathic pain.  Infection: 0; 0; 0. Revision: 0; 0; 0.
Pregabalin vs placel	bo					
Buvanendran et al. 2010[56] USA 2006-2007 Single centre	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis. 120; 120 (9; 2 did not receive postoperative treatment but ITT analysis) Mean 64.0 (SD 8.3); 63.3 (8.9) 76%; 70%	of fentanyl (5µg/m using continuous PCA bolus doses to oral opioid (moral sequired). All pacelecoxib 400mg twice daily for 3 did not before surgery, twice daily for the postoperative day twice daily on day 12, and 50mg twice days 13 and 14	aesthetic. 1.5 25µg fentanyl for epidural d pupivacaine w capsule closu 2 hours post- al) and bupiva basal infusion (maximum 10 rphine, oxyco- atients receive 1–2 hours bef ays in hospita 00mg 1–2 150mg first 10 s, 75mg s 11 and	iml 0.75 injected lrug adnivith epinure. From operativicaine (1 of 6 of 6 of 1) of 6 of 6 of 1) of 6 of 6 of 1) of 6 of 7 of 1 of 6 of 1) of 6 of 7 of 1) of 1 of 1 of 1 of 1 of 1 of 1 of	% hyperbaric d intrathecally. hinistration. ephrine infiltrated m completion of e, epidural infusion (mg/ml) initiated (hr with epidural Patients transitioned nd hydromorphone) perative oral gery and 200mg  cebo 1–2 h before twice daily for the postoperative days, ally on days 11 and twice daily on days	6 months 7; 5 Low risk of bias Mean VRS pain score at 6 months: pregabalin 0.41 (SD 1.20); control 0.95 (1.80). p=0.0084. Distributions skewed but nonparametric Wilcoxon significant (p=0.0176). Difference of 0.54 less than MCID of 1.0. In the pregabalin group the incidence of neuropathic pain measured using S-LANSS was 0% (0/113) and 5.2% (6/115) in the placebo group (p=0.014). No clinically significant adverse events up to 6 months and no falls. Sedation, confusion and dry mouth more frequent in pregabalin than placebo group on day of surgery and first postoperative day.
FNB long duration v	s FNB short duration	1				

Ilfeld et al. 2009[108] USA 2005-2007 2 centres	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 25; 25 Median 66 (IQR 60, 70); 64 (60, 69) 56%; 60%	Femoral catheter inserted using 0.2% ropivacaine infusion (8ml, controlled bolus; 30-minute lock POD1.  1 week oral acetaminophen (97 sustained release oral opioid (0 hours), and either oral aspirin (1200mg every 12 hours). Oral cor i.v. morphine sulfate 2-4 mg	6 and 12 months 4; 1 lost to follow up High risk of bias: uneven loss to follow up between groups; muscle weakness resulted in lower dose of infusion on POD1 (10 continuous; 3 saline) Groups had similar WOMAC pain scores at 6 and 12 months	
		At 6 a.m. POD1, infusion pump replaced with infusion pump with 0.2% ropivacaine.  At 6 p.m. POD2 pump replaced with portable infusion pump (400ml 0.2% ropivacaine). Catheter removed evening of POD4.	At 6 a.m. POD1, infusion pump replaced but saline substituted.  At 6 p.m. POD2 pump replaced with portable infusion pump (saline).  Catheter removed evening of POD4	(p>0.05). MI: 1; 0. PE: 1; 0. Fall: 1; 0. Catheter leak, dislodged: 1; 2
Ilfeld et al. 2011[109] USA 2007-2009 2 centres	Primary unilateral cemented TKR for osteoarthritis 40; 40 (39; 38 included in RCT) Median 61 (IQR 58, 67); 66 (60, 70) 67%; 66%	Femoral catheter inserted using nerve stimulator. FNB with 0.2% ropivacaine infusion (6ml/hr basal; 4ml patient-controlled bolus; 30-min lockout) from surgery until POD1.  1 week oral acetaminophen (975mg every 6 hours), sustained release oral opioid (Oxycontin, 10mg every 12 hours), and either oral aspirin (650mg daily) or celecoxib (200mg every 12 hours). Oral (oxycodone 5mg or 10mg tablets) and/ or i.v. opioids (morphine sulfate 2-4mg) for breakthrough pain.  At 6 a.m. POD2, infusion pump replaced and 0.2%		12 months 11; 12 incomplete follow up High risk of bias: 11;12 did not have 4 measures out of 6 up to 12 months; graph suggests WOMAC pain lower pre-intervention in continuous infusion group. No difference in WOMAC pain scores between randomised groups (p>0.05). Falls: 4; 0
		ropivacaine continued.  At 6 p.m. POD2 pump replaced with portable infusion pump (400ml 0.2% ropivacaine). Catheter removed evening of POD4	substituted.  At 6 p.m. POD2 pump replaced with portable infusion pump (saline).  Catheter removed evening of POD4	
Choy et al. 2011[42] Korea 2006-2007	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis	Spinal anaesthesia. Continuous POD3. Catheter inserted with u Analgesia induced with 20ml of 2% lidocaine with 1:200,000 ep	2 years 4; 3 lost to follow up	

1 surgeon	33; 30 (2 patients received GA and excluded) Mean 66.7 (SD 10); 67.5 (11) 97%; 93%	(butorphanol 4mg, ketorolac 150mg, saline 50ml), programmed to deliver 1 mg bolus (lockout 10 min) with maximum dose 6mg/hr. i.v. paracetamol 2g 4 times/ day and oral ibuprofen 600mg 3 times/ day for breakthrough pain			Low risk of bias for 2 year outcome measures.  At 2 years, intervention WOMAC pain mean 7.2 (SD 2), control 6.3 (SD 1); p=0.2  Superficial infection: 1; 1	
FNB continuous hia	│ h concentration vs F					
Albrecht et al. 2014[41] Canada 2009-2011 1 hospital	Scheduled primary unilateral TKR 32; 32; 35 Mean 61 (CI 57, 64); 63 (60, 67);63 (60, 66) 46%; 44%; 52%	Stimulating catheter inserted with ultrasound guidance. Immediately after catheter placement, 10ml mepivacaine 2% was injected through the catheter. SNB using 30 ml ropivacaine 0.2%. Spinal anaesthesia with 2.5 to 3.0 ml isobaric bupivacaine 0.5% and 0.1mg intrathecal morphine.  Bolus of 20ml ropivacaine 0.2% with epinephrine 1:400,000 into the femoral catheter followed by ropivacaine 0.2% at a rate of 5 ml/hr with patient-controlled boluses of 5ml available every 30minutes.  Bolus of 20ml ropivacaine 0.2% with epinephrine 1:400,000 into femoral catheter followed by ropivacaine 0.2% at a rate of 1 ml/hr with patient-controlled boluses of 10 ml available every 30minutes.		12 months 4;0;2 lost to follow up Low risk of bias. No separate pain outcome. Mean WOMAC score at 12 months: high concentration FNB 17 (95% CI 7, 27); 22 (14, 30); 18 (8, 27). P=0.68 Falls: 0; 0; 1		
		block vs FNB continuo				
Morin et al. 2005[110] Germany Before 2005 1 centre	Elective unilateral TKR 30; 30; 30	Oral pre-medication with 20mg chlorazepate. General anaesthesia with intravenous propofol and 4–8µg/kg i.v. fentanyl and desflurane in N2O. 100mg diclofenac suppository after anaesthesia induction and 2.5g intravenous metamizole before end of surgery. Postoperative 3 daily doses of oral diclofenac 50mg. i.v. PCA			9–12 months 7; 6; 5 High risk of bias due to large losses to follow up, non-blinded outcome collection, and differences between	

	Median 68 (IQR 62, 74); 71 (63, 74); 65 (53, 73) 50%; 70%; 59%	with piritramide bo 10 mins for 48 hou	olus 2mg as needed wit urs.	th lockout interval of	groups in BMI and anaesthetist's opinion of difficulty of catheter placement.  No difference between groups in level of pain at the knee joint during past 4 weeks: FNB median 2.5 (IQR
		Continuous FNB Stimulating catheter used. Initial bolus of prilocaine 1% and ropivacaine 0.75%. 300mg prilocaine 1% (30ml) and 150mg ropivacaine 0.75% (20ml). During first 48hrs post- operative ropivacaine 0.2% infusion 14ml/hr.	Continuous FNB and continuous SNB Stimulating catheter used. Initial bolus of prilocaine 1% and ropivacaine 0.75%. In each catheter: 200mg prilocaine 1% (20ml) and 75mg ropivacaine 0.75% (10ml). During first 48hrs post-operative infusion through each catheter of 0.2% ropivacaine 7ml/hr.	Continuous psoas compartment block Stimulating catheter used. Initial bolus of prilocaine 1% and ropivacaine 0.75%. 300mg prilocaine 1% (30ml) and 150mg ropivacaine 0.75% (20ml). During first 48hrs postoperative ropivacaine 0.2% infusion 14ml/hr.	1, 4), FNB and SNB 2 (1, 4), Psoas block 2 (IQR 1, 4), p=0.44  No early complications but longer term adverse events not reported.
ACB continuous vs					
Davidson et al. 2016[111] USA 2013-2014 2 studies combined from 1 centre	Primary, unilateral TKR or unicompartmental 54 (39 TKR, 16 UKR); 56 (41 TKR, 15 UKR) TKR mean 67 (SD 8); 66 (7). UKR 70 (10); 68 (12)	Spinal or general anaesthesia. Intra-operative i.v. fentanyl, hydromorphone, and/or morphine.  LIA with 30 ml ropivacaine (0.5%), ketorolac (30 mg), and epinephrine (5 µg/ml).  Post-operative: oral acetaminophen (975 mg every 6 hr), celecoxib (200 mg every 12 hr), and sustained release oxycodone (10 mg every 12 hr). For breakthrough pain, infusion pump bolus (4 ml, 30-min lock-out). Rescue opioid titrated to pain severity. 10 ml lidocaine (2%) bolus was given via the perineural catheter for moderate or severe pain.			12 months 31; 29 High risk of bias due to partial follow up TKR and UKR combined. Pain score (0-10) at 12 months median 0.0 (IQR 0.0, 3.0); 0.5 (0.0, 2.0). P=0.80). Pain score >0: 35%; 32%. P=0.65. No difference at 4 months when follow up more complete (51;

	TKR 59%; 66%. UKR 47%; 47%	Ultrasound guided ACB. Ropivacaine 0.2% at basal rate of 6 ml/hr, a 4-ml bolus, and a lockout of 30 minutes	Ultrasound guided continuous FNB. Ropivacaine 0.2% at basal rate of 6 ml/hr, a 4-ml bolus, and a lockout of 30 minutes	52) in pain score (p=0.80) or pain score >0 (p=0.48). Falls in hospital: 2; 5
ACB single vs FNI	B single			
Macrinici et al. 2017[43] USA Before 2017 1 centre	Primary unilateral TKR, indication not specified (selected by the surgeon for TKA) 49; 49 Mean 67 (SD 8); 67 (8) 61%; 63%	Multimodal regimen including analgesics, opioids. LIA 40ml All patients received an ultrascinto ACB and FNB sites.  Immediately after surgery, 30ml solution with 100ml Marcaine into ACB site. 30 ml saline into FNB site	Marcaine 0.25%.	6 months 3; 4 lost to follow up. 6; 3 complications Low risk of bias VAS pain similar between groups at 6 months. No difference in functional outcomes Medical complications: 3; 0. Surgical complication: 0; 1. Temporary foot drop: 3; 2.
FNB continuous v	s oral opioid			
Nader et al. 2012[36] USA 2007-2008 1 surgeon	Elective unilateral TKR 31; 31 Median (IQR) 65 (60, 76); 64 (60, 71) 58%; 77%	Before surgery, patients receive needed. Epidural with 10mg 0 injected intrathecally. Intraope infusion of 25-75mcg/kg/minut area, PCA epidural with basal bupivacaine and 10 mg/ml hydroxidated boluses of 3 ml with minutes and per hour maximul discontinued and epidural cath POD 1. All subjects received 5 surgery and 40 mg enoxaparir Continuous FNB inserted with use of stimulator. After discontinuation of epidural anaesthesia on the morning of POD1 10mL bolus of ropivacaine 0.25% followed	5% isobaric bupivacaine rative sedation with propofol e. In post-anesthesia recovery infusion of 3 ml/hr (1 mg/ml lromorphone) with patienta lockout interval of 15 m of 15 ml. Infusion letter removed on morning of mg warfarin on evening of	6 and 12 months  1; 1 lost to follow up at 12 months  Low risk of bias  No difference in overall median  NRS pain score at 6 months and 12  months: 0 (IQR 0, 1); 0 (0, 1).  p=1.0. At 12 months, some  evidence favouring hydrocodone for  pain ascending/ descending stairs:  1 (0, 2); 0 (0, 0). p=0.01. Also,  suggestion of reduced pain in  hydrocodone group at night in bed  (p=0.06) and sitting/ lying (p=0.07),  standing upright (p=0.10). No  difference walking on flat surface  (p=0.41).
		by 5ml/h infusion of 0.1% ropivacaine. On morning of POD 2, ropivacaine infusion	hours with oral hydromorphone 2 mg over	Falls in month after surgery: 1;0. Positive joint aspirate: 3; 0. VTE: 0; 4.

