

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## What are patients' preferences for revision surgery after periprosthetic joint infection? A discrete choice experiment

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031645
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-May-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Carroll, Fran; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Goberman-Hill, Rachael; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Strange, Simon; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Blom, AW; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Moore, Andrew; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School
Keywords:	Discrete Choice Experiment, Hip < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY, periprosthetic infection, ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 What are patients' preferences for revision surgery after periprosthetic joint infection? A discrete  
4  
5 choice experiment  
6  
7

8 **Authors:**  
9

10 F E Carroll  
11  
12

13 R Goberman-Hill  
14  
15

16 S Strange  
17  
18

19 A W Blom  
20  
21

22 A J Moore  
23  
24

25 Department of Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol.  
26  
27

28 Corresponding author: Dr Andrew J Moore. Translational Health Sciences (Southmead),  
29  
30 Musculoskeletal Research Unit, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of  
31  
32 Bristol, Learning and Research Building, Level 1, Southmead Hospital, Bristol, BS10 5NB, UK. Email:  
33  
34 [a.j.moore@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:a.j.moore@bristol.ac.uk). Telephone: 0117 414 7877  
35  
36

37  
38 Word count: 3076  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

Objectives: Understanding patients' preferences for treatment is crucial to provision of good care and shared decisions, especially when more than one treatment option exists for a given condition.

One such condition is infection of the area around the prosthesis after hip replacement, which affects between 0.4 and 3% of patients. There is more than one treatment option for this major complication and our study aimed to assess the value that patients place on aspects of revision surgery for periprosthetic hip infection.

Design: We identified four attributes of revision surgery for periprosthetic hip infection. Using a discrete choice experiment (DCE) we measured the value placed on each attribute by 57 people who had undergone either one- or two-stage revision surgery.

Setting: The DCE was conducted with participants from 9 National Health Service hospitals in the United Kingdom.

Participants: Adults who had undergone revision surgery for periprosthetic hip infection (n=57).

Results: Overall, the strongest preference was for a surgical option that resulted in no restrictions on engaging in valued activities after a new hip is fitted. Less valued, but still important attributes, included a shorter time taken from the start of treatment to return to normal activities, few or no side effects from antibiotics, and having only one operation.

Conclusions: Results highlight that people who have had revision surgery for periprosthetic hip infection most value aspects of care that affect their ability to engage in normal everyday activities.

These were the most important characteristics in decisions about revision surgery.

## Keywords

*Discrete choice experiment; hip; periprosthetic infection; orthopaedic surgery*

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first study to quantify the value that patients place on different aspects of revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection.
- Using a rigorous process involving empirical qualitative research we identified four attributes for the DCE.
- It was feasible for participants to complete the questionnaires, meaning the results were as expected with patients selecting a combination of options reflecting their preferred choice.
- While, the sample size of 57 participants sufficiently powered the analyses presented here, it is too small to conduct any subgroup analyses.
- The majority of the study sample were white, male and educated, so results may not reflect the preferences of the wider surgical population.

## Introduction

For people with osteoarthritis, hip replacement is a common procedure that aims to improve function and reduce pain. In 2016 over 100,000 hip replacement procedures were conducted in the UK. With an ageing population, rates are predicted to rise <sup>1</sup>. Although successful for many people, approximately 0.4 -1% of patients who have undergone primary hip replacement <sup>2,3</sup> and 2-3% of patients undergoing revision hip replacement <sup>4</sup> develop deep periprosthetic joint infection (PJI) severe enough to warrant surgical revision. Patients with PJI find it devastating. Symptoms include severe pain, inflammation, discharge from the surgical wound, fever, nausea, malaise, reduction in or loss of function, dislocation, and if left untreated can lead to disability and/or death <sup>5</sup>.

PJI is extremely challenging to treat. Treatment can include 'debridement, antibiotic treatment and implant retention' (DAIR), used in 7.6% of cases, or more commonly major revision surgery, which involves removal of the infected prosthesis, radical debridement of infected tissue and

1  
2  
3 reimplantation of a new prosthesis with subsequent antibiotic treatment <sup>4</sup>. Revision surgery can be  
4  
5 provided in a single operation (one-stage) or as a staged operation (two-stage) where the infected  
6  
7 implant is removed and the patient is left without an implant (with or without a temporary spacer)  
8  
9 while receiving antibiotic treatment. In the staged process reimplantation of the new implant is  
10  
11 delayed, commonly for up to 6 months, but in some instances over 12 months later <sup>5,6</sup>. There is no  
12  
13 clear evidence that either a one or two-stage strategy is superior in eradicating infection <sup>7,8</sup>, but  
14  
15 qualitative research has shown that two-stage revision places a greater burden on patients and  
16  
17 families than one-stage revision. This burden is due to the extended period of immobility in between  
18  
19 operations, complications associated with the period of immobility, and deep psychological distress,  
20  
21 with some patients reporting depression and suicidal thoughts <sup>6</sup>.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Surgeons' decisions about which type of revision surgery is most appropriate for an individual  
27  
28 patient take into account many factors. Our previous work indicates that decisions are based on a  
29  
30 combination of a surgeon's own training and clinical experience of different techniques; the  
31  
32 availability of hospital infrastructure such as microbiology services to quickly identify the infecting  
33  
34 organism; characteristics of the infecting organism and duration of infection; patient characteristics  
35  
36 such as age, comorbidities, frailty, and extent of damaged tissue; and published evidence of revision  
37  
38 techniques, or reports by senior colleagues. Surgeons also considered patients' preferences for  
39  
40 surgery, although this could often involve the choice between long-term suppressive antibiotics or  
41  
42 surgery <sup>9</sup>. There is no quantitative evidence that characterises patients' preferences for one-stage or  
43  
44 two-stage revision surgery in this context and this is an important area of work to be investigated.  
45  
46 The aim of this study is to assess the surgical preferences of patients who underwent revision  
47  
48 surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 This study is part of a larger programme of research which aims to improve outcomes for patients  
58  
59 after periprosthetic joint infection (NIHR PGfAR: RP-PG-1210-12005). The programme includes a  
60

1  
2  
3 randomised clinical trial comparing one-stage and two-stage revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint  
4  
5 infection<sup>10</sup> within which this study was embedded.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 Methods:

### 12 13 Discrete choice experiments (DCEs)

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 We undertook a discrete choice experiment (DCE) to quantify the surgical preferences of patients  
19  
20 who underwent revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection. The DCE was embedded within a  
21  
22 randomised clinical trial that evaluated clinical and cost effectiveness of revision surgery for  
23  
24 prosthetic hip joint infection and compared one-stage revision surgery with two-stage revision  
25  
26 surgery. Patients who were taking part in the trial were eligible for the DCE. Ethical approval for the  
27  
28 study was granted by NRES Committee South West – Frenchay on 31 December 2014 (14/SW/1166).  
29  
30 All participants provided written informed consent to take part in the DCE study.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 DCEs are an established method in health services research and have been used to explore a range  
37  
38 of health-related services and treatments<sup>11-13</sup>. DCEs involve asking respondents to choose between  
39  
40 hypothetical scenarios which describe goods or services, where a service may mean an intervention  
41  
42 or an approach to care. The method aims to establish what attributes of that service influence their  
43  
44 decision-making and to what extent. This enables quantification of the marginal impact of these  
45  
46 attributes. Scenarios within a DCE describe the service of interest (in this case, revision joint  
47  
48 replacement) using the same set of attributes, but at different levels in each scenario. Choices  
49  
50 between scenarios, or whether to accept or reject a scenario, are used to estimate the influence and  
51  
52 value of the different attribute levels.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Questionnaire development

When a patient faces revision surgery for prosthetic hip infection, a one-stage or a two-stage operation is required, and the decision about which is undertaken is made largely at the discretion of the surgeon, taking into account patient preferences for treatment. The DCE study was designed to engage patients in their preferences for the features associated with these two surgical options, given neither is currently known to be clinically superior in terms of patient outcomes.

Qualitative methods are recommended for DCE attribute development because they enable conceptual development of attributes directly from people's experiences and so better reflect the issues that are likely to matter most to people when making a decision<sup>14</sup>. For this study we developed attributes from our previous qualitative study which explored impact of prosthetic joint infection and its treatment on patients and their recovery process; one-to-one interviews were conducted with 19 patients with PJI, focusing on the impact of PJI and surgical treatment. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and the qualitative data set was analysed thematically<sup>6</sup>. Levels of attributes were assigned by refining the language used to convey the meaning of the attributes, and particularly where some quantification of an attribute was mentioned by participants during qualitative interview, as illustrated in Table 1<sup>14</sup>.

Table 1 describes the attribute and level selection based on the earlier qualitative work, including illustrative quotations and rationale.

The final questionnaire comprised a single scenario task in which respondents were asked to imagine this was the first time that they had been offered the two surgical options presented and were asked to consider them carefully before selecting the one (from a pair) they would prefer.

