

# **Comparative efficacy of exercise therapy for patellofemoral pain: A network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials**

Yu-Xiu Ji<sup>a</sup>, Yu-Jie Xie<sup>\*a</sup>, Xiao-Zhu Zhou<sup>a</sup>, Shuang Wang<sup>a</sup>, Ling Li<sup>b</sup>, Akira Miyamoto<sup>c</sup>, Chi Zhang<sup>\*\*a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Rehabilitation Medicine Department, The Affiliated Hospital of Southwest Medical University, Luzhou, 646000, Sichuan, People's Republic of China.

<sup>b</sup> Chinese Evidence-based Medical and Cochrane China Center, West China Hospital, Chengdu, 610041, Sichuan, People's Republic of China.

<sup>c</sup> Department of Physical Therapy Faculty of Rehabilitation of Kobe International University, Japan.

\*Co-first author: Yu-Jie Xie

\*\*Corresponding author: Chi Zhang; E-mail: [chizhang\\_swmu@126.com](mailto:chizhang_swmu@126.com)

## **Abstract:**

**Objective:** To investigate the effective exercise prescription in randomized controlled trials (RCTs) for patellofemoral pain (PFP).

**Design:** A network meta-analysis.

**Data sources:** PubMed (including Medline), Embase, Web of Science, PEDro, Clinicaltrials.gov and other resources for RCTs.

**Eligibility criteria for selecting studies:** RCTs of exercise interventions for PFP with outcomes of pain intensity or functional improvement.

**Primary outcome measure:** Pain intensity is measured by 'worst pain in the past week' on a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) or Numerical Rating Pain Scale (NRS).

## **Data extraction:**

Two researchers independently extracted data and assessed the bias of risks. We used Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation to appraise the strength of the evidence.

## **Results:**

A total of 45 trials with 42,319 patients were included in this network meta-analysis (NMA). For the primary outcomes, all included treatments were superior to a wait-and-see approach: PNF + exercise (SMD -2.88, 95%CIs -4.75 to -1.02), whole body exercise (-1.57, -3.15 to -0.00), hip-and knee-focused exercise therapy (-1.32, -2.57 to -0.06), foot orthoses + exercise (-1.06, -2.92 to -0.06), hip exercise (-1.10, -2.44 to 0.24), knee brace + exercise(-0.91, -2.54 to 0.72), gait retraining exercise (-2.55, -4.72 to -0.37), knee exercise (-0.92, -2.16 to 0.33), knee arthroscopy +

exercise (-0.61, -2.44 to 1.22), target exercise (-0.52, -2.38 to 1.33), kinesiotaping + exercise (-0.54, -2.07 to 0.99), education + exercise (-0.47, -2.31 to 1.38), feedback exercise (-0.22, -1.86 to 1.43). Exercise therapy with education (SMD -0.25, 95%CI -1.76 to 1.26) was better than exercise alone in alleviating pain intensity.

**Conclusion:**

The knee and hip combination strength training is highly effective in muscle strength improvement. All treatments in our NMA were superior to nontreatment, we recommend avoiding a wait-and-see approach. Comprehensive therapy based on individual evaluation can effectively improve the symptoms of patients.

**Keywords:** biomechanical phenomena; knee; patellofemoral pain; exercise; osteoarthritis;

## **Web appendices**

### Contents

Web appendix1 Excluded studies with reasons for exclusions, including references to excluded studies

Web appendix2 Studies awaiting classification

Web appendix3 Studies identified in trial registers

Web appendix4 Treatments and treatment categories (ie, classes)

Web appendix5 Characteristics included studies, interventions and outcomes

Web appendix6 Risk of bias judgements per study

Web appendix7 Certainty of the Evidence (GRADE approach)

Web appendix8 Data analyses, treatment level results

Web appendix9 A recommended exercise therapy

## WEB APPENDIX1. EXCLUDED STUDIES AND REASONS FOR EXCLUSION

Study identifier	Reason(s) for exclusion
Lee, J.H., et al 2021	Wrong intervention: compares static and dynamic quadriceps stretching exercises
Lee, J.H., et al 2021	Wrong intervention: compare static and dynamic hamstring stretching
Almeida, G.P.L., et al 2021	Wrong intervention: compare anteromedial versus posterolateral hip musculature strengthening
Abd-Elmonem, A.M., et al 2021	Wrong study populations: 72 children, seven to twelve years old
Zarei, H., et al 2020	Wrong intervention: exercise therapy or exercise-therapy+dry needling group
Yosmaoğlu, H.B., et al 2020	Wrong intervention: received standard multimodal treatment
Wang, B., et al 2020	Wrong outcomes: changes from baseline in the patellofemoral joint stress and contact force.
Tan, J.M., et al 2020	Wrong study populations: Twenty-one participants with PFOA
Tan, J.M., et al 2020	Wrong study design: cross-sectional study Wrong study populations: 179 individuals aged 50 years and diagnosed PFOA
Tan, J.M., et al 2020	Wrong study design: cross-sectional study Wrong study populations: 188 participants with symptomatic PFOA
Talbot, L.A., et al 2020	Wrong intervention: neuromuscular electrical stimulation
O'Sullivan, I.C., et al 2020	Wrong study design: Protocol
Matthews, M., et al 2020	Wrong study design: A two-arm parallel, multicentre randomised superiority clinical trial
Marshall, A.N., et al 2020	Wrong outcomes: triplanar kinematics at the trunk, hip, knee, and ankle were collected via 3-dimensional motion capture.
Ma, Y.T., et al 2020	Wrong intervention: trigger point dry needling
Letafatkar, A., et al 2020	Wrong outcomes: Kinematic and kinetic measurements
Hott, A., et al 2020	Wrong study design: Cohort study
Glaviano, N.R., et al 2020	Wrong intervention: patterned electrical neuromuscular stimulation
Celik, D., et al 2020	Wrong intervention: Neuromuscular electrical stimulation
Albornoz-Cabello, M., et al 2020	Wrong intervention: Monopolar dielectric diathermy by emission of radiofrequency
Straszek, C.L., et al 2019	Wrong study design: A randomized crossover study
Smith, B.E., et al 2019	Wrong study purpose: to explore potential barriers and facilitators with patients and physiotherapists with patellofemoral pain

Smith, B.E., et al 2019	Wrong intervention: a loaded self-managed exercise programme (n =30) or usual physiotherapy (n=30).
Rees, D., et al 2019	Wrong study purpose: make inferences about knee kinematics during running.
Prohorova, E. S., et al 2019	Wrong language: Russian
Lewinson, R. T., et al 2019	Wrong study purpose: To determine whether footwear insoles alter biomechanical variables associated with running injuries.
Glaviano, N.R., et al 2019	Wrong intervention: Patterned electrical neuromuscular stimulation
Dos Santos, A.F., et al 2019	Wrong intervention: gait retraining Wrong study design: Case series report
Aliberti S PhD, P.T., et al 2019	Wrong study purpose: To analyze the immediate effects of a distal gait modification session
Adel, J., et al 2019	Wrong study populations: participants with PFOA
Wyndow, N., et al 2019	Wrong study populations: Fifty-one participants with PFOA
Sit, R.W.S., et al 2018	Wrong study populations: 208 patients with knee osteoarthritis
Sit, R.W.S., et al 2018	Wrong study populations: 208 participants with coexistence of PFOA and TFOA
Ramskov, D., et al 2018	Wrong study populations: healthy recreational runners
Mulvad, B., et al 2018	Wrong study purpose: to describe the incidence proportion of different types of running-related injuries (RRI)
Esculier, J.F., et al 2018	Wrong study design: Secondary analyses
Earl-Boehm, J.E., et al 2018	Wrong study purpose: To develop clinical prediction rules
Bonanno, D.R., et al 2018	Wrong study purpose: To evaluate the effectiveness of prefabricated foot orthoses for the prevention of lower limb overuse injuries.
Son, S.J., et al 2017	Wrong intervention: transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation
Roper, J.L., et al 2017	Wrong study purpose: investigated the effects of gait retraining from rearfoot strike to forefoot strike
Matthews, M., et al 2017	Wrong study design: protocol
Lee, J., et al 2017	Wrong outcomes: Surface electromyography activities in the VMO, VL, and AbdH
Greuel, H., et al 2017	Wrong study populations: 22 healthy participants
Espí-López, G.V., et al 2017	Wrong intervention: trigger point dry needling
Cotic, M., et al 2017	Wrong study purpose: isolated resurfacing of the trochlea using an inlay prosthesis without changing the complex kinematics of the patellofemoral joint.
Collins, N.J., et al 2017	Wrong study design: A cross-over, proof-of-concept study
Bazett-Jones, D.M., et al 2017	Wrong study design: Crossover study
Servodio Iammarrone, C., et al 2016	Wrong intervention: pulsed electromagnetic fields

Riel, H., et al 2016	Wrong outcomes: the mean deviation of the prescribed time under tension per repetition in seconds
Rathleff, M.S., et al 2016	Wrong outcomes: sEMG of the VL and VM during stair descent
Rathleff, M.S., et al 2016	Wrong outcomes: the change in localized and distal from baseline to follow-up
Petersen, W., et al 2016	Wrong intervention: a medially directed patellar realignment brace and supervised exercise
Keays, S. L., et al 2016	Wrong study design: prospective cohort study
Glaviano, N. R., et al 2016	Wrong intervention: patterned electrical neuromuscular stimulation Wrong study design: Cohort study
Glaviano, N.R., et al 2016	Wrong intervention: patterned electrical neuromuscular stimulation
Esculier, J.F., et al 2016	Wrong intervention: Group 1: education; Group 2: education +an exercise program ; Group 3: education +running gait retraining advice
Araújo, C.G., et al 2016	Wrong outcomes: the level of muscle activity of each muscle
Tsai, L.C., et al 2015	Wrong intervention: lower extremity off-axis training
Strecker, W., et al 2015	Wrong study populations: Patellofemoral maltracking
Palmer, K., et al 2015	Wrong outcomes: Knee kinematics
Lewinson, R.T., et al 2015	Wrong intervention: an experimental 3 mm lateral wedge or control 6 mm medial wedge group
Lankhorst, N.E., et al 2015	Wrong study design: Secondary exploratory analysis
Keays, S. L., et al 2015	Wrong study design: crossed study
Hott, A., et al 2015	Wrong study design: protocol
Crossley, K.M., et al 2015	Wrong study populations: 92 people aged $\geq 40$ years with symptomatic and radiographic PFJ OA participated.
Baldon Rde, M., et al 2015	Wrong outcomes: the lower limb and trunk kinematics in the frontal plane assessed during a single-legged squat task
Sugimoto, D., et al 2014	Wrong study populations: 21 high school women volleyball players
Rabelo, N.D., et al 2014	Wrong study design: protocol
Petersen, W., et al 2014	Wrong study design: Pro study
Knoop, J., et al 2014	Wrong study populations: Ninety-five participants with knee OA
Khayambashi, K., et al 2014	Wrong study design: Comparative control trial

Bonacci, J., et al 2014	Wrong study populations: 22 trained runners
Baldon Rde, M., et al 2014	Wrong outcomes: trunk endurance and eccentric hip and knee muscle strength
Toumi, H., et al 2013	Wrong study purpose: To investigate the extent to which quadriceps muscle activation and strength are responsible for patellofemoral pain.
Rodrigues, P., et al 2013	Wrong study populations: Kinematics of 16 asymptomatic and 17 runners with AKP
Pattyn, E., et al 2013	Wrong study purpose: to examine by muscle functional magnetic resonance imaging
Østerås, B., et al 2013	Wrong intervention: high-dose, high-repetition medical exercise therapy, and the control group received low-dose, low-repetition exercise therapy.
Østerås, B., et al 2013	Wrong intervention: high-dose, high-repetition MET for the experimental group, and low-dose, low-repetition exercise therapy for the control group.
Osorio, J.A., et al 2013	Wrong study design: Crossover experimental design.
Lewinson, R. T., et al 2013	Wrong study populations: Nine healthy runners participated
Boldt, A.R., et al 2013	Wrong study populations: Twenty female runners with and without PFPS participated
Rathleff, M.S., et al 2012	Wrong outcomes: fill out self-reported questionnaires , a 7-point Likert scale
Pattyn, E., et al 2012	Wrong study purpose: aims to identify factors that could predict the short-term functional outcome
Kettunen, J.A., et al 2012	Wrong study design: 5-year follow-up , secondary study
Willy, R. W., et al 2011	Wrong outcomes: Using a handheld dynamometer and standard motion capture procedures
Shih, Y. F., et al 2011	Wrong study populations: pronated-foot runners with overuse knee or foot pain
Mostamand, J., et al 2011	Wrong outcomes: using an EMG unit
Tan, S.S., et al 2010	Wrong study purpose: determine the cost effectiveness of exercise therapy
MacLean, C. L., et al 2010	Wrong study populations: injured runners
Irish, S.E., et al 2010	Wrong outcomes: The EMG of VMO and VL was measured and used to calculate the VMO:VL ratio
Balci, P., et al 2009	Wrong outcomes: the MRFS System , a visual analog scale , the Kujala questionnaire
Selfe, J., et al 2008	Wrong study purpose: investigated the effect of patellar bracing and taping on the three-dimensional mechanics of the knee during a controlled eccentric step down task.

Ng, G. Y., et al 2008	Wrong outcomes: VMO/VL EMG ratio
Crossley, K.M., et al 2008	Wrong study design: protocol Wrong study populations: 90 people with PFJ OA
Bily, W., et al 2008	Wrong study design: a pilot study
Bakhtiary, A. H., et al 2008	Wrong study populations: 32 female university students with a diagnosis of patellar chondromalacia
McCrary, J.L., et al 2007	Wrong outcomes: Three-dimensional kinematic data were collected for each subject at 60 Hz
Herrington, L., et al 2007	Wrong intervention: Group 1 performed knee extension exercises, group 2 performed seated leg press exercises, and group 3 received no treatment.
Avraham, F., et al 2007	Wrong study design: a pilot study
van Linschoten, R., et al 2006	Wrong study design: The PEX study
Singer, B.J., et al 2006	Wrong study purpose: An open label pilot investigation of the efficacy of Botulinum toxin type A
Cowan, S.M., et al 2006	Wrong outcomes: the EMG amplitude of the vastus medialis obliquus and vastus lateralis during the concentric phase of stair stepping.
Boling, M.C., et al 2006	Wrong study populations: Fourteen subjects diagnosed with PFPS and 14 healthy control subjects
Bennell, K., et al 2006	Wrong outcomes: EMG onsets of VMO and VL , stance phase knee flexion and vertical ground reaction force
O'Sullivan, S. P., et al 2005	Wrong outcomes: maximum VMO activity
Macintyre, J. G. 2005	Wrong study design: secondary study
Hazneci, B., et al 2005	Wrong outcomes: knee passive joint position sense, quadriceps and hamstring muscle strength
Denton, J., et al 2005	Wrong outcomes: measurements of hip internal and external rotation, hip extension, and iliotibial band muscle length
Crossley, K.M., et al 2005	Wrong outcomes: Stance-phase knee flexion
Coqueiro, K.R., et al 2005	Wrong outcomes: electromyographic muscle data
Ward, S. R., et al 2004	Wrong study purpose: To determine if persons with patella alta exhibit elevated patellofemoral joint stress compared to pain-free controls during normal and fast walking speeds.
Van Tiggelen, D., et al 2004	Wrong study populations: 167 military recruits without history of knee pain
Quilty, B., et al 2003	Wrong study populations: who had knee pain and predominant PFJ OA
Sathe, V.M., et al 2002	Wrong study design: an MRI study

Ng, G. Y., et al 2002	Wrong study design: Pre- and post-treatment design
Cowan, S.M., et al 2002	Wrong outcomes: electromyographic (EMG) activity of the vasti
Schneider, F., et al 2001	Wrong study purpose: alternatives for cases of therapy resistance
Lam, P. L., et al 2001	Wrong outcomes: The ratio of surface-integrated electromyographic signals of vastus medialis obliquus over vastus lateralis
Witvrouw, E., et al 2000	Wrong intervention: only closed kinetic chain exercises or only open kinetic chain exercises
Callaghan, M.J., et al 2000	Wrong study populations: twenty healthy volunteers
Timm, K.E. 1998	Wrong study purpose: examined the effects of a high volume of submaximal knee muscle exercise on objective measures of PFP and PFC
Laprade, J., et al 1998	Wrong study populations: eight PFPS female subjects and 19 controls
Thomeé, R. 1997	Wrong outcomes: torque measurements
Bynum, E. B., et al 1995	Wrong intervention: closed kinetic chain exercises or open kinetic chain exercises
Werner, S., et al 1993	Wrong outcomes: Borg's pain scale
Kannus, P., et al 1992	Wrong intervention: intraarticular injections

#### References to excluded studies in web appendix 2[1-126]

1. Lee, J.H., et al., Static and Dynamic Quadriceps Stretching Exercises in Patients With Patellofemoral Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Sports Health*, 2021. 13(5): p. 482-489.
2. Lee, J.H., et al., Effects of Static and Dynamic Stretching With Strengthening Exercises in Patients With Patellofemoral Pain Who Have Inflexible Hamstrings: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Sports Health*, 2021. 13(1): p. 49-56.
3. Almeida, G.P.L., et al., Anteromedial versus posterolateral hip musculature strengthening with dose-controlled in women with patellofemoral pain: A randomized controlled trial. *Phys Ther Sport*, 2021. 49: p. 149-156.
4. Abd-Elmonem, A.M., et al., Clinical and radiological outcomes of corrective exercises and neuromuscular electrical stimulation in children with flexible flatfoot: A randomized controlled trial. *Gait Posture*, 2021. 88: p. 297-303.
5. Zarei, H., et al., Added Value of Gluteus Medius and Quadratus Lumborum Dry Needling in Improving Knee Pain and Function in Female Athletes With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 2020. 101(2): p. 265-274.
6. Yosmaoğlu, H.B., et al., Targeted Treatment Protocol in Patellofemoral Pain: Does Treatment Designed According to Subgroups Improve Clinical Outcomes in Patients Unresponsive to Multimodal Treatment? *Sports Health*, 2020. 12(2): p. 170-180.