		discontinued. Femoral catheter removed 24 hours after previous dose of enoxaparin.	4 hours for breakthrough pain	
FNB continuous vs	PCA			
Wang et al. 2015[112] China 2012-2013 3 centres	Elective unilateral TKR 82; 86 No significant differences in age or sex	General anaesthesia with mida fentanyl (1µg/kg), propofol (1-2 (0.15mg/kg). Anaesthesia main during surgery. Intramuscular ir metoclopramide and 2.5mg dro surgery. Post-surgery, celocoxi patients with severe pain, and i Continuous FNB with ultrasound stimulator. After surgery, 0.2% ropivacaine (20ml) injected through catheter. Then an analgesia pump was attached delivering 0.2% ropivacaine 8ml/hr.	mg/kg) and cisatracurium stained with sevoflurane njection with 10mg speridol 30 minutes before b and parecoxib 40mg for	6 and 12 months 2; 4 lost to follow up at 12 months Unclear risk of bias: limited reporting of randomisation methods. No differences were observed between groups at 6 or 12 months for any HSS domain including pain. No nerve injuries
Peng et al. 2014[38] China Before 2014 1 centre (2 surgical teams with 4 surgeons and 2 anaesthesiologists)	Primary unilateral TKR 140;140 Mean: 66.8 (SD 9.4); 68.0 (SD 11.2) 73%; 65%	General intravenous and inhala midazolam 0.1-0.15mg/kg (etor patients >65 years), propofol 2.0.3-1.0μg/kg, and vecuronium 0 of anaesthesia. Maintenance w sevoflurane and continuous intremifentanil 7-8μg/kg/hr and prwound closure, 5-10μg intraver dose of PCA injected. i.v. inject	6 and 12 months 31; 38 at 12 months Low risk of bias Chronic post-operative pain (NRS 1+) in 38.5% of PCA group at 6 months compared with 25.7% in FNB group (p=0.021). No difference at 12 months (p=0.273).	
		FNB with ultrasound guidance. Initial dose of 10ml 2% lidocaine and 10ml 1% ropivacaine. 30 minutes before end of operation, catheter connected to PCA pump; patients received loading dose of 5ml of 0.15% ropivacaine followed by infusion of 0.15% ropivacaine at 5ml/hr, with bolus of 5mL	i.v. PCA with tramadol 800mg, flurbiprofen axetil 100mg, and dexamethasone 5mg with saline to a volume of 80ml. Loading dose of 2ml followed by an infusion rate of 1 ml/hr with bolus of 2 ml. Lock time 15min.	Authors only reported short term adverse events associated with use of PCA.

Wu and Wong 2014[37] China 2009-2011 1 centre	Unilateral elective TKR, 98% for osteoarthritis 40; 39 (30; 30 after post randomisation exclusions) Mean 68.8 (SD 6.4); 68.9 (7.5) 73%; 73%	and lock time of 30 min. Preoperatively, a loading dose of 30ml was injected for intraoperative analgesia.  Paracetamol, sustained releas (codeine or morphine). Spinal Catheter inserted under nerve stimulation and ultrasound guidance. Standardised bolus of 15 mL 0.5% levobupivacaine. Continuous infusion of 8 to 12 mL/h 0.08% levobupivacaine postoperatively until POD 3	Intravenous PCA morphine after the operation	6 months 2; 2 not pre- and peri-operative exclusions Low risk of bias No separate pain outcome but improvement of KSS from pre-operative was FNB 48.73 and PCA 44.7 (p=0.513) Including patients not followed up.
				Deaths: 0; 0. Infection: 1;1. DVT: 2; 3. Shock: 3;2. Transfusion: 2;3. Also from excluded cases. Atrial fibrillation and confusion: 0; 1. PE: 0; 1. Sepsis: 1;0. ICU admission for shock: 1; 0.
FNB and SNB contir	nuous vs epidural PC	'A		
Anastase et al. 2014[113] Germany 2010-2011 1 centre	Primary unilateral TKR 55; 50 Mean 68.2 (SD 9.2); 69.7 (SD 8.7) 65%; 69%	Premedication with 10 mg ora anaesthesia with light sedation Supplemental postoperative a piritramid  After spinal anaesthesia installed, SNB and FNB catheters inserted with ultrasound guidance. 5 ml bolus 0.2% ropivacaine. FNB with an hourly rate of 5 ml, bolus administration of 5 ml by the patient and the lock-out interval of 20 mins. SNB 5 ml/h to a maximum of 8 ml/h, 5 ml bolus administered by the patient	n: 12.5mg 0.5% bupivacaine.	6 and 12 months 15; 14 High risk of bias due to large loss to follow up Pain during previous 4 weeks: 1 no pain, 2 very little, 3 little, 4 moderate, 5 loud, 6 very loud (translation from German). No difference at 6 months p=0.37. At 12 months, FNB/SNB median 2.00 (1.00, 2.00), PCA 2.00 (2.00, 2.00) p=0.004 favouring FNB/SNB. No falls associated with quadriceps weakness. 6 and 12 month adverse events not reported.

		and lock-out interval of 20 minutes.		
FNB single vs LIA				
Fan et al. 2016[39] China	Primary unilateral TKR (75% osteoarthritis; 25%	General anaesthesia in all but surgery, i.v. morphine, PCA a	nd parecoxib 40mg	1 year 3 protocol violations
2012-2014 Single hospital, 2 surgeons	rheumatoid arthritis) 80; 80 (78; 79 in analysis) Mean 68.4 (SD 8.8); 67.6 (6.3) 79%; 86%	FNB performed pre- operatively with 20ml ropivacaine 0.5%. After cementing prostheses, 50ml of saline injected into periarticular soft tissue.	Placebo equivalent of FNB with saline  After cementing prostheses, 50ml of LIA mixture containing morphine (1ml: 10mg), ropivacaine (10ml: 100mg), and diprospan (1ml: 5mg betamethasone dipropionate and 2mg betamethasone sodium phosphate) injected into periarticular soft tissue.	Low risk of bias  No separate pain outcome. Mean KSS at 1 year similar between groups: 94.2 (SD 2.6); LIA 93.9 (3.1). p=0.51 Infection: 0; 0. DVT: 1; 1. Femoral nerve injury: 1; 0.
FNB single and epic	lural vs LIA			
Reinhardt et al. 2014[40] USA	Elective unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis	Spinal anaesthetic (2.5ml 0.5d daily. Oral Perocet or Vicodin Dilaudid for severe breakthrough	% bupivacaine). Mobic 15mg as required. Subcutaneous ugh pain. Intravenous Toradol.	1 year 0: 0 of patients who received allocated intervention Low risk of bias VAS pain at 1 year similar between groups (noted in text and shown graphically) No wound-related complications or infections. 1 DVT and 1 DVT plus PE in epidural group. Arthrofibrosis: 2; 1
2010-2012 Single hospital, 2 surgeons	51; 51 (49; 45 received allocated intervention) Mean 67.9 (SD 10.9); 66.6 (10.1) 59.2%; 57.8%	Combined spinal-epidural (500ml hydromorphone 10µg/ml and bupivacaine HCl 0.06%).  Single intra-operative FNB injection (30ml 0.25% bupivacaine).  Continuous 48-hour epidural infusion (4ml/hr with 4ml per demand dose, locked out every 10 minutes with an hourly limit of 20ml). Epidural infusion weaned to 2ml/hr on POD1 and to 0 ml/hr at 5 p.m on POD1. Demand dose with	ropivacaine infusion at 7 ml/hr until POD2. Placebo epidural catheter, no FNB, and postoperative placebo continuous epidural infusion of saline.	

LIA with corticostero	old vo LIA with no o	lockout parameters continued for 48 hours.  Placebo intraarticular knee catheter placed intraoperatively with continuous saline 7ml/hr infusion until POD2.		
Seah et al. 2011[53] Singapore 2004-2005 1 hospital	TKR 50; 50 Mean 65.4; 67.9 Sex not stated	General or spinal anaesthesia. and PCA (with morphine bolus of minutes, and maximum dose 8 Intraoperative periarticular injection of 0.5ml/kg 1:200,000 epinephrine and 0.5% bupivacaine diluted with 30ml of normal saline. 40mg of corticosteroid (triamcinolone acetonide) was added to half the mixture. The solution with the corticosteroid was injected into the deep tissues. The remaining solution was injected into the skin incision before closure.	of 1mg, lock-out time 5	6 months and 2 years No losses to follow up reported Low risk of bias No separate pain outcome but no statistically significant difference in OKS between groups at 2 years Deep infection: 1; 1
Yue et al. 2013[114] China 2011-2012 1 hospital	Unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 36; 36 Mean 70.2 (SD 6.4); 69.3 (5.7) 89%; 89%	General anaesthesia. PCA (25 bolus, 6 minutes lock-out, and 5 hours after surgery. 5-10mg intrescue. Celecoxib pre- and posi Injections with local anaesthetic agent and adrenaline (0.75% ropivacaine 30ml, 1:1000 adrenaline 0.5ml, and isotonic sodium chloride solution 70ml) plus corticosteroid (1ml betamethasone).	img/hr maximum) for 72 ramuscular morphine as	6 and 12 months No loss to follow up reported Unclear risk of bias. No separate pain outcome. No difference in mean KSS between groups at 6 or 12 months No incision infection or tendon rupture complications

		Another 50ml syringes fluid without corticosteroid was infiltrated into the skin Another 50ml syringes without corticosteroid vinfiltrated into the skin		corticosteroid was		
LIA including ketore	olac vs epidural					
Spreng et al. 2012[115], Spreng et al. 2010[116] Norway 2007–2009 1 hospital	Unilateral, non- cemented TKR with no patella resurfacing 34; 34; 34 66.5 (SD 11.); 67.2 (SD 8.9); 65.8 (SD 10.1) 61%;61%;67%	Premedication with anaesthesia with 13 fentanyl. If indicated sedation. Acetaming morphine for 48 hou minutes lockout time release oxycodone analgesia.	3-15mg bupi I, up to 10m ophen 1g evurs after sur e). When Potwice daily.	vacaine 5 Il/hr 10mg very 6 hou gery (2mg CA stoppe 5mg oxyc	img/ml with 20µg /ml propofol for irs. i.v. PCA y bolus with 10 ed, 10mg slow codone as rescue	12 months 13 did not provide complete data Unclear risk of bias due to limited reporting (long-term outcome only reported as conference abstract). Perioperative analgesic treatment did not have any significant influence on any KOOS outcomes.
	01/0,01/0,07/0	ketorolac 1ml (30mg/ml) and morphine 5ml (1mg/ml). Infiltration with ropivacaine 150mg, epinephrine 0.5mg, ketorolac 30mg and morphine 5mg in 150ml saline. After closure, catheter placed into knee joint and 10ml infiltrate injected. 22-24 hours after surgery, 20ml injection through catheter of ropivacaine 19ml (7.5mg/ml) and ketorolac 1ml (30mg/ml). i.v. injection of	6ml saline Infiltration ropivacain 150mg, epinephrir 0.5mg, ke 30mg and morphine 150ml sali After clost catheter p into knee 10 ml infilt injected. 2 hours afte surgery, 2 injection th catheter o ropivacain (7.5mg/ml saline 1ml injection o 1ml. Sham epic catheter.	with he ne torolac 5mg in ne. ure, laced joint and rate 12-24 r 0ml nrough f le 19ml ) and . i.v. f saline	inserted immediately before spinal anaesthesia. When spinal anaesthesia started to wear off, epidural infusion for 48 hrs with 6-10 ml/hr fentanyl 2µg/ml, epinephrine 1µg/ml, bupivacaine 1mg/ml. No knee infiltrations. Sham knee catheter with no injections	Infection: 0; 0; 1. No long-term adverse events reported

		ketorolac 1ml (30mg/ml). Sham epidural catheter.			
Spinal with added sulphate	d high dose morphine	sulphate vs spinal	with added low dos	e morphine sulpha	ite vs spinal with no morphine
Foadi et al.	Unilateral TKR	3ml spinal anaesthe	esia with 0.5% bupiva	6 months	
2017[117]	or THR for	Post-operative 1 g r	metamizole (orally or	"only a few dropouts". >70%	
Germany	osteoarthritis		morphine (intraveno	questionnaire return rate.	
Before 2017	16; 16; 17	subcutaneous) as re	escue	Unclear risk of bias due to limited	
1 centre	Mean 67.63 (SE	medication		reporting of pilot RCT.	
	2.45); 67.33 (2.87); 63.71 (3.14) 56%; 44%; 65%	0.2mg morphine sulphate added to spinal anaesthesia	0.1mg morphine sulphate added to spinal anaesthesia	No morphine sulphate added to spinal anaesthesia	No difference in WOMAC pain between groups at 6 months.  No adverse events noted