1  
2  
3 With a  $4 \times 4 \times 2 \times 2$  design (two four-level and two two-level attributes), a total of 64 different  
4 combinations of attribute levels (profiles) is possible. This converts to 32 pairs of profiles, which as a  
5 'full factorial' was considered to be too large for participants to complete <sup>15</sup>. An orthogonal main  
6 effects plan was therefore used to reduce the number of choice sets to 16 <sup>16</sup>. Each profile was  
7 presented with its pair, and participants were required to select which option they preferred (see  
8 Figure 1).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 Patient and Public Involvement

20  
21  
22 The questionnaire was piloted and refined in collaboration with 5 patient and public involvement  
23 representatives. At an initial meeting of representatives, group members were involved in  
24 questionnaire development and suggested improvements to its formatting to aid readability, clearer  
25 phrasing of the questions to avoid ambiguity, and shortening of the instruction leaflet for clarity. At a  
26 subsequent meeting, members of the group completed the questionnaire and fed back on their  
27 experience. They completed the questionnaire without assistance and felt the instructions were  
28 clear but suggested that key points in the questions should be highlighted and that a contact  
29 telephone number should be added to enable participants to seek assistance if needed. For  
30 participants in the study, a summary of findings will be sent to those who indicated that they wished  
31 to be informed.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 Participants

49  
50  
51 Patients who were recruited into the INFORM randomised controlled trial (ISRCTN10956306)  
52 received the discrete choice task after completing the 18-month primary outcome measure. The  
53 questionnaire was either posted to participants or completed in person with the assistance of a  
54 research nurse during a hospital clinic visit.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Data analysis

Sample size calculations for DCEs are challenging due to dependence on the true parameter values estimated in the choice model<sup>17</sup>. However, reliable statistical analysis has been demonstrated with sample sizes of 40–120 respondents and combined with the rarity of periprosthetic joint infection (1% of those undergoing hip replacement), a sample size above 50 participants for the DCE was deemed adequate to obtain sufficient data for analysis and interpretation<sup>18, 19</sup>.

Paper questionnaires were distributed to participants as part of the follow-up data collection in the INFORM trial. Questionnaires were returned to the study team between January 2017 and November 2018 and data entered onto a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. DCE data were effects coded and analysed using STATA SE 15<sup>20, 21</sup>. The influence of the four attributes on patient choices was analysed using a conditional logit model. As attribute levels are effects coded, the mean of all coefficients is 0 across each attribute. The coefficients indicate the strength of preference for each level, where more positive values indicate a greater likelihood that the patient would select a surgical option where that particular attribute level is present.

## Results:

### Participants

Of the 80 discrete choice questionnaires provided to trial participants, 57 were returned fully complete (71%) from patients from 9 trial sites. Data from 6 questionnaires was not used in analysis as they were partially or totally incomplete. Responding participants had a mean age of 70 (range 51 to 90), 21 (37%) were female, 26 (46%) had undergone 1-stage revision, 14 (25%) lived alone and 41 (72%) were retired from work. Table 2 provides further demographic information.

Table 2 – Demographic and Clinical characteristics of the DCE Respondents

Characteristic	Participants (N=57)
Age – Yrs [mean] (range)	70 (51-90)
Gender [number] (%)	
Male	36 (63)
Female	21 (37)
Ethnicity [number] (%)	
White	55(96)
Black	1 (2)
Mixed	1 (2)
Marital Status [number] (%)	
Married / Partner	42 (74)
Divorced / Separated / Widowed	12 (21)
Single	3 (5)
Living Arrangements [number] (%)	
With Partner / somebody else	43 (75)
Alone	14 (25)
Schooling/Education [number] (%)	
Left at normal school leaving age	35 (61)
Left after normal school leaving age	15 (26)
Left before normal school leaving age	7 (12)
Work Situation [number] (%)	
Retired	41 (72)
Working / Sick leave	14 (25)

Unemployed	2 (4)
Surgery Received for Prosthetic Hip Joint Infection [number] (%)	
2-stage revision	31 (54)
1-stage revision	26 (46)

### Discrete choice experiment

Table 3 shows the regression coefficients and the results from the 57 patients who had fully completed the discrete choice questionnaire.

Table 3 – discrete choice task results from conditional logistic regression

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Standard error</i>	<i>95% confidence interval</i>	<i>P value</i>
Ability to engage in valued activities after new hip is fitted.	Can do everything*	0.70			
	Can do most things	0.49	.08	.33 to .64	<0.001
	Cannot do most things	-0.39	.07	-.53 to -.24	<0.001
	Cannot do anything	-0.80	.13	-1.05 to -0.55	<0.001
Antibiotic side effects	Don't affect me much*	0.22			

	Affects me a lot	-0.22	.05	-.33 to -.12	<0.001
Number of operations	1*	0.20			
	2	-0.20	.07	-.35 to -.06	<0.001
Time taken after surgical treatment starts, to return to normal activities.	3m*	0.20			
	6m	0.31	.09	.14 to .48	<0.001
	12m	-0.06	.05	-.15 to .04	0.22
	18m	-0.45	.10	-.64 to -.26	<0.001
<i>*Indicates reference category within attribute</i>					

Analysis indicates that participants had the strongest preference for a surgical option that resulted in the least restrictions on engaging in valued activities after the new hip is fitted, illustrated by the largest positive coefficient. Other less valued but important preferences were for a surgical strategy that would result in a shorter time after surgical treatment starts to return to normal activities, few or no side effects from antibiotics, and only one operation. The results also suggest that the least restrictions on engaging in valued activities, and the shortest time taken to return to normal activity are the individual attributes most valued by patients in this sample. This is indicated by the larger spread of coefficients (i.e. more 'value' is placed on changes in these attributes). The most acceptable option was a time period of between 3 to 6 months to return to normal activity, however

1  
2  
3 there is no clear preference up to 12 months, although 18 months appeared to be significantly  
4  
5 disfavoured.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 Discussion:

11  
12  
13 This study aimed to investigate and understand patients' preferences for aspects of revision surgery  
14  
15 for periprosthetic joint infection. Four relevant attributes were identified through earlier qualitative  
16  
17 work, and quantitatively, patients in this study most value the ability to engage in valued activities  
18  
19 and the time taken to return to normal daily activities. This reflects the findings of our previous  
20  
21 qualitative work which shows that although both revision strategies impacted greatly on patients  
22  
23 and their families, patients receiving two-stage revision surgery experience particularly long periods  
24  
25 of immobility and social isolation. This was often followed by a protracted recovery period, which  
26  
27 could leave patients much less able than before their primary operation, and some patients  
28  
29 experienced profoundly negative psychological effects associated with physical suffering, loss of  
30  
31 dignity and independence<sup>6</sup>. It appears that for patients in our sample, 3-6 months to return to  
32  
33 normal activity was preferable, although there was no significant difference up to 12 months, but 18  
34  
35 months was disfavoured. This suggests that the acceptable margin of recovery for patients is up to  
36  
37 12 months after their receipt of a new hip joint.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Discrete choice methodology can be challenging for participants because the format of questions is  
45  
46 different to standard surveys and items can seem repetitive. We collected feedback from the first 11  
47  
48 participants who completed the questionnaire. We found that those participants who were  
49  
50 supported by a research nurse when completing the questionnaire were more likely to complete it  
51  
52 and return it, compared with those who received the questionnaire by post and completed it alone.  
53  
54 Participant feedback suggested that the questionnaire was difficult to complete, as the scenarios  
55  
56 were similar and appeared to be repetitive. To address this, we amended the questionnaire format  
57  
58 and instructions and offered participants support either face-to-face or by phone with one of the  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 study research nurses. Nurses were then able to answer queries about the questionnaire and offer  
4 support if needed. The results suggest the group completed the questionnaire in a rational and  
5  
6 logical way, meaning the results were as expected with patients selecting an optimal combination of  
7  
8 options as their preferred choice. This is an important methodological finding because although our  
9  
10 study demonstrates the feasibility of the DCE method with this population, others conducting similar  
11  
12 studies with older, ill populations could consider in advance the need for professional support in the  
13  
14 completion of discrete choice questionnaires.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 Participants were all individuals who participated in a clinical trial and had already undergone  
22  
23 revision surgery for periprosthetic joint infection. This meant that the choices that participants were  
24  
25 asked to make in the questionnaire were based on scenarios unlikely to reflect their real-life  
26  
27 experiences as in reality such choices would not be available to them, since decisions about surgical  
28  
29 strategies are based on a wider variety of clinical, surgeon, patient and organisational factors<sup>9</sup>. Also,  
30  
31 patients were not being faced with these decisions at the time of questionnaire completion as we  
32  
33 decided that it would be unethical to ask patients awaiting treatment to complete a DCE about  
34  
35 surgical options in a hypothetical context, at a time when they may be particularly vulnerable. To do  
36  
37 so would not meet an ethical standard of protection from harm as it might mean that patients were  
38  
39 inadvertently led to believe that there were more or different options available to them than were  
40  
41 clinically indicated at that time.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46  
47  
48 We also found that some participants reported difficulty separating their own recent personal  
49  
50 experience of revision surgery from the hypothetical scenarios presented in the questionnaire, as  
51  
52 they found it hard to imagine receiving a treatment option that differed from the one that they had  
53  
54 received. In terms of methodology, many DCE's are conducted with participants who already have  
55  
56 some experience of the treatment attributes under investigation<sup>12, 18, 19, 22</sup>. In our study previous  
57  
58 experience meant that participants had some appreciation of the attributes being tested. While, the  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 sample size of 57 participants provided sufficient data for the analyses presented here, the sample  
4  
5 size was too small to conduct any subgroup analysis to identify whether preferences would differ  
6  
7 between participants who had received one or two stage revision. Similarly, patients who are older,  
8  
9 still working or live alone may have had stronger preferences for a one-stage operation than those  
10  
11 who are younger, retired and have support at home to cope with a two-stage procedure. The  
12  
13 majority of the study sample were also white, male and educated, which means that results may not  
14  
15 reflect the preferences of the wider surgical population. Further research could explore preferences  
16  
17 in a more diverse population.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 This work has provided an initial and important first step in understanding patients' preferences for  
24  
25 characteristics associated with revision surgery for periprosthetic infection. It is important that  
26  
27 orthopaedic healthcare professionals discuss these attributes with patients when discussing options  
28  
29 for surgical and antibiotic treatment for periprosthetic infection.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 Implications