7. Wang, B., et al., Twelve-Week Gait Retraining Reduced Patellofemoral Joint Stress during Running in Male Recreational Runners. *Biomed Res Int*, 2020. 2020: p. 9723563.
8. Tan, J.M., et al., Immediate effects of foot orthoses on lower limb biomechanics, pain, and confidence in individuals with patellofemoral osteoarthritis. *Gait Posture*, 2020. 76: p. 51-57.
9. Tan, J.M., et al., Can radiographic patellofemoral osteoarthritis be diagnosed using clinical assessments? *Musculoskeletal Care*, 2020. 18(4): p. 467-476.
10. Tan, J.M., et al., Associations of foot and ankle characteristics with knee symptoms and function in individuals with patellofemoral osteoarthritis. *J Foot Ankle Res*, 2020. 13(1): p. 57.
11. Talbot, L.A., et al., Electrical Stimulation Therapies for Active Duty Military with Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Randomized Trial. *Mil Med*, 2020. 185(7-8): p. e963-e971.
12. O'Sullivan, I.C., et al., HAPPi Kneecaps! Protocol for a participant- and assessor-blinded, randomised, parallel group feasibility trial of foot orthoses for adolescents with patellofemoral pain. *J Foot Ankle Res*, 2020. 13(1): p. 50.
13. Matthews, M., et al., Does foot mobility affect the outcome in the management of patellofemoral pain with foot orthoses versus hip exercises? A randomised clinical trial. *Br J Sports Med*, 2020. 54(23): p. 1416-1422.
14. Marshall, A.N., et al., Visual Biofeedback and Changes in Lower Extremity Kinematics in Individuals With Medial Knee Displacement. *J Athl Train*, 2020. 55(3): p. 255-264.
15. Ma, Y.T., et al., Effects of Trigger Point Dry Needling on Neuromuscular Performance and Pain of Individuals Affected by Patellofemoral Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Pain Res*, 2020. 13: p. 1677-1686.
16. Letafatkar, A., et al., Long-term efficacy of conditioning training program combined with feedback on kinetics and kinematics in male runners. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*, 2020. 30(3): p. 429-441.
17. Hott, A., et al., Predictors of Pain, Function, and Change in Patellofemoral Pain. *Am J Sports Med*, 2020. 48(2): p. 351-358.
18. Glaviano, N.R., et al., Improvements in Lower-Extremity Function Following a Rehabilitation Program With Patterned Electrical Neuromuscular Stimulation in Females With Patellofemoral Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Sport Rehabil*, 2020. 29(8): p. 1075-1085.
19. Celik, D., et al., The effectiveness of superimposed neuromuscular electrical stimulation combined with strengthening exercises on patellofemoral pain: A randomized controlled pilot trial. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil*, 2020. 33(4): p. 693-699.
20. Albornoz-Cabello, M., et al., Monopolar dielectric diathermy by emission of radiofrequency in Patellofemoral pain. A single-blind-randomized clinical trial. *Electromagn Biol Med*, 2020. 39(4): p. 282-289.
21. Straszek, C.L., et al., Exercise-induced hypoalgesia in young adult females with long-standing patellofemoral pain - A randomized crossover study. *Eur J Pain*, 2019. 23(10): p. 1780-1789.
22. Smith, B.E., et al., Barriers and facilitators of loaded self-managed exercises and physical activity in people with patellofemoral pain: understanding the feasibility of delivering a multicentred randomised controlled trial, a UK qualitative study. *BMJ Open*, 2019. 9(6): p. e023805.
23. Smith, B.E., et al., A loaded self-managed exercise programme for patellofemoral pain: a mixed methods feasibility study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2019. 20(1): p. 129.

24. Rees, D., A. Younis, and S. MacRae, Is there a correlation in frontal plane knee kinematics between running and performing a single leg squat in runners with patellofemoral pain syndrome and asymptomatic runners? *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*, 2019. 61: p. 227-232.
25. Prohorova, E.S., A.G. Ponomareva, and V.V. Ar'kov, [Correction of the lumbosacral orthosis in the patients presenting with patellofemoral pain syndrome with the use of physical exercise therapy]. *Vopr Kurortol Fizioter Lech Fiz Kult*, 2019. 96(2): p. 33-38.
26. Lewinson, R.T. and D.J. Stefanyshyn, Effect of a Commercially Available Footwear Insole on Biomechanical Variables Associated With Common Running Injuries. *Clin J Sport Med*, 2019. 29(4): p. 341-343.
27. Glaviano, N.R., et al., Impairment-Based Rehabilitation With Patterned Electrical Neuromuscular Stimulation and Lower Extremity Function in Individuals With Patellofemoral Pain: A Preliminary Study. *J Athl Train*, 2019. 54(3): p. 255-269.
28. Dos Santos, A.F., et al., Effects of three gait retraining techniques in runners with patellofemoral pain. *Phys Ther Sport*, 2019. 36: p. 92-100.
29. Aliberti S PhD, P.T., et al., Immediate effects of a distal gait modification during stair descent in individuals with patellofemoral pain. *Physiother Theory Pract*, 2019. 35(12): p. 1243-1249.
30. Adel, J., et al., Squatting versus squatting with hip adduction in management of patellofemoral osteoarthritis: A randomized controlled trial. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil*, 2019. 32(3): p. 463-470.
31. Wyndow, N., et al., Foot and ankle characteristics and dynamic knee valgus in individuals with patellofemoral osteoarthritis. *J Foot Ankle Res*, 2018. 11: p. 65.
32. Sit, R.W.S., et al., Clinic-Based Patellar Mobilization Therapy for Knee Osteoarthritis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Ann Fam Med*, 2018. 16(6): p. 521-529.
33. Sit, R.W.S., et al., Clinical effectiveness of patella mobilisation therapy versus a waiting list control for knee osteoarthritis: a protocol for a pragmatic randomised clinical trial. *BMJ Open*, 2018. 8(3): p. e019103.
34. Ramskov, D., et al., Progression in Running Intensity or Running Volume and the Development of Specific Injuries in Recreational Runners: Run Clever, a Randomized Trial Using Competing Risks. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 2018. 48(10): p. 740-748.
35. Mulvad, B., et al., Diagnoses and time to recovery among injured recreational runners in the RUN CLEVER trial. *PLoS One*, 2018. 13(10): p. e0204742.
36. Esculier, J.F., et al., Predictors of clinical success in runners with patellofemoral pain: Secondary analyses of a randomized clinical trial. *J Sci Med Sport*, 2018. 21(8): p. 777-782.
37. Earl-Boehm, J.E., et al., Treatment Success of Hip and Core or Knee Strengthening for Patellofemoral Pain: Development of Clinical Prediction Rules. *J Athl Train*, 2018. 53(6): p. 545-552.
38. Bonanno, D.R., et al., Effectiveness of foot orthoses for the prevention of lower limb overuse injuries in naval recruits: a randomised controlled trial. *Br J Sports Med*, 2018. 52(5): p. 298-302.
39. Son, S.J., et al., Efficacy of Sensory Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation on Perceived Pain and Gait Patterns in Individuals With Experimental Knee Pain. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 2017. 98(1): p. 25-35.
40. Roper, J.L., et al., Gait Retraining From Rearfoot Strike to Forefoot Strike does not change Running Economy. *Int J Sports Med*, 2017. 38(14): p. 1076-1082.

41. Matthews, M., et al., The Foot Orthoses versus Hip eXercises (FOHX) trial for patellofemoral pain: a protocol for a randomized clinical trial to determine if foot mobility is associated with better outcomes from foot orthoses. *J Foot Ankle Res*, 2017. 10: p. 5.
42. Lee, J., J. Yoon, and H. Cynn, Foot exercise and taping in patients with patellofemoral pain and pronated foot. *J Bodyw Mov Ther*, 2017. 21(1): p. 216-222.
43. Greuel, H., et al., Does the Powers™ strap influence the lower limb biomechanics during running? *Gait Posture*, 2017. 57: p. 141-146.
44. Espí-López, G.V., et al., Effectiveness of Inclusion of Dry Needling in a Multimodal Therapy Program for Patellofemoral Pain: A Randomized Parallel-Group Trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 2017. 47(6): p. 392-401.
45. Cotic, M., P. Forkel, and A.B. Imhoff, [Patellofemoral arthroplasty]. *Oper Orthop Traumatol*, 2017. 29(1): p. 40-50.
46. Collins, N.J., et al., Immediate effects of foot orthoses on pain during functional tasks in people with patellofemoral osteoarthritis: A cross-over, proof-of-concept study. *Knee*, 2017. 24(1): p. 76-81.
47. Bazett-Jones, D.M., et al., Acute Responses of Strength and Running Mechanics to Increasing and Decreasing Pain in Patients With Patellofemoral Pain. *J Athl Train*, 2017. 52(5): p. 411-421.
48. Servodio Iammarrone, C., et al., Is there a role of pulsed electromagnetic fields in management of patellofemoral pain syndrome? Randomized controlled study at one year follow-up. *Bioelectromagnetics*, 2016. 37(2): p. 81-8.
49. Riel, H., et al., Efficacy of live feedback to improve objectively monitored compliance to prescribed, home-based, exercise therapy-dosage in 15 to 19 year old adolescents with patellofemoral pain- a study protocol of a randomized controlled superiority trial (The XRCISE-AS-INSTRUcted-1 trial). *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2016. 17: p. 242.
50. Rathleff, M.S., et al., Effect of exercise therapy on neuromuscular activity and knee strength in female adolescents with patellofemoral pain-An ancillary analysis of a cluster randomized trial. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*, 2016. 34: p. 22-9.
51. Rathleff, M.S., et al., Self-reported Recovery is Associated With Improvement in Localized Hyperalgesia Among Adolescent Females With Patellofemoral Pain: Results From a Cluster Randomized Trial. *Clin J Pain*, 2016. 32(5): p. 428-34.
52. Petersen, W., et al., Evaluating the potential synergistic benefit of a realignment brace on patients receiving exercise therapy for patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized clinical trial. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*, 2016. 136(7): p. 975-82.
53. Keays, S.L., M. Mason, and P.A. Newcombe, Three-Year Outcome After a 1-Month Physiotherapy Program of Local and Individualized Global Treatment for Patellofemoral Pain Followed by Self-Management. *Clin J Sport Med*, 2016. 26(3): p. 190-8.
54. Glaviano, N.R. and S.A. Saliba, Immediate Effect of Patterned Electrical Neuromuscular Stimulation on Pain and Muscle Activation in Individuals With Patellofemoral Pain. *J Athl Train*, 2016. 51(2): p. 118-28.
55. Glaviano, N.R., et al., Improvements in kinematics, muscle activity and pain during functional tasks in females with patellofemoral pain following a single patterned electrical stimulation treatment. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*, 2016. 32: p. 20-7.

56. Esculier, J.F., et al., Effects of rehabilitation approaches for runners with patellofemoral pain: protocol of a randomised clinical trial addressing specific underlying mechanisms. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2016. 17: p. 5.
57. Araújo, C.G., et al., McConnell's patellar taping does not alter knee and hip muscle activation differences during proprioceptive exercises: A randomized placebo-controlled trial in women with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*, 2016. 31: p. 72-80.
58. Tsai, L.C., et al., Effects of Off-Axis Elliptical Training on Reducing Pain and Improving Knee Function in Individuals With Patellofemoral Pain. *Clin J Sport Med*, 2015. 25(6): p. 487-93.
59. Strecker, W. and J. Dickschas, [Torsional osteotomy : Operative treatment of patellofemoral maltracking]. *Oper Orthop Traumatol*, 2015. 27(6): p. 505-24.
60. Palmer, K., C. Hebron, and J.M. Williams, A randomised trial into the effect of an isolated hip abductor strengthening programme and a functional motor control programme on knee kinematics and hip muscle strength. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2015. 16: p. 105.
61. Lewinson, R.T., et al., Altering Knee Abduction Angular Impulse Using Wedged Insoles for Treatment of Patellofemoral Pain in Runners: A Six-Week Randomized Controlled Trial. *PLoS One*, 2015. 10(7): p. e0134461.
62. Lankhorst, N.E., et al., Can we predict which patients with patellofemoral pain are more likely to benefit from exercise therapy? A secondary exploratory analysis of a randomized controlled trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 2015. 45(3): p. 183-9.
63. Keays, S.L., M. Mason, and P.A. Newcombe, Individualized physiotherapy in the treatment of patellofemoral pain. *Physiother Res Int*, 2015. 20(1): p. 22-36.
64. Hott, A., et al., Study protocol: a randomised controlled trial comparing the long term effects of isolated hip strengthening, quadriceps-based training and free physical activity for patellofemoral pain syndrome (anterior knee pain). *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2015. 16: p. 40.
65. Crossley, K.M., et al., Exercise, education, manual-therapy and taping compared to education for patellofemoral osteoarthritis: a blinded, randomised clinical trial. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*, 2015. 23(9): p. 1457-64.
66. Baldon Rde, M., et al., Evaluating eccentric hip torque and trunk endurance as mediators of changes in lower limb and trunk kinematics in response to functional stabilization training in women with patellofemoral pain. *Am J Sports Med*, 2015. 43(6): p. 1485-93.
67. Sugimoto, D., et al., Effects of compliance on trunk and hip integrative neuromuscular training on hip abductor strength in female athletes. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2014. 28(5): p. 1187-94.
68. Rabelo, N.D., et al., Neuromuscular training and muscle strengthening in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a protocol of randomized controlled trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2014. 15: p. 157.
69. Petersen, W., et al., The Patella Pro study - effect of a knee brace on patellofemoral pain syndrome: design of a randomized clinical trial (DRKS-ID:DRKS00003291). *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2014. 15: p. 200.
70. Knoop, J., et al., Is the severity of knee osteoarthritis on magnetic resonance imaging associated with outcome of exercise therapy? *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*, 2014. 66(1): p. 63-8.
71. Khayambashi, K., et al., Posterolateral hip muscle strengthening versus quadriceps strengthening for patellofemoral pain: a comparative control trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 2014. 95(5): p. 900-7.

72. Bonacci, J., et al., Take your shoes off to reduce patellofemoral joint stress during running. *Br J Sports Med*, 2014. 48(6): p. 425-8.
73. Baldon Rde, M., et al., Effects of functional stabilization training on pain, function, and lower extremity biomechanics in women with patellofemoral pain: a randomized clinical trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 2014. 44(4): p. 240-251, a1-a8.
74. Toumi, H., et al., The role of muscle strength & activation patterns in patellofemoral pain. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*, 2013. 28(5): p. 544-8.
75. Rodrigues, P., et al., Medially posted insoles consistently influence foot pronation in runners with and without anterior knee pain. *Gait Posture*, 2013. 37(4): p. 526-31.
76. Pattyn, E., et al., Muscle functional MRI to evaluate quadriceps dysfunction in patellofemoral pain. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*, 2013. 45(6): p. 1023-9.
77. Østerås, B., et al., Dose-response effects of medical exercise therapy in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomised controlled clinical trial. *Physiotherapy*, 2013. 99(2): p. 126-31.
78. Østerås, B., H. Østerås, and T.A. Torstensen, Long-term effects of medical exercise therapy in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome: results from a single-blinded randomized controlled trial with 12 months follow-up. *Physiotherapy*, 2013. 99(4): p. 311-6.
79. Osorio, J.A., et al., The effects of two therapeutic patellofemoral taping techniques on strength, endurance, and pain responses. *Phys Ther Sport*, 2013. 14(4): p. 199-206.
80. Lewinson, R.T., J.T. Worobets, and D.J. Stefanyshyn, Knee abduction angular impulses during prolonged running with wedged insoles. *Proc Inst Mech Eng H*, 2013. 227(7): p. 811-4.
81. Boldt, A.R., et al., Effects of medially wedged foot orthoses on knee and hip joint running mechanics in females with and without patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Appl Biomech*, 2013. 29(1): p. 68-77.
82. Rathleff, M.S., et al., Early intervention for adolescents with patellofemoral pain syndrome--a pragmatic cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2012. 13: p. 9.
83. Pattyn, E., et al., What predicts functional outcome after treatment for patellofemoral pain? *Med Sci Sports Exerc*, 2012. 44(10): p. 1827-33.
84. Kettunen, J.A., et al., Knee arthroscopy and exercise versus exercise only for chronic patellofemoral pain syndrome: 5-year follow-up. *Br J Sports Med*, 2012. 46(4): p. 243-6.
85. Willy, R.W. and I.S. Davis, The effect of a hip-strengthening program on mechanics during running and during a single-leg squat. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 2011. 41(9): p. 625-32.
86. Shih, Y.F., Y.K. Wen, and W.Y. Chen, Application of wedged foot orthosis effectively reduces pain in runners with pronated foot: a randomized clinical study. *Clin Rehabil*, 2011. 25(10): p. 913-23.
87. Mostamand, J., D.L. Bader, and Z. Hudson, The effect of patellar taping on EMG activity of vasti muscles during squatting in individuals with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Sports Sci*, 2011. 29(2): p. 197-205.
88. Tan, S.S., et al., Cost-utility of exercise therapy in adolescents and young adults suffering from the patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*, 2010. 20(4): p. 568-79.
89. MacLean, C.L., R. van Emmerik, and J. Hamill, Influence of custom foot orthotic intervention on lower extremity intralimb coupling during a 30-minute run. *J Appl Biomech*, 2010. 26(4): p. 390-9.

90. Irish, S.E., et al., The effect of closed-kinetic chain exercises and open-kinetic chain exercise on the muscle activity of vastus medialis oblique and vastus lateralis. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2010. 24(5): p. 1256-62.
91. Balci, P., et al., [The effects of two different closed kinetic chain exercises on muscle strength and proprioception in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome]. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc*, 2009. 43(5): p. 419-25.
92. Selfe, J., et al., The biomechanics of step descent under different treatment modalities used in patellofemoral pain. *Gait Posture*, 2008. 27(2): p. 258-63.
93. Ng, G.Y., A.Q. Zhang, and C.K. Li, Biofeedback exercise improved the EMG activity ratio of the medial and lateral vasti muscles in subjects with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*, 2008. 18(1): p. 128-33.
94. Crossley, K.M., et al., Targeted physiotherapy for patellofemoral joint osteoarthritis: a protocol for a randomised, single-blind controlled trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2008. 9: p. 122.
95. Bily, W., et al., Training program and additional electric muscle stimulation for patellofemoral pain syndrome: a pilot study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 2008. 89(7): p. 1230-6.
96. Bakhtiary, A.H. and E. Fatemi, Open versus closed kinetic chain exercises for patellar chondromalacia. *Br J Sports Med*, 2008. 42(2): p. 99-102; discussion 102.
97. McCrory, J.L., et al., The effect of a single treatment of the Protonics system on lower extremity kinematics during gait and the lateral step up exercise. *Gait Posture*, 2007. 25(4): p. 544-8.
98. Herrington, L. and A. Al-Sherhi, A controlled trial of weight-bearing versus non-weight-bearing exercises for patellofemoral pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 2007. 37(4): p. 155-60.
99. Avraham, F., et al., The efficacy of treatment of different intervention programs for patellofemoral pain syndrome--a single blinded randomized clinical trial. Pilot study. *ScientificWorldJournal*, 2007. 7: p. 1256-62.
100. van Linschoten, R., et al., The PEX study - Exercise therapy for patellofemoral pain syndrome: design of a randomized clinical trial in general practice and sports medicine [ISRCTN83938749]. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*, 2006. 7: p. 31.
101. Singer, B.J., et al., An open label pilot investigation of the efficacy of Botulinum toxin type A [Dysport] injection in the rehabilitation of chronic anterior knee pain. *Disabil Rehabil*, 2006. 28(11): p. 707-13.
102. Cowan, S.M., et al., Patellar taping does not change the amplitude of electromyographic activity of the vasti in a stair stepping task. *Br J Sports Med*, 2006. 40(1): p. 30-4.
103. Boling, M.C., et al., Outcomes of a weight-bearing rehabilitation program for patients diagnosed with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 2006. 87(11): p. 1428-35.
104. Bennell, K., M. Duncan, and S. Cowan, Effect of patellar taping on vasti onset timing, knee kinematics, and kinetics in asymptomatic individuals with a delayed onset of vastus medialis oblique. *J Orthop Res*, 2006. 24(9): p. 1854-60.
105. O'Sullivan, S.P. and C.A. Popelas, Activation of vastus medialis obliquus among individuals with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2005. 19(2): p. 302-4.
106. Macintyre, J.G., 5-year follow-up of open or closed kinetic chain exercises for patellofemoral pain. *Clin J Sport Med*, 2005. 15(3): p. 199-200.
107. Hazneci, B., et al., Efficacy of isokinetic exercise on joint position sense and muscle strength in patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*, 2005. 84(7): p. 521-7.