## 2. Myofascial trigger point dry needling

Author	Indication	Common pain managemen	Follow up	
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Group 1 (intervention)	Group C (control)	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Mayoral et al. 2013[118] Spain 2007-2008 Single centre	Unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 20; 20 Mean 71.7 (SD 6.1); 72.9 (7.9) 72.5%	General or spinal anaesthesi After anaesthesia and surgery started, dry needling applied 20 times to all myofascial trigger points by a trained and experienced physical therapist.	If spinal anaesthesia used, dry needling simulated behind screen	6 months 4; 5 High risk of bias due to large losses to follow up WOMAC pain at 6 months: mean 3.24 (SD 3.03); 3.13 (2.72). Difference not statistically significant. No difference between groups in VAS pain (p=0.725) or proportion of patients reporting significant VAS pain at 6 months.

	No complications related to the dry needling intervention. Other adverse events not collected.
--	--

### 3. Tourniquet

Author	Indication	Common blood conservation	on strategies	Follow up
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Group 1 (intervention)	Group C (control)	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Ejaz et al. 2014[58] Denmark 2011-2012 1 centre	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 35; 35 (33; 31 received intervention) Mean 68 (SD 8.0); 68 (7.8) 45.5%; 45.2%	Before surgery, oral tranexar (0.5g) 3 hours after surgery a postoperatively.  Appropriately sized thigh tourniquet applied. Limb exsanguination by elevation for 2 minutes and cuff inflated to 250mm Hg.	Appropriately sized thigh tourniquet applied but not inflated. Served as safety device in case of uncontrollable bleeding.	6 and 12 months 0; 0 of those who received intervention Low risk of bias Statistically significant difference in KOOS pain intensity at 2 months favouring TKR without a tourniquet (p < 0.001). Small difference between groups not statistically significant at 6 and 12 months. Small number of adverse events did not suggest extra risk in the group with no tourniquet.
Liu et al. 2014[59] Australia Before 2014 1 surgeon	Unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 10; 10 Mean 67.0; 70.0 30%; 10%	PCA. No CPM  Tourniquet inflated to 300 mmHg before skin incision.  Tourniquet deflated after wound closure and dressing.	Tourniquet placed but not inflated	6 and 12 months 0; 0 Low risk of bias No separate pain measure. Total OKS not significantly different at 6 and 12 months Blood transfusions: 3; 0.
Mittal et al. 2012[61] Australia 2008-2010	Primary unilateral TKR 31; 34	Autologous blood re-infused Short duration. Tourniquet set at 300mm Hg inflated	if required  Long-duration. Tourniquet set at 300mm Hg inflated before	1 year 5; 2

Abdel-Salam and Eyres 1995[119] UK Date not stated 1 surgeon  Primary unilateral TKR of which 91% osteoarthritis 40; 40 Mean 72 (range 65-80); 74 (64-82) 57.5%; 62.5%  Primary unilateral al.2016[120] Turkey 2015 1 surgeon  Primary unilateral for 2 minutes and tourniquet inflated to twice systolic blood pressure  Primary unilateral al.2016[120] Turkey 2015 1 surgeon  Primary unilateral al.2016[120] Turkey 1 surgeon  Primary unilateral for 2 minutes and tourniquet inflated to 125mm Hg above systolic blood pressure  Primary unilateral TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30;	1 centre	Mean 67.5 (SD 8.9); 66.6 (8.4) 81%:74%	prior to cemen and deflated w hardened		skin incision and when cement ha		Low risk of bias. However, RCT terminated early due to increased need for blood transfusion in short duration tourniquet group.  No separate pain outcome. Total OKS (0-48) at 52 weeks higher in long-duration group reflecting better recovery than short duration group but not significantly (p=0.12). Mean difference approximately 5 which is greater than MCID of 4[78].  Transfusions: 10; 2. Patient reported adverse event: 26; 12
UK Date not stated 1 surgeon  Mean 72 (range 65-80); 74 (64-82) 57.5%; 62.5%  Primary unilateral TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30; 30;	Abdel-Salam and	Primary unilateral	Tourniquet pla	ced around thig	gh		1 and 2 years
Date not stated 1 surgeon  Date not stated 1 surgeon  Date not stated 1 surgeon  Mean 72 (range 65-80); 74 (64-82) 57.5%; 62.5%  Primary unilateral al.2016[120] Turkey 2015 1 surgeon  Description  Description  Description  Osteoarthritis 40; 40  Mean 72 (range 65-80); 74 (64-82) 57.5%; 62.5%  Description  Description  Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.8); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  Description  Osteoarthritis 40; 40  Mean 72 (range 65-80); 74 (64-82)  Description  Mean 72 (range 65-80); 74 (64-82)  Description	Eyres 1995[119]		Limb exsangui	nated for 2	Tourniquet not i	nflated	0; 0
65-80); 74 (64-82)   57.5%; 62.5%   Significantly different at 1 or 2 years.   Significantly different at 1 or 2 years.   Blood loss similar between groups.   Wound infections: 5;0. DVT: 4;0	Date not stated	osteoarthritis 40; 40	minutes and tourniquet inflated to twice systolic		uet .		reporting of methods. No pain
Sükür et al.2016[120] Turkey 2015 1 surgeon  Primary unilateral TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  Primary unilateral TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  Premary unilateral TKR, in women with osteoarthritis blood pressure  Knee in 90° flexion and tourniquet inflated to 125mm Hg above systolic blood pressure  Knee in 90° flexion and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Knee in 90° flexion and tourniquet during wound closure  Knee in full extension and tourniquet during wound closure  Similar between groups. No infections, fractures or instability requiring revision within 6 months		65-80); 74 (64- 82)					year 90 (78-97); 91 (80-97). Not
Turkey 2015 1 surgeon  TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  Knee in 90° flexion and tourniquet deflated during wound closure  TR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30  Knee in 90° flexion and tourniquet deflated during wound closure  TKR, in women with osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30  Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.9); 68.4 (6.8)  GRAPH TRANSITION OF THE PROPERTY O		57.5%; 62.5%					
Turkey 2015 1 surgeon  With osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.9); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  With osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.9); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  With osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.9); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  Knee in 90° flexion and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Vision in methods but not presented in results.  KSS results not reported at 6 months but no significant differences between groups at 3 months.  Surgical and wound complications similar between groups. No infections, fractures or instability requiring revision within 6 months					to 125mm Hg ab	ove systolic	6 months
2015 1 surgeon  Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.9); 68.4 (6.8) 100%  Rifee in 30 flexion and tourniquet deflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 flexion and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet deflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Rifee in 40 extension and tourniquet inflated during wound closure  Fligh risk of bias. RSS outcome noted in methods but not presented in results.  KSS results not reported at 6 months but no significant differences between groups at 3 months.  Surgical and wound complications similar between groups. No infections, fractures or instability requiring revision within 6 months		,	•		T	1	0;0;0;0
	2015	30; 30; 30; 30 Mean 67.0 (SD 7.0); 66.9 (8.5); 68.4 (6.9); 68.4 (6.8)	flexion and tourniquet deflated during wound closure	flexion and tourniquet inflated during wound closure	extension and tourniquet deflated during wound	extension and tourniquet inflated during wound	in methods but not presented in results.  KSS results not reported at 6 months but no significant differences between groups at 3 months.  Surgical and wound complications similar between groups. No infections, fractures or instability requiring revision within 6 months

Zhang et al.2016	Primary TKR for	Tourniquet		No tourniquet		Not clear
[121]	osteoarthritis					High risk of bias. Variable follow up.
China	84; 82					HSS outcome noted in methods but not presented in results.
2014-2015	Not reported  Not reported					HSS not reported.
1 hospital	Not reported					Transfusion rates similar between groups. At mean follow up of 12 -13 months, patients operated on without a tourniquet had a lower rate of DVT (2.4%) compared with those with a tourniquet (10.7%).
Zhang et al.	Primary unilateral	Tourniquet inflated to 300-337mm Hg. Tranexamic acid not				6 months
2017[62]	cemented TKR for osteoarthritis	generally used	· ·		I <del></del>	0; 0; 0
China	50; 50; 50	Tourniquet for	Tournique removed		Tourniquet from first bone	Low risk of bias
2008-2011 1 surgeon	Mean 70.3 (SD 6.6); 71 (10.2);	entire operation removed wound cl		osteotom	osteotomy until wound closure	No separate pain outcome. HSS similar between groups at 6 months (p=0.839).
	68.2 (6.8) 54%; 60%; 50%					At 2 weeks DVT: 0; 0; 1. Intramuscular vein thrombosis: 4; 3; 3. Transfusions: 30%; 26%; 10%
Huang et al.	Primary unilateral	Tranexamic acid	•		•	6 months
2017[60]	TKR for osteoarthritis	Tourniquet		No tourni	quet	0; 0
China	50; 50					Low risk of bias
2015 1 centre	Mean 66.2 (SD 8.3); 65.1 (6.8)					VAS pain similar between groups at 6 months (p=0.728). Mean HSS score 90.3 (SD 3.2); 91.2 (2.5). P=0.151
	64%; 68%					DVT: 0; 0. PE: 0; 0. Intramuscular venous thrombosis: 6; 4. Superficial infection: 1; 0. Wound secretion: 6; 0. No significant difference in blood loss between groups.

## 4. Compression bandage

or Indication Common treatments Follow up	
---	--

Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Intervention	Control	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Brock et al. 2017[70] UK 2013-2014 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 25; 25 (24 received intervention) Mean 67.3 (SD 8.2); 69.5 (6.8) 66.7%; 64.0%	Hydrocolloid dressing left in p 10-14 Soft inner layer with compressive outer layer bandage. Removed after 24 hours.	Standard bandaging with soft inner layer and crepe bandage outer layer. Removed after 24 hours and cryocuff used.	6 months 0; 0 of patients receiving intervention Low risk of bias No separate pain outcome. Mean OKS similar between groups at 6 months: 35.8 (SD 7.7); 34.3 (10.6). P=0.58 No infections or thromboembolic events in either group