36  
37 Results of this study offer insight into the preferences of patients for revision surgery and provide  
38  
39 valuable information to surgeons from all disciplines. Although factors affecting patient preferences  
40  
41 for surgery differ to those valued by medical professionals, consideration should be given to such  
42  
43 factors in order to aid shared decision-making where clinical equipoise between options exists.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Previous research using discrete choice approaches has explored patient preferences in a surgical  
49  
50 context. This has included examination of preferences for surgical versus non-surgical interventions  
51  
52 in a range of conditions, such as oesophageal cancer and ulcerative colitis <sup>22, 23</sup>. Some research has  
53  
54 explored preferences for conditions in which there are two surgical options, including for ectopic  
55  
56 pregnancy, vaginal wall prolapse, and osteoarthritis <sup>24, 25</sup>. Across all of these conditions, evidence  
57  
58 suggests that patients choose options that reduce the need for further surgery or operations, have a  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shorter recovery time, lower risk of symptom recurrence and improve ability to preserve existing  
4 joint motion in the case of osteoarthritis. Findings from the current study are similar in that patients  
5 prefer a surgical option that reduces the number of operations, recovery time and the side effects of  
6 antibiotics. However, in the setting of infected joint replacement, patients placed highest value on  
7 restoration of function. This was more important to the patients in our study than the number of  
8 operations they would have to undergo. Although our study focused on the preferences between  
9 one and two-stage surgery surgeons may need to consider these preferences during shared  
10 decision-making about all options for revision surgery for prosthetic hip infection, including the role  
11 of debridement with retention of implants (DAIR). Although DAIR is only efficacious in approximately  
12 60% of cases, it is associated with a quicker return to valued activities and improved joint function <sup>26</sup>.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 Conclusions

29  
30 Our results show that the most valued characteristics in decisions about revision surgery for  
31 prosthetic hip infection were the ability to engage in valued activities and time taken to return to  
32 normal activity. This builds on the findings of our previous qualitative work which shows that  
33 although both revision strategies impact greatly on patients and their families' everyday lives,  
34 patients receiving two-stage revision surgery experience particularly long periods of immobility and  
35 social isolation <sup>6</sup>. The desire to return to everyday activities should be taken into account when  
36 surgeons are discussing options with patients, particularly when there is equipoise from a surgical  
37 perspective about the options available, and when the decision is 'preference sensitive'.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 Funding

50  
51 This study is funded by the National Institute for Health Research Programme Grants for Applied  
52 Research (NIHR PGfAR) programme (grant number: RP-PG-1210-12005) and supported by the NIHR  
53 Comprehensive Clinical Research Network (CRN). This study was also supported by the NIHR  
54 Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 University of Bristol. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the  
4  
5 NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.  
6  
7

## 8 9 Author Contributions

10  
11 FEC: Contributed to design, analysis and interpretation of data, and drafting the manuscript. RG-H:  
12  
13 Contributed to conception, design, interpretation of data, drafting and revising the manuscript. SS:  
14  
15 Contributed to design, data collection and revising the manuscript. AWB: Contributed to the  
16  
17 conception, design, interpretation of data and revising the manuscript. AJM: Contributed to the  
18  
19 design, interpretation of data, drafting and revising the manuscript. All authors gave final approval  
20  
21 of the submitted manuscript.  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 27 Competing Interests

28  
29 None declared  
30  
31  
32

## 33 34 Data Availability

35  
36 Anonymised research data will be made available at the University of Bristol Research Data  
37  
38 Repository (data.bris) beginning 1 year after publication of the results. Access will be  
39  
40 granted to bona fide researchers after the University of Bristol Data Access Committee has  
41  
42 approved their request. Please contact data-bris@bristol.ac.uk in the first instance.  
43  
44  
45

## 46 47 Acknowledgements

48  
49 The authors thank the participants who gave their time to complete a discrete choice questionnaire.  
50  
51 We also thank Dr Erik Lenguerrand for providing demographic data for the study sample and advice  
52  
53 on presentation of statistical results. We would also like to thank the study administration and  
54  
55 management team: Makita Werrett and Beverley Evanson for their invaluable support. The authors  
56  
57 would also like to thank the INFORM Research Advisory Group (I-RAG) and the Patient Experience  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Partnership in Research (PEP-R) at the University of Bristol for their contributions to the refinement  
4  
5 of the questionnaire.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 References

- 12  
13  
14 1. National Joint Registry. National Joint Registry 14th Annual Report 2017: National Joint  
15 Registry for England, Wales, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man; 2017 [Available from:  
16 [www.njrreports.org.uk](http://www.njrreports.org.uk).  
17
- 18 2. Blom AW, Taylor AH, Pattison G, Whitehouse S, Bannister GC. Infection after total hip  
19 arthroplasty. The Avon experience. The Journal of bone and joint surgery British volume.  
20 2003;85(7):956-9.
- 21 3. Phillips JE, Crane TP, Noy M, Elliott TS, Grimer RJ. The incidence of deep prosthetic infections  
22 in a specialist orthopaedic hospital: a 15-year prospective survey. The Journal of bone and joint  
23 surgery British volume. 2006;88(7):943-8.
- 24 4. Lenguerrand E, Whitehouse MR, Beswick AD, Jones SA, Porter ML, Blom AW. Revision for  
25 prosthetic joint infection following hip arthroplasty: Evidence from the National Joint Registry. Bone  
26 & joint research. 2017;6(6):391-8.
- 27 5. Zimmerli W, Trampuz A, Ochsner PE. Prosthetic-joint infections. The New England journal of  
28 medicine. 2004;351(16):1645-54.
- 29 6. Moore AJ, Blom AW, Whitehouse MR, Goberman-Hill R. Deep prosthetic joint infection: a  
30 qualitative study of the impact on patients and their experiences of revision surgery. BMJ open.  
31 2015;5(12):e009495.
- 32 7. Kunutsor SK, Whitehouse MR, Blom AW, Beswick AD. Re-Infection Outcomes following One-  
33 and Two-Stage Surgical Revision of Infected Hip Prosthesis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.  
34 PloS one. 2015;10(9):e0139166.
- 35 8. Kunutsor SK, Whitehouse MR, Blom AW, Board T, Kay P, Wroblewski BM, et al. One- and  
36 two-stage surgical revision of peri-prosthetic joint infection of the hip: a pooled individual  
37 participant data analysis of 44 cohort studies. European journal of epidemiology. 2018;33(10):933-  
38 46.
- 39 9. Moore AJ, Blom AW, Whitehouse MR, Goberman-Hill R. Managing uncertainty - a  
40 qualitative study of surgeons' decision-making for one-stage and two-stage revision surgery for  
41 prosthetic hip joint infection. BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2017;18(1):154.
- 42 10. Strange S, Whitehouse MR, Beswick AD, Board T, Burston A, Burston B, et al. One-stage or  
43 two-stage revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection--the INFORM trial: a study protocol for a  
44 randomised controlled trial. Trials. 2016;17:90.
- 45 11. Louviere J, Street DJ, Burgess L. A 20+ years' retrospective on choice experiments.  
46 Marketing research and modeling: Progress and prospects: Springer; 2004. p. 201-14.
- 47 12. de Bekker-Grob EW, Hofman R, Donkers B, van Ballegooijen M, Helmerhorst TJ, Raat H, et al.  
48 Girls' preferences for HPV vaccination: a discrete choice experiment. Vaccine. 2010;28(41):6692-7.
- 49 13. Liede A, Mansfield CA, Metcalfe KA, Price MA, Snyder C, Lynch HT, et al. Preferences for  
50 breast cancer risk reduction among BRCA1/BRCA2 mutation carriers: a discrete-choice experiment.  
51 Breast cancer research and treatment. 2017;165(2):433-44.
- 52 14. Coast J, Al-Janabi H, Sutton EJ, Horrocks SA, Vosper AJ, Swancutt DR, et al. Using qualitative  
53 methods for attribute development for discrete choice experiments: issues and recommendations.  
54 Health economics. 2012;21(6):730-41.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47
15. Marshall D, Bridges JF, Hauber B, Cameron R, Donnalley L, Fyie K, et al. Conjoint Analysis Applications in Health - How are Studies being Designed and Reported?: An Update on Current Practice in the Published Literature between 2005 and 2008. *The patient*. 2010;3(4):249-56.
  16. Hedayat AS, Sloane NJA, Stufken J. *Orthogonal arrays: theory and applications*: Springer Science & Business Media; 2012.
  17. Lancsar E, Louviere J. Conducting discrete choice experiments to inform healthcare decision making: a user's guide. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2008;26(8):661-77.
  18. Salkeld G, Solomon M, Butow P, Short L. Discrete-choice experiment to measure patient preferences for the surgical management of colorectal cancer. *The British journal of surgery*. 2005;92(6):742-7.
  19. de Bekker-Grob EW, Essink-Bot ML, Meering WJ, Koes BW, Steyerberg EW. Preferences of GPs and patients for preventive osteoporosis drug treatment: a discrete-choice experiment. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2009;27(3):211-9.
  20. Bech M, Gyrd-Hansen D. Effects coding in discrete choice experiments. *Health economics*. 2005;14(10):1079-83.
  21. StataCorp. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 15*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2017.
  22. Noordman BJ, de Bekker-Grob EW, Coene P, van der Harst E, Lagarde SM, Shapiro J, et al. Patients' preferences for treatment after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for oesophageal cancer. *The British journal of surgery*. 2018;105(12):1630-8.
  23. Bewtra M, Kilambi V, Fairchild AO, Siegel CA, Lewis JD, Johnson FR. Patient preferences for surgical versus medical therapy for ulcerative colitis. *Inflammatory bowel diseases*. 2014;20(1):103-14.
  24. van Mello NM, Mol F, Opmeer BC, de Bekker-Grob EW, Essink-Bot ML, Ankum WM, et al. Salpingotomy or salpingectomy in tubal ectopic pregnancy: what do women prefer? *Reproductive biomedicine online*. 2010;21(5):687-93.
  25. Notten KJ, Essers BA, Weemhoff M, Rutten AG, Donners JJ, van Gestel I, et al. Do patients prefer mesh or anterior colporrhaphy for primary correction of anterior vaginal wall prolapse: a labelled discrete choice experiment. *BJOG : an international journal of obstetrics and gynaecology*. 2015;122(6):873-80.
  26. Kunutsor SK, Beswick AD, Whitehouse MR, Wylde V, Blom AW. Debridement, antibiotics and implant retention for periprosthetic joint infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis of treatment outcomes. *The Journal of infection*. 2018;77(6):479-88.