108. Denton, J., et al., The addition of the Protonics brace system to a rehabilitation protocol to address patellofemoral joint syndrome. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 2005. 35(4): p. 210-9.
109. Crossley, K.M., et al., Physical therapy improves knee flexion during stair ambulation in patellofemoral pain. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*, 2005. 37(2): p. 176-83.
110. Coqueiro, K.R., et al., Analysis on the activation of the VMO and VLL muscles during semisquat exercises with and without hip adduction in individuals with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*, 2005. 15(6): p. 596-603.
111. Ward, S.R. and C.M. Powers, The influence of patella alta on patellofemoral joint stress during normal and fast walking. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*, 2004. 19(10): p. 1040-7.
112. Van Tiggelen, D., et al., Effect of bracing on the prevention of anterior knee pain--a prospective randomized study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*, 2004. 12(5): p. 434-9.
113. Quilty, B., et al., Physiotherapy, including quadriceps exercises and patellar taping, for knee osteoarthritis with predominant patello-femoral joint involvement: randomized controlled trial. *J Rheumatol*, 2003. 30(6): p. 1311-7.
114. Sathe, V.M., et al., Acute effects of the Protonics system on patellofemoral alignment: an MRI study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*, 2002. 10(1): p. 44-8.
115. Ng, G.Y. and J.M. Cheng, The effects of patellar taping on pain and neuromuscular performance in subjects with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Clin Rehabil*, 2002. 16(8): p. 821-7.
116. Cowan, S.M., et al., Physical therapy alters recruitment of the vasti in patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*, 2002. 34(12): p. 1879-85.
117. Schneider, F., K. Labs, and S. Wagner, Chronic patellofemoral pain syndrome: alternatives for cases of therapy resistance. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*, 2001. 9(5): p. 290-5.
118. Lam, P.L. and G.Y. Ng, Activation of the quadriceps muscle during semisquatting with different hip and knee positions in patients with anterior knee pain. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*, 2001. 80(11): p. 804-8.
119. Witvrouw, E., et al., Open versus closed kinetic chain exercises for patellofemoral pain. A prospective, randomized study. *Am J Sports Med*, 2000. 28(5): p. 687-94.
120. Callaghan, M.J., et al., The reproducibility of multi-joint isokinetic and isometric assessments in a healthy and patient population. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*, 2000. 15(9): p. 678-83.
121. Timm, K.E., Randomized controlled trial of Protonics on patellar pain, position, and function. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*, 1998. 30(5): p. 665-70.
122. Laprade, J., E. Culham, and B. Brouwer, Comparison of five isometric exercises in the recruitment of the vastus medialis oblique in persons with and without patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*, 1998. 27(3): p. 197-204.
123. Thomeé, R., A comprehensive treatment approach for patellofemoral pain syndrome in young women. *Phys Ther*, 1997. 77(12): p. 1690-703.
124. Bynum, E.B., R.L. Barrack, and A.H. Alexander, Open versus closed chain kinetic exercises after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. A prospective randomized study. *Am J Sports Med*, 1995. 23(4): p. 401-6.
125. Werner, S. and E. Eriksson, Isokinetic quadriceps training in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*, 1993. 1(3-4): p. 162-8.
126. Kannus, P., et al., Effect of intraarticular glycosaminoglycan polysulfate treatment on patellofemoral pain syndrome. A prospective, randomized double-blind trial comparing glycosaminoglycan polysulfate with placebo and quadriceps muscle exercises. *Arthritis Rheum*,

## Web appendix2. Studies found through database searches, awaiting classification

<i>Study identifier</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Matthews, M., et al 2021	Infographic.
Aghakeshizadeh, F., et al 2021	No full text made available.
Zago, J., et al 2020	No full text made available.
Begum, R., et al 2020	No full text made available.
Foroughi, F., et al 2019	Box plot, line chart. Lack of specific data.
Hamstra-Wright, K.L., et al 2017	Box plot. Lack of specific data.
Yilmaz Yelvar, G.D., et al 2015	No full text made available.
Ismail, M. M., et al 2013	No full text made available.
Crossley, K., et al 2002	Box plot, line chart. Lack of specific data.
Eng, J. J., et al 1993	Line chart. Lack of specific data.

### References to excluded studies in web appendix 3

1. Matthews, M., et al., Infographic. Does foot mobility affect the outcome in the management of patellofemoral pain with foot orthoses versus hip exercises? A randomised clinical trial. Br J Sports Med, 2021. 55(5): p. 281-282.
2. Aghakeshizadeh, F., A. Letafatkar, and A.C. Thomas, Internal and external focus show similar effect on the gait kinematics in patients with patellofemoral pain: A randomised controlled trial. Gait Posture, 2021. 84: p. 155-161.
3. Zago, J., et al., Osteopathic Manipulative Treatment Versus Exercise Program in Runners With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Randomized Controlled Trial. J Sport Rehabil, 2020. 30(4): p. 609-618.
4. Begum, R., et al., Effects of McConnell taping combined with strengthening exercises of vastus medialis oblique in females with patellofemoral pain syndrome. J Pak Med Assoc, 2020. 70(4): p. 728-730.
5. Foroughi, F., et al., Added Value of Isolated Core Postural Control Training on Knee Pain and Function in Women With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2019. 100(2): p. 220-229.
6. Hamstra-Wright, K.L., et al., Individuals With Patellofemoral Pain Have Less Hip Flexibility Than Controls Regardless of Treatment Outcome. Clin J Sport Med, 2017. 27(2): p. 97-103.
7. Yilmaz Yelvar, G.D., et al., The effect of postural stabilization exercises on pain and function in females with patellofemoral pain syndrome. Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc, 2015. 49(2): p. 166-74.
8. Ismail, M.M., M.H. Gamaleldein, and K.A. Hassa, Closed kinetic chain exercises with or without additional hip strengthening exercises in management of patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. Eur J Phys Rehabil Med, 2013. 49(5): p. 687-98.
9. Crossley, K., et al., Physical therapy for patellofemoral pain: a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial. Am J Sports Med, 2002. 30(6): p. 857-65.
10. Eng, J.J. and M.R. Pierrynowski, Evaluation of soft foot orthotics in the treatment of patellofemoral pain syndrome. Phys Ther, 1993. 73(2): p. 62-8; discussion 68-70.



**WEB APPENDIX3. Potentially eligible trials from trial registers**

	<b>Trial identifier</b>	<b>Treatment comparison</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1.	NCT03054701	Hip specific resistance exercise VS Knee specific resistance exercise	Completed	No full text
2.	NCT05261100	Core stability exercises VS Conventional Physical Therapy	Recruiting	
3.	NCT04340453	Exercise with Blood Flow restriction training VS Hip and Knee Exercise Program VS stretching	Ongoing	
4.	NCT04631614	Warm up VS Passive calf muscle stretching VS Ankle joint mobilization - weight-bearing mobilization with movement (WB-MWM) technique	Not yet recruiting	
5.	NCT05120583	Pilates exercises VS Traditional physical therapy program	Ongoing	
6.	NCT03985254	Strength Training Group (STG) VS Strength and Power Training Group (SPTG)	Unknown	Study Protocol
7.	NCT02827084	Kinesio Taping VS Placebo	Unknown	Exclude, wrong outcomes, web appendix 2
8.	NCT03163290	Posterolateral Hip Complex Exercises VS Anteromedial Hip Complex Exercises	Ongoing	
9.	NCT04538508	Diathermy VS Supervised knee exercises	Completed	
10.	NCT02591680	Neuromuscular training VS Muscle strengthening	Unknown	
11.	NCT00496964	Botulinum toxin A + exercise VS Placebo	Terminated	Exclude, wrong intervention, web appendix 2
12.	NCT03364855	Star excursion balance test VS Kinesthetic Ability Trainer 00 VS SEBT and KAT 2000	Unknown	

13.	NCT04011436	Strengthening program	Completed	No full text
14.	NCT02352909	Education VS Exercise program VS Gait retraining	Completed	No full text
15.	NCT02841384	taping patellar McConnell VS Placebo taping	Completed	No full text
16.	NCT04225000	Exercise Group VS Mobilization Group	Completed	No full text
17.	NCT05083897	hip adduction isometric contraction	Not yet recruiting	
18.	NCT04462718	Radiofrequency VS Therapeutic Exercise	Completed	
19.	NCT03042559	Protonics Knee brace VS Sports Cords	Completed Has result	
20.	NCT02597673	Home Exercise Program (HEP) VS NMES VS TENS	Completed Has results	
21.	NCT02114294	Isolated hip strengthening VS Quadriceps based training VS Active control	Active, not recruiting	
22.	NCT02707679	Mulligan's Straight leg-raise with traction VS Mulligan's Mobilization with Movement VS Kinesiotaping VS Exercise	Completed	
23.	NCT02241148	Acetaminophen 500mg VS Kinesio taping	Terminated	
24.	NCT00445224	Hip Progressive Resistive Exercise VS Quad Progressive Resistive Exercises	Completed Has results	
25.	NCT0197531	Lumbopelvic Manipulation VS Passive lumbar spine flexion and extension	Completed	
26.	NCT01691170	Stretching Hamstring VS Quadriceps Strengthening	Completed	
27.	NCT01504100		Completed	
28.	NCT03324204	Neuromuscular Training VS Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy (ESWT)	Unknown	
29.	NCT00401050	chiropractic manipulative therapy VS knee exercises VS	Completed	

		Graston nstrument Soft Tissue Mobilization (GISTM)		
30.	NCT01290705	High exercise therapy VS Low exercise therapy	Completed	
31.	NCT03069547	Quadriceps Exercise program VS Hip Exercise program	Active, not recruiting	
32.	NCT05125263	kinesiotaping group VS mulligan taping group	Active, not recruiting	
33.	NCT00451347	Quadriceps strength training VS Taping VS Home exercise	Unknown	
34.	NCT04748692	Local exercise therapy VS Spinal manual therapy	ongoing	
35.	NCT04975113	progressive neuromuscular exercise program VS Exercise and Taping	ongoing	
36.	NCT00736736	Additional Hip Muscle Strengthening to Leg Press Exercise VS Leg Press Exercise	Completed	
37.	NCT02123602	core stabilization VS lower extremity training only	Unknown	
38.	NCT02674841	Feedback on TUT VS No feedback on TUT VS Exercise	Completed	Exclude, wrong study design, web appendix 2
39.	NCT04478422	Muscle strengthening with vascular occlusion VS Conventional muscle strengthening	Not yet recruiting	
40.	NCT00451438	muscle activity of gluteus medius and tensor fascia lata during submaximal isometric muscle contraction	Completed	Exclude, wrong study design, "case-control", web appendix 2
41.	NCT04086615	NMES and exercise supplemented with high BFR VS NMES and exercise supplemented with low BFR	Recruiting	
42.	NCT04480528	Blood Flow Restriction Training (BFRT) VS Sham Blood Flow Restriction Training (Sham BFRT)	Completed	No full text
43.	NCT02854774	Muscle activation exercises	Terminated	No additional funding is available to continue this pilot study at this

				time
44.	NCT03285464	Hip strengthening program VS use the trunk as a lever to strengthen the hip	Completed	Exclude, wrong outcomes, web appendix 2
45.	NCT02624245	Physical Therapy VS Movement control training	Completed	No full text
46.	NCT00451087	leg press training VS isokinetic training	Unknown	
47.	NCT02837289	Therapy taping VS Placebo taping	Completed	Exclude, wrong outcomes, web appendix 2
48.	NCT04264429	Infrapatellar strap VS Elastic band	Recruitment	
49.	NCT03101956	Lumbar Spine Manipulation VS Lumbar Spine Manipulation Placebo	Completed	No full text
50.	NCT03099512	SFE VS Exercise	Completed	No full text
51.	NCT01727596	Taping	Completed	No full text
52.	NCT04760158	Taping group vs Sham Taping group vs exercise group	Completed	No full text
53.	NCT04173468	MWM Group vs Mulligan Taping Group	Ongoing	
54.	NCT00662493	Motor control retraining program VS Quadriceps strengthening program	Completed	No full text
55.	NCT00348647	physical training program to prevent injuries	Unknown	
56.	NCT02322515	Intervention taping VS Placebo Taping	Completed	No full text
57.	NCT03117205	Application of Kinesio Taping® VS Kinesio Taping® placebo application	Completed	No full text
58.	NCT03771495	Joint Mobilization VS Laying on of Hands	Completed	Exclude, wrong outcomes, web appendix 2
59.	NCT02333617	Dry Needling VS Soft Tissue Mobilization VS Placebo Control VS Hip and core strengthening exercises	Terminated	

60.	NCT05168332	EMG-BF guided patellar taping VS sham patellar taping without EMG-BF guided stimulation; maximum voluntary isometric contraction exercise	Recruiting	
61.	NCT04031248	Whole body vibration VS EXERCISE group	Completed	No full text
62.	NCT03293121	Strength and Coordination Training VS Walking	Completed	No full text
63.	NCT03067545	Step rate increase	Completed	Exclude, wrong participants, web appendix 2
64.	NCT04119310	Lumbar-thrust mobilization VS Sham thrust-mobilization	Unknown	
65.	NCT03620799	Manual therapy	Unknown	
66.	NCT00166777	exercise training	Unknown	
67.	NCT04747223	Run Gait Retraining	Not yet recruiting	
68.	NCT02514005	Manual therapy VS Dry needling	Completed	Exclude, wrong comparisons
69.	NCT04989023	Blood flow restriction (BFR) with low load resistance training	Not yet recruiting	
70.	NCT02825238	Supervised exercise program	Completed	Exclude, wrong study design, a feasibility, web appendix2
71.	NCT04332900	Elastic hip strap VS Insole	Not yet recruiting	
72.	NCT04589871	Taping technique VS A supervised exercise protocol	Completed	Exclude, wrong participants, patellofemoral arthritis, web appendix2

#### Web appendix4: Treatments and treatment categories (ie, classes)

Categories (ie, classes)	Category definition	Treatments	Studies
Gait retraining exercise	Exercise in combination with personalized advice on running gait modifications	Gait retraining exercise	Jean-Francois Esculier 2017 <sup>[1]</sup> Jason Bonacci 2017 <sup>[2]</sup> Jenevieve L Roper 2016 <sup>[3]</sup>
Foot orthoses +exercise	Exercise in combination with prefabricated orthotics to be placed under the foot in the shoe to support the arch	Foot orthoses +exercise	Jason Bonacci 2017 <sup>[2]</sup> Carsten M Mølgaard 2017 <sup>[4]</sup>
Feedback exercise	Exercise in combination with visual and auditory feedback on contraction time and pulling force	Feedback exercise	Henrik Riel 2018 <sup>[5]</sup> Selina L M Yip 2006 <sup>[6]</sup> N Dursun 2001 <sup>[7]</sup>
Manipulation treatment + exercise	Exercise in combination with soft tissue treatment, manipulative procedures to the lumbosacral, sacroiliac, hip, ankle, and foot adjustments	Manipulation treatment + exercise	James W Brantingham 2009 <sup>[8]</sup> Gustavo Telles 2016 <sup>[9]</sup>
Knee brace +exercise	Exercise in combination with a patellar brace	Knee brace +exercise	Liliam B Priore 2019 <sup>[10]</sup> Victor M Y Lun 2005 <sup>[11]</sup> Mastour S Alshaharani 2019 <sup>[12]</sup>

Kinesiotaping + exercise	Exercise in combination with application of taping/movement to the patella	Kinesiotaping + exercise	Serdar Demirci 2017 <sup>[13]</sup> Eda Akbaş 2011 <sup>[14]</sup> Lucas Simões Arrebola 2019 <sup>[15]</sup> Martin Whittingham 2004 <sup>[16]</sup> Jehoon Lee 2014 <sup>[17]</sup> Marjon Mason 2011 <sup>[18]</sup>
Knee arthroscopy and exercise	Exercise in combination with resection of inflamed/scarred medial plicae, abrasion of chondral lesions and shaving of excessive and inflamed synovium	Knee arthroscopy + exercise	Jyrki A Kettunen 2007 <sup>[19]</sup>
Education	Education consisted of information or advice given by a health care practitioner on patellofemoral pain, (aggravating) exercise and management of pain/symptoms. Delivered either face to face or in the form of written materials	Education Education + exercise	Liliam B Priore 2019 <sup>[10]</sup> M S Rathleff 2015 <sup>[20]</sup>
Blood flow restriction + exercise	Exercise in combination with the cuff on the proximal thigh and inflated to the prescribed pressure in the resting position of the exercise to be performed	Blood flow restriction + exercise	Lachlan Giles 2017 <sup>[21]</sup>

Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Exercise in combination with vibration stimuli	Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Angel Yañez-Álvarez 2020 <sup>[22]</sup> Ebrahim Rasti 2020 <sup>[23]</sup> Mustafa Corum 2018 <sup>[24]</sup>
Exercise therapy	Resistance exercise, that is muscles contracting against resistance provided in the form of weights, bands or body/limb weight with the goal of improving muscle strength, endurance or mass. Programs targeted the lower limb and/or trunk muscles (with/without general aerobic conditioning as warm-up/cool-down). This could be delivered face to face or as a home exercise program	General exercise	Khalil Khayambashi 2012 <sup>[25]</sup> Chen-Yi Song 2009 <sup>[26]</sup> Mahsa Emamvirdi 2019 <sup>[27]</sup>
		Knee exercise	Alexandra Hott 2020 <sup>[28]</sup> Marcelo Camargo Saad 2018 <sup>[29]</sup> Alexandra Hott 2019 <sup>[30]</sup> Reed Ferber 2014 <sup>[31]</sup> Kimberly L Dolak 2011 <sup>[32]</sup> Mehtap Şahin 2016 <sup>[33]</sup> Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2012 <sup>[34]</sup> Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2011 <sup>[35]</sup> Theresa Helissa Nakagawa 2008 <sup>[36]</sup> Lori A Bolgla 2016 <sup>[37]</sup>
		Hip exercise	Alexandra Hott 2020 <sup>[28]</sup> Marcelo Camargo Saad 2018 <sup>[29]</sup> Alexandra Hott 2019 <sup>[30]</sup> Reed Ferber 2014 <sup>[31]</sup> Kimberly L Dolak 2011 <sup>[32]</sup> Chen-Yi Song 2009 <sup>[26]</sup>

					Mehtap Şahin 2016 <sup>[33]</sup>
				Knee and hip exercise	Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2012 <sup>[34]</sup>
					Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2011 <sup>[35]</sup>
					Theresa Helissa Nakagawa 2008 <sup>[36]</sup>
				Stretching therapy	Lori A Bolgla 2016 <sup>[37]</sup>
				Motor Control Training	F Revelles Moyano 2012 <sup>[38]</sup>
				Target Exercise	Nayra Deise Dos Anjos Rabelo 2017 <sup>[39]</sup>
					Alireza Motealleh 2019 <sup>[40]</sup>
					Benjamin T Drew 2017 <sup>[41]</sup>
					G Syme 2008 <sup>[42]</sup>
				Supervised Exercise	Farzin Halabchi 2015 <sup>[43]</sup>
				Kinetic Chain Exercise	R van Linschoten 2009 <sup>[44]</sup>
					Erik Witvrouw 2004 <sup>[45]</sup>
No treatment		No treatment or continuing with current/planned management		No treatment	R van Linschoten 2009 <sup>[44]</sup>
					Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2011 <sup>[35]</sup>
					Khalil Khayambashi 2012 <sup>[25]</sup>
					Mahsa Emamvirdi 2019 <sup>[27]</sup>

---

---

**Reference:**

- 1 J. F. Esculier, L. J. Bouyer, B. Dubois et al. Is combining gait retraining or an exercise programme with education better than education alone in treating runners with patellofemoral pain? A randomised clinical trial. *Br J Sports Med* **52**, 659–666, doi:10.1136/bjsports-2016-096988 (2018).
- 2 J. Bonacci, M. Hall, N. Saunders et al. Gait retraining versus foot orthoses for patellofemoral pain: a pilot randomised clinical trial. *J Sci Med Sport* **21**, 457–461, doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2017.09.187 (2018).
- 3 J. L. Roper, E. M. Harding, D. Doerfler et al. The effects of gait retraining in runners with patellofemoral pain: A randomized trial. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* **35**, 14–22, doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2016.03.010 (2016).
- 4 C. M. Mølgaard, M. S. Rathleff, J. Andreassen et al. Foot exercises and foot orthoses are more effective than knee focused exercises in individuals with patellofemoral pain. *J Sci Med Sport* **21**, 10–15, doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2017.05.019 (2018).
- 5 H. Riel, M. Matthews, B. Vicenzino et al. Feedback Leads to Better Exercise Quality in Adolescents with Patellofemoral Pain. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* **50**, 28–35, doi:10.1249/mss.0000000000001412 (2018).
- 6 S. L. Yip , G. Y. Ng. Biofeedback supplementation to physiotherapy exercise programme for rehabilitation of patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Clin Rehabil* **20**, 1050–1057, doi:10.1177/0269215506071259 (2006).
- 7 N. Dursun, E. Dursun , Z. Kiliç. Electromyographic biofeedback-controlled exercise versus conservative care for patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* **82**, 1692–1695, doi:10.1053/apmr.2001.26253 (2001).
- 8 J. W. Brantingham, G. A. Globe, M. L. Jensen et al. A feasibility study comparing two chiropractic protocols in the treatment of patellofemoral pain syndrome. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* **32**, 536–548, doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2009.08.005 (2009).
- 9 G. Telles, D. R. Cristovão, F. A. Belache et al. The effect of adding myofascial techniques to an exercise programme for patients with anterior knee pain. *J Bodyw Mov Ther* **20**, 844–850, doi:10.1016/j.jbmt.2016.02.007 (2016).

- 10 L. B. Priore, S. Lack, C. Garcia et al. Two Weeks of Wearing a Knee Brace Compared With Minimal Intervention on Kinesiophobia at 2 and 6 Weeks in People With Patellofemoral Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* **101**, 613–623, doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2019.10.190 (2020).
- 11 V. M. Lun, J. P. Wiley, W. H. Meeuwisse et al. Effectiveness of patellar bracing for treatment of patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Clin J Sport Med* **15**, 235–240, doi:10.1097/01.jsm.0000171258.16941.13 (2005).
- 12 M. S. Alshaharani, E. B. Lohman, K. Bahjri et al. Comparison of Protonics™ Knee Brace With Sport Cord on Knee Pain and Function in Patients With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Sport Rehabil* **29**, 547–554, doi:10.1123/jsr.2018-0171 (2020).
- 13 S. Demirci, G. I. Kinikli, M. J. Callaghan et al. Comparison of short-term effects of mobilization with movement and Kinesiotaping on pain, function and balance in patellofemoral pain. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* **51**, 442–447, doi:10.1016/j.aott.2017.09.005 (2017).
- 14 E. Akbaş, A. O. Atay, I. Yüksel. The effects of additional kinesio taping over exercise in the treatment of patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* **45**, 335–341, doi:10.3944/aott.2011.2403 (2011).
- 15 L. S. Arrebola, R. Teixeira de Carvalho, P. Y. Lam Wun et al. Investigation of different application techniques for Kinesio Taping® with an accompanying exercise protocol for improvement of pain and functionality in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome: A pilot study. *J Bodyw Mov Ther* **24**, 47–55, doi:10.1016/j.jbmt.2019.05.022 (2020).
- 16 M. Whittingham, S. Palmer, F. Macmillan. Effects of taping on pain and function in patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* **34**, 504–510, doi:10.2519/jospt.2004.34.9.504 (2004).
- 17 J. Lee, H. Lee, W. Lee. Effect of Weight-bearing Therapeutic Exercise on the Q-angle and Muscle Activity Onset Times of Elite Athletes with Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Phys Ther Sci* **26**, 989–992, doi:10.1589/jpts.26.989 (2014).
- 18 M. Mason, S. L. Keays, P. A. Newcombe. The effect of taping, quadriceps strengthening and stretching prescribed separately or combined on patellofemoral pain. *Physiother Res Int* **16**, 109–119, doi:10.1002/pri.486 (2011).
- 19 J. A. Kettunen, A. Harilainen, J. Sandelin et al. Knee arthroscopy and exercise versus exercise only for chronic patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Med* **5**, 38, doi:10.1186/1741-7015-5-38 (2007).

- 20 M. S. Rathleff, E. M. Roos, J. L. Olesen et al. Exercise during school hours when added to patient education improves outcome for 2 years in adolescent patellofemoral pain: a cluster randomised trial. *Br J Sports Med* **49**, 406–412, doi:10.1136/bjsports-2014-093929 (2015).
- 21 L. Giles, K. E. Webster, J. McClelland et al. Quadriceps strengthening with and without blood flow restriction in the treatment of patellofemoral pain: a double-blind randomised trial. *Br J Sports Med* **51**, 1688–1694, doi:10.1136/bjsports-2016-096329 (2017).
- 22 A. Yañez-Álvarez, B. Bermúdez-Pulgarín, S. Hernández-Sánchez et al. Effects of exercise combined with whole body vibration in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomised-controlled clinical trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* **21**, 582, doi:10.1186/s12891-020-03599-2 (2020).
- 23 E. Rasti, Z. Rojhani-Shirazi, N. Ebrahimi et al. Effects of whole body vibration with exercise therapy versus exercise therapy alone on flexibility, vertical jump height, agility and pain in athletes with patellofemoral pain: a randomized clinical trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* **21**, 705, doi:10.1186/s12891-020-03732-1 (2020).
- 24 M. Corum, C. Basoglu, S. Yakal et al. Effects of whole body vibration training on isokinetic muscular performance, pain, function, and quality of life in female patients with patellofemoral pain: a randomized controlled trial. *J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact* **18**, 473–484 (2018).
- 25 K. Khayambashi, Z. Mohammadkhani, K. Ghaznavi et al. The effects of isolated hip abductor and external rotator muscle strengthening on pain, health status, and hip strength in females with patellofemoral pain: a randomized controlled trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* **42**, 22–29, doi:10.2519/jospt.2012.3704 (2012).
- 26 C. Y. Song, Y. F. Lin, T. C. Wei et al. Surplus value of hip adduction in leg-press exercise in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. *Phys Ther* **89**, 409–418, doi:10.2522/ptj.20080195 (2009).
- 27 M. Emamviridi, A. Letafatkar, M. Khaleghi Tazji. The Effect of Valgus Control Instruction Exercises on Pain, Strength, and Functionality in Active Females With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome. *Sports Health* **11**, 223–237, doi:10.1177/1941738119837622 (2019).
- 28 A. Hott, J. I. Brox, A. H. Pripp et al. Patellofemoral pain: One year results of a randomized trial comparing hip exercise, knee exercise, or free activity. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* **30**, 741–753, doi:10.1111/sms.13613 (2020).
- 29 M. C. Saad, R. A. Vasconcelos, L. V. O. Mancinelli et al. Is hip strengthening the best treatment option for females with patellofemoral pain? A randomized controlled trial of three different types of exercises. *Braz J Phys Ther* **22**, 408–416, doi:10.1016/j.bjpt.2018.03.009 (2018).

- 30 A. Hott, J. I. Brox, A. H. Pripp et al. Effectiveness of Isolated Hip Exercise, Knee Exercise, or Free Physical Activity for Patellofemoral Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Sports Med* **47**, 1312–1322, doi:10.1177/0363546519830644 (2019).
- 31 R. Ferber, L. Bolgla, J. E. Earl-Boehm et al. Strengthening of the hip and core versus knee muscles for the treatment of patellofemoral pain: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *J Athl Train* **50**, 366–377, doi:10.4085/1062-6050-49.3.70 (2015).
- 32 K. L. Dolak, C. Silkman, J. Medina McKeon et al. Hip strengthening prior to functional exercises reduces pain sooner than quadriceps strengthening in females with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized clinical trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* **41**, 560–570, doi:10.2519/jospt.2011.3499 (2011).
- 33 M. Şahin, F. F. Ayhan, P. Borman et al. The effect of hip and knee exercises on pain, function, and strength in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. *Turk J Med Sci* **46**, 265–277, doi:10.3906/sag-1409-66 (2016).
- 34 T. Y. Fukuda, W. P. Melo, B. M. Zaffalon et al. Hip posterolateral musculature strengthening in sedentary women with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled clinical trial with 1-year follow-up. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* **42**, 823–830, doi:10.2519/jospt.2012.4184 (2012).
- 35 T. Y. Fukuda, F. M. Rossetto, E. Magalhães et al. Short-term effects of hip abductors and lateral rotators strengthening in females with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* **40**, 736–742, doi:10.2519/jospt.2010.3246 (2010).
- 36 T. H. Nakagawa, T. B. Muniz, M. Baldon Rde et al. The effect of additional strengthening of hip abductor and lateral rotator muscles in patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Clin Rehabil* **22**, 1051–1060, doi:10.1177/0269215508095357 (2008).
- 37 L. A. Bolgla, J. Earl-Boehm, C. Emery et al. PAIN, FUNCTION, AND STRENGTH OUTCOMES FOR MALES AND FEMALES WITH PATELLOFEMORAL PAIN WHO PARTICIPATE IN EITHER A HIP/CORE- OR KNEE-BASED REHABILITATION PROGRAM. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* **11**, 926–935 (2016).
- 38 F. R. Moyano, M. C. Valenza, L. M. Martin et al. Effectiveness of different exercises and stretching physiotherapy on pain and movement in patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil* **27**, 409–417, doi:10.1177/0269215512459277 (2013).

- 39 N. Rabelo, L. O. P. Costa, B. M. Lima et al. Adding motor control training to muscle strengthening did not substantially improve the effects on clinical or kinematic outcomes in women with patellofemoral pain: A randomised controlled trial. *Gait Posture* **58**, 280–286, doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2017.08.018 (2017).
- 40 A. Motealleh, M. Mohamadi, M. B. Moghadam et al. Effects of Core Neuromuscular Training on Pain, Balance, and Functional Performance in Women With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Clinical Trial. *J Chiropr Med* **18**, 9–18, doi:10.1016/j.jcm.2018.07.006 (2019).
- 41 B. T. Drew, P. G. Conaghan, T. O. Smith et al. The effect of targeted treatment on people with patellofemoral pain: a pragmatic, randomised controlled feasibility study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* **18**, 338, doi:10.1186/s12891-017-1698-7 (2017).
- 42 G. Syme, P. Rowe, D. Martin et al. Disability in patients with chronic patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomised controlled trial of VMO selective training versus general quadriceps strengthening. *Man Ther* **14**, 252–263, doi:10.1016/j.math.2008.02.007 (2009).
- 43 F. Halabchi, R. Mazaheri, M. A. Mansournia et al. Additional Effects of an Individualized Risk Factor–Based Approach on Pain and the Function of Patients With Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Clin J Sport Med* **25**, 478–486, doi:10.1097/jsm.000000000000177 (2015).
- 44 R. van Linschoten, M. van Middelkoop, M. Y. Berger et al. Supervised exercise therapy versus usual care for patellofemoral pain syndrome: an open label randomised controlled trial. *Bmj* **339**, b4074, doi:10.1136/bmj.b4074 (2009).
- 45 E. Witvrouw, L. Danneels, D. Van Tiggelen et al. Open versus closed kinetic chain exercises in patellofemoral pain: a 5–year prospective randomized study. *Am J Sports Med* **32**, 1122–1130, doi:10.1177/0363546503262187 (2004).

## WEB APPENDIX N5. CHARACTERISTICS OF INCLUDED STUDIES

**Table1. Study characteristic**

RCT	Type of population	Sample size	Main baseline characteristics	Treatments	Outcome measures	Follow-up	
Jean-Francois Esculier 2017	Participants with PFP for at least 3 months	Total n=69 Group1:23 Group2:23 Group3:23	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 group2 group3 15/8 14/9 14/9 5.8±1.8 7.0±1.4 6.0±2.0 16.4±16.3 42.2±47.4 28.0±42.4	Group1: education Group2: exercises + exercise Group3: gait retraining +exercise	•Visual analogue scale (VAS) •Knee Outcome Survey of the Activities of Daily Living Scale (KOS-ADLS)	•20 weeks
Jason Bonacci 2017	Active runners with clinically diagnosed PFP	Total n =16 Group1:8 Group2:8	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 group2 8/0 4/4 78.13 ± 6.56 81.88 ± 7.10 48.25 ± 56.87 46.50 ± 40.72	Group1: foot orthoses group Group2: gait retraining group	•worst and average pain on a 100 mm visual analogue scale •global improvement, anterior knee pain scale	•12 weeks
Jenevieve L Roper 2016	Recreational runners	Total n =16 Group1:8 Group2:8	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (Media)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 group2 ? ? 5.3 (4.2 to 6.4) 4.4 (3.3 to 5.5) ? ?	Group: exercise group Group2: control group	•knee pain during and/or after running;	•4 weeks
Henrik Riel 2018	Adolescents with PFP	Total n =40 Group1:20 Group2:20	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(week)</i>	group1 group2 16/4 19/1 67.1 (11.2) 69.2 (11.6) > 6 weeks > 6 weeks	Group1: Control group Group2: Feedback group	•Kujala Patellofemoral Scale (KPS);	•4 weeks
Selina L M Yip 2006	Subjects diagnosed with PFP	Total n = 26 Group1:13 Group2:13	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i>	group1 group2 ? ? 39.99±19.6 41.99±18.6	Group1: exercise-only group Group2: biofeedback + exercise group	•patellar alignments and perceived pain severity	•No

			<i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	?	?			
N Dursun 2001	Sixty patients (48 women, 12 men; age range, 17–50yr) were selected for this study	Total n = 60 Group1:30 Group2:30	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 24/6 7.3 ±1.5 9.7 ±8.1	group2 24/6 7.5 ± 1.6 10.8 ±7.7	Group1: control group Group2: biofeedback group	•visual analog scale (VAS) •Functional Index Questionnaire (FIQ)	•12 weeks
James W Brantingham 2009	Males and females 18 to 45	Total n = 31 Group1:13 Group2:18	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 2/11 2.56 ±2.10 >3months	group2 4/14 3.06 ±2.38 >3months	Group1: a local manipulative group Group2: a full kinetic chain manipulative therapy group	•AKPS •VAS	•8 weeks
Gustavo Telles 2016	Patients with a clinical diagnosis of anterior knee pain was conducted.	Total n = 18 Group1:9 Group2:9	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 ? 8.0±2.2 ?	group2 ? 6.5±2.6 ?	Group1: strengthen the hip muscles and home exercises Group2: strengthening the hip muscles, myofascial techniques, stretching and home exercises	•the numeric pain rating scale (NPRS) •the Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS)	•No
Carsten M Mølgaard 2017	Forty adult individuals ±28 women, 12 men) diagnosed with PFPS.	Total n = 40 Group1:20 Group2:20	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(weeks)</i>	group1 ? 68-10 >12weeks	group2 ? 64-14 >12weeks	Group1: the control group (CG), receiving the standard knee targeted exercises Group2: the intervention group (IG), receiving the standard knee targeted exercises combined with foot targeted exercises and foot orthoses	•the Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcomes Score self - reported questionnaire where the sub scale “Pain” was chosen as the primary outcome	•4 months •12 months
Liliam B Priore 2019	Individuals with PFP aged 18-40 years.	Total n = 50 Group1:25 Group2:25	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 ? 73.52 (8.79) 50.52(43.02)	group2 ? 76.60 (11.80) 51.24 (64.02)	Group1: Brace Group, participants included in this group received a knee brace plus an educational leaflet	•Primary outcome: The Tampa scale for kinesiophobia •Secondary outcomes: The AKPS; The IPAQ-short form;	•4 weeks