#### 5. Blood conservation

Author	Indication	Common blood conservation	Follow up	
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Intervention	Control	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Tranexamic acid	1			1
Sa-Ngasoongsong	Primary knee	Drain and compressive dressing		6 months
et al. 2011[64]	osteoarthritis with unilateral primary	25ml saline solution	25ml saline solution injected	0; 0
Thailand	cemented	containing 250mg tranexamic acid injected into	into knee joint after fascial	Low risk of bias
2008-2009	computer	knee joint after fascial	closure	No separate pain score reported but
1 hospital	assisted TKR 24; 24	closure		WOMAC overall score mean 18.6 (SD 7.6); 20.8 (6.4). P=0.282
,	69.0 (SD 8.2);			Lower peri-operative blood loss in
	69.2 (7.6)			tranexamic acid group and need for blood transfusion, 1/24 compared
	91.7%; 75%			with 8/24 in control group. No DVT,

						wound complications or infection reported in either group	
Kim et al. 2014[63] Korea 2009-2011 1 hospital  Sa-Ngasoongsong et al. 2013[65] Thailand 2010-2011 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 90; 90 Mean 73.5 (SD 5.5); 71.9 (SD 5.9) 88%; 87%  Primary unilateral cemented TKR for osteoarthritis 45; 45; 45 Mean 68.1 (SD 6.2); 67.6 (8.7);	containing 500mg tranexamic acid injected into knee	o mL of s slow 80 min ation, 3 e dressir 25ml sa solution containii tranexar	No tranexiplacebo  ng line ng 250mg mic acid		1 year 0; 0 Low risk of bias WOMAC pain mean 3.2 (2.6); 2.8 (2.3). Difference not statistically significant Lower blood loss and need for allogenic transfusion in tranexamic acid group. No DVT. 1 PE in control group.  1 year 0; 0; 0 Low risk of bias No separate pain outcome but WOMAC mean 14.5 (7.1); 15.1 (6.2);	
	6.2); 67.6 (8.7); 66.2 (7.3) 88.9%; 93.3%; 95.6%	joint after fascial closure via drain tube.  injected into k joint after fasc closure via drain tube.		er fascial	Ciosure	15.5 (6.6). P=0.42  Total blood and Hb loss lower in intervention groups than control. Fewer transfusions in 500mg (0) than 250mg tranexamic acid group (6) and control group (10). 2 DVT in 500mg group. 1 DVT in 250mg group. 1 PE and 3 DVT in control group. No infections.	
Hourlier et al. 2015[67]	Primary unilateral TKR for	Tourniquet, electrocautery, routine haemostasis, superficial drain. No blood salvage system.				6 months 0; 0	
France 2009-2010 1 hospital	osteoarthritis 52; 54 74 (SD 6); 72 (7) 62%; 63%	10 mg/kg intra-operative tranexamic infusion. At hours, continuous infusion tranexamic acid 2 mg/l for 20 hours via electric syringe	rerative single bolu bon. After 2 tranexamic is infusion of the intraopera 2 mg/kg/hr 2 hours, p		us of 30 mg/kg c acid as an tive infusion. After lacebo saline s infusion via ringe	Low risk of bias.  No separate pain score but KSS clinical score mean 90 (SD 6); 90 (13). P=0.90  No difference between groups in tota blood loss. 1 MUA in single treatment	

				group. No deep infections or revisions.
Huang et al. 2017[60] China 2015 1 centre	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 50; 50 Mean 66.2 (SD 8.3); 65.8 (6.3) 64%; 70%	Tourniquet inflated to 100mm I and deflated after wound closu Intravenous tranexamic acid 20mg/kg before incision and tranexamic acid 10mg/kg at 3, 6, 12 and 24 hours. 1g tranexamic acid in 50ml saline irrigated into wound during operation		6 months 0; 0 Low risk of bias VAS pain similar between groups at 6 months (p=0.728). Mean HSS score (0-100) better in tranexamic acid group than controls: 90.3 (SD 3.2); 88.9 (3.0). P<0.001. Mean difference 1.4 lower than MCID of 8.29[81] Greater blood loss in control group than tranexamic group (p<0.001). DVT: 0; 0. PE: 0; 0. Intramuscular venous thrombosis: 6; 3. Superficial infection: 1; 3. Wound secretion: 6; 9.
Thrombin infusion	n			
Kusuma et al. 2013[68] USA Not stated 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 40; 40 Mean 64.6 (SD 10.2); 64.5 (7.3) 82.5%; 67.5%	Tourniquet, drain, Esmarch ba 20,000 IU thrombin infusion (1,000 IU/mL) through fascial defect	Closure and drain placement protocol without the thrombin infusion.	1 year (6 months and 2 years also reported) 0; 0 Low risk of bias No separate pain outcome. KSS mean 95.5; 96.0. p=0.45 Lower drop in Hb in thrombin group. Blood transfusion in 4 intervention and 7 control patients. 1 control patient had haematoma. No hospital readmissions
Flexion vs extens				
Napier et al. 2014[69] UK 2003-2004 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR of which 89% for osteoarthritis 90; 90	No drains or tranexamic acid Flexion. Operated knee kept in passive flexion (120°) post-operatively for 6 hours using a jig. Wound redressed and placed in flexion over a	Extension. Operated knee kept in full passive extension	1 year 5; 1 (12 did not attend follow up) Low risk of bias. No separate pain outcome. OKS mean 20.5 (SD9.0); 22.1 (9.7). P=0.27

	Mean 70.4 (SD 9.9) 71.0 (7.6) 74%; 64%	single pillow until POD1 morning.		1 MI and 1 DVT in each group. 1 haematoma in flexion group. 1 deep infection and 1 extensor muscle weakness in extension group. More transfusions in extension group (p=0.002)
Auto-transfusion of	washed blood			
Thomas et al.	Unilateral TKR	Allogenic transfusion if Hb fell	below 9g/dl	6 months
2001[122]	115; 116	Auto-transfusion of wound	Wound drainage discarded	Losses to follow up not reported
UK Not stated	Mean 69.3 (range 32-95);	drainage if volume >125ml post-operative. Blood		Unclear risk of bias due to limited details of methods and follow up.
1 hospital	70.0 (40-88) 62%; 53%	washed and re-suspended before re-infusion using a centrifugal cell washing machine		No separate pain outcome. No significant difference in EQ-5D between groups.  7% of auto-transfusion group required allogenic transfusion compared with 28% in control group. Fewer infections, readmissions and GP visits in auto-transfusion group. No significant differences in other serious adverse events or mortality between groups.

## 6. Platelet rich plasma

Author	Indication	Common blood conservation	Follow up	
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Group 1 (intervention)	Group C (control)	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Aggarwal et al. 2014[123]	Primary unilateral surgery or first surgery of staged	Tourniquet. No tranexamic acid or suction drain. Blood transfusion if necessary due to intraoperative blood loss or postoperative haemoglobin <8g/dl.		6 months No losses to follow up reported

India 2010-2011	bilateral TKR for osteoarthritis	8 ml PRP, prepared from patient's blood. Calcium chloride for activation given	No treatment	High risk of bias due to unexplained differences in numbers of patients in randomised groups.
1 surgeon	7; 14 Mean 56.43 (SD 7.59); 53.79 (9.75) Sex not stated	in a separate syringe in 4:1 ratio. PRP and calcium chloride injected into the posterior recess, gutters and capsule, and repaired extensor mechanism and prepatellar fat.		No separate pain outcome. WOMAC total at 6 months PRP mean 7.14 (SE 0.69), controls 7.86 (1.23), p=0.173 PRP group had lower fall in haemoglobin and need for blood transfusion

## 7. Cryotherapy

Author	Indication	Common treatment	Follow up	
Country Recruitment dates	Number randomised	Group 1 (intervention)	Group 1 (intervention)	Losses to follow up intervention; control
Setting	intervention;			Risk of bias issues
•	control Age			Key results
	% female			
Wang 2017[124]	Unilateral TKR for	CPM for 2 weeks		6 months
China	osteoarthritis	Compression cold therapy for	No compression cold therapy	0; 0
2013-2015	53; 53 Mean 65.23 (SD	48 hours		Unclear risk of bias due to limited reporting
	5.41); 64.97(5.36) 62.3%; 58.5%			No separate pain outcome. At 6 months 87% of cryotherapy patients had excellent or good knee function compared with 69% of controls (p=0.032).
				No adverse events reported in either group during functional training

#### 8. Denusomab

Author	Indication	Common treatment	Follow up	
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Group 1 (intervention)	Group 1 (intervention)	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Ledin et al. 2017[72] Sweden 2012-2014 2 centres	Elective cemented primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 25; 25 Mean 66 (SD 6.3); 64 (5.5) 60%; 60%	Injection of 60mg denusomab 1 day after surgery and after 6 months	Injection of placebo 1 day after surgery and after 6 months	12, 24 months 0; 2 Low risk of bias No significant differences in KOOS pain or other KOOS domains between groups 12 12 or 24 months No suspected unexpected adverse reactions in either group

## 9. Continuous passive motion

Author	Indication	Common treatment		Follow up		
Country Recruitment dates Setting  Number randomised intervention; control Age % female		Group 1 (intervention)	Group 2 (intervention) Group C (control)		Group C (control)	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Leach et al. 2006[125] UK Before 2005 1 hospital	Unilateral cruciate retaining rotating platform TKR for osteoarthritis 85 overall Mean 71.2 (range 53-84); 72.9 (52- 89)	Physiotherapy protoc exercises to improve exercises. CPM commenced on postoperative day set range 0–30 and used hour twice per day. E	ROM and of first tat a			6 and 12 months 25 patients lost to follow up High risk of bias due to large loss to follow up and use of date of birth randomisation No difference in mean VAS pain at 1 year, CPM 0.6; control 0.9. p=0.49

	50%; 54%	range was increased with discharge at POI				Adverse events not reported
Sahin et al.	Primary unilateral	Standard physiothera	іру	I		6 months
2006[126] Turkey Before 2006 1 hospital	TKR for osteoarthritis 15; 16 Mean 61 (SD 6.0); 61.6 (7.5) 86%; 86%	From POD 1, CPM 2. 2x/day. Initially 0-40° and increased by 10° until POD 7	flexion each day	No CPM		3 lost to follow up Unclear risk of bias as patients were followed up by treating physician. Mean difference in VAS pain 0.1/10 slightly favouring no CPM group (95% CI -0.8, 0.9; P=0.87) Adverse events not known
Pope et al. 1997[127] Australia 1988-1999 1 hospital	Primary unilateral or bilateral TKR of which 86% for osteoarthritis 62 (70 knees). Authors excluded those not followed up so groups were 18; 20; 19 Mean 72.5 (95% CI 64.4, 74.98); 72.7 (70.4, 75.0); 69.4 (64.4, 74.98) 64.7%; 50%; 72.2%	Physiotherapy comm  Patients had an initial CPM range of 0-40° increased by 10° twice, on day after surgery and day 2, so that 0-60° flexion achieved before removal of machine at 48 hours	enced on p Patients h initial CPN 0-70° incre 10° twice, after surge day 2, so flexion acl before rer machine a hours	A an A range of eased by on day ery and that 0-90° hieved moval of	e day 1  Knee placed in an extension splint in the recovery room	6 and 12 months 8 patients (12 knees) excluding 1 death High risk of bias due to losses to follow up and limited reporting of methods No separate pain outcome. However, "pain disability" contributed up to 50 points out of a total of 70-point functional score (70 best outcome). No difference between groups in functional score: CPM 0-40 median 56 (range 20, 70); CPM 0-70 52 (10, 70); no CPM 52 (25, 70). p=0.80 CPM groups had greater blood loss than controls, p=0.008). 1 manipulation under anaesthesia in no CPM group, 2 revisions due to patellar dislocation in the 0-40 CPM group, 1 PE death in the 0-70 CPM group.
Beaupré etal. 2001[128]	Primary unilateral TKR of which	Standardised exercis a slider board session	•	spital admi	ssion which included	6 months

Canada 1997-1998 1 hospital	92% for osteoarthritis 40; 40; 40 Mean 68 (SD 9); 68 (9); 69 (8) 52.5%; 50%; 30%	3 sessions (2 hours) with CPM machine per day from POD2. Range increased from starting range 0-30 degrees as tolerated.	Minimum minute slid therapy se per day in to one in t standardis exercise. I knee flexid extension and lying performed independe tolerated.	der board essions addition he sed Active on and in sitting positions	No intervention further than standardised exercise.	6; 8; 6 Unclear risk of bias due to losses to follow up Mean WOMAC pain at 6 months: 76 (15); 85 (15); 79 (16). No difference over time between groups, p=0.62. Long-term adverse events. Need for MUA: 1; 1; 0. DVT: 0; 1; 0. Cellulitis: 0; 0; 1. Infection 0; 0; 1.
Kumar et al. 1996[129] USA Before 1996 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 40 (46 knees); 33 (37) Mean 69 (range 52-86); 68 (42-88) 58%; 67%	Standard physiotherapy  CPM from POD 0. Initially 10 hours/ day 0-90° until discharge  No CPM. Pas movement ("o to 90° 2x/ day		Passive range of t ("drop and dangle") day initially for 20 ater 30-45 minutes.	6 months 15; 13 lost to follow up High risk of bias due to large losses to follow up No separate pain outcome. KSS CPM 82.7; Drop and dangle 80.7. p=0.78 Haematoma 3;1. Closed manipulation 1;3. DVT 0;0. PE 0;1	
Worland et al. 1998[130] USA 1996 1 hospital	Unilateral or bilateral TKR for osteoarthritis. 91 patients (114 knees randomised). After post- randomisation exclusions: 37 (49 knees); 43 (54 knees) Mean 70.2 (range 44-84) 66.25%	CPM and physiothera At home after discharmachine 3 hours per replaced knee for 10 c	ge, CPM day on	Physical t	nission herapist home visit 1 e times per week for	6 months  11 patients (11 knees)  Unclear risk of bias due to postoperative exclusions not reported separately for groups and limited reporting of methods.  No separate pain outcome. At 6 months, mean HSS score CPM 95.3 (SD 2.8); physiotherapy 95.7 (3.0). P=0.49.  Adverse events not reported.