48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1 – qualitative support for attributes included in the discrete choice questionnaire

Attribute	Evidence of attribute inclusion, with pseudonym and surgery type	Levels	Rationale for levels
Number of operations	"There's no way I want two more big operations now at	1) 1 operation	Two types of revision surgery

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	<p>my time of life. You do it all or not at all..."I said there was no way I wanted two ops" (Harriet, 1-stage)</p> <p>"Of course, emotionally, you want it over and done with as soon as possible...but ultimately that has to be done in the correct way. There's the tortoise and hare situation. There's absolutely no point in rushing ahead if ultimately it's going to fail." (Maggie, 2-stage)</p>	<p>2) 2 operations</p>	<p>are currently provided in healthcare, and involve either one or two operations</p>
<p>Ability to engage in valued activities after new hip is fitted.</p>	<p>"Fourteen months without a hip joint so it meant that I couldn't drive a car, I couldn't do anything that I'd been used to doing, playing golf or doing anything. Well, I gave up</p>	<p>1) Can do everything</p> <p>2) Can do most things</p> <p>3) Cannot do most things</p>	<p>Following revision surgery, the ability to engage in valued activities can be</p>

<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60</p>	<p>golf actually after the first revision” (Don, 2-stage)</p> <p>“But when I for example went to, on holiday recently and I had serious problems getting into the bath to stand in the shower. Because I, I couldn’t get in. And in a wet – on a wet surface and that, I’m very conscious of not falling in. I can’t afford to fall. So, pain I’ve got none, stiffness none.</p> <p>Physical function limitations, and that’s one of them.” (Rory, 1-stage)</p> <p>“My aim has always been to get back on my feet as soon as I can, and to walk as good as I can, and that’s a big disappointment. I’m</p>	<p>4) Cannot do anything</p>	<p>reduced in a major, or somewhat more minor way. These levels capture variation in ability identified by patients.</p>
---	--	------------------------------	--

	<p>not where I think I should have been” (Robert, 2-stage)</p>		
<p>Time taken after surgical treatment starts, to return to normal activities.</p>	<p>“I didn’t want to go 14 weeks with effectively one leg. What was worse was not knowing that I had to endure all of those weeks not knowing that I was ever going to get another hip joint back.” (Maggie, 2-stage)</p> <p>“If I had known how hard it was going to be for her to walk in that interim six months, and if there seemed to have been a reasonable, or a good possibility that the infection would be nuked in a one stage, then that might have been a better</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 3 months</li> <li>2) 6 months</li> <li>3) 12 months</li> <li>4) 18 months</li> </ol>	<p>These time intervals demonstrate best approximations and a reflection of the need to ensure normal expectations of time taken for soft tissue recovery as expected by surgeons. 18 months is the maximum end point that surgeons would suggest for recovery time.</p>



	<p>outcome for her” (Amelia, 2-stage)</p> <p>“I would’ve thought that if you wanted to go back to work...you wouldn’t be very happy [having a 2-stage operation] because you wouldn’t be able to do nothing for those six weeks again. Then you’d have to go all through it again after three months of having it done. Six weeks is only a month and a half, and then in another month and a half you’re having it all done again.” (Jim, 1-stage)</p>		
Antibiotic side effects	<p>“...the nightmare on heavy antibiotics, toiletry wise. Now I’ve had to move into a, another bed. My wife and I are married 50 plus</p>	1) Affects me a lot	Antibiotics are an essential method of attempting to ensure the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	<p>years, and I have to have my own room because I'm getting up in the night.” (Rory, 1-stage)</p> <p>“...I stayed on antibiotics then for, for ever...and after the first [week of antibiotics] I was just dying. I just wanted to lie on the floor and die. I felt so sick. So ill.” (Lottie, 2-stage)</p> <p>“I felt fine. When I was going to see the surgeon... They'd say, 'How are you today?' I'd say, 'I feel fine, fit! [laughs] I feel well in myself, I eat well.’” (Ray, 2-stage)</p>	<p>2) Don't affect me much</p>	<p>periprosthetic joint infection is treated and subsequently clear. For some patients, the impact of these antibiotics is significant, while for others there are less severe side effects.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------	--

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

OPTION H1	OR	OPTION H2
I take antibiotics and the side effects <b>don't affect me much</b>		I take antibiotics and the side effects <b>affect me a lot</b>
<i>and</i>		<i>and</i>
I have <b>two</b> operations		I have <b>one</b> operation
<i>and</i>		<i>and</i>
After my new hip is fitted, I <b>can do most of the things</b> that I want to do		After my new hip is fitted, I <b>cannot do most of the things</b> that I want to do
<i>and</i>		<i>and</i>
After my surgical treatment starts, it takes <b>6 months</b> to get back to the things that I normally do		After my surgical treatment starts, it takes <b>12 months</b> to get back to the things that I normally do

Please only tick **ONE** box:

OPTION H1 
OPTION H2

Figure 1 - example profile  
338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

# BMJ Open

## What are patients' preferences for revision surgery after periprosthetic joint infection? A discrete choice experiment

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031645.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Sep-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Carroll, Fran; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Goberman-Hill, Rachael; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Strange, Simon; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Blom, AW; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School Moore, Andrew; University of Bristol, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Research methods
Keywords:	Discrete Choice Experiment, Hip < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY, periprosthetic infection, ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 1 What are patients' preferences for revision surgery after periprosthetic joint infection? A discrete  
4  
5 2 choice experiment  
6  
7

8  
9 3 **Authors:**

10  
11  
12 4 F E Carroll

13  
14  
15 5 R Gooberman-Hill

16  
17  
18 6 S Strange

19  
20  
21 7 A W Blom

22  
23  
24 8 A J Moore

25  
26  
27 9 Department of Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol.

28  
29  
30 10 Corresponding author: Dr Andrew J Moore. Translational Health Sciences (Southmead),  
31  
32 11 Musculoskeletal Research Unit, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of  
33  
34 12 Bristol, Learning and Research Building, Level 1, Southmead Hospital, Bristol, BS10 5NB, UK. Email:  
35  
36 13 [a.j.moore@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:a.j.moore@bristol.ac.uk). Telephone: 0117 414 7877

37  
38  
39 14 Word count: 3088

40  
41  
42 15

43  
44  
45 16

46  
47  
48 17

49  
50  
51 18

52  
53  
54 19

55  
56  
57 20

58

59

60

## 1 Abstract

2 Objectives: Understanding patients' preferences for treatment is crucial to provision of good care  
3 and shared decisions, especially when more than one treatment option exists for a given condition.

4 One such condition is infection of the area around the prosthesis after hip replacement, which  
5 affects between 0.4 and 3% of patients. There is more than one treatment option for this major  
6 complication and our study aimed to assess the value that patients place on aspects of revision  
7 surgery for periprosthetic hip infection.