					Group2: Leaflet Group , participants received an educational leaflet containing general information about PFP	The FSDT		
Victor M Y Lun 2005	136 subjects diagnosed with PFPS	Total n =136 Group1:34 Group2:32 Group3:32 Group4:31	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 ? 4.4 (2.9) 11 (8)	group3 ? 4.2 (3.0) 10 (7)	Group1: the structured home rehabilitation program only group (E group) Group2: the patellar brace group only (B group) Group3: the structured home rehabilitation program and a patellar brace group (EB group) Group4: the structured home rehabilitation program and a knee sleeve group (ES group)	•knee function (KF) •10-cm visual analogue scale (VAS) pain ratings	•12 weeks
Mastour S Alshaharani 2019	41 subjects with patellofemoral pain	Total n = 41 Group1:21 Group2:20	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(day), mean(rang)</i>	group1 12/9 4.5±1.5 730 (30,4705)	group2 8/12 3.8±0.7 530 (37,3650)	Group1: the Protonics™ knee brace group Group2: the sport cord group	•Global Rating of Change (GROC) scale •the Kujala score •the Numeric Pain Rating Scale •lateral step-down test	•No
Serdar Demirci 2017	35 female patients diagnosed with unilateral PFP	Total n =35 Group1:18 Group2:17	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month)</i>	group1 18/0 3.5 ± 2.01 >2 months	group2 17/10 4.2 ± 1.40 >2 months	Group1: MWM group Group2: KT group	•Kujala Patellofemoral Pain Scoring	•6 weeks
Eda Akbaş 2017	31 women with PFPS	Total n = 31 Group1:16	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i>	group1 16/0	group2 15/0	Group1: kinesio taping group Group2: control group	•Visual analog scale •Anterior Knee Pain Scale /	•No

		Group2:15	<i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i>	7.08 ±2.49	6.11 ±2.43		Kujala Scale		
			<i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	11.80±10.84	14.75±16.32				
Lucas Simões Arrebola 2019	43 women with at least a 3-month history of PFPS	Total n = 43 Group1:13 Group2:14 Group3:16	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month)</i>	group1 13/0 4.08 (3.01) >3months	group3 16/0 4.13 (3.18) >3months	Group1: kinesio taping group Group2: KT-LRFT group, using KT® for lateral rotation of the femur and tibia Group3: control group	•Numerical pain rating scale (NPRS) •Kujala Anterior Knee Pain Scale (AKPS)	•12 weeks	
Martin Whittingham 2004	Twenty-four men and 6 women aged 17 to 25 years participated in the study	Total n = 30 Group1:10 Group2:10 Group3:10	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 ? 7.5 ± 1.0 ?	group3 ? 7.5 ± 0.8 ?	Group1: Taping and Exercise group, patella taping combined with a standardized exercise program Group2: Placebo Taping and Exercise group, placebo patella taping and exercise program Group3: exercise Alone group, exercise program alone	•Visual analog scale •Functional Index Questionnaire Scores	•No	
Jehoon Lee 2014	34 (21 men, 13 women) elite athletes	Total n = 34 Group1:13 Group2:11 Group3:10	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 6/7 3.9 (1.5) ?	group2 3/8 4.4 (1.4) ?	group3 4/6 3.8 (1.2) ?	Group1: elastic band exercise group Group2: a sling exercise group Group3: control group	•visual analogue scale (VAS) •static and dynamic Q angles •onset time of electromyographic activity of vastus medialis oblique (VMO) and vastus lateralis (VL)	•No
Marjon Mason 2011	41 subjects took part in this study	Total n = 41, (60 knees) Group1:15 k Group2:15 k	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month)</i>	group1 ? 3.43 (2.4) >1month	group2 ? 3.25 (2.1) >1month	Group1: infrapatellar taping group Group2: quadriceps strengthening group, open chain terminal	•isokinetic quadriceps strength •quadriceps length •pain •pain-free knee flexion angle	•No	

		Group3:15 k Group4:15 k			extension quadriceps strengthening Group3: quadriceps stretching group, quadriceps stretching Group4: control group	during a step-down		
Jyrki A Kettunen 2007	A total of 56 patients with chronic PFPS.	Total n = 56 Group1:28 Group2:28	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 17/11 39.0 (28.1) 54.9 (73.4)	group2 10/18 41.4 (28.7) 45.0 (74.9)	Group1:an arthroscopy group (N = 28), knee arthroscopy + 8-week home exercise program; Group2: a control group (N = 28), the same 8-week home exercise program only	•the Kujala score on patellofemoral pain and function •visual analog scales (VASs)	•9 months •24 months
M S Rathleff 2015	121 adolescents from 15-19 years of age	Total n = 121 Group1:59 Group2:62	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, Median and IQR</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 51/8 47 (33;69)	group2 46/16 48 (34;64)	Group1: patient education Group2: patient education combined with exercise therapy	•Knee pain •Recovery •Knee injury •Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS) •Physical Activity Scale (PAS) •EuroQol5-dimensions (EQ-5D) •Satisfaction measured on a five-point Likert scale	•3 months •6 months •12 months •24 months
Lachlan Giles 2017	Sixty-nine participants ±87% completed the study	Total n = 69 Group1:35 Group2:34	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 ? 55.7 (13.9) 31.6 (40.9)	group2 ? 51.4 (15.3) 37.8 (55.5)	Group1: BFR group, n=35 Group2: standard group, n=34; ;	•Kujala Patellofemoral Score •Visual Analogue Scale •isometric knee extensor torque •quadriceps muscle thickness	•6 months
Angel Yañez-Álvarez	Adults who had reported anterior knee	Total n = 50 Group1:25	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i>	group1 14/11	group2 12/13	Group1: exercise group + whole body vibration	•VAS of 10 cm •Douleur Neuropathique-4 items	•No

2020	pain	Group2:25	<i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(week)</i>	56 ± 20.2 >12weeks	59 ± 13.6 >12weeks	Group2: control group	(DN4) •Knee flexion-extension range of movement (ROM) •Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS) •Kujala Patellofemoral Score	
Ebrahim Rasti 2020	Twenty-four male athletes with a diagnosis of PFP	Total n = 24 Group1:12 Group2:12	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 0/12 5.83 ± 0.83 ?	group2 0/12 6.08 ± 0.99 ?	Group1: WBV + exercise Group2: exercise	•pain (a 0-to-10 linear numerical rating scale (NRS))	•No
Mustafa Corum 2018	34 women with PFP , women aged between 18-40 years.	Total n = 34 Group1:18 Group2:16	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 18/0 4.9±1.5 3- 6 months 6-12months >12 months	group2 16/0 5.0±1.7 4 (25.0) 0 (0.0) 12 (75.0)	Group1: WBV training + home exercise Group2: home exercise	•visual analog scale (VAS) •Kujala Patellofemoral Score (KPS) •Short Form-36 (SF-36)	•6 months
F Revelles Moyano 2012	74 patients with a pain history more than six months	Total n = 74 Group1:35 Group2:33 Group3:26	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month)</i>	group2 14/19 6.00 ± 1.43 >6months	group3 5/21 6.05 ± 1.45 >6months	Group1: a classic stretching group Group2: a proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation and aerobic exercise group Group3: a control treatment received educational materials (control group)	•Knee Society Score •Visual analogue scale •knee range of motion	•No
Nayra Deise	Thirty-four women	Total n = 34	<b>Variable</b>	group1	group2	Group1: patients in the S group;	•AKPS	•3 months

Dos Anjos Rabelo 2017	were randomly assigned to two groups.	Group1:17 Group2:17	<i>Sex, F/M</i> 17/0 17/0 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> 6.6 ± 1.0 6.1 ± 1.4 <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> 49.3 ± 40.5 46.2 ± 33.0	Group2: patients in the MC&S group	•NPRS	•6 months
Alireza Motealleh 2019	a sample of 28 women with unilateral PFPS	Total n = 28 Group1:14 Group2:14	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 14/0 14/0 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, Median and IQR</i> 60.00 (40.00-72.5) 65.00 (47.5-70.00) <i>Duration of symptoms(month)</i> >2months >2months	Group1: physical therapy exercise program Group2: core neuromuscular training + physical therapy exercise program	•Visual Analog Scale •Kujala patellofemoral questionnaire	•No
Benjamin T Drew 2017	Twenty-six participants	Total n = 26 Group1:14 Group2:12	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 7/7 8/4 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> 4.7 (1.68) 5.4 (2.3) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), Median and IQR</i> 30 (16.5–75.25) 33 (10.5–54)	Group1: MT group Group2: UC group	•AKPS •Worst NRS •Average NRS •GROC	•No
G Syme 2008	63 PFPS patients	Total n = 63 Group1:21 Group2:22 Group3:20	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 group3 <i>Sex, F/M</i> ? ? ? <i>Average pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> 47.7 (29.6) 51.3(29.4) 59.6(21.8) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> 49.0 (37.5) 45.5 (35.3) 50.5 (41.3)	Group1: Selective “vastus medialis oblique activation” group; Group2: General “quadriceps femoris strengthening” group; Group3: Control “no treatment” group	•NRS-101 average pain intensity •McGill pain questionnaire •SF-36 physical component summary score •SF-36 mental component summary score	•No
Farzin Halabchi 2015	Patients both sexes, 18-40 years) with clinically diagnosed PFPS of the duration over 2 months.	Total n =53 Group1:26 Group2:27	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> ? ? <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-100, mean (SD)</i> 62.8 (17.9) 53.4 (22) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> 31.9 (21.2) 30.1 (22.4)	Group1: n=26 in the intervention (according to the identified risk factors); Group2: n=27 in the control group	•visual analog scale •Kujala patellofemoral score	•12 weeks
R van Linschoten	A total of 131 participants were	Total n = 131 Group1:65	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 42/23 42/24	Group1: n1=65 in the intervention group: received as	•7-point Likert scale •numerical rating scale	•3 months •12 months

2009	included in the study.	Group2:66	<i>Rest pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> 4.14 (2.3) 4.03 (2.3) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> <i>2-6 months (%)</i> 69.2 66.6; <i>6-24 months (%)</i> 31.8 33.4	standardized exercise program; Group2: n2=66 in the control group: usual care, which comprised a “wait and see” approach of res;	•Kujala patellofemoral score	
Erik Witvrouw 2004	60 PFPS patients	Total n = 60 Group1:30 Group2:30	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> ? ? <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> 5.3 (3.2) 5.0 (3.3) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), Median and IQR</i> 15.1(1.5-28) 15.1(1.5-28)	Group1: CKC group: only closed kinetic chain exercises Group2: OKC group: only open kinetic chain exercises	•visual analog scales (VAS) •3 functional tests •Muscle Strength Measurement	•5 years
Alexandra Hott 2020	112 patients with a clinical diagnosis of PFP (≥3 months ±mean 39 months)	Total n = 112 Group1:37 Group2:39 Group3:36	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 group3 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 24/13 25/14 24/12 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (95%CI)</i> 6.0 (5.2 to 6.8) 6.5 (5.8 to 7.1) 5.8 (5.1 to 6.5) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> <i>3-6 months</i> 2 (5) 1 (3) 5 (14) <i>6-12 months</i> 7 (19) 5 (13) 11 (31) <i>12-24 months</i> 8 (22) 10 (25) 6 (17) <i>&gt;24 months</i> 20 (54) 23 (59) 14 (39)	Group1: The hip exercise group Group2: The knee exercise group Group3: The control group receive no prescribed exercise	•Visual Analog Scale (VAS) •Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia •Knee Self-Efficacy Score •Euro-Qol (EQ-5D-5L)	•12 months
Marcelo Camargo Saad 2018	Forty recreational female athletes between the ages of 18 and 28 years with PFP.	Total n =40 Group1:10 Group2:10 Group3:10 Group4:10	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 10/0 10/0 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> 6.34 ± 1.85 5.05 ± 1.27 <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> ? ?	Group1: Quadriceps strengthening group (QG); Group2: HIP strengthening group (HG); Group3: Stretching group (SG) Group4: Control group (CG)	•visual analog scale •Anterior Knee Pain Scale AKPS) •hip and quadriceps strength •lower limb kinematics	•No
Alexandra Hott 2019	112 patients with a clinical diagnosis of	Total n = 112 Group1:39	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 group3 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 24/13 25/14 24/12	Group1: education combined with isolated hip-focused	•Visual Analog Scale (VAS) •Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia	•3 months

	PFP.	Group2:37 Group3:36	<i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (95%CI)</i> 6.0 6.5 5.8 (5.2 to 6.8) (5.8 to 7.1) (5.1 to 6.5) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> 3-6 months 2 (5) 1 (3) 5 (14) 6-12 months 7 (19) 5 (13) 11 (31) 12-24 months 8 (22) 10 (25) 6 (17) >24 months 20 (54) 23 (59) 14 (39)	exercise Group2: traditional knee-focused exercise Group3: free physical activity	•Knee Self-Efficacy Score •Euro-Qol (EQ-5D-5L)	
Reed Ferber 2014	199 patients with PFP	Total n = 199 Group1:111 Group2:88	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 77/34 56/32 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, Mean ±SD (95%CI)</i> 5.12 ±1.66 4.96 ±1.66 (4.76, 5.38) (4.61, 5.30) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> >4weeks >4weeks	Group1: HIP treatment group Group2: KNEE treatment group	•visual analog scale •Anterior Knee Pain Scale	•No
Kimberly L Dolak 2011	Thirty-three females with PFPS	Total n = 33 Group1:17 Group2:16	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 17/0 16/0 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> 4.6 ± 2.5 4.2 ± 2.3 <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> 36 ± 34 27 ± 34	Group1: hip strengthening Group2: quadriceps strengthening	•VAS scores •LEFS scores •HABD and HER strength	•8 weeks •3 months
Mehtap Şahin 2016	fifty-five young female patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome were included.	Total n = 55 Group1:27 Group2:28	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 27/0 28/0 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, median (IQR)</i> 6 (5.5–7) 7 (6–7) <i>Duration of symptoms(month), median (IQR)</i> 6 (4–24) 8 (4–24)	Group1: knee-only exercise programs Group2: hip-and-knee exercises	•Kujala Anterior Knee Pain Scale questionnaire •VAS •isokinetic muscle strength test; •Trendelenburg and muscle tightness tests	•No
Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2012	The study sample included women provoke PFPS.	Total n =54 Group1:26 Group2:28	<b>Variable</b> group1 group2 <i>Sex, F/M</i> 26/0 28/0 <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> 6.6 ± 1.2 6.2 ± 1.1 <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i> 21.0 ± 17.7 23.2 ±19.0	Group1:KE group Group2: KHE group	•numeric pain rating scale (NPRS) •LEFS •Anterior Knee Pain Scale	•6 months •12 months

						(AKPS)			
Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2011	The female patients were between 20 and 40 years of age	Total n =70 Group1:22 Group2:23 Group3:25	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 22/0 4.9 ± 2.5 >3months	group2 23/0 4.9 ± 2.9 >3months	group3 25/0 5.2 ± 1.6 >3months	Group1: knee group; Group2: knee + hip group Group3:no-treatment group	•(NPRS) •LEFS •(AKPS)	•No
Theresa Helissa Nakagawa 2008	Participants diagnosed with patellofemoral pain syndrome	Total n =14 Group1:7 Group2:7	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 ? 5.0 ± 2.1 ?	group2 ? 5.5 ± 1.5 ?		Group1: hip exercise Group2: hip + knee exercise	•visual analogue scale •isokinetic eccentric	•No
Khalil Khayambashi 2012	Females with a diagnosis of bilateral PFP lasting at least 6 months (both knees)	Total n = 28 Group1:14 Group2:14	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 14/0 7.9 ± 1.7 >6months	group2 14/0 6.6 ± 2.0 >6months		Group1: exercise group Group2: no-exercise control group	•visual analog scale •WOMAC •hip strength	•6 months
Chen-Yi Song 2009	Eighty-nine patients with PFPS	Total n = 89 Group1:29 Group2:30 Group3:30	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 21/8 4.80±2.26 41.8±36.1	group2 22/8 4.85±2.49 38.3±34.2	group3 26/4 4.99±2.18 27.7±41.0	Group1: hip adduction combined with leg-press exercise Group2: leg-press exercise only Group3: no exercise	•visual analog scale (VAS-W) •Lysholm scale scores •VMO morphology	•No
Mahsa Emamviridi 2019	Sixty-four amateur female volleyball players with PFPS and equal years of exercise experience	Total n = 64 Group1:32 Group2:32	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month)</i>	group1 32/0 6.1 ± 1.18 >8weeks	group2 32/0 6 ± 1.35 >8weeks		Group1: VCI exercise training Group2: Written instructions + heat or ice treatment	•Visual analog scale (VAS) •lower extremity performance tests •Peak Torque and Time to Peak Torque	•No
Lori A Bolgla 2016	One hundred eighty-five patients	Total n = 185 Group1:105 Group 2:80	<b>Variable</b> <i>Sex, F/M</i> <i>Worst pain, VAS 0-10, mean (SD)</i> <i>Duration of symptoms(month), mean(rang)</i>	group1 73/32 5.2(0.2) >1months	group2 51/29 5.0(0.2) >1months		Group1: hip/core rehabilitation program Group2: knee rehabilitation program	•Visual analog scale (VAS) •Anterior Knee Pain Scale (AKPS) •hip and knee isometric strength	•No

RCT=randomized controlled trial, 95%CI=95% Confidence Interval, n= number, SD = standard deviation, IQ = interquartile, ? = unknown, F=Female, M=Male