MacDonald et al. 2000[131]	Primary unilateral TKR for	Active ROM, passive using walker or crutcl	ROM exercises, mobil hes.	lised as tolerated	6 and 12 months Not reported	
Canada Before 2000 1 hospital	osteoarthritis 40; 40; 40 Age and sex not reported	CPM commenced POD 0. Initially 0- 50 degrees. Provided for 18-24 hour/ day. Increased by 10 degrees/ hour as tolerated. Continued until POD 1	CPM commenced POD 0. Initially 70- 110 degrees. Provided for 18-24 hr/ day. Not increased. Continued until POD 1	No CPM	Unclear risk of bias due to limited and selective reporting.  No separate pain outcome. No statistical differences between groups for KSS at 6 and 12 months.  Adverse events not reported	
Bennett et al.	Primary unilateral	Standard in hospital p	ohysiotherapy program	me	12 months	
2005[74] Australia 1997-2000 1 hospital	TKR for osteoarthritis 47; 48; 52 70.7; 71.4; 71.7 72.3%; 64.6%; 67.3%	Standard CPM from 0° to 40° for 2x3 hours on POD 1 increased by 10° per day until POD 6. Extension splint applied overnight	Early flexion CPM commenced in recovery room from 90° to 50° knee flexion. Increased gradually to CPM 90° to 0° for 2x3 hours in day 4-6.	No CPM	1 patient excluded due to inability to achieve 90° flexion Low risk of bias No separate pain outcome. No significant difference in KSS between groups at 1 year. No difference in wound healing between groups	
Ersözlü et al.	Primary unilateral TKR for	Conventional physica		<b>,</b>	2 years	
2009[73] Turkey 2003-2004	osteoarthritis 30; 30; 30 Mean 65 (range 54-73); 61 (49- 80); 62 (52-78) 66%; 55%; 57%	CPM set at 30-40° from POD1. Increased as tolerated to POD7. 1 hour CPM 3x/day.	CPM set at 60-70° from POD3. Increased by 10°/ day to POD7. 1 hour CPM 3x/day.	No CPM	2 years  1; 1; 2  Low risk of bias  No separate pain outcome. KSS scores 98; 95; 92. No significant difference between groups p=0.67.  Infection 0; 0; 1. Arrhythmia 0; 1; 0. No difference in complications between groups	

## 10. Electrical stimulation

Author	Indication	Common rehabilitation strategies	

Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Intervention	Intervention	Common rehabilitation strategies
Avramidis et al. 2011[75] Greece 2005-2006 1 hospital	Elective primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 38; 38 Mean 70.54 (SD 4.68); 70.66 (3.73) 80%; 82.9%	Standard physiotherapy for 6 we Transcutaneous electric muscle stimulation of the vastus medialis muscle from POD2 2x/ day for 2 hours for 6 weeks.	No intervention	1 year 3 (intervention intolerance); 3 Low risk of bias Improved SF-36 bodily pain at 1 year in intervention group compared with control, mean 92 (SD 10.57); 79.48 (12.72). P<0.001. Difference of 12.52 close to MCID of 16.86[82]. No difference in OKS or American KSS Adverse events not reported
Stevens-Lapsley et al. 2012[132] USA 2006-2010 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 35; 31 Mean 66.2 (SD 9.1); 64.8 (7.7) 57.1%; 51.6%	Standard inpatient rehabilitation, therapy  Neuromuscular electrical stimulation commenced on POD2 for 6 weeks 2x/ day.	No intervention	6 months and 1 year 5; 6 Unclear risk of bias due to baseline differences in WOMAC No difference in resting pain (points) at 1 year intervention mean 0.6 (SD 1.4); control 0.4 (1.5). Also similar at 6 months. Mean WOMAC total score better at 1 year in intervention group compared with control, 5.7 (5.9); 10.0 (12.2) and at 6 months. However, probably explained by baseline differences. Authors state no differences for change in WOMAC. DVT 1; 0. Unspecified complication 1; 0. Infection 0; 2. Revision 0; 1

Levine et al.	Elective unilateral	2 sessions of ROM exercise		6 months
2013[133] USA Before 2013 1 surgeon	TKR for osteoarthritis 35; 35 Mean 68.1; 65.1 76%; 62%	Neuromuscular electrical stimulation commenced 14 days pre-operatively until 1 day before surgery. Recommenced at POD1 for 60 days. After hospital discharge no direct contact with a physical therapist	Formal physical therapy programme with progressive resistive exercises and strengthening in hospital and after discharge supervised by physical therapist.	5; 9 Unclear risk of bias due to large uneven losses to follow up KSS pain favoured intervention at 6 months but not significantly 79.08 (SD 10.97); 75.5 (14.77); 95%CI for difference -3.78, 10.93. Similar for WOMAC total score, 95%CI for difference -3.19, 14.81. Confusion 2; 0
Moretti et al.	Primary unilateral	Rehabilitation protocol including	СРМ	6 and 12 months
2012[77] Italy 2008-2010 1 hospital	TKR for osteoarthritis 15; 15 Mean 70.0 (SD 10.6); 70.5 (8.1) Not reported	Pulsed electromagnetic fields (I-ONE therapy) from POD7, 4 hours/ day for 60 days	No intervention	No losses to follow up Low risk of bias Mean VAS pain (10-point scale) lower at 12 months in intervention group compared with control, 0.5 (SD 1.3); 3.6 (3.9). p< 0.05. Mean difference of 2.1 (10-point scale) greater than MCID of 16.1 (100- point scale)[83] Difference also at 6 months. More swelling of the knee in intervention patients than controls, statistically significant at 1 and 2 months
Adravanti et al. 2014[134]	Primary unilateral TKR for	Standard rehabilitation protocol: active and passive mobilisation  Pulsed electromagnetic fields No intervention		6 months 4; 3
Italy 1 hospital	osteoarthritis 16; 17 Mean 66 (SD 13); 73 (5) 62.5%; 52.9%	Pulsed electromagnetic fields (I-ONE therapy) by POD7 for 4 hours/ day for 60 days	INO IIILEI VEIILIOII	High risk of bias: small study, proportionately high losses to follow up  At 6 months, mean VAS pain in intervention group lower than in controls (p<0.05). At 3 years, 1/14 intervention patients and 4/12 controls reported severe pain

	No difference between groups in swelling at 6 months.

## 11. Rehabilitation

Author	Indication	Common rehabilitation strategies		Follow up			
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Intervention	Control	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results			
Walking guidance ar	nd training						
Li et al. 2017[79] China 2015-2016 1 hospital	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 43; 43 Mean 76.33 (SD 5.28); 78.47 (5.50) 55.8%; 51.2%	Before TKR, general guidance on joint activities, quadriceps muscle strength, use of aids, diet guidance, correct walking methods and precautions.  Knee passive flexion and extension to 90° and quadriceps muscle strength training commenced on POD 1. POD 3-7, straight leg raising exercises. 2 weeks after replacement, increased joint activities and muscle strength training, centre of gravity transfer training, limb weight training, and walking training.  Standing, weight and balance exercises from POD 1. From POD 2, walking guidance and training.		6 months 0; 0 Low risk of bias Mean VAS pain at 6 months: 0.51 (SD 0.74); 2.83 (0.88) favouring walking intervention group, p<0.01. Difference of 2.42 (10 point scale) greater than the MCID of 16.1 (100- point scale)[83]. HSS scores at 6 months favoured intervention, p<0.01. No infection, allergic reaction or immune reaction in either group. Intervention not associated with swelling, pain, prosthesis loosening, thrombosis, or delayed wound healing			
Aquatic therapy Liebs et al. 2012[81]	Aquatic therapy Liebs et al. 2012[81] Elective primary Continuous passive motion machines daily after removal of 6, 12 and 24 months						
Germany 2003-2004 4 hospitals	Elective primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 87;98	suction drains. Programme o motion activities; exercises for	f daily physiotherapy: range of or improvement of muscle ice, coordination and gait; and	13.8%; 19.4% excluding deaths and unexplained reasons Low risk of bias			

	Mean 68.5 (SD 8.6); 70.9 (7.5) 70.1%;73.5%	Aquatic therapy for 3 postoperative week proprioception, coording to cuffs, training k Aquatic therapy beg on the 6th postopera day with the wound covered with a wate adhesive dressing.	5. Pool exdination a ickboards inning ative	ercises aim nd strength and bar flo Aquatic the exercise at	ned at training of ening with aid of ats.  erapy as pool fiter the completion nealing on the 14th	WOMAC pain at 12 months: early aquatic mean 13.2 (SD 15.0); late aquatic 17.4 (22.4) p=0.22. No difference at 6 and 24 months.  5 early aquatic therapy patients and 1 late aquatic therapy patient readmitted to hospital within 3 months. 2 early aquatic patients and 1 late aquatic patient readmission directly or indirectly related to the intervention.
Rahmann et al. 2009[135] Australia	Unilateral primary TKR or THR for	Standard ward-base physiotherapy treatn with an occlusive, w.	nent per d	lay. Surgica	I wounds covered	6 months 4;2;0 for combined THR and TKR Unclear risk of bias as TKR patients
2003-2005 1 hospital with 2 surgeons	osteoarthritis (50% TKR)  18;19;17 (11 had been excluded post-randomisation due to complications in hospital Mean 69.4 (SD 6.5); 69.0 (8.9); 70.4 (9.2)  44.4%; 63.2%; 70.6%	From day 4, 1 to 1 individual physiotherapy. Aquatic physiotherapy programme to maximize function and strength. 40 mins/ day. Fast pace metronome 80-88 bpm	individua physioth Water ex program general on targe specific t retraining aquatic	erapy. Rercise me with exercises eted at functional g in the nent. Slow tronome	From day 4, 1 to 1 individual ward-based physiotherapy. 40 mins/ day	more likely to receive ward-based control intervention. THR and TKR analysed together  No difference in overall WOMAC outcome at 6 months in THR and TKR patients combined between aquatic at fast pace and ward-based (p=0.929) and aquatic at 2 paces (p=0.872).  No adverse events reported after intervention commenced.
Supported early disconnected Mahomed et al.	Primary unilateral	Innationt physiother	201/			12 months
2008[82]	TKR or THR for	Discharged home when able to independently transfer supine to sitting and sitting to standing, walk 30 metres and climb stairs if necessary.  Transfer to independent rehabilitation centre for 14 day stay.		No losses to follow up		
Canada 2000-2002 2 centres	osteoarthritis (approximately 50% TKR) 119;115			rehabilita	ation centre for 14	Low risk of bias (analysis by actual treatment received showed similar results)  WOMAC pain at 12 months
	68	within 48 hours and	Physiotherapist home visit within 48 hours and			marginally favoured home-based

	About 67% women	subsequent management along a multidisciplinary clinical pathway (4-16 visits). Then outpatient physiotherapy or self-directed programme.		rehabilitation mean 87 (SD 16); 83 SD (20), p=0.08 but this was not statistically significant. Mean difference of 4 less than MCID of 8-9[77]. Results did not differ between TKR and THR patients.  Similar rates of dislocation, DVT and readmissions between groups. 2% inpatient group developed infections compared with 0 in home group
Hill et al. 2000[136] UK	Unilateral, primary TKR,	Care pathway for medical, nurs from admission until day 5		1 year No losses to follow up reported after
1997-1998 1 centre	irrespective of diagnosis or concomitant disease 70 randomised, with 32;28 eligible for trial at day 5	Outreach team domiciliary visit prior to admission with assessment of home environment. At days 5–7, patients assessed to ensure discharge safe. Outreach team visit on day of discharge with further visits as required. 1+ physiotherapist visit linked with nurses to monitor knee performance. Discharge when skin clips removed, wound healed and specialist orthopaedic assistance not required, usually day 10–12	Inpatient care until removal of skin clips and wound healing.	commencement of intervention Unclear risk of bias due to limited reporting of methods. No pain outcome or patient reported outcome. Control group had better mean KSS scores, but this did not reach statistical significance at 1 year or earlier.  1;1 serious infection, other wound infections 1;6, painful joints 9;4, other minor complications similar between groups
Flexion or extension				T
Wang et al. 2014[80] China 2009-2010 1 centre	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 40; 40 Mean 68.34 (SD 7.09), 67.87 (6.47) 17.5%; 22.5%	No patellar replacement or later Articular capsule, soft tissue and skin enclosed in 90° flexion which was maintained for 1-2 min after wound closure.	Wound closure performed in full extension	6 months  No losses to follow up  Low risk of bias  Mean VAS pain in flexion group 1.15 (SD 0.73); extension group 1.12 (0.68), p=0.64