8 Design: We identified four attributes of revision surgery for periprosthetic hip infection. Using a  
9 discrete choice experiment (DCE) we measured the value placed on each attribute by 57 people who  
10 had undergone either one- or two-stage revision surgery for infection.

11 Setting: The DCE was conducted with participants from 9 National Health Service hospitals in the  
12 United Kingdom.

13 Participants: Adults who had undergone revision surgery for periprosthetic hip infection (n=57).

14 Results: Overall, the strongest preference was for a surgical option that resulted in no restrictions on  
15 engaging in valued activities after a new hip is fitted ( $\beta=0.7$ ). Less valued, but still important  
16 attributes, included a shorter time taken from the start of treatment to return to normal activities (6  
17 months;  $\beta=0.3$ ), few or no side effects from antibiotics ( $\beta=0.2$ ), and having only one operation  
18 ( $\beta=0.2$ ).

19 Conclusions: Results highlight that people who have had revision surgery for periprosthetic hip  
20 infection most value aspects of care that affect their ability to engage in normal everyday activities.

21 These were the most important characteristics in decisions about revision surgery.

22

## 1 Keywords

2 *Discrete choice experiment; hip; periprosthetic infection; orthopaedic surgery*

## 3 Strengths and limitations of this study

- 4 • This is the first study to quantify the value that patients place on different aspects of revision  
5 surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection.
- 6 • Using a rigorous process involving empirical qualitative research we identified four attributes  
7 for the DCE.
- 8 • It was feasible for participants to complete the questionnaires, meaning the results were as  
9 expected with patients selecting a combination of options reflecting their preferred choice.
- 10 • While, the sample size of 57 participants sufficiently powered the analyses presented here, it  
11 is too small to conduct any subgroup analyses.
- 12 • The majority of the study sample were white, male and educated, so results may not reflect  
13 the preferences of the wider surgical population.

## 15 Introduction

16 For people with osteoarthritis, hip replacement is a common procedure that aims to improve  
17 function and reduce pain. In 2016 over 100,000 hip replacement procedures were conducted in the  
18 UK. With an ageing population, rates are predicted to rise <sup>1</sup>. Although successful for many people,  
19 approximately 0.4 -1% of patients who have undergone primary hip replacement <sup>2,3</sup> and 2-3% of  
20 patients undergoing revision hip replacement <sup>4</sup> develop deep periprosthetic joint infection (PJI)  
21 severe enough to warrant surgical revision. Patients with PJI find it devastating. Symptoms include



1  
2  
3 1 severe pain, inflammation, discharge from the surgical wound, fever, nausea, malaise, reduction in  
4  
5 2 or loss of function, dislocation, and if left untreated can lead to disability and/or death <sup>5</sup>.  
6  
7  
8 3 PJI is extremely challenging to treat. Treatment can include ‘debridement, antibiotic treatment and  
9  
10 4 implant retention’ (DAIR), used in 7.6% of cases, or more commonly major revision surgery, which  
11  
12 5 involves removal of the infected prosthesis, radical debridement of infected tissue and  
13  
14 6 reimplantation (“fitting”) of a new prosthesis with subsequent antibiotic treatment <sup>4</sup>. Revision  
15  
16 7 surgery can be provided in a single operation (one-stage) or as a staged operation (two-stage) where  
17  
18 8 the infected implant is removed and the patient is left without an implant (with or without a  
19  
20 9 temporary spacer) while receiving antibiotic treatment. In the staged process reimplantation of the  
21  
22 10 new implant is delayed, commonly for up to 6 months, but in some instances over 12 months later <sup>5</sup>.  
23  
24 11 <sup>6</sup>. There is no clear evidence that either a one or two-stage strategy is superior in eradicating  
25  
26 12 infection <sup>7,8</sup>, but qualitative research has shown that two-stage revision places a greater burden on  
27  
28 13 patients and families than one-stage revision. This burden is due to the extended period of  
29  
30 14 immobility in between operations, complications associated with the period of immobility, and deep  
31  
32 15 psychological distress, with some patients reporting depression and suicidal thoughts <sup>6</sup>.  
33  
34  
35 16 Surgeons’ decisions about which type of revision surgery is most appropriate for an individual  
36  
37 17 patient take into account many factors. Our previous work indicates that decisions are based on a  
38  
39 18 combination of a surgeon’s own training and clinical experience of different techniques; the  
40  
41 19 availability of hospital infrastructure such as microbiology services to quickly identify the infecting  
42  
43 20 organism; characteristics of the infecting organism and duration of infection; patient characteristics  
44  
45 21 such as age, comorbidities, frailty, and extent of damaged tissue; and published evidence of revision  
46  
47 22 techniques, or reports by senior colleagues. Surgeons also considered patients’ preferences for  
48  
49 23 surgery, although this could often involve the choice between long-term suppressive antibiotics or  
50  
51 24 surgery <sup>9</sup>. There is no quantitative evidence that characterises patients’ preferences for one-stage or  
52  
53 25 two-stage revision surgery in this context and this is an important area of work to be investigated.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 The aim of this study is to assess the surgical preferences of patients who underwent revision  
4  
5 2 surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection.  
6  
7

8 3  
9  
10  
11 4 This study is part of a larger programme of research which aims to improve outcomes for patients  
12  
13 5 after periprosthetic joint infection (NIHR PGfAR: RP-PG-1210-12005). The programme includes a  
14  
15 6 randomised clinical trial comparing one-stage and two-stage revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint  
16  
17 7 infection<sup>10</sup> within which this study was embedded.  
18  
19  
20  
21 8

## 22 23 24 9 **Methods:**

### 25 26 27 28 29 10 **Discrete choice experiments (DCEs)**

30  
31  
32  
33 11 We undertook a discrete choice experiment (DCE) to quantify the surgical preferences of patients  
34  
35 12 who underwent revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection. The DCE was embedded within a  
36  
37 13 randomised clinical trial that evaluated clinical and cost effectiveness of revision surgery for  
38  
39 14 prosthetic hip joint infection and compared one-stage revision surgery with two-stage revision  
40  
41 15 surgery. Patients who were taking part in the trial were eligible for the DCE. Ethical approval for the  
42  
43 16 study was granted by NRES Committee South West – Frenchay on 31 December 2014 (14/SW/1166).  
44  
45 17 All participants provided written informed consent to take part in the DCE study.  
46  
47  
48  
49 18

50  
51 19 DCEs are an established method in health services research and have been used to explore a range  
52  
53 20 of health-related services and treatments<sup>11-14</sup>. DCEs involve asking respondents to choose between  
54  
55 21 hypothetical scenarios which describe goods or services, where a 'service' may mean an intervention  
56  
57 22 or an approach to care. The method aims to establish what attributes of that service influence their  
58  
59 23 decision-making and to what extent. This enables quantification of the marginal impact of these

1  
2  
3 1 attributes. Scenarios within a DCE describe the service of interest (in this case, revision joint  
4  
5 2 replacement) using the same set of attributes, but at different levels in each scenario. Choices  
6  
7 3 between scenarios, or whether to accept or reject a scenario, are used to estimate the influence and  
8  
9 4 value of the different attribute levels.  
10  
11  
12 5  
13  
14

## 15 6 Questionnaire development

16  
17  
18  
19 7 When a patient faces revision surgery for prosthetic hip infection, a one-stage or a two-stage  
20  
21 8 operation is required, and the decision about which is undertaken is made largely at the discretion  
22  
23 9 of the surgeon, taking into account patient preferences for treatment. The DCE study was designed  
24  
25 10 to engage patients in their preferences for the features associated with these two surgical options,  
26  
27 11 given neither is currently known to be clinically superior in terms of patient outcomes.  
28  
29  
30 12  
31  
32 13 Qualitative methods are recommended for DCE attribute development because they enable  
33  
34 14 conceptual development of attributes directly from people's experiences and so better reflect the  
35  
36 15 issues that are likely to matter most to people when making a decision <sup>15</sup>. For this study we  
37  
38 16 developed attributes from our previous qualitative study which explored impact of prosthetic joint  
39  
40 17 infection and its treatment on patients and their recovery process; one-to-one interviews were  
41  
42 18 conducted with 19 patients with PJI, focusing on the impact of PJI and surgical treatment. The  
43  
44 19 interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and the qualitative data set was analysed thematically  
45  
46 20 <sup>6</sup>. Levels of attributes were assigned by refining the language used to convey the meaning of the  
47  
48 21 attributes, and particularly where some quantification of an attribute was mentioned by participants  
49  
50 22 during qualitative interview, as illustrated in Table 1 <sup>15</sup>.  
51  
52  
53 23  
54  
55 24 Table 1 describes the attribute and level selection based on the earlier qualitative work, including  
56  
57 25 illustrative quotations and rationale.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5 2 The final questionnaire comprised a single scenario task in which respondents were asked to imagine  
6  
7 3 this was the first time that they had been offered the two surgical options presented and were asked  
8  
9 4 to consider them carefully before selecting the one (from a pair) they would prefer.  
10  
11  
12 5