**Table 2. Study characteristic (extended)**

1	
Study	Jean-Francois Esculier 2017
Methods	<p>Group1: education on symptoms management and training modifications (education)</p> <p>Group2: exercise programme in addition to education (exercises)</p> <p>Group3: gait retraining in addition to education (gait retraining)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Participants Participants were recruited using advertisements within the running community of Quebec City.</p> <p>Included criteria:</p> <p>(1) be aged 18 to 45 years; (2) report a minimal weekly running distance of 15 km; (3) present with PFP for at least 3 months; (4) experience minimum pain levels of 3/10 on a visual analogue scale (VAS) during running and during three tasks among stairs, kneeling, squatting and resisted knee extension<sup>7</sup> and (5) score a maximum of 85/100 on the Knee Outcome Survey of the Activities of Daily Living Scale (KOS-ADLS; the primary outcome).</p> <p>Excluded criteria:</p> <p>(1) symptoms onset following an acute trauma; (2) symptoms believed to originate from patellar tendon<sup>27</sup> or menisci<sup>28</sup>; (3) concurrent lower limb injuries; (4) past history of patellar dislocation or lower limb surgery and (5) presence of rheumatoid, neurological or degenerative diseases.</p>
Treatment	<p>Education group: Runners received education on load management and were instructed to self-modify running training according to symptoms. They were asked to increase the frequency of their weekly trainings, to decrease each session's duration and speed and to avoid downhill and stairs running. Run-walk intervals were allowed. Runners were instructed to maintain PFP level at no more than 2/10 during running. Furthermore, pain had to return to pretraining levels within 60 min post-training, without increases in symptoms the following morning. Individualised weekly programmes, which could be modified by runners depending on symptoms, were designed by the treating physiotherapists and progressed based on the evolution of symptoms. Gradually, running distance was increased according to symptoms, before adding speed and hills.<sup>29</sup> This specific intervention was provided to all groups. The education group received no other instructions.</p> <p>Exercises group: In addition to the education component, runners were asked to perform a standardised home exercise programme aimed at improving strength, capacity to sustain mechanical load and dynamic control of the lower limbs. The personalised programme included four phases of 2 weeks and gradually progressed through higher difficulty under physiotherapist guidance. Three to four exercises were performed three times per week (maximum 20 min/session), and one exercise (lower limb control) was performed daily (Supplementary file 1).</p>

	<p>Gait retraining group: Together with education, runners received personalised advice on running gait modifications. Runners were asked to increase step rate by 7.5%–10%. If deemed necessary by the physiotherapist (no significant reduction of impact or runner unable to increase step rate), runners were also asked to run softer and to adopt a nonrearfoot strike pattern. Participants had a 10-minute treadmill session with physiotherapist feedback at every visit to the clinic.</p>
2	
Study	Jason Bonacci 2017
Methods	<p>Group1: foot orthoses group Group2: gait retraining group</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria: (i) aged 18–40 years; (ii) antero-patella or retro-patella pain that was non-traumatic, longer than six weeks duration and provoked by jogging/running or squatting, hopping/jumping or kneeling or prolonged sitting; (iii) worst pain over the previous week of at least 30/100 mm on a visual analogue scale (0 = no pain, 100 = worst pain imaginable); (iv) running at least 10 km per week; (v) tender over the patellar facet; and (vi) pain on step-down from a 25-cm step or during a double leg squat. All participants used a rearfoot footfall at the time of enrollment.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria: (i) concomitant injury or pathology of other knee structures; (ii) a history of knee surgery; (iii) any foot condition that precludes the use of foot orthoses or running in a minimalist shoe; (iv) a history of use of foot orthoses or minimalist footwear; and (v) pain in and/or referred pain from the hip or lumbar spine.</p>
Treatment	<p>Participants were randomly allocated to either gait retraining or to wear foot orthoses.</p> <p>Group1: Participants allocated to wear foot orthoses attended up to four orthoses fitting sessions. Participants received a prefabricated, commercially available full-length orthoses (Vasyli International, Brisbane, Australia)</p> <p>Group2: Participants allocated to gait retraining underwent 10 supervised gait retraining sessions on a treadmill over the first six weeks. Participants attended a physiotherapy clinic twice in the first 4 weeks and once per week thereafter. Gait retraining included two key components: (i) running in a minimalist shoe (Vibram Seeya, Vibram, MA, USA); and (ii) a 10% increase in running cadence. Cadence was controlled by a metronome (Seiko DM51, Seiko Instruments Inc., Japan) and baseline self-selected running cadence was measured via digital video camera footage (Casio Exilim, Casio, Japan).</p>
3	
Study	Jenevieve L Roper 2016
Methods	<p>Group1: exercise group(n=8) Group2: control group(n=8) Protocol Research personnel randomized subjects using a random numbers</p>

	<p>generator to either the control group or experimental group using blocked randomization so that there were an equal number (n=8) of subjects in each group. This trial was a parallel-group trial. Randomization was also done within sex to ensure equal representation and reduce the likelihood of influence of sex-specific variables.</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Include criteria:  Participants self-reported as runners who RFS and reported having mild to moderate chronic, running-related knee pain that occurred during and/or after they ran. All participants reported that running was included in their regular training regimen.</p> <p>Exclude criteria:  Subjects were excluded if they had a history of knee surgery on the affected knee, traumatic patellar dislocation, pregnant subjects, and/or any neurological impediments that would influence gait.</p>
Treatment	<p>Eight subjects (experimental group) performed eight gait retraining sessions in the Exercise Physiology Lab at the University of New Mexico over a two -week period, while the control group (n=8) performed eight running sessions without the intervention.</p> <p>Group1:  The eight gait retraining sessions took place on a treadmill. Run time started at 15 minutes and gradually increased to 30 minutes.  the experimental group using mirror feedback and scripted statements, such as “run on your toes” and/or “run on the balls of your feet” were used. If necessary, subjects received additional feedback, such as detailed verbal instructions on how to accurately perform forefoot strike running. The research team visually confirmed that subjects were indeed using a forefoot strike. During the first four sessions subjects were given continuous feedback. During the last four sessions, the feedback was gradually removed.</p> <p>Group2:  The control group also performed eight training sessions that were comprised of the same exercise volume (15 minutes gradually increasing to 30 minutes) on the same treadmill. The subjects also ran in front of a mirror, but did not receive any verbal feedback that aided in modifying their running pattern. Subjects in the control group were told “nice job” or “keep it up” to ensure they made no adjustments to their running pattern.</p>
4	
Study	Henrik Riel 2018
Methods	<p>Group1: Control group(n=20)  Group2: Feedback group(n=20)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:  15 to 19 year of age; anterior knee pain of nontraumatic origin, which is provoked by at least two of the following activities-prolonged sitting with bent knees or kneeling, squatting, running, jumping, or ascending or descending stairs; tenderness on palpation of the peripatellar borders; pain of more than 6 wk</p>

	<p>duration; and self-reported worst pain during the previous week Q30 mm on a 100-mm visual analog scale (VAS).</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>concomitant pain from other structures in the knee (e.g., ligament, tendon, or cartilage), the hip, or the lumbar spine; previous knee surgery; and self-reported patellofemoral joint instability.</p>
Treatment	<p>Forty 15- to 19-yr-old adolescents with PFP were randomized to real-time BandCizeri-iPad feedback on contraction time or not by a physiotherapist.</p> <p>Adolescents received different settings of real-time feedback from the BandCizeri app on the iPad. The feedback group was provided with visual and auditory feedback on contraction time and pulling force, whereas the control group was only provided with real-time feedback on pulling force.</p> <p>Adolescents were instructed to perform three elastic band exercises: seated knee extension and freestanding hip abduction and extension. These exercises have previously been found effective in patients with PFP.</p>
5	
Study	Selina L M Yip 2006
Methods	<p>Group1: exercise-only group(n=13)</p> <p>Group2: biofeedback + exercise group(n=13)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>The inclusion criteria were men and women who had insidious onset of patellofemoral pain for more than six months. Subjects must have a positive apprehensive test result, and must experience anterior knee pain in at least two of the following activities: ascending stairs, descending stairs, squatting, kneeling, prolonged sitting, hopping and jumping.</p> <p>Excluded criteria:</p> <p>Subjects were excluded if they had degenerative changes on radiography, chondral damage, meniscal lesion, ligamentous instability, previous knee surgery or traumatic injury, and signs of acute inflammation.</p>
Treatment	<p>The subjects were then randomly assigned into either the EMG biofeedback + exercise group or the exercise-only group by drawing lots.</p> <p>The exercise protocol was an eight-week home programme comprising the following components: (1) flexibility exercises (stretching of lower limb muscles including quadriceps, hamstring, gastrocnemius, hip adductors and iliotibial band; and mobilization to the patella); (2) strengthening exercises for the quadriceps with emphasis on vastus medialis obliquus recruitment (quadriceps set, terminal knee extension, semi-squatting, wall slide, lunge, step-up, step-down, eccentric hamstring exercise, hip adduction exercise); (3) balance and proprioception training; (4) pylometric and agility training. The subjects were asked to perform 15 minutes of home exercises daily. After 5 minutes of flexibility exercises, the subjects would perform each strengthening exercise for three sets with 10 repetitions. They were required to keep logs of their exercise time and frequency and the research physiotherapist contacted them weekly by phone to monitor their progress.</p>

	The subjects in the EMG biofeedback + exercise group were given a surface EMG biofeedback machine, The subjects were asked to selectively increase the activity of vastus medialis obliquus while maintaining a relatively stable activity in vastus lateralis during the exercises.
6	
Study	N Dursun 2001
Methods	Group1: control group (n =30) Group2: biofeedback group (n =30)
Recruitment of participants	Included criteria: 1) a diagnosis of unilateral patellofemoral pain syndrome based on the subject having at least 5 of the 7 symptoms listed in table 1,8(2) no evidence of other intra- or extraarticular knee pathologies, determined by physical examination and radiographic evaluation; (3) normal range-of-motion values of the knee, as measured by a goniometer; (4) no history of knee trauma, intraarticular injection therapy, or surgery; and (5) no use of nonsteroid anti-inflammatory drugs within 15 days before treatment began.
Treatment	Group2 received electromyographic biofeedback training plus the conventional exercise program. Group1(the control group) received the conventional exercise program only. The conventional exercise program consisted of the following components: (1) strengthening exercises for quadriceps and vastus medialis obliquus (isometric exercises in the form of quadriceps setting, straight leg raising, hip adductor strengthening, terminal knee extension exercises, closed kinetic chain exercises); (2) flexibility training (stretching exercises for hamstrings, gastrocnemius soleus, iliotibial band, quadriceps); (3) proprioception training; and (4) endurance training by bicycling. The conventional exercise program for both groups was supervised by the same physical therapist 5 days a week for the first 4 weeks and 3 days a week thereafter. Biofeedback training was performed with a Myomed 932, aa 2-channel electromyography machine. Clear and full-screen display of the electromyographic signal with a curve was obtained for both the vastus medialis and vastus lateralis. Also, auditory feedback for the vastus medialis was provided. The electrodes were applied to areas of greatest muscle bulk. The 2 active electrodes from each channel were placed as close together as possible along the direction of the fibers of each muscle. The ground electrode was placed equidistant from the corresponding active electrodes. The 30-minute training sessions were held 3 days a week for 4 weeks.
7	
Study	James W Brantingham 2009
Methods	a local manipulative group (group A, n1=13) a full kinetic chain manipulative therapy group (group B, n2=18)
Recruitment of participants	Diagnosis/Inclusion Criteria 1. Anterior, peripatellar, or retropatellar knee pain of more than 3 months from at least 2 of the following: prolonged sitting, stair climbing, squatting, running,

	<p>kneeling, and hopping/jumping or overuse activities with the pain of any of these activities relieved by rest.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Insidious or gradual onset of symptoms unrelated to a traumatic incident.</li> <li>3. Presence of pain upon palpation of the patellar facets, on step down from a 25-cm step, or during a double- legged squat.</li> <li>4. X-ray or MRI findings were not required as there is no clear correlation between severity of complaints and arthroscopic or radiologic findings.</li> <li>5. A VAS (worst pain) of <math>\geq 5.0</math> and an AKPS of <math>\geq 50</math>.</li> <li>6. The “PARTS” system was used to facilitate determination of concurrent segmental joint dysfunction or “subluxation complex” requiring chiropractic manipulative therapy (CMT).</li> </ol> <p>Exclusion criteria: included other disorders such as osteoarthritis, instability, or medial meniscus injuries. Specifically, (1) patellar subluxation/dislocation, locking due to meniscal, internal, and intraarticular derangement or pathology (ie, anterior cruciate ligament injury, ligament tear, laxity, or instability); (2) Osgood-Schlatters or Sinding-Larsen-Johanson syndromes, knee joint effusion, autoimmune or seronegative arthritides, bursitis, patellar tendonitis; (3) previous knee surgery; (4) neurologic disorders that influence gait and similar disorders; (5) illiteracy or the inability to understand and answer questionnaires and/or consent forms; (6) inability to attend all treatment sessions; and (7) previous physical therapy, chiropractic, or massage therapy in the last 3 months. Prescribed and over-the-counter medication use was allowed if initiated before study entry, although patients were requested to not begin using medications or other common treatments, such as injections, during the study. Similarly, foot orthotics were allowed if currently worn but could not be added/modified during the trial.</p>
Treatment	<p>Group A: manipulative therapy (grades I through V) to the local knee joints in conjunction with soft tissue (GISTM) and exercise therapy.</p> <p>Group B: manipulative therapy (grades I through V) to the FKC: lumbosacral, sacroiliac, and (all) lower-extremity joints including the knee, ankle and foot, and exercise and soft tissue (GISTM) treatment .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-a dosing level of 1 to 3 times per week</li> <li>-generally 2 to 6 weeks</li> <li>-combined with home exercises.</li> <li>-Exercises were to be performed twice, daily except for Sunday (day off).</li> <li>-Two months after the last or sixth treatment, a follow-up visit obtained outcome measures.</li> </ul> <p>Manipulative therapy: Protocol 1 (group A):</p> <p>CMT procedures included (all grades of mobilization and/or high velocity low amplitude manipulation starting with lesser grades of mobilization and grades increased per PARTS indications, patient age, and tolerance; cavitation is not</p>

required nor necessary) the patellofemoral joint (patellar mobilization);tibiofemoral: axial elongation, AP (anterior to posterior) and PA tibial glide, internal/external rotation tibial glide, and varus or valgus tibiofemoral glide. Proximal fibular (proximal fibulotibial) technique included AP and PA, superior (S) to inferior (I) or IS glide.

Protocol 2 (group B):

For those randomized to group B (in addition to the above manipulative procedures as outlined in protocol 1), manipulative procedures to the lumbosacral, sacroiliac, hip, ankle, and foot adjustments were applied.

Soft Tissue Treatment (GISTM).

Groups A and B received GISTM procedures as the soft tissue therapy. All providers delivering this modality were required to be trained and certified in GISTM. GISTM was administered to patients with PFPS using methodology as outlined in the Graston Technique Instruction Manual.<sup>40</sup>Both treatment groups received the same GISTM treatment.

The following structures/soft tissue problems were evaluated using the scanning instrument GT 4 and treated using the instrument appropriate for the lesion: vastus medialis oblique fascial restriction, patellar femoral soft tissue joint restriction, iliotibial band insertion at the patellar attachment, rectus femorus adhesion, and/or restriction of the patellar tendon both suprapatellar and infrapatellar. GISTM was applied for a maximum of 3 minutes per site. For the purposes of this pilot study, ice was not applied after GISTM. Post-GISTM treatment allows for either icing or passive stretching posttreatment, with the latter being applied to the areas that had GISTM after therapy

EXERCISE—IDENTICAL FOR GROUPS 1 AND 2

Warm-up is performed at the clinic and at home and consisted of:

-Isometrics

- O Three sets of 10 repetitions held for 5 to 10 seconds
- O Quadriceps setting
- O Supine straight leg raising, held at 30° to 45°
- O Short arc quadriceps extension exercises
- O Isometric hip abduction while standing (4 sets of a 30-second hold)

-Eccentric strengthening

- O Squats (bilateral) up to 40°of knee flexion combined with isometric gluteal muscle contractions (4 sets of 10 repetitions)
- O Standing single-leg squat with slow lowering of knee into flexion (with external rotation for isolating the vastus medialis = eccentric quadriceps strengthening) up to 40°

-Stretching

- O Hamstrings static stretch held 3 repetitions for 30seconds each
- O Quadriceps static stretch held 3 repetitions for 30seconds each

	O Static stretches will be appropriate for age and fitness (eg, standing quadriceps stretch for a younger fit subject or kneeling quadriceps stretch with an older subject)
8	
Study	Gustavo Telles 2016
Methods	Group A: manipulative therapy (grades I through V) to the local knee joints in conjunction with soft tissue (GISTM) and exercise therapy; Group B: manipulative therapy (grades I through V) to the FKC.
Recruitment of participants	Inclusion criteria: Patients were included if they had located pain in the patellar region for at least one month or pain for at least three of the following conditions: squatting, going up and / or down stairs, being seated for long periods, kneeling and pain on palpation in the patellar region and the patellar tendon. Exclusion criteria: Exclusion criteria were previous physiotherapy treatment for patients with these symptoms, knee surgery less than a year ago, full knee prosthesis, previous trauma, patellar fracture, patellar dislocation and rheumatoid conditions.
Treatment	GROUP (E); strengthen the hip muscles and home exercises GROUP (EM): strengthening the hip muscles, myofascial techniques, stretching and home exercises -treated for a maximum of 10 sessions, each session lasting about 30 minutes -each week for two sessions. -The maximum duration of treatment was five weeks.  TREATMENT PROTOCOL FOR THE EXERCISE GROUP (E) (3 X 10 repetitions) -Strengthening exercises for hip abductor muscles 1- Side lying hip abduction 2-Patient in an orthostatic position produces a hip abduction against an elastic resistance band (Thera Band®, black color) _x0001_ -Strengthening exercises for lateral hip rotator muscles 3- Hip lateral rotation in side lying position (both knee and hip flexed at 60°) 4- Hip lateral rotation against elastic band (Thera Band®; black color) while sitting bedside (both hip and knee flexed at 90°) -Strengthening exercises for Gluteus Maximus 5- Hip extension in prone position (15°) and knee flexed at 90° Home Based Exercises Patient was oriented to realize all described exercise above without resistance EXERCISE PLUS MYOFASCIAL TECHNIQUE GROUP (EM) -Strengthening exercises: The same exercises as the E Group -Myofascial Release technique 1-Rectus femoris muscle 2- Tensor fasciae latae muscle