	No wound complications, patella
	fracture or infection requiring surgery
	in either group

## 12. Wound management

Author	Indication	Common wound management strategies		Follow up
Country Recruitment dates	Number randomised	Intervention	Control	Losses to follow up intervention; control
Setting	intervention; control			Risk of bias issues
	Age			Key results
	% female			
Kong et al. 2014[71]	cemented unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 50; 50 Mean 69.0 (SD	Skin staples removed on day 10 and wound closure strip		6 and 12 months
South Korea		applied for 5 days		2; 2 lost to follow up
2011		After removal of wound closure strip, patients managed operation scars with application of silicone gel for 1 month after stitches removed	After removal of wound closure strip, patients managed operation scars with application of petroleum gel for 1 month after stitches removed	Low risk of bias
1 surgeon				At 12 months, VAS pain in silicone gel group mean 2.50 (SD 1.16); control 2.92 (1.90). P=0.201. No difference at 6 months, p=0.886.
				No wound dehiscence or infection associated with application of silicone gel or petroleum

#### 13. Anabolic steroids

Author	Indication	Common rehabilitation strat	tegies	Follow up
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Intervention	Control	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
		Cold compression and CPM		6, 9 and 12 months

Hohmann et al. 2010[83] Australia Before 2010 1 surgeon	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 5; 5 Mean 66.2 (range 58, 72); 65.2 (59, 72) 20%; 40%	On day 5, intramuscular injection of 50 mg Nandrolone decanoate solution. Patients visited every 2 weeks and injections continued for 6 months.	On day 5, intramuscular injection of saline. Patients visited every 2 weeks and injections continued for 6 months.	0; 0 lost to follow up Low risk of bias (but small feasibility study) No separate pain outcome. KSS at 12 months in intervention group mean 91.4 (SD 3.5); control 81.2 (SD 7.1). p=0.03. Difference also at 6 months (p=0.04), marginal at 9 months (p=0.06). Difference in means at 12 months of 10.2 close to MCID of 12.3[79].
				Intervention group had smaller decrease in bone mineral density at 6 months than controls but not significant

## 14. Guided imagery

Author	Indication	Common rehabilitation strate	egies	Follow up
Country Recruitment dates Setting	Number randomised intervention; control Age % female	Intervention	Control	Losses to follow up intervention; control Risk of bias issues Key results
Jacobson et al. 2016[137] USA 2011-2012 1 surgeon	Primary unilateral TKR for osteoarthritis 42; 40 (41; 39 received treatment) Mean 65.0 SD 8.6) 62.2%	Participants listened to a 19- 21-minute CD each day for 2 weeks before and 3 weeks after surgery. Content covered concerns and hopes about TKR with aim to facilitate mind-body connections to promote optimal TKR outcomes.	Participants listened to a 17- 21-minute CD each day for 2 weeks before and 3 weeks after surgery. Content comprised poetry, short stories and essays	6 months 12; 10 of patients receiving treatments High risk of bias due to large losses to follow up Mean WOMAC pain 2.7 (SD 3.1); 3.5 (SD 3.3). P<0.001 Adverse events not reported

CD compact disc; CPM Continuous passive motion; DN4 Douleur Neuropathique 4; FNB Femoral nerve block; HSS Hospital for Special Surgery; i.v. intravenous; KOOS Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score; KSS Knee Society Score; LIA local infiltration analgesia; NRS Numerical rating scale; OKS Oxford Knee Score; ONB obturator nerve block; PCA Patient controlled analgesia; PNB psoas nerve block; SF-36 Short Form 36 Health Survey; S-LANSS Leeds assessment of Neuropathic Symptoms and Signs Pain Scale; SNB Sciatic nerve block; TKR Total knee replacement; VAS Visual analogue scale; VTE Venous thromboembolism; WOMAC Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index.

## Supplementary material. Risk of bias assessment

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blind outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias	Summary
Pain manageme	ent					•		
Albrecht et al. 2014[41]	Computer generated	Anaesthetist blind to allocation	Physiotherapists, surgeons, research assistants collecting data, and members of the Acute Pain Service were kept blinded to group allocation.	Physiotherapists, surgeons, research assistants collecting data, and members of the Acute Pain Service were kept blinded to group allocation.	ITT analysis low losses to follow up	No but not checked protocol	Study was terminated early with 61% of planned recruitment completed due to change in standard anaesthesia at hospital	Low
Anastase et al. 2014[113]	Method of the Ulm Institute of Statistics	Method of the Ulm Institute of Statistics	No	No	15:14 lost to follow up	No but not checked protocol	ASA comorbidities differed between groups	High
Aveline et al. 2014[55]	Computer generated	opaque sealed envelopes	Blinded syringes prepared by nurse not involved in study	Yes	Low losses to follow up	Consistent with short term follow up paper	No	Low
Bergeron et al. 2009[105]	Blocks of different sizes according to list preprepared by study epidemiologist	Not described	Anaesthetist not blind. Patients blind	Nurse observers collecting data blind to allocation	32/59 lost to follow up	No but not checked protocol	No	High
Buvanendran et al. 2010[56]	computer generated	Yes, physicians and nurses blind	Yes	Yes	ITT	Protocol not checked	No	Low

Choy et al. 2011[42]	Computer generated	sealed envelope	No, the catheter was removed at either day 3 or 7	Patient reported outcome. Other outcomes by blinded independent physician	Low losses to follow up	Protocol not checked but reasonable range of outcomes	No	Low
Davidson et al. 2016[111]	Computer generated	Sealed opaque envelopes	Subjects and investigators were not masked to treatment group	Subjects and investigators were not masked to treatment group. PROM	31; 29 lost to follow up	None apparent but protocol not checked	Combined data from 2 RCTs	High
Fan et al. 2016[39]	No details	sealed opaque envelopes	Patients and assessors blind to randomisation	Patients and assessors blind to randomisation	2% protocol violation	No but not checked protocol	No	Low
Foadi et al. 2017[117]	Computer generated	Not described	Not described	Patient reported outcome	>70% questionnaire return	None apparent but protocol not checked	Described as pilot study	Unclear
Gao et al. 2017[35]	Random number table	Not described	Blind to patients	Blind to observers	2; 1; 0	None apparent but protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low
Ilfeld et al. 2009[108]	Computer generated	Investigators, patients, and all clinical staff were unaware of treatment group assignments	Investigators, patients, and all clinical staff were unaware of treatment group assignments	Investigators, patients, and all clinical staff were unaware of treatment group assignments	4:1 lost to follow up	No but not checked protocol	Basal infusion halved on POD1 in 10 intervention patients compared with 3 controls	High
Ilfeld et al. 2011[109]	Computer generated tables	Solutions prepared by investigational pharmacist	Yes. Intervention and control solutions indistinguishable	Patient reported outcomes. Staff masked to treatment group	11;12 did not have 4 measures out	Protocol not checked	WOMAC and WOMAC domain scores	High

				assignment performed all measures and assessments	of 6 up to 12 months	but seems reasonable	somewhat lower pre- intervention in extended infusion group. Authors report change scores	
Macrinici et al. 2017[43]	Computer generated	Staff performing injections blind	Anaesthesiologist, surgeons, patients and physical therapists blind to allocation	Yes	3; 4 lost to follow up. 6; 3 complications	None apparent but protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low
McDonald et al. 2016[52]	Computerised blocked	Study coordinator independent of care and surgery	Patients blind. Surgeon aware of study	Outcome assessment blind to allocation	1; 4 unexplained	None apparent, protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low
Meunier et al. 2007[54]	Computer generated	Sealed envelope	Randomisation code broken after 1 year	Yes	ITT reported except for 12 month pain outcome	No but not checked protocol	M/F ratio differed	Low
Morin et al. 2005[110]	Allocated randomly	Sealed envelope	All patients received some form of nerve block. Anaesthesiologist not blind to intervention	Observers not blinded	Per protocol analysis	No but not checked protocol	Difference between groups in anesthetist's opinion of difficulty of catheter placement. BMI differed between groups	High
Motififard et al. 2017[49]	Computer generated	Study coordinator independent of care and surgery	Patients blind. Surgeon aware of study	Outcome assessment blind to allocation	3; 7 (1; 4 unexplained)	None apparent, protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low

Nader et al. 2012[36]	Computer generated	Opaque envelope	No	Patient reported outcome	1:1 lost to follow up	Protocol not checked but reasonable range of outcomes	FNB group somewhat higher BMI	Low
Niemeläinen et al. 2014[47]	No details	Opaque sealed envelopes	Only research nurse preparing infiltrate aware of randomisation. All other personnel unaware until after 1 year follow up	Only research nurse preparing infiltrate aware of randomisation. All other personnel unaware until after 1 year follow up	All patients who received intervention completed follow up	No but not checked protocol	No	Low
Peng et al. 2014[38]	Computer generated	Not possible	Not possible	Patient reported outcome	31:38 lost at 12 months but ITT and per- protocol analysis	No but not checked protocol	No	Low
Perrin and Purcell 2009[107]	No details	Sealed syringe code stored in pharmacy department	yes	Yes	4 failed to complete protocol	No but not checked protocol	Pilot investigation. High risk of bias due to recruitment difficulties leading to small trial	High
Reinhardt et al. 2014[40]	Computer generated	Maintained by pharmacy department for blinding	Patients blind to intervention	Blinded research assistant and partially physical therapist	0 reported lost to follow up of those who received interventions	No but not checked protocol	No	Low
Seah et al. 2011[53]	Randomisation tables	Sealed envelopes. Anaesthetist and surgeon blind before opening of	Blinding of patients not stated	Blind outcome assessors and PROMs	No losses to follow up reported	No but not checked protocol	No	Low

		sealed envelope						
Shum et al. 2009[106]	No details	No details	Anaesthetist performing the blocks was not involved in the postoperative follow-up and data collection	Patient reported	14% and 20%	No but not checked protocol	Mean patient weight lower in no FNB group. More favourable mean OKS in no FNB group. Two groups combined for 2 year outcome but not for earlier	High
Spreng et al. 2012[115], Spreng et al. 2010[116]	Hospital pharmacy	Epidural catheter or sham set-up taped along the back of the patient and connected to an infusion pump covered in an opaque bag. Also sham knee catheter	Patients blind	Blind outcome assessment	13%	Limited reporting in conference abstract	Conference abstract only so limited information additional to early follow up paper	Unclear
Wang et al. 2015[112]	No details	No details	Not stated	Not stated	2:4 lost to follow up	No but not checked protocol	No	Unclear
Wegener et al. 2013[44]	No details	Opaque envelope	Patients, surgeons and researchers not blind to intervention	Patients not blinded	2:7:5 lost to follow up	No. Protocol checked	no	Low
Widmer et al. 2012[34]	Coded envelope	Coded envelope	Except for anaesthetist and surgeon	Both the investigators and patients were blinded	None reported as incomplete	No but protocol not checked	No	Low