13  
14 6 With a  $4 \times 4 \times 2 \times 2$  design (two four-level and two two-level attributes), a total of 64 different  
15  
16 7 combinations of attribute levels (profiles) is possible. This converts to 32 pairs of profiles, which as a  
17  
18 8 'full factorial' was considered to be too large for participants to complete <sup>16</sup>. An orthogonal main  
19  
20 9 effects plan was therefore used to reduce the number of choice sets to 16 <sup>17</sup>. Each profile was  
21  
22 10 presented with its pair, and participants were required to select which option they preferred (see  
23  
24 11 Figure 1).  
25  
26  
27  
28 12

### 30 13 Patient and Public Involvement

31  
32  
33  
34 14 The questionnaire was piloted and refined in collaboration with 5 patient and public involvement  
35  
36 15 representatives. At an initial meeting of representatives, group members were involved in  
37  
38 16 questionnaire development and suggested improvements to its formatting to aid readability, clearer  
39  
40 17 phrasing of the questions to avoid ambiguity, and shortening of the instruction leaflet for clarity. At a  
41  
42 18 subsequent meeting, members of the group completed the questionnaire and fed back on their  
43  
44 19 experience. They completed the questionnaire without assistance and felt the instructions were  
45  
46 20 clear but suggested that key points in the questions should be highlighted and that a contact  
47  
48 21 telephone number should be added to enable participants to seek assistance if needed. For  
49  
50 22 participants in the study, a summary of findings will be sent to those who indicated that they wished  
51  
52 23 to be informed.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 1  
5  
6  
78 2 **Participants**  
9

10  
11  
12 3 Patients who were recruited into the INFORM randomised controlled trial (ISRCTN10956306)  
13  
14 4 received the discrete choice task after completing the 18-month primary outcome measure. The  
15  
16 5 questionnaire was either posted to participants or completed in person with the assistance of a  
17  
18 6 research nurse during a hospital clinic visit.  
19  
20  
21 7

22  
23  
24 8 **Data analysis**  
25  
26  
27

28 9 Sample size calculations for DCEs are challenging due to dependence on the true parameter values  
29  
30 10 estimated in the choice model <sup>18</sup>. However, reliable statistical analysis has been demonstrated with  
31  
32 11 sample sizes of 40–120 respondents and combined with the rarity of periprosthetic joint infection  
33  
34 12 (1% of those undergoing hip replacement), a sample size above 50 participants for the DCE was  
35  
36 13 deemed adequate to obtain sufficient data for exploratory analysis and interpretation <sup>19, 20</sup>.  
37  
38  
39 14

40  
41 15 Paper questionnaires were distributed to participants as part of the follow-up data collection in the  
42  
43 16 INFORM trial. Questionnaires were returned to the study team between January 2017 and  
44  
45 17 November 2018 and data entered onto a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. DCE data were effects coded  
46  
47 18 and analysed using STATA SE 15 <sup>21, 22</sup>. The influence of the four attributes on patient choices was  
48  
49 19 analysed using a conditional logit model. As attribute levels are effects coded, the mean of all  
50  
51 20 coefficients is 0 across each attribute. The effects coded preference weights (coefficients) produced  
52  
53 21 by the conditional logit model are estimated relative to the mean effect of the attribute, with the p  
54  
55 22 value indicating the statistical significance of “the difference between the estimated preference  
56  
57 23 weight and the mean effect of the attribute” <sup>23</sup>.  
58  
59  
60

1

2 **Results:**3 **Participants**

4 Of the 80 discrete choice questionnaires provided to trial participants, 57 were returned fully  
 5 complete (71%) from patients from 9 trial sites. Data from 6 questionnaires was not used in analysis  
 6 as they were partially or totally incomplete. Responding participants had a mean age of 70 (range 51  
 7 to 90), 21 (37%) were female, 26 (46%) had undergone 1-stage revision, 14 (25%) lived alone and 41  
 8 (72%) were retired from work. Table 2 provides further demographic information.

9

10 *Table 2 – Demographic and Clinical characteristics of the DCE Respondents*

Characteristic	Participants (N=57)
Age – Yrs [mean] (range)	70 (51-90)
Gender [number] (%)	
Male	36 (63)
Female	21 (37)
Ethnicity [number] (%)	
White	55(96)
Black	1 (2)
Mixed	1 (2)
Marital Status [number] (%)	
Married / Partner	42 (74)
Divorced / Separated / Widowed	12 (21)
Single	3 (5)

Living Arrangements [number] (%)	
With Partner / somebody else	43 (75)
Alone	14 (25)
Schooling/Education [number] (%)	
Left at normal school leaving age	35 (61)
Left after normal school leaving age	15 (26)
Left before normal school leaving age	7 (12)
Work Situation [number] (%)	
Retired	41 (72)
Working / Sick leave	14 (25)
Unemployed	2 (4)
Surgery Received for Prosthetic Hip Joint Infection [number] (%)	
2-stage revision	31 (54)
1-stage revision	26 (46)

1

## 2 Discrete choice experiment

3 Table 3 shows the regression coefficients and the results from the 57 patients who had fully  
4 completed the discrete choice questionnaire.

5

6 Table 3 – discrete choice task results from conditional logistic regression

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>Standard error</i>	<i>95% confidence interval</i>	<i>P value</i>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ability to engage in valued activities after new hip is fitted.	Can do everything*	0.70			
10 11 12 13 14		Can do most things	0.49	.08	.33 to .64	<0.001
15 16 17 18		Cannot do most things	-0.39	.07	-.53 to -.24	<0.001
19 20 21 22 23 24 25		Cannot do anything	-0.80	.13	-1.05 to -0.55	<0.001
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	Antibiotic side effects	Don't affect me much*	0.22			
		Affects me a lot	-0.22	.05	-.33 to -.12	<0.001
37 38 39 40 41 42 43	Number of operations	1*	0.20			
		2	-0.20	.07	-.35 to -.06	<0.001
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	Time taken after surgical treatment starts, to return to normal activities.	3months*	0.20			
53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60		6months	0.31	.09	.14 to .48	<0.001
		12months	-0.06	.05	-.15 to .04	0.22
		18months	-0.45	.10	-.64 to -.26	<0.001



<i>*Indicates reference category within attribute</i>					

1

2

3 Analysis indicates that participants had the strongest preference for a surgical option that resulted in  
 4 the least restrictions on engaging in valued activities after the new hip is fitted, illustrated by the  
 5 largest preference weight. Other less valued but important preferences were for a surgical strategy  
 6 that would result in a shorter time after surgical treatment starts to return to normal activities, few  
 7 or no side effects from antibiotics, and only one operation. The results also suggest that the least  
 8 restrictions on engaging in valued activities, and the shortest time taken to return to normal activity  
 9 are the individual attributes most valued by patients in this sample. This is indicated by the larger  
 10 spread of coefficients (i.e. more 'value' is placed on changes in these attributes). The most  
 11 acceptable option was a time period of between 3 to 6 months to return to normal activity, however  
 12 there is no clear preference up to 12 months, although 18 months appeared to be significantly  
 13 disfavoured.

14

## 15 Discussion:

16 This study aimed to investigate and understand patients' preferences for aspects of revision surgery  
 17 for periprosthetic joint infection. Four relevant attributes were identified through earlier qualitative  
 18 work, and quantitatively, patients in this study most value the ability to engage in valued activities  
 19 and the time taken to return to normal daily activities. This reflects the findings of our previous  
 20 qualitative work which shows that although both revision strategies impacted greatly on patients  
 21 and their families, patients receiving two-stage revision surgery experience particularly long periods  
 22 of immobility and social isolation. This was often followed by a protracted recovery period, which  
 23 could leave patients much less able than before their primary operation, and some patients

1  
2  
3 1 experienced profoundly negative psychological effects associated with physical suffering, loss of  
4  
5 2 dignity and independence <sup>6</sup>. It appears that for patients in our sample, 3-6 months to return to  
6  
7 3 normal activity was preferable, although there was no significant difference up to 12 months, but 18  
8  
9 4 months was disfavoured. This suggests that the acceptable margin of recovery for patients is up to  
10  
11 5 12 months after their receipt of a new hip joint.  
12  
13  
14 6

15  
16 7 Discrete choice methodology can be challenging for participants because the format of questions is  
17  
18 8 different to standard surveys and items can seem repetitive. We collected feedback from the first 11  
19  
20 9 participants who completed the questionnaire. We found that those participants who were  
21  
22 10 supported by a research nurse when completing the questionnaire were more likely to complete it  
23  
24 11 and return it, compared with those who received the questionnaire by post and completed it alone.  
25  
26 12 Participant feedback suggested that the questionnaire was difficult to complete, as the scenarios  
27  
28 13 were similar and appeared to be repetitive. To address this, we amended the questionnaire format  
29  
30 14 and instructions and offered participants support either face-to-face or by phone with one of the  
31  
32 15 study research nurses. Nurses were then able to answer queries about the questionnaire and offer  
33  
34 16 support if needed. The results suggest the group completed the questionnaire in a rational and  
35  
36 17 logical way, meaning the results were as expected with patients selecting an optimal combination of  
37  
38 18 options as their preferred choice. This is an important methodological finding because although our  
39  
40 19 study demonstrates the feasibility of the DCE method with this population, others conducting similar  
41  
42 20 studies with older, ill populations could consider in advance the need for professional support in the  
43  
44 21 completion of discrete choice questionnaires.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 23 Participants were all individuals who participated in a clinical trial and had already undergone  
54  
55 24 revision surgery for periprosthetic joint infection. This meant that the choices that participants were  
56  
57 25 asked to make in the questionnaire were based on scenarios unlikely to reflect their real-life  
58  
59 26 experiences as in reality such choices would not be available to them, since decisions about surgical  
60