	<p>-Muscle Stretching technique</p> <p>1- Tensor fasciae latae muscle</p> <p>2- Rectus femoris muscle</p> <p>3- Hamstrings muscles</p> <p>Each stretch was held for 30 seconds to the point of tightness or slight discomfort. Each stretch was performed two times, accumulating 60 seconds per stretch.</p>
9	
Study	Carsten M Mølgaard 2017
Methods	the control group (CG): receiving the standard knee targeted exercises; the intervention group (IG): receiving the standard knee targeted exercises combined with foot targeted exercises and foot orthoses;
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) anterior or retro patellar knee pain for more than twelve weeks; (b)excessive calcaneal eversion measured as calcaneal valgus in relaxed bilateral standing greater than 6°;(c) pain elicited at least by two of the following four tests; (i) Isometric muscle contraction with slightbent knee, (ii) palpation of the patellofemoral joint line, (iii) patellar compression against the femoral bone (iv) active resisted knee extension (d) between 18 and 60 years of age; (e) able and motivated in completing the study.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>(I) previous knee surgery, except for diagnostic arthroscopy; (II) clinical suspicion of knee osteoarthritis or specific foot and/or knee pathologies (e.g.patellar tendinopathy, lesions of the menisci, cartilage, bone, collateral or cruciate ligaments); (III) and physically or mentally incapable of following the exercise protocol.</p>
Treatment	<p>The CG and IG both received three sessions of physiotherapy during a three-month period after inclusion.The three sessions with an experienced physiotherapist were individually adjusted to educate , manual therapy treatment of the soft tissues around the patella , tibio-fibular joint , and soft tissue mobilisation of the iliotibial tract , patellar taping with medialisation of the patella with sports tape and a home exercise program which primarily targeted neuromuscular strength with repetition maximum of 15 - 20 reps .These home-based exercises included squats , semi squat , lunges , knee extensions with rubber band sitting.</p> <p>The IG also received one weekly , supervised , session during the three - month period(a total of 12 sessions).The content of the foot exercise program is illustrated in Figure1.The standardised program was designed with the possibility of individual adjustments in relation to pain and functional level (see foot exercise program , Supplemental Digital Content)</p>
10	
Study	Liliam B Priore 2019
Methods	Brace Group: Participants included in this group received a knee brace plus an educational leaflet;

	Leaflet Group (minimal intervention): The participants received an educational leaflet containing general information about PFP.
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:  unilateral anterior knee pain when performing at least two of the following: sitting for prolonged time, squatting, kneeling, running, climbing and descending stairs, and jumping and landing; insidious onset symptoms lasting at least 3 months; the worst knee pain level in the previous week higher than 30mm in a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS 0-100mm);and score lower than in the Anterior Knee Pain Scale (AKPS)</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:  history of surgery on any lower limb joint; history of patellar subluxation, clinical evidence of meniscal injury (tibiofemoral joint line tenderness and Thessaly's test at 20° of knee flexion), ligament instability or patellar tendinopathy; osteoarthritis in any lower limb joint assessed clinically; patient-reported spine, hips, ankle or foot pain; presence of neurological disease; no previous physiotherapy treatment for PFP (at least 6 months prior to study commenced).</p>
Treatment	<p>●Brace Group:  Participants included in this group received a knee brace plus an educational leaflet (Appendix I). Participants received instructions to use the knee brace for 2 weeks while performing activities of daily living or sports that had previously resulted in knee pain. The type of knee brace used was a commercial flexible model, with approximate weight of 160g (Figure 1). The brace is made of neoprene material and contained four flexible steel rods that offer extra reinforcement aimed at controlling knee joint during movement, and two adjustable flaps to improve compression. The participants received a diary to report the number of hours and activities they used the knee brace and if there were any adverse effects due to its use.</p> <p>●Leaflet Group (minimal intervention):  The participants received an educational leaflet containing general information about PFP. The content included was related to (i) mechanical and psychological factors in PFP; (ii) load management and; (iii) treatment options (Appendix I). Participants included in this group were instructed to do not use any type of orthoses, brace or bandage in the lower limbs for the period they were involved in the study. The knee brace was offered for the participants of this group after studies completion</p>
11	
Study	Victor M Y Lun 2005
Methods	A structured home rehabilitation program only group (E group); Patellar brace group only (B group); A structured home rehabilitation program and a patellar brace group (EB group); A structured home rehabilitation program and a knee sleeve group (ES group);

<p>Recruitment of participants</p>	<p>❖Inclusion criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●History Criteria           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Atraumatic unilateral and/or bilateral peripatellar or retropatellar knee pain for at least 3 weeks but no greater than 2 years</li> <li>2. Patellofemoral knee pain with and/or after activity</li> <li>3. Inactivity patellofemoral pain and/or stiffness, especially with sitting with knees in a flexed position</li> <li>4. No prior history of any significant knee injury (including but not limited to patellar subluxations/dislocations/fractures and ligament or meniscal injuries, and so forth) or knee surgery</li> <li>5. No previous treatment with physiotherapy</li> </ol> </li> <li>●Physical Examination           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No or minimal articular or soft-tissue periarticular effusion or bursitis</li> <li>2. No significant joint line tenderness</li> <li>3. No intra-articular ligamentous instability</li> <li>4. Peripatellar tenderness 6 mild inferior patellar pole tendernes</li> </ol> </li> <li>●Radiologic Investigation           <p>Subjects had standing anterior posterior, lying lateral (or decubitus lateral), and supine skyline plain film x-rays taken of their affected knees. The position of the knee for the lying lateral view was taken with the subject lying on the affected side with the knee bent at 30°. The position of the knee for the skyline view was taken as described by Merchant et al,<sup>14</sup> with subjects lying supine with their legs resting over the edge of the x-ray table onto a wooden frame that positioned the knee at 45° of flexion. With the edge of the film cassette placed on the lower leg, the x-ray beam was directed caudally at a 30° angle relative to the femur. The distance of the x-ray tube from the film cassette was about 183 cm.</p> </li> </ul> <p>❖Exclusion criteria :</p> <p>Subjects previously treated with NSAIDs, off-the-shelf knee sleeves or braces, and/or in-shoe orthotics were included in the study. Patients with any bony abnormalities including bony fracture, osteochondritis dissecans, bipartite patella, or osteoarthritis were excluded from participating in the study.</p>
<p>Treatment</p>	<p>A structured home rehabilitation program only group(E group)          Patellar brace group only (B group)          A structured home rehabilitation program and a patellar brace group (EB group)          A structured home rehabilitation program and a knee sleeve group (ES group)          the E,EB, and ES groups: a standardized lower limb strengthening and stretching home program</p> <p>❖Strengthening program:</p> <p>The strengthening component of the program consisted of a 6-stage progression of 2-leg eccentric drop squats, then single leg lunges, and finally 1-leg eccentric</p>

	<p>drop squats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Progressive 6-Stage Drop Squat Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stage1: day1–5, Slow drop squat (3-s descent and 5-s ascent)</li> <li>Stage2: day6–10, Fast drop squat (1-s descent and 3-s ascent)</li> <li>Stage3: day11–40, Fast drop squat with 2.5-lb hand weights in each hand, with an addition of 2.5 lb every5 days until 15 lb is reached</li> <li>Stage4: day41–45, Lunge squat with 2.5-lb hand weights in each hand</li> <li>Stage5: day46–50, One-legged fast drop squat</li> <li>Stage6: day51+, One-legged fast drop squat × 2–3 d/wk</li> </ul> </li> <li>●the 2-leg drop squats by standing with feet shoulder-width apart and toes pointed forward; then quickly allowed their knees to collapse momentarily to 35°of knee flexion. The quadriceps were then rapidly contracted to stop further collapse; then slowly stood straight.Subjects progressed through the program by initially doing 2 leg squats slowly with body weight;</li> <li>●Then quickly as described above with body weight; then quickly with 5-lb weights in each hand; then quickly with 10-lb weights in each hand; and finally, quickly with 15-lb weights in each hand.</li> <li>●The next progression of the program was single-leg lunges. Stepping forward with 1 leg until the forward knee was flexed to about 90°. Subjects performed the lunges alternating between both legs. Single-leg squats were the final progression of the program.</li> <li>●Single-leg squats were performed like the 2-leg drop squats except standing only on 1 leg. Subjects performed single-leg squats initially with body weight and then with 5-lb weights in each hand.</li> <li>●Subjects progressed through each stage of the program every 5 days. Three sets of 20 repetitions of each exercise on a daily basis. There was a rest of 1 to 2 minutes between each set. This comprised a 40-day build-up phase of the program.</li> <li>●The subjects then maintained their strengthening in a maintenance program by doing the single-leg squats with 5-lb weights in each hand on alternating days.</li> <li>●If there was significant worsening of symptoms at any stage of progression, subjects were instructed to return to the previous step for another 5 days.</li> </ul> <p>❖stretching program:</p> <p>The stretching component of the rehabilitation program consisted of seated spinal rotations, supine hip external rotation, standing quadriceps stretch, and sitting hamstring stretch. Stretches were performed daily prior to and after the strengthening component of the program. Each stretch was performed passively 3 times, with each stretch held for 30 seconds.</p>
12	
Study	Mastour S Alshaharani 2019
Methods	Group1: the Protonics™ knee brace group Group2: the sport cord group

<p>Recruitment of participants</p>	<p>Inclusion criteria:  male or female 18-45 years of age; has exhibited patellofemoral pain symptoms for more than 1 month and have a pain level <math>\geq 3</math> on the NPRS; has experienced pain during at least 2 functional activities, such as squatting, ascending/descending stairs, and/or running.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:  Individuals who had experienced traumatic injuries to the knee joint or lower extremity, displayed signs or symptoms of a meniscus lesion or ligamentous-related pathology, had been diagnosed with a neurological disorder, diabetes, osteoarthritis, osteoporosis, or rheumatoid arthritis, or reported taking any over-the-counter pain medications during the study period were excluded from the study.</p>
<p>Treatment</p>	<p>All subjects completed three study visits, and a total of four measurements were taken at baseline, immediately following the first session, at two weeks, and at 4 weeks.</p> <p>The Protonics™ knee brace group: warm up exercises, specific therapeutic exercises that are part of the Protonic Therapy Program (PTP).</p> <p>❖The warm-up :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The subject wearing the Protonics™ knee brace set at a moderate resistance level and flexing the knees while sitting, standing, and reclining in the supine and prone positions.</li> <li>●The exercises, were done in sets of 10-15 repetitions, 3 sets per day, 3 times per week, for 4 weeks.</li> <li>●Each set took about 5 minutes for subjects to complete, or 15 minutes per day.</li> </ul> <p>❖The PTP has three phases:</p> <p>Phase I: 1st Day of Week 1; 1 Session; Education, Warm-up, Walking  Phase II: Weeks 1-2; 3 Sessions per Week; Walking, Hamstring curl in supine, prone, and sitting positions  Phase III: Weeks 3-4; 3 Sessions per Week; Walking, Hamstring curl in standing position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●At the start of each phase, subjects were given detailed instructions on how to perform the warm up and therapeutic exercises and instructed to perform them at home 3 times per week.</li> <li>●During Phase I or day 1, subjects were asked to walk for 5 minutes or as tolerated at varying speeds while wearing the brace. Subjects also performed the Protonics™ gait and Protonics™ neuromuscular repositioning techniques.</li> <li>●During Phase II or weeks 1 and 2, subjects performed the same Protonics™ techniques, and were asked to walk for 8 minutes or as tolerated at varying speeds and inclines. Subjects were also instructed to perform 10-15 repetitions of the hamstring curl in the prone, supine, and seated positions at home.</li> <li>●During Phase III or weeks 3 and 4, subjects were once again asked to perform</li> </ul>

	<p>the aforementioned Protonics™ techniques, but this time they were also asked to walk forwards and backwards at varying speeds and inclines for 10 minutes or as tolerated. They were also instructed to do 10-15 repetitions of the standing hamstring curl.</p> <p>The sport cord group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖The same warm-ups and exercises using the sport cord in the supine, standing, sitting, and prone positions.</li> <li>❖The only difference is that subjects were asked to only walk backwards instead of forwards in order to avoid activation of the hip flexor muscle. The appropriate level of resistance for each subject was calculated by multiplying their weight in pounds by 0.3. Subjects were then given either light, medium, or heavy resistance cords according to the following classification scheme: light (pink color) with resistance 3 (R3), 0-30 lbs.; medium (orange color) with resistance 5 (R5) 0-50 lbs.; heavy (yellow color) with resistance 7 (R7) 0-70 lbs.</li> </ul> <p>All subjects completed three study visits, and a total of four measurements were taken at baseline, immediately following the first session, at two weeks, and at 4 weeks.</p>
13	
Study	Serdar Demirci 2017
Methods	<p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p>Group1: MWM group(n1=18)</p> <p>Group2: KT group(n2=17)</p>
Recruitment of participant	<p>Included criteria:</p> <p>(i) durations lasting longer than two months, (ii) pain scoring three or more according to Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) during at least two activities (prolonged sitting, ascending-descending stairs, squatting, kneeling and jumping-running), (iii) age between 20 and 45 (to reduce the risk of osteoarthritic changes in patellofemoral joint).</p> <p>Excluded criteria:</p> <p>The patients who had meniscus tear, bursitis, ligament injury, patellar tendon lesions, joint degeneration, patellofemoral dislocation and/or recurrent subluxation as well as those who had undergone lower extremity surgery were excluded. Patient with knee pain caused by the hip, lumbal spine or ankle joint were also excluded.</p>
Treatment	<p>All the patients were evaluated before the treatment, 45 min after the initial treatment, at the end of the 4-session-treatment during 2-week period and 6 weeks later.</p> <p>Group1:</p> <p>Straight Leg-Raise with Traction: The extremity on which the practice would be performed in supine position was grasped from the ankle level and was, then,</p>

	<p>subjected to traction longitudinally. Afterward, the knee was lifted up passively while in extension and was kept for waiting for a few seconds at the point where tension was felt and was, then, returned to its initial position. The practice was repeated 10 times, and 3 sets of practice at 1-min-intervals were performed.</p> <p>Tibial Gliding: The patients were asked, in the first place, whether or not they felt any pain in the course of the active knee flexioneextension movement while in supine position. In the patients who had pain, the treatment was started on in the position in which no load was transferred onto the knee joint. Each patient was tested in every direction in the course of the active knee flexioneextension movement so as to find out the best pain-free gliding direction (medialelateral part of the tibia, anterioreposterior, internaleexternal rotation). While a hand femur was being fixated in accordance with the treatment direction selected by the therapist, the other hand was subjected to gliding towards tibia, and at that moment, the patient was asked to perform 10 repetitive active knee flexioneextension. The practice was performed by doing 10 repetitions for 3 sets and by providing 1-min-resting time between the sets. Throughout the treatment process, particular attention was paid to allowing the position of the hands, the gliding direction and force to remain the same all through the movement process.<sup>25,37</sup> If the patient felt no pain in supine position both during and after the practice, the position in which weight/load was conveyed was started to be performed (Fig. 3). This group of patients was also given an additional home exercise program specific to the technique and in the direction selected for the treatment.</p> <p>Group2: To maintain proprioceptive stimulation in the quadriceps (from origo towards insertio) and to alleviate the tension of hamstring muscle, a 'Y'-shaped kinesiotope was applied by using the muscle technique. Afterward, 2 pieces of 'I'-shaped tapes were stretched by 75% through the mechanical correction technique and were applied around the patellar circumference in the way that it would allow the patella to move naturally in the femoral cavity while the knee was in flexion.</p>
14	
Study	Eda Akbaş 2011
Methods	Group1: kinesio taping (KT group, n1=15) Group2: control group (n2=16)
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>(1)with a diagnosis of unilateral PFPS participated in this study</p> <p>(2) aged between 17 and 50 years and female</p> <p>Excluded criteria:</p> <p>(1) tendonitis, Osgood-Schlatter syndrome;</p> <p>(2) known articular cartilage;</p> <p>(3) meniscus or ligament damage;</p> <p>(4) history of patellar subluxation or dislocation and previous knee surgery.</p>
Treatment	Both groups received the same muscle strengthening and soft tissue stretching

	<p>exercises for six weeks.</p> <p>Group 1(KT group): muscle strengthening and soft tissue stretching exercises for six weeks and KT group additionally received kinesio taping at four-day intervals for six weeks.</p> <p>Group 2(Control group): muscle strengthening and soft tissue stretching exercises for six weeks.</p>
15	
Study	Lucas Simões Arrebola 2019
Methods	<p>Group1: kinesio taping (KT group, n1=13)</p> <p>Group2: using KT® for lateral rotation of the femur and tibia (KT-LRFT group, n2=14)</p> <p>Group3: control group (CG group, n3=16).</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>(1)women between the ages of 18 and 45 years who were irregularly active according to the International Physical Activity Questionnaire criteria (Matsudo et al., 2001)</p> <p>(2)The participants each had a history of knee pain for at least 3 months, reported increased pain in at least 3 PFPS-related activities, such as climbing stairs, jumping, kneeling, knee flexion for a long period, or pain on palpation of the medial or lateral facet of the patella, and had a body mass index (BMI) &lt; 29.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Excluded criteria:</p> <p>(1) knee osteoarthritis;</p> <p>(2) previous surgery on the lumbar spine or lower limbs;</p> <p>(3) patellar or quadriceps tendinopathy;</p> <p>(4) patellofemoral instability;</p> <p>(5) ligament or meniscal lesion;</p> <p>(6) and sensitivity to the material used in the application of the KT method;</p> <p>(7) If they presented with other types of pain symptoms not associated with PFPS, that interfered with their performance during the exercise protocol period.</p>
Treatment	<p>All groups underwent the same muscle strengthening and motor control procedures for 12 weeks.</p> <p>Rehabilitation protocol:</p> <p>●1-4 weeks:</p> <p>Strengthening exercises (80% 1RM): hip abductors,quadriceps in closed kinetic chain, and tricepssurae (3 sets of 12 repetitions)</p> <p>Strengthening with elastic resistance: quadriceps in open kinetic chain and lateral hip rotators (3 sets of 12 repetitions each)</p> <p>●4-8 weeks:</p> <p>1-4 weeks strengthening plus motor control exercises and core training (3 sets of 30 s each of planks and lateral planks)</p> <p>●8-12 weeks:</p> <p>1-4 weeks strengthening plus progression of the motor control exercises to unstable planes and core training (3 sets of 1 min each of planks and lateral</p>