Williams et al. 2013[51]	Computer generated	Not stated	Patients and assessors blind	Patients and assessors blind	3:1 of those who received treatment	No but not checked protocol	No	Low
Wu and Wong 2014[37]	Computer	Sealed envelopes	No	No	Available cases	No but not checked protocol	No	Low
Wylde et al. 2015[45]	Trials unit	Trials unit	Surgeon and anaesthetist not blind to allocation, Patients blind	Patients and research nurses blind to allocation	ITT with imputed data	No as per protocol	No	Low
Yue et al. 2013[114]	No details	No details	Surgeons and patients were double-blinded to the injection administered	surgeons and patients were double-blinded to the injection administered	Losses to follow up not reported	Limited reporting	No	Unclear
	ger point dry ne		1	1			•	
Mayoral et al. 2013[118]	Computerised	Not described	Patient and other researchers apart from physical therapist blind	Patient outcomes	4: 5 loss to follow up	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	High
Tourniquet		_						
Abdel-Salam and Eyres 1995[119]	Card system	Not described	No	No	No losses to follow up	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Unclear
Ejaz et al. 2014[58]	Block randomised	Sealed envelopes	Patients unaware	PROM	No losses to follow up of those who received treatments	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Low
Huang et al. 2017[60]	Computer generated	Sealed opaque envelopes	Surgeons not blind. Patients blind to allocation	Data collector blind to allocation	No losses to follow up reported	None apparent but protocol	Groups similar at baseline	Low

						not checked		
Liu et al. 2014[59]	Excel	Not described	Patients blind	PROM	No losses	None apparent but protocol not checked.	No	Low
Mittal et al. 2012[61]	Computer generated	Sealed opaque envelopes	Patient blind	Outcome assessors blind. PROM	5:2	None apparent but protocol not checked	Study stopped because of high risk of transfusion in short tourniquet duration group	Low
Şükür et al.2016[120]	Computer generated	Not described	Possibly patients	Outcome assessors blind	No losses to follow up	KSS outcome noted in methods but not presented in results	No	High
Zhang et al. 2017[62]	Excel	Randomisation by blinded researcher.	Patients and nurses on ward blind	Not clear	No losses reported	None apparent but protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low
Zhang et al.2016[121]	Randomly allocated	Not clear	Not clear	Not clear	Not clear	HSS outcome noted in methods but not presented in results	No	High

Brock et al. 2017[70]	Web-based	Not specified	Not possible	No but PROMs	4; 2 of those receiving intervention	None apparent but protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low
Blood conserv		•			•			•
Hourlier et al. 2015[67]	Computer generated	Opaque envelopes	Anaethsetist, surgeon and patient blind to treatment allocation	Assessors blind	No missing data	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Low
Huang et al. 2017[60]	Computer generated	Sealed opaque envelopes	Surgeons not blind. Patients blind to allocation	Data collector blind to allocation	No losses to follow up reported	None apparent but protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low
Kim et al. 2014[63]	Computer generated	Not stated	patients blind to allocation	Clinical investigator blind to allocation	No missing data	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Low
Kusuma et al. 2013[68]	Computer generated	Sealed envelopes	Surgeon and patient blind	Outcome assessor blind	No missing data	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Low
Napier et al. 2014[69]	Computer generated	Sealed envelopes	Unlikely	Not stated but PROM	low losses to follow up	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Low
Sa- Ngasoongsong et al. 2011[64]	Computer generated	Sealed envelopes	Surgeon and patient blind	Outcome assessor blind	No missing data	None apparent but	No	Low

						protocol not checked		
Sa- Ngasoongsong et al. 2013[65]	Computer generated	Sealed envelopes	Surgeon and patient blind	Outcome assessor blind	No missing data	None apparent but protocol not checked	Some difference between groups in pre- operative Hb	Low
Thomas et al. 2001[122]	Not described	not stated	Not reported	Not reported but PROM	Not reported but ITT	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Unclear
Platelet rich pla						1		
Aggarwal et al. 2014[123]	Not described	Opaque envelopes	Patients blind	Patients and examiners blind	No losses to follow up reported	None apparent but protocol not checked	Odd numbers in groups from randomisation	High
Cryotherapy					_			
Wang 2017[124]	No details	No details	No details	No details	No losses to follow up	None apparent but protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Unclear
Denusomab	T =	T = -		T	T	T	T	1 -
Ledin et al. 2017[72]	Randomisation list produced by the study monitor	Syringes prepared independently	Investigators and patients blind	Unblinding was done after all the data had been locked	0; 2	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Low
Continuous pa			Lat	I.B	0005 "	T N I	4 1 1	1
Beaupré et al. 2001[128]	Computer generated	Sealed envelopes	No	Researcher unaware and PROMs	6:8:6. Results carried	No	4 controls; 1 SB	Unclear

					forward for missing data		reassigned to CPM	
Bennett et al. 2005[74]	Block	Not stated	Operating surgeon blind. Patient not	Independent assessor blind	1 not included in analyses as not able to achieve 90 degree flexion	No	No	Low
Ersözlü et al. 2009[73]	Divided into groups by random selection	Not described	No	Surgeon score	A diabetic patient from the control group was excluded because of a superficial wound infection, a patient with a cardiac problem in group II due to dysrhythmia, and two patients due to insufficient follow-up.	Not apparent	No differences baseline	Unclear
Kumar et al. 1996[129]	Random number generator	Not stated	No	Not described	Large loss to follow up	Not all data clearly reported	No	High
Leach et al. 2006[125]	Allocation by date of birth	No	No	Blinded evaluation	Large loss to follow up	No	No	High
MacDonald et al. 2000[131]	Computer generated	Allocation concealed	No	Not described	Not reported	Yes, not all outcomes reported in full	No	Unclear
Pope et al. 1997[127]	Not described	Not described	Not described	Not described	No separate reporting. 8 patients (12 knees)	None apparent but protocol	No	High

					excluding 1 death	not checked		
Sahin et al. 2006[126]	Not described	Not stated	No	Followed up by treating physician	Low loss to follow up	No	No	Unclear
Worland et al. 1998[130]	Not described	Not described	No	Researcher blind	Not reported separately	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	Unclear
Electrical stimu	ılation	•	•				•	l .
Adravanti et al. 2014[134]	Computer generated	Not described	Research assistant not involved in patient assessment	Principal investigator and all physicians in charge of clinical controls were blinded to patient allocation	78% retained at 6 months	Not apparent but protocol not checked	No	High
Avramidis et al. 2011[75]	Computer generated	Not described	No	Independent assessors blind	3 (intolerance of intervention); 3	Not apparent	Baseline similar	Low
Levine et al. 2013[133]	Drawing papers from hat	Not described	No	Not described. WOMAC PROM	5:9 for KSS pain and WOMAC	Not apparent but protocol not checked	No	Unclear
Moretti et al. 2012[77]	Computer generated	Not described	Physicians, as well as medical assessors, were blinded to the allocation of patients in the study groups	Physicians, as well as medical assessors, were blinded to the allocation of patients in the study groups	No losses reported	Not apparent but protocol not checked	No	Low
Stevens- Lapsley et al. 2012[132]	Stratified	Concealed	No	no but standardised scripts used	5; 6	Not apparent but protocol	WOMAC, BMI unequal at baseline	Unclear

						not checked		
Rehabilitation		1	<u> </u>			onconca		l .
Hill et al. 2000[136]	Not described	Not stated	Not possible	Not described	No losses to follow up after initial 23222	No but protocol not checked	No	Unclear
Li et al. 2017[79]	Random number table	Not stated	Not possible	Not described but PROM	No losses to follow up	No but protocol not checked	Groups similar at baseline	Low
Liebs et al. 2012[81]	Computer generated	Allocation concealed	Not possible	No but PROM	Low losses to follow up (<20% if deaths and other explained reasons not counted)	No but protocol not checked	No	Low
Mahomed et al. 2008[82]	Block randomisation	Not stated	Not possible	PROM	No loss	No but protocol not checked	ITT gave similar results to analysis according to actual discharge destination (20 inpatient group received home based)	Low
Rahmann et al. 2009[135]	Not described	Sealed numbered envelopes	Not possible	Assessor blind to intervention. Patient reported outcome	Low losses to follow up	No but protocol not checked	TKR patients more likely to receive ward-based control intervention. THR and TKR analysed together	Unclear
Wang et al. 2014[80]	Computer generated	Surgeons did not participate	Surgery was performed by the	Postoperative evaluation was	No loss to follow up	None apparent	No baseline differences	Low

		in pre- operative grouping	physicians who did not participate in the preoperative grouping and postoperative evaluation	conducted by the physicians who were unaware of the grouping.		but protocol not checked		
Wound manage Kong et al.	Not described	Not described	Placebo used	Patient outcome	Low loss to	None	Similar at	Low
2014[71]		1101 0333/1303	1 100000	T diloni odioomo	follow up	apparent but protocol not checked	baseline	
Anabolic steroi		l Niet were enterel	Diameter Autol	Daniela labara	01 +- (-11	NI	I NI	T 1
Hohmann et al. 2010[83]	Internet based	Not reported	Placebo trial	Double-blind design minimized systemic error and eliminated observer and experimenter's bias	0 loss to follow up	None apparent	None apparent but small study	Low
Guided imager		10 00	15	Lv	10.10.1	Lai	T. N.	I.e.
Jacobson et al. 2016[137]	Permuted blocks	Opaque CD holders	Personnel yes, participants no	Yes	12; 10 of patients receiving treatment	None apparent but protocol not checked	No	High

## References to all RCTs of peri-operative interventions with long-term pain or score follow up, irrespective of risk of bias assessment (numbering consistent with main article)

- 34. Widmer BJ, Scholes CJ, Pattullo GG, et al. Is femoral nerve block necessary during total knee arthroplasty?: a randomized controlled trial. J Arthroplasty 2012;27:1800-5.
- 35. Gao WL, Li H, Liu BQ, et al. Analgesic effect of femoral and sciatic nerve block under multimodal analgesia in total knee arthroplasty. Chinese Journal of Tissue Engineering Research 2017;21:2966-72.
- 36. Nader A, Kendall MC, Wixson RL, et al. A randomized trial of epidural analgesia followed by continuous femoral analgesia compared with oral opioid analgesia on short- and long-term functional recovery after total knee replacement. Pain Med 2012;13:937-47.
- 37. Wu JWS, Wong YC. Elective unilateral total knee replacement using continuous femoral nerve blockade versus conventional patient-controlled analgesia: perioperative patient management based on a multidisciplinary pathway. Hong Kong Med J 2014;20:45-51.
- 38. Peng L, Ren L, Qin P, et al. Continuous femoral nerve block versus intravenous patient controlled analgesia for knee mobility and long-term pain in patients receiving total knee replacement: a randomized controlled trial. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med 2014;2014;569107.
- 39. Fan L, Yu X, Zan P, et al. Comparison of local infiltration analgesia with femoral nerve block for total knee arthroplasty: A prospective, randomized clinical trial. J Arthroplasty 2016;31:1361-5.
- 40. Reinhardt KR, Duggal S, Umunna BP, et al. Intraarticular analgesia versus epidural plus femoral nerve block after TKA: A randomized, double-blind trial. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014;472:1400-8.
- 41. Albrecht E, Morfey D, Chan V, et al. Single-injection or continuous femoral nerve block for total knee arthroplasty? Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014;472:1384-93.
- 42. Choy WS, Lee SK, Kim KJ, et al. Two continuous femoral nerve block strategies after TKA. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc 2011;19:1901-8.
- 43. Macrinici GI, Murphy C, Christman L, et al. Prospective, double-blind, randomized study to evaluate single-injection adductor canal nerve block versus femoral nerve block: postoperative functional outcomes after total knee arthroplasty. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2017:42:10-6.
- 44. Wegener JT, van Ooij B, van Dijk CN, et al. Long-term pain and functional disability after total knee arthroplasty with and without single-injection or continuous sciatic nerve block in addition to continuous femoral nerve block: a prospective, 1-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2013;38:58-63.
- 45. Wylde V, Lenguerrand E, Gooberman-Hill R, et al. Effect of local anaesthetic infiltration on chronic postsurgical pain after total hip and knee replacement: the APEX randomised controlled trials. Pain 2015;156:1161-70.
- 47. Niemeläinen M, Kalliovalkama J, Aho A, et al. Single periarticular local infiltration analgesia reduces opiate consumption until 48 hours after total knee arthroplasty. A randomized placebo-controlled trial involving 56 patients. Acta Orthop 2014;85:614-9.
- 49. Motififard M, Omidian A, Badiei S. Pre-emptive injection of peri-articular-multimodal drug for post-operative pain management in total knee arthroplasty: a double-blind randomized clinical trial. Int Orthop 2017;41:939-47.
- 51. Williams D, Petruccelli D, Paul J, et al. Continuous infusion of bupivacaine following total knee arthroplasty: a randomized control trial pilot study. J Arthroplasty 2013;28:479-84.

52. McDonald DA, Deakin AH, Ellis BM, et al. The technique of delivery of peri-operative analgesia does not affect the rehabilitation or outcomes following total knee arthroplasty. Bone Joint J 2016;98-B:1189-96.