1  
2  
3 1 strategies are based on a wider variety of clinical, surgeon, patient and organisational factors<sup>9</sup>. Also,  
4  
5 2 patients were not being faced with these decisions at the time of questionnaire completion as we  
6  
7 3 decided that it would be unethical to ask patients awaiting treatment to complete a DCE about  
8  
9 4 surgical options in a hypothetical context, at a time when they may be particularly vulnerable. To do  
10  
11 5 so would not meet an ethical standard of protection from harm as it might mean that patients were  
12  
13 6 inadvertently led to believe that there were more or different options available to them than were  
14  
15 7 clinically indicated at that time.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 9 We also found that some participants reported difficulty separating their own recent personal  
22  
23 10 experience of revision surgery from the hypothetical scenarios presented in the questionnaire, as  
24  
25 11 they found it hard to imagine receiving a treatment option that differed from the one that they had  
26  
27 12 received. In terms of methodology, many DCE's are conducted with participants who already have  
28  
29 13 some experience of the treatment attributes under investigation<sup>12, 19, 20, 24</sup>. In our study previous  
30  
31 14 experience meant that participants had some appreciation of the attributes being tested. While, the  
32  
33 15 sample size of 57 participants provided sufficient data for the analyses presented here, the sample  
34  
35 16 size was too small to conduct any subgroup analysis to identify whether preferences would differ  
36  
37 17 between participants who had received one or two stage revision. Similarly, patients who are older,  
38  
39 18 still working or live alone may have had stronger preferences for a one-stage operation than those  
40  
41 19 who are younger, retired and have support at home to cope with a two-stage procedure. The  
42  
43 20 majority of the study sample were also white, male and educated, which means that results may not  
44  
45 21 reflect the preferences of the wider surgical population. Further research could explore preferences  
46  
47 22 in a more diverse population.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 24 This work has provided an initial and important first step in understanding patients' preferences for  
55  
56 25 characteristics associated with revision surgery for periprosthetic infection. It is important that  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 orthopaedic healthcare professionals discuss these attributes with patients when discussing options  
2 for surgical and antibiotic treatment for periprosthetic infection.

#### 4 Implications

5 Results of this study offer insight into the preferences of patients for revision surgery and provide  
6 valuable information to surgeons from all disciplines. Although factors affecting patient preferences  
7 for surgery differ to those valued by medical professionals, consideration should be given to such  
8 factors in order to aid shared decision-making where clinical equipoise between options exists.

9  
10 Previous research using discrete choice approaches has explored patient preferences in a surgical  
11 context. This has included examination of preferences for surgical versus non-surgical interventions  
12 in a range of conditions, such as oesophageal cancer and ulcerative colitis <sup>24, 25</sup>. Some research has  
13 explored preferences for conditions in which there are two surgical options, including for ectopic  
14 pregnancy, vaginal wall prolapse, and osteoarthritis <sup>26, 27</sup>. Across all of these conditions, evidence  
15 suggests that patients choose options that reduce the need for further surgery or operations, have a  
16 shorter recovery time, lower risk of symptom recurrence and improve ability to preserve existing  
17 joint motion in the case of osteoarthritis. Findings from the current study are similar in that patients  
18 prefer a surgical option that reduces the number of operations, recovery time and the side effects of  
19 antibiotics. However, in the setting of infected joint replacement, patients placed highest value on  
20 restoration of function. This was more important to the patients in our study than the number of  
21 operations they would have to undergo. Although our study focused on the preferences between  
22 one and two-stage surgery surgeons may need to consider these preferences during shared  
23 decision-making about all options for revision surgery for prosthetic hip infection, including the role  
24 of debridement with retention of implants (DAIR). Although DAIR is only efficacious in approximately  
25 60% of cases, it is associated with a quicker return to valued activities and improved joint function <sup>28</sup>.

1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5

## 6 2 Conclusions

7  
8  
9 3 Our results show that the most valued characteristics in decisions about revision surgery for  
10  
11 4 prosthetic hip infection were the ability to engage in valued activities and time taken to return to  
12  
13 5 normal activity. This builds on the findings of our previous qualitative work which shows that  
14  
15 6 although both revision strategies impact greatly on patients and their families' everyday lives,  
16  
17 7 patients receiving two-stage revision surgery experience particularly long periods of immobility and  
18  
19 8 social isolation <sup>6</sup>. The desire to return to everyday activities should be taken into account when  
20  
21 9 surgeons are discussing options with patients, particularly when there is equipoise from a surgical  
22  
23 10 perspective about the options available, and when the decision is 'preference sensitive'.  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 11 Funding

29  
30  
31  
32 12 This study is funded by the National Institute for Health Research Programme Grants for Applied  
33  
34 13 Research (NIHR PGfAR) programme (grant number: RP-PG-1210-12005) and supported by the NIHR  
35  
36 14 Comprehensive Clinical Research Network (CRN). This study was also supported by the NIHR  
37  
38 15 Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the  
39  
40 16 University of Bristol. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the  
41  
42 17 NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 18 Author Contributions

49  
50  
51 19 FEC: Contributed to design, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and revising the manuscript.  
52  
53 20 RG-H: Contributed to conception, design, interpretation of data, drafting and revising the  
54  
55 21 manuscript. SS: Contributed to design, data collection and revising the manuscript. AWB:  
56  
57 22 Contributed to the conception, design, interpretation of data and revising the manuscript. AJM:  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 Contributed to the design, interpretation of data, drafting and revising the manuscript. All authors  
4  
5 2 gave final approval of the submitted manuscript.  
6  
7  
8

### 9 3 Competing Interests

10  
11  
12  
13 4 None declared  
14  
15  
16

### 17 5 Data Availability

18  
19  
20  
21 6 Anonymised research data will be made available at the University of Bristol Research Data  
22  
23 7 Repository (data.bris) beginning 1 year after publication of the results. Access will be  
24  
25 8 granted to bona fide researchers after the University of Bristol Data Access Committee has  
26  
27 9 approved their request. Please contact data-bris@bristol.ac.uk in the first instance.  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 10 Acknowledgements

33  
34  
35  
36 11 The authors thank the participants who gave their time to complete a discrete choice questionnaire.  
37  
38 12 We also thank Dr Erik Lenguerand for providing demographic data for the study sample and advice  
39  
40 13 on presentation of statistical results. We would also like to thank the study administration and  
41  
42 14 management team: Makita Werrett and Beverley Evanson for their invaluable support. The authors  
43  
44 15 would also like to thank the INFORM Research Advisory Group (I-RAG) and the Patient Experience  
45  
46 16 Partnership in Research (PEP-R) at the University of Bristol for their contributions to the refinement  
47  
48 17 of the questionnaire.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1 – qualitative support for attributes included in the discrete choice questionnaire

Attribute	Evidence of attribute inclusion, with pseudonym and surgery type	Levels	Rationale for levels
Number of operations	<p>“There’s no way I want two more big operations now at my time of life. You do it all or not at all...” “I said there was no way I wanted two ops” (Harriet, 1-stage)</p> <p>“Of course, emotionally, you want it over and done with as soon as possible...but ultimately that has to be done in the correct way. There’s the tortoise and hare situation. There’s absolutely no point in rushing ahead if</p>	<p>1) 1 operation</p> <p>2) 2 operations</p>	<p>Two types of revision surgery are currently provided in healthcare, and involve either one or two operations</p>

	<p>ultimately it's going to fail.” (Maggie, 2-stage)</p>		
<p>Ability to engage in valued activities after new hip is fitted.</p>	<p>“Fourteen months without a hip joint so it meant that I couldn't drive a car, I couldn't do anything that I'd been used to doing, playing golf or doing anything. Well, I gave up golf actually after the first revision” (Don, 2-stage)</p> <p>“But when I for example went to, on holiday recently and I had serious problems getting into the bath to stand in the shower. Because I, I couldn't get in. And in a wet – on a wet surface and that, I'm very conscious of not falling in. I can't afford to fall. So, pain I've got</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Can do everything</li> <li>2) Can do most things</li> <li>3) Cannot do most things</li> <li>4) Cannot do anything</li> </ol>	<p>Following revision surgery, the ability to engage in valued activities can be reduced in a major, or somewhat more minor way. These levels capture variation in ability identified by patients.</p>



	<p>none, stiffness none.</p> <p>Physical function limitations, and that's one of them." (Rory, 1-stage)</p> <p>"My aim has always been to get back on my feet as soon as I can, and to walk as good as I can, and that's a big disappointment. I'm not where I think I should have been" (Robert, 2-stage)</p>		
<p>Time taken after surgical treatment starts, to return to normal activities.</p>	<p>"I didn't want to go 14 weeks with effectively one leg. What was worse was not knowing that I had to endure all of those weeks not knowing that I was ever going to get another hip joint back." (Maggie, 2-stage)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 3 months</li> <li>2) 6 months</li> <li>3) 12 months</li> <li>4) 18 months</li> </ol>	<p>These time intervals demonstrate best approximations and a reflection of the need to ensure normal expectations of time taken for soft tissue recovery as</p>

<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60</p>	<p>“If I had known how hard it was going to be for her to walk in that interim six months, and if there seemed to have been a reasonable, or a good possibility that the infection would be nuked in a one stage, then that might have been a better outcome for her” (Amelia, 2-stage)</p> <p>“I would’ve thought that if you wanted to go back to work...you wouldn’t be very happy [having a 2-stage operation] because you wouldn’t be able to do nothing for those six weeks again. Then you’d have to go all through it again after three months of having it done. Six weeks is only a month and a half, and then</p>		<p>expected by surgeons. 18 months is the maximum end point that surgeons would suggest for recovery time.</p>
---	--	--	--

	<p>in another month and a half you're having it all done again." (Jim, 1-stage)</p>		
Antibiotic side effects	<p>"...the nightmare on heavy antibiotics, toiletry wise. Now I've had to move into a, another bed. My wife and I are married 50 plus years, and I have to have my own room because I'm getting up in the night." (Rory, 1-stage)</p> <p>"...I stayed on antibiotics then for, for ever...and after the first [week of antibiotics] I was just dying. I just wanted to lie on the floor and die. I felt so sick. So ill." (Lottie, 2-stage)</p> <p>"I felt fine. When I was going to see the surgeon...</p>	<p>1) Affects me a lot</p> <p>2) Don't affect me much</p>	<p>Antibiotics are an essential method of attempting to ensure the periprosthetic joint infection is treated and subsequently clear. For some patients, the impact of these antibiotics is significant, while for others there are less severe side effects.</p>

	They'd say, 'How are you today?' I'd say, 'I feel fine, fit! [laughs] I feel well in myself, I eat well.'" (Ray, 2-stage)		
--	---	--	--

## References

1. National Joint Registry. National Joint Registry 14th Annual Report 2017: National Joint Registry for England, Wales, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man; 2017 [Available from: [www.njrreports.org.uk](http://www.njrreports.org.uk).
2. Blom AW, Taylor AH, Pattison G, Whitehouse S, Bannister GC. Infection after total hip arthroplasty. The Avon experience. The Journal of bone and joint surgery British volume. 2003;85(7):956-9.
3. Phillips JE, Crane TP, Noy M, Elliott TS, Grimer RJ. The incidence of deep prosthetic infections in a specialist orthopaedic hospital: a 15-year prospective survey. The Journal of bone and joint surgery British volume. 2006;88(7):943-8.
4. Lenguerrand E, Whitehouse MR, Beswick AD, Jones SA, Porter ML, Blom AW. Revision for prosthetic joint infection following hip arthroplasty: Evidence from the National Joint Registry. Bone & joint research. 2017;6(6):391-8.
5. Zimmerli W, Trampuz A, Ochsner PE. Prosthetic-joint infections. The New England journal of medicine. 2004;351(16):1645-54.
6. Moore AJ, Blom AW, Whitehouse MR, Goberman-Hill R. Deep prosthetic joint infection: a qualitative study of the impact on patients and their experiences of revision surgery. BMJ open. 2015;5(12):e009495.
7. Kunutsor SK, Whitehouse MR, Blom AW, Beswick AD. Re-Infection Outcomes following One- and Two-Stage Surgical Revision of Infected Hip Prosthesis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PloS one. 2015;10(9):e0139166.
8. Kunutsor SK, Whitehouse MR, Blom AW, Board T, Kay P, Wroblewski BM, et al. One- and two-stage surgical revision of peri-prosthetic joint infection of the hip: a pooled individual participant data analysis of 44 cohort studies. European journal of epidemiology. 2018;33(10):933-46.
9. Moore AJ, Blom AW, Whitehouse MR, Goberman-Hill R. Managing uncertainty - a qualitative study of surgeons' decision-making for one-stage and two-stage revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection. BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2017;18(1):154.
10. Strange S, Whitehouse MR, Beswick AD, Board T, Burston A, Burston B, et al. One-stage or two-stage revision surgery for prosthetic hip joint infection--the INFORM trial: a study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. Trials. 2016;17:90.
11. Louviere J, Street DJ, Burgess L. A 20+ years' retrospective on choice experiments. Marketing research and modeling: Progress and prospects: Springer; 2004. p. 201-14.

12. de Bekker-Grob EW, Hofman R, Donkers B, van Ballegooijen M, Helmerhorst TJ, Raat H, et al. Girls' preferences for HPV vaccination: a discrete choice experiment. *Vaccine*. 2010;28(41):6692-7.
13. Liede A, Mansfield CA, Metcalfe KA, Price MA, Snyder C, Lynch HT, et al. Preferences for breast cancer risk reduction among BRCA1/BRCA2 mutation carriers: a discrete-choice experiment. *Breast cancer research and treatment*. 2017;165(2):433-44.
14. van Dijk JD, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CG, Marshall DA, MJ IJ. An Empirical Comparison of Discrete Choice Experiment and Best-Worst Scaling to Estimate Stakeholders' Risk Tolerance for Hip Replacement Surgery. *Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research*. 2016;19(4):316-22.
15. Coast J, Al-Janabi H, Sutton EJ, Horrocks SA, Vosper AJ, Swancutt DR, et al. Using qualitative methods for attribute development for discrete choice experiments: issues and recommendations. *Health economics*. 2012;21(6):730-41.
16. Marshall D, Bridges JF, Hauber B, Cameron R, Donnalley L, Fyie K, et al. Conjoint Analysis Applications in Health - How are Studies being Designed and Reported?: An Update on Current Practice in the Published Literature between 2005 and 2008. *The patient*. 2010;3(4):249-56.
17. Hedayat AS, Sloane NJA, Stufken J. *Orthogonal arrays: theory and applications*: Springer Science & Business Media; 2012.
18. Lancsar E, Louviere J. Conducting discrete choice experiments to inform healthcare decision making: a user's guide. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2008;26(8):661-77.
19. Salkeld G, Solomon M, Butow P, Short L. Discrete-choice experiment to measure patient preferences for the surgical management of colorectal cancer. *The British journal of surgery*. 2005;92(6):742-7.
20. de Bekker-Grob EW, Essink-Bot ML, Meerding WJ, Koes BW, Steyerberg EW. Preferences of GPs and patients for preventive osteoporosis drug treatment: a discrete-choice experiment. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2009;27(3):211-9.
21. Bech M, Gyrd-Hansen D. Effects coding in discrete choice experiments. *Health economics*. 2005;14(10):1079-83.
22. StataCorp. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 15*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2017.
23. Hauber AB, Gonzalez JM, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CG, Prior T, Marshall DA, Cunningham C, et al. Statistical Methods for the Analysis of Discrete Choice Experiments: A Report of the ISPOR Conjoint Analysis Good Research Practices Task Force. *Value in health : the journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research*. 2016;19(4):300-15.
24. Noordman BJ, de Bekker-Grob EW, Coene P, van der Harst E, Lagarde SM, Shapiro J, et al. Patients' preferences for treatment after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for oesophageal cancer. *The British journal of surgery*. 2018;105(12):1630-8.
25. Bewtra M, Kilambi V, Fairchild AO, Siegel CA, Lewis JD, Johnson FR. Patient preferences for surgical versus medical therapy for ulcerative colitis. *Inflammatory bowel diseases*. 2014;20(1):103-14.
26. van Mello NM, Mol F, Opmeer BC, de Bekker-Grob EW, Essink-Bot ML, Ankum WM, et al. Salpingotomy or salpingectomy in tubal ectopic pregnancy: what do women prefer? *Reproductive biomedicine online*. 2010;21(5):687-93.
27. Notten KJ, Essers BA, Weemhoff M, Rutten AG, Donners JJ, van Gestel I, et al. Do patients prefer mesh or anterior colporrhaphy for primary correction of anterior vaginal wall prolapse: a labelled discrete choice experiment. *BJOG : an international journal of obstetrics and gynaecology*. 2015;122(6):873-80.
28. Kunutsor SK, Beswick AD, Whitehouse MR, Wylde V, Blom AW. Debridement, antibiotics and implant retention for periprosthetic joint infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis of treatment outcomes. *The Journal of infection*. 2018;77(6):479-88.

Legend: Figure 1. Example profile of DCE

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

OPTION H1	OR	OPTION H2
I take antibiotics and the side effects <b>don't affect me much</b>		I take antibiotics and the side effects <b>affect me a lot</b>
<i>and</i>		<i>and</i>
I have <b>two</b> operations		I have <b>one</b> operation
<i>and</i>		<i>and</i>
After my new hip is fitted, I <b>can do most of the things</b> that I want to do		After my new hip is fitted, I <b>cannot do most of the things</b> that I want to do
<i>and</i>		<i>and</i>
After my surgical treatment starts, it takes <b>6 months</b> to get back to the things that I normally do		After my surgical treatment starts, it takes <b>12 months</b> to get back to the things that I normally do

Please only tick ONE box:

OPTION H1 
OPTION H2

Figure 1. Example profile of DCE  
160x90mm (300 x 300 DPI)