- 53. Seah VWT, Chin PL, Chia SL, et al., double-blind, randomised controlled trial. Singapore Med J 2011;52:19-23.
- 54. Meunier A, Lisander B, Good L. Effects of celecoxib on blood loss, pain, and recovery of function after total knee replacement: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. Acta Orthop 2007;78:661-7.
- 55. Aveline C, Roux AL, Hetet HL, et al. Pain and recovery after total knee arthroplasty: a 12-month follow-up after a prospective randomized study evaluating Nefopam and Ketamine for early rehabilitation. Clin J Pain 2014;30:749-54.
- 56. Buvanendran A, Kroin JS, Della Valle CJ, et al. Perioperative oral pregabalin reduces chronic pain after total knee arthroplasty: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. Anesth Analg 2010;110:199-207.
- 58. Ejaz A, Laursen AC, Kappel A, et al. Faster recovery without the use of a tourniquet in total knee arthroplasty. Acta Orthop 2014;85:422-6.
- 59. Liu D, Graham D, Gillies K, et al. Effects of tourniquet use on quadriceps function and pain in total knee arthroplasty. Knee Surg Relat Res 2014;26:207-13.
- 60. Huang Z, Xie X, Li L, et al. Intravenous and topical tranexamic acid alone are superior to tourniquet use for primary total knee arthroplasty: A prospective, randomized controlled trial. J Bone Joint Surg (Am) 2017;99:2053-61.
- 61. Mittal R, Ko V, Adie S, et al. Tourniquet application only during cement fixation in total knee arthroplasty: a double-blind, randomized controlled trial. ANZ J Surg 2012;82:428-33.
- 62. Zhang Y, Li D, Liu P, et al. Effects of different methods of using pneumatic tourniquet in patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty: a randomized control trial. Ir Jr Med Sci 2017;186:953-9.
- 63. Kim TK, Chang CB, Kang YG, et al. Clinical value of tranexamic acid in unilateral and simultaneous bilateral TKAs under a contemporary blood-saving protocol: a randomized controlled trial. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc 2014;22:1870-8.
- 64. Sa-Ngasoongsong P, Channoom T, Kawinwonggowit V, et al. Postoperative blood loss reduction in computer-assisted surgery total knee replacement by low dose intra-articular tranexamic acid injection together with 2-hour clamp drain: a prospective triple-blinded randomized controlled trial. Orthop Rev 2011;3:e12.
- 65. Sa-Ngasoongsong P, Wongsak S, Chanplakorn P, et al. Efficacy of low-dose intraarticular tranexamic acid in total knee replacement; a prospective triple-blinded randomized controlled trial. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2013;14:340.
- 67. Hourlier H, Reina N, Fennema P. Single dose intravenous tranexamic acid as effective as continuous infusion in primary total knee arthroplasty: a randomised clinical trial. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg 2015;135:465-71.
- 68. Kusuma SK, Sheridan KC, Wasielewski RC. Use of bovine thrombin to reduce blood loss in primary total knee arthroplasty: a controlled randomized trial. J Arthroplasty 2013;28:1278-81.
- 69. Napier RJ, Bennett D, McConway J, et al. The influence of immediate knee flexion on blood loss and other parameters following total knee replacement. Bone Joint J 2014;96-B:201-9.
- 70. Brock T, Sprowson A, Muller S, et al. STICKS study Short-sTretch Inelastic Compression bandage in Knee Swelling following total knee arthroplasty a feasibility study. Trials 2017:18:6.
- 71. Kong CG, Kim GH, Kim DW, et al. The effect of topical scar treatment on postoperative scar pain and pruritus after total knee arthroplasty. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg 2014;134:555-9.

72. Ledin H, Good L, Aspenberg P. Denosumab reduces early migration in total knee replacement. Acta Orthop 2017;88:255-8.

- 73. Ersözlü S, Sahin O, Ozgür A, et al. The effects of two different continuous passive motion protocols on knee range of motion after total knee arthroplasty: a prospective analysis. Acta Orthop Traumato 2009;43:412-8.
- 74. Bennett LA, Brearley SC, Hart JAL, et al. A comparison of 2 continuous passive motion protocols after total knee arthroplasty: a controlled and randomized study. J Arthroplasty 2005;20:225-33.
- 75. Avramidis K, Karachalios T, Popotonasios K, et al. Does electric stimulation of the vastus medialis muscle influence rehabilitation after total knee replacement? Orthopedics 2011;34:175.
- 77. Moretti B, Notarnicola A, Moretti L, et al. I-ONE therapy in patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty: a prospective, randomized and controlled study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2012;13:88.
- 79. Li L, Wang Z, Yin MH, et al. Effect of early gait training on the functional rehabilitation after total knee arthroplasty. Chinese Journal of Tissue Engineering Research 2017;21:4288-93.
- 80. Wang S, Xia J, Wei Y, et al. Effect of the knee position during wound closure after total knee arthroplasty on early knee function recovery. J Orthop Surg Res 2014;9:79.
- 81. Liebs T, Herzberg W, Rüther W, et al. Multicenter randomized controlled trial comparing early versus late aquatic therapy after total hip or knee arthroplasty. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2012;93:192-9.
- 82. Mahomed NN, Davis AM, Hawker G, et al. Inpatient compared with home-based rehabilitation following primary unilateral total hip or knee replacement: a randomized controlled trial. J Bone Joint Surg (Am) 2008;90:1673-80.
- 83. Hohmann E, Tetsworth K, Hohmann S, et al. Anabolic steroids after total knee arthroplasty. A double blinded prospective pilot study. J Orthop Surg Res 2010;5:93.
- 105. Bergeron SG, Kardash KJ, Huk OL, et al. Functional outcome of femoral versus obturator nerve block after total knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat R* 2009;467:1458-62.
- 106. Shum CF, Lo NN, Yeo SJ, et al. Continuous femoral nerve block in total knee arthroplasty: immediate and two-year outcomes. *J Arthroplasty* 2009;24:204-9.
- 107. Perrin SB, Purcell AN. Intraoperative ketamine may influence persistent pain following knee arthroplasty under combined general and spinal anaesthesia: a pilot study. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 2009;37:248-53.
- 108. Ilfeld BM, Meyer RS, Le LT, et al. Health-related quality of life after tricompartment knee arthroplasty with and without an extended-duration continuous femoral nerve block: a prospective, 1-year follow-up of a randomized, triple-masked, placebo-controlled study. *Anesth Analg* 2009;108:1320-5.
- 109. Ilfeld BM, Shuster JJ, Theriaque DW, et al. Long-term pain, stiffness, and functional disability after total knee arthroplasty with and without an extended ambulatory continuous femoral nerve block: A prospective, 1-year follow-up of a multicenter, randomized, triple-masked, placebo-controlled trial. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2011;36:116-20.
- 110. Morin AM, Kratz CD, Eberhart LH, et al. Postoperative analgesia and functional recovery after total-knee replacement: comparison of a continuous posterior lumbar plexus (psoas compartment) block, a continuous femoral nerve block, and the combination of a continuous femoral and sciatic nerve block. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2005;30:434-45.
- 111. Davidson E, Machi A, Sztain J, et al. Adductor canal versus femoral continuous peripheral nerve blocks for knee arthroplasty: A one-year follow-up pilot study of two randomized, controlled clinical trials. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2016;41.
- 112. Wang F, Zhou Y, Sun J, et al. Influences of continuous femoral nerve block on knee function and quality of life in patients following total knee arthroplasty. *Int J Clin Exp Med* 2015;8:19120-5.

113. Anastase DM, Winckelmann J, Geiger P. Effects of regional anaesthesia techniques on patients' satisfaction after total knee arthroplasty. *Jurnalul Roman de Anestezie Terapie Intensiva* 2014;21:35-43.

- 114. Yue D-b, Wang B-l, Liu K-p, et al. Efficacy of multimodal cocktail periarticular injection with or without steroid in total knee arthroplasty. *Chinese Med J* 2013;126:3851-5.
- 115. Spreng UJ, Andersson E, Dahl V. Long-term outcome after total knee arthroplasty local infiltration analgesia (LIA) vs. Epidural analgesia. *Br J Anaesth* 2012;108:ii419.
- 116. Spreng UJ, Dahl V, Hjall A, et al. High-volume local infiltration analgesia combined with intravenous or local ketorolac+morphine compared with epidural analgesia after total knee arthroplasty. *Br J Anaesth* 2010;105:675-82.
- 117. Foadi N, Karst M, Frese-Gaul A, et al. The improved quality of postoperative analgesia after intrathecal morphine does not result in improved recovery and quality of life in the first 6 months after orthopedic surgery: a randomized controlled pilot study. *J Pain Res* 2017;10:1059-69.
- 118. Mayoral O, Salvat I, Martin MT, et al. Efficacy of myofascial trigger point dry needling in the prevention of pain after total knee arthroplasty: A randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med* 2013;2013:Article ID 694941.
- 119. Abdel-Salam A, Eyres KS. Effects of tourniquet during total knee arthroplasty. A prospective randomised study. *J Bone Joint Surg (Br)* 1995;77:250-3.
- 120. Sükür E, Öztürkmen Y, Akman Y, et al. The effect of tourniquet and knee position during wound closure after total knee arthroplasty on early recovery of range of motion: a prospective, randomized study. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2016;136:1773-80.
- 121. Zhang Q, Dong J, Gong K, et al. Effects of tourniquet use on perioperative outcome in total knee arthroplasty. *Chinese Journal of Reparative and Reconstructive Surgery* 2016;30:421-5.
- 122. Thomas D, Wareham K, Cohen D, et al. Autologous blood transfusion in total knee replacement surgery. *Br J Anaesth* 2001;86:669-73.
- 123. Aggarwal AK, Shashikanth VS, Marwaha N. Platelet-rich plasma prevents blood loss and pain and enhances early functional outcome after total knee arthroplasty: a prospective randomised controlled study. *Int Orthop* 2014;38:387-95.
- 124. Wang X. Impact of local compression cryotherapy combined with continuous passive motion on the early functional recovery after total knee arthroplasty. *Chinese Journal of Tissue Engineering Research* 2017;21:998-1003.
- 125. Leach W, Reid J, Murphy F. Continuous passive motion following total knee replacement: a prospective randomized trial with follow-up to 1 year. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2006;14:922-6.
- 126. Sahin E, Akalin E, Bircan C, et al. The effects of continuous passive motion on outcome in total knee arthroplasty. *Journal of Rheumatology and Medical Rehabilitation* 2006;17:85-90.
- 127. Pope RO, Corcoran S, McCaul K, et al. Continuous passive motion after primary total knee arthroplasty. Does it offer any benefits? *J Bone Joint Surg (Br)* 1997;79:914-7.
- 128. Beaupre LA, Davies DM, Jones CA, et al. Exercise combined with continuous passive motion or slider board therapy compared with exercise only: a randomized controlled trial of patients following total knee arthroplasty. *Physical therapy* 2001;81:1029-37.
- 129. Kumar PJ, McPherson EJ, Dorr LD, et al. Rehabilitation after total knee arthroplasty: a comparison of 2 rehabilitation techniques. *Clin Orthop Relat R* 1996:93-101.
- 130. Worland RL, Arredondo J, Angles F, et al. Home continuous passive motion machine versus professional physical therapy following total knee replacement. *J Arthroplasty* 1998;13:784-7.
- 131. MacDonald SJ, Bourne RB, Rorabeck CH, et al. Prospective randomized clinical trial of continuous passive motion after total knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2000:30-5.

132. Stevens-Lapsley JE, Balter JE, Wolfe P, et al. Early neuromuscular electrical stimulation to improve quadriceps muscle strength after total knee arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. *Physical therapy* 2012;92:210-26.

- 133. Levine M, McElroy K, Stakich V, et al. Comparing conventional physical therapy rehabilitation with neuromuscular electrical stimulation after TKA. *Orthopedics* 2013;36:e319-24.
- 134. Adravanti P, Nicoletti S, Setti S, et al. Effect of pulsed electromagnetic field therapy in patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty: a randomised controlled trial. *Int Orthop* 2014;38:397-403.
- 135. Rahmann AE, Brauer SG, Nitz JC. A specific inpatient aquatic physiotherapy program improves strength after total hip or knee replacement surgery: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2009;90:745-55.
- 136. Hill SP, Flynn J, Crawford EJP. Early discharge following total knee replacement -- a trial of patient satisfaction and outcomes using an orthopaedic outreach team. *J Orthop Nurs* 2000;4:121-6.
- 137. Jacobson AF, Umberger WA, Palmieri PA, et al. Guided imagery for total knee replacement: A randomized, placebo-controlled pilot study. *J Altern Complement Med* 2016;22:563-75.