	<p>planks)</p> <p>Group 1(KT group): The KT method applications were performed once a week throughout the 12-week treatment protocol period. the symptomatic leg was chosen for the KT® method.</p> <p>Group2(KT-LRFT group): the taping was performed with the initial anchorage on the suprapatellar region under 0% tension. The therapeutic zone had a tension of &gt;50% involving the entire lateral region of the patella. The final anchorage was on the tibial tuberosity with 0% tension. In the KT-LRFT group, the participant's lower limb was initially in the lateral rotation position before the taping application. The initial anchorage was on the posterior superior iliac spine under 0% tension. The therapeutic zone was in a spiral format throughout the extension of the patients' lower limbs with tension of&lt;50%. The tape involved the greater trochanter, the medial femoral condyle, and the lateral region of the leg, ending at the lateral malleolus region, with the final anchorage placed with 0% tension</p> <p>Group 3(Control group): muscle strengthening and motor control procedures for 12 weeks</p>
16	
Study	Martin Whittingham 2014
Methods	<p>Group1: patella taping combined with a standardized exercise program (Taping and Exercise group, n1=10)</p> <p>Group2: placebo patella taping and exercise program (Placebo Taping and Exercise group, n2=10)</p> <p>Group3: exercise program alone (Exercise Alone group, n3=10)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) pain on ascending and/or descending stairs, squat- ting, sitting for extended periods of time, or associated with an increase in physical activity.</li> <li>(2) subjects were aged 17 to 25 years (reflecting the age of recruits), men and women, and able to give informed consent.</li> </ol> <p>Excluded criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) a history of subluxation or dislocation of the patella, anterior or posterior cruciate ligament insufficiency, previous knee surgery or meniscal damage, or any other underlying musculoskeletal problems that would have prevented the subject from performing the exercises.</li> </ol>
Treatment	<p>All subjects attended the physiotherapy department at 08:00 hours each day for the application of tape and performance of exercises, and were advised to remove the tape at the end of the day.</p> <p>The performance of all exercises was completed wearing standard-issue military clothing and training shoes. The program was designed to enhance VMO activation and was graduated so that subjects only progressed to the next exercise when 3 sets of 10 repetitions of the previous exercise could be performed without pain. Non-weight-bearing isometric, inner-range isotonic (from approximately</p>

	<p>10° flexion to full extension), and straight leg raise quadriceps exercises were included.</p> <p>A variety of weight-bearing exercises were also completed. These included isometric quadriceps contractions in sitting (knees at 90° flexion), bilateral quarter squats (in standing), and unilateral quarter squats (all with a rolled towel between the knees). Further progressions included 506 unilateral quarter-squats (without a rolled towel), controlled step-downs (backwards, sideways, and forwards), and hip external rotation exercises (standing with the lateral aspect of the affected leg against the wall, hip and knee flexed to 90°, and pushing the leg into the wall). Thirty repetitions of each exercise were completed except for the final exercise, where only 10 repetitions were performed (with a 20-second hold).</p> <p>Stretches for the quadriceps, hamstrings, gastrocnemius, and iliotibial band were also included (20-second hold, 4 repetitions).</p> <p>Group 1(Taping and Exercise group): muscle strengthening and soft tissue stretching exercises for six weeks and KT group additionally received kinesio taping at four-day intervals for six weeks.</p> <p>Group2(Placebo Taping and Exercise group): tape was placed across the surface of the patella without patella alignment correction.</p> <p>Group3(Exercise Alone group) : did not have any tape applied,only performed the exercises</p>
17	
Study	Jehoon Lee 2014
Methods	<p>Group1= elastic band exercise group (n=13, EBG)</p> <p>Group2=a sling exercise group (n=11, SEG)</p> <p>Group3= control group (n=10, CG)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria: The criteria used for the diagnosis of PFPS were based on those used in other PFPS studies: diagnosis of PFPS by a medical doctor<sup>17</sup>); and at least two of the following activities exacerbated their symptoms: prolonged sitting, ascending or descending stairs, squatting, and kneeling.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria: unregulated neurological impairment, knee surgery in the past 2 years, or acquired structural or functional lower limb failures, such as systemic arthritis ligamentous knee injury.</p>
Treatment	<p>●Group 1(EBG group): In the training course, the therapeutic exercises of EBG were performed 3 times a week (30 min) for 8 weeks. Each therapeutic exercise program included a warm-up (stationary bike, 10 min), exercise program (EBG with weight-bearing, 20 min), and cool-down (hamstring self-stretching, 5 min). Therapeutic exercise programs were performed one-on-one with a physical therapist.</p> <p>●Group 2(SEG group): In the training course, the therapeutic exercises of SEG were performed 3 times a</p>

	<p>week (30 min) for 8 weeks. Each therapeutic exercise program included a warm-up (stationary bike, 10 min), exercise program (SEG with weight-bearing, 20 min), and cool-down (hamstring self-stretching, 5 min). Therapeutic exercise programs were performed one-on-one with a physical therapist.</p> <p>●Group 3(CG group): the control group did not perform a therapeutic exercise program.</p>
18	
Study	Marjon Mason 2011
Methods	<p>Group 1(infrapatellar taping group)</p> <p>Group 2(quadriceps strengthening group): Open chain terminal extension quadriceps strengthening</p> <p>Group 3(quadriceps stretching group): Quadriceps stretching</p> <p>Group 4(Control group)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria: had pain for at least one month, located behind or around the patella with two or more of the following: prolonged sitting with knees bent, squatting, kneeling, ascending or descending stairs or running. At least two of these activities should increase the pain in order to be classified as PFPS.</p> <p>Excluded criteria: (1)had meniscal symptoms; (2)required surgery; (3)rheumatoid symptoms; (4)had a synovitis; (5)had back pain.</p>
Treatment	<p>During the second week, all subjects followed an identical programme of combined taping, groups and no Day differences for the Control group were established, a series of planned comparisons across Day for each Group on each measure were conducted. Due to the number of planned comparisons, a more conservative significance level of <math>\alpha \leq 0.01</math> was adopted to control for increased Type 1 errors. Further analyses (t-test) were conducted to compare the changes in all subjects over the second week of treatment. During this period, all subjects were treated identically using all three modalities. Results quadriceps strengthening and quadriceps stretching.</p> <p>intervention for the first week</p> <p>Group 1(infrapatellar taping group): Subjects in the taping group had infrapatellar taping applied for one week. The taping was applied immediately distal to the patella with the patient in long-sitting and the quadriceps relaxed. On application, pressure was directed posteriorly and superiorly so as to create a supporting sling for the patella. One layer of 50 mm wide hypoallergenic adhesive non-woven, non-rigid fabric underwrap tape (Therafix, PhysioMed, Ausmedic, Australia) and three layers of 38 mm rigid zinc- oxide sports tape (PhysioMed, Ausmedic, Australia) were applied (Figure 2). Subjects were instructed to keep the tape as dry as possible and to remove the tape if any signs of allergy arose. The taping was replaced by</p>

	<p>the treating physiotherapist if it came off during the week.</p> <p>Group 2(quadriceps strengthening group): Open chain terminal extension quadriceps strengthening</p> <p>Group 3(quadriceps stretching group): Quadriceps stretching</p> <p>Group 4(Control group): received no taping or exercise. All subjects received an overview of knee anatomy and function, especially in relation to the loading of the PF joint and the importance of the quadriceps muscle. They were advised to avoid painful activities like lunges and squats.</p>
19	
Study	Jyrki A Kettunen 2007
Methods	<p>Group1: an arthroscopy group (N = 28), knee arthroscopy + 8-week home exercise program;</p> <p>Group2: a control group (N = 28), the same 8-week home exercise program only;</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria: Age 18-40 years Female or male. Characteristic history of PFPS and symptoms lasting at least 6 months. Patellofemoral pain during knee loading physical activity, such as jumping, running, squatting, or going up or down stairs. Patellofemoral pain when the knee was kept in flexion for a prolonged period, with relief on extension.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria: Disabling general illness; Reported knee ligamentous or meniscal injuries; Previous knee surgery; Physician diagnosed knee osteoarthritis; A history of patellar dislocation; however, subjects with patellar subluxation are included in the study; Other knee problems than PFPS diagnosed clinically (such as jumper's knee); Other knee problems than PFPS diagnosed radiographically (such as osteochondritis dissecans); Physical therapy for PFPS within the previous 4 weeks; Pregnancy; Competitive athlete</p>
Treatment	<p>❖arthroscopy group: During arthroscopy the following procedures were performed: resection of inflamed/scarred medial plicae, abrasion of chondral lesions and shaving of excessive and inflamed synovium. Minor corrections of the patellofemoral articulation were performed, such as lateral capsular discision in the case of clear lateral patellar subluxation in the beginning of knee flexion. Moreover, possible meniscal tears were treated.</p> <p>❖PFPS Exercise protocol: The duration of each session was 30 min.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●First part of the program (weeks 1-4)</li> </ul> <p>First two exercise weeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Exercise every day and repeat the protocol twice daily.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 1 to 4: 10 - 20 repetitions each.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 5 to 7: 3 - 5 repetitions each.</li> </ul> <p>Weeks three and four:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Exercise every day and repeat the protocol four times a day.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 1 to 4: 10- 40 repetitions each.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 5 to 7: 3 -5 repetitions each.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Second part of the program (weeks 5-8)</li> </ul> <p>Weeks five and six:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Exercise every day and repeat the protocol twice daily.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 8 to 11: 10 - 20 repetitions each.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 12 to 14:3 -5 repetitions each.</li> </ul> <p>Weeks seven and eight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Exercise every day and repeat the protocol four times a day.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 8 to 11:10 - 40 repetitions each.</li> <li>. Exercises numbers 12 to 14:3 -5 repetitions each.</li> </ul>
20	
Study	M S Rathleff 2015
Methods	Group1: patient education, n1=59 Group2: patient education combined with exercise therapy, n2=62
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>insidious onset of anterior knee or retropatellar pain of more than 6 weeks duration and provoked by at least two of the following situations: prolonged sitting or kneeling, squatting, running, hopping or stair climbing; tenderness on palpation of the patella, pain when stepping down or double leg squatting; and worst pain during the previous week of more than 30 mm on a 100 mm visual analogue scale (VAS).</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>Exclusion criteria were concomitant injury or pain from the hip, lumbar spine or other knee structures; previous knee surgery; self-reported patellofemoral instability; knee joint effusion; use of physiotherapy for treating knee pain within the previous year; or at least weekly use of anti-inflammatory drugs.</p>
Treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖group1:Patient education</li> </ul> <p>One physiotherapist delivered the patient education in the two clusters randomised to patient education alone. The standardised patient education was held one-on-one with the adolescents and their parents.</p> <p>It lasted for about 30 min</p> <p>It covered:pain management; how to modify physical activity using pacing and load management strategies; information on optimal knee alignment during daily tasks; and responses to questions from the adolescent or the parents. Adolescents</p>

	<p>also received this information in an eight-page leaflet.</p> <p>❖group2:Patient education + exercise therapy</p> <p>One of two physiotherapists delivered the exercise therapy and patient education in each cluster.</p> <p>The exercise therapy was consisted of a combination of supervised group training sessions and unsupervised home-based exercises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The supervised group training sessions consisted of neuromuscular training of the muscles around the foot, knee and hip, strength training for the knee and hip, patellofemoral soft tissue mobilisation, and stretching of the muscles around the hip and knee. To progressively match the exercise level to the performance level of each participant, all exercises were available in multiple levels of difficulty .All adolescents started with exercises at level 1 and progressed from there. The progression followed previously described rules.</li> <li>•The unsupervised home exercises consisted of approximately 15 min of quadriceps and hip muscle retraining and stretching. Instructions were given immediately after patient education together with a five-page leaflet with pictures and descriptions of the exercises. The exercises were to be performed each day except on the days of supervised group training. The adolescents were instructed to incorporate the exercises into their normal daily routines.</li> </ul> <p>Taping corrections were applied in a predetermined order of anterior tilt, medial tilt, glide and fat pad unloading until the participant’s pain was reduced by at least 50%.Tape was only used if adolescents achieved a minimum of 50% reduction in pain measured with a 10 cm VAS during a two-leg squat immediately after application of the tape.</p> <p>The supervised exercises were offered three times per week on school premises immediately after the end of the school day for 3 months. Exercise sessions were offered at three time points during the afternoon of each of three designated weekdays, a total of nine options weekly. The adolescents were told they should continue with the exercises on their own after the intervention period.</p>
21	
Study	Lachlan Giles 2017
Methods	Group1: BFR group, n=35; Group2: standard group, n=34;
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Participants between 18 and 40 years were included if they experienced PFP as evidenced by the following: atraumatic onset of anterior knee pain for greater than 8 weeks; pain with any two activities, including running, jumping, squatting, kneeling, stair ascent/descent or prolonged sitting; pain with any two of patellar compression; palpation of the peripatellar region; and resisted isometric knee extension when sitting.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>Participants were excluded if they had coexisting pathology around the knee, including patellar subluxation or dislocation, other sources of anterior knee pain</p>

	<p>(bursa, fat pad), knee surgery, or if they participated in weight training of the legs within the past 6 months (to not include previous non-responders). Participants were excluded on suspicion of patellar tendinopathy, with strong consideration of pain localised to the patellar tendon, increased symptoms with dynamic loads and pain reduction with sustained isometric contraction. Participants were excluded from the study if they were found to be at elevated risk of venous thrombosis (lower limb surgery in the past 6 months, cardiovascular conditions, including high blood pressure (&gt;140/90), diabetes, unexplained chest pain or heart condition, fainting or dizzy spells during physical activity/exercise that causes loss of balance, pregnancy,<sup>22</sup> or if exercise was contraindicated.</p>
Treatment	<p>BFR group:8 weeks of leg press and leg extension + at 30% of 1RM; Standard group:8 weeks of leg press and leg extension + at 70% of 1 repetition maximum (1RM).</p> <p>Features common to BFR and standardised quadriceps strengthening:Each group performed 5 min of ‘light’ intensity exercise bike to warm up, leg press between 0° and 60° knee flexion and leg extension from 90° to 45° knee flexion. Six rehabilitation sessions were performed with one-on-one supervision from the physiotherapist (three sessions in the first week, then at 2-week intervals), and the remainder of the sessions were performed under group supervision.</p> <p>❖BFR group training:</p> <p>Participants in the BFR group placed the cuff on the proximal thigh and inflated to the prescribed pressure in the resting position of the exercise to be performed (leg press or leg extension). The exercises were performed at approximately 30% of 1RM with the BFR cuff inflated. One set of 30 repetitions (or volitional fatigue), then three sets of 15 repetitions were performed.The cuff remained on for the 30 s rest between sets and was removed after the exercise was completed.</p> <p>❖Standardised quadriceps strengthening group training:</p> <p>The standardised quadriceps strengthening group performed three sets of 7–10 repetitions (approximately 70% of 1RM) with placebo BFR. The placebo was a 5 cm elastic cuff placed firmly around the proximal thigh, with enough room for two fingers between the skin and the cuff. This did not affect the amount of repetitions performed during strength training in preliminary testing.</p>
22	
Study	Angel Yañez-Álvarez 2020
Methods	Group1: exercise group + whole body vibration Group2: control group
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>i) insidious onset of anterior knee pain with a duration greater than 12 weeks; ii) self-reported patellofemoral pain intensity <math>\geq 30</math> mm on the 100 mm Visual Analogue Scale (VAS); iii) pain provoked by at least two of the following situations: prolonged sitting or kneeling, squatting, running, hopping or</p>

	<p>ascending or descending stairs.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:  Patellofemoral dislocation or subluxation;  knee osteoarthritis (confirmed with radiological tests);  knee joint effusion; concomitant injury or pain from the hip, lumbar spine, or other knee structures (meniscus, ligaments, bursa, synovial plica, infrapatellar fat);  traumatic lesions of soft tissues or previous orthopaedic surgery in lower limbs;  having received knee injections of corticosteroids or hyaluronic acid; cognition or impaired communication;  being involved in an ongoing medical-legal dispute.</p>
Treatment	<p>Group1:  The experimental group performed 12 supervised sessions of hip, knee and core strengthening exercises on a vibration platform 3 times per week during 4 weeks.  1.The frequency of the vibration platform was fixed at 40Hz along the study and the amplitude of the vibration platform (peak-to-peak displacement) was set at 2 mm in the first two weeks, and 4 mm during the following two.  2.The acceleration peak for these parameters were 3.2G and 6.4G respectively. In terms of force (Newtons) developed for the participants to perform the exercises, this ranged from 748.5 N in a neutral environment to 2395.2 N  3. Each session was structured following scheduled phases of warm-up, main active part and, finally, cool-down and stretching. The warm-up phase consisted of different lower limb active exercises to increase the blood flow, muscle temperature and to activate the central nervous system. All exercises in the warm-up and conditioning phases were performed considering the time on the vibration platform in sets of 30s, with 30 s of rest between repetitions.Finally, the cool-down period involved global stretching and trunk and lower limb relaxation, with exercises involving 60 s of work and 6 s of rest and 120 s of work with 12 s of rest,respectively. The total duration of the program was 22 min.</p> <p>Group2:  The same protocol but without vibration stimuli.</p>
23	
Study	Ebrahim Rasti 2020
Methods	Group1: WBV + exercise, n1=12 Group2: exercise, n=12
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:  Patients were included if they had unilateral patellofemoral pain which was aggravated during at least two of these activities: running, hopping, kneeling, squatting, prolonged sitting, and ascending and descending stairs .An additional criterion was a positive result in at least one of the following: patellar apprehension test, vastus medialis coordination test, or eccentric step-down test</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:  contraindications for WBV (kidney stone disease, diabetes, cardiopulmonary</p>

	disease, recent fractures, acute edema, acute disk herniation, using a heart pacemaker, epilepsy), as well as any history of patellar dislocation or subluxation, previous hip, knee or ankle surgery, and any other conditions that may cause anterior knee pain, such as tibiofemoral pathologies
Treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Group1: exercise therapy with whole body vibration training with frequency of 50 Hz and amplitude of 4 mm and for 2 sets 60 seconds with 30 second rest between sets are performed for 4 weeks and three times a week.</li> <li>●Group2: exercise therapy is performed for 4 weeks and three times per week.</li> </ul> <p>Patients of both groups received 4 weeks of exercise therapy (3 sessions of 45 to 60 min/week) in two phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Phase 1 (1st and 2nd weeks): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.3 min warm-up on a stationary bike</li> <li>2.Quadriceps setting, supine straight-leg raises (SLR), side-lying SLR, single-leg stance</li> <li>3.Self-stretches of the Hamstring, quadriceps, and calf muscles</li> </ol> </li> <li>●Phase 2 (3rd and 4th weeks): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.3 min warm-up on a stationary bike</li> <li>2.Self-stretches of the iliotibial band, hamstring ,quadriceps , and calf muscles</li> <li>3. Quadriceps setting</li> <li>4.Dynamic exercises: single-leg cable machine exercises in flexion, extension and abduction directions, bilateral mini-squat , and prone-plank exercise</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
24	
Study	Mustafa Corum 2018
Methods	Group1: WBV training + home exercise, n1=18 Group2: home exercise, n2=16
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Among these patients, a total of 40 women aged between 18-40 years diagnosed with either unilateral or bilateral PFP with at least three months symptom history with an average pain during activity (previous week) equal to or greater than 3 cm on a 10 cm visual analogue scale (VAS). Diagnosis of PFP was based on clinical criteria of peri- or retropatellar pain on at least 2 of the following activities such as prolonged sitting, squatting, ascending or descending stairs, kneeling, hopping, or running and positive clinical patellar test.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>Exclusion criteria were as follows: participation in any systematic training programs such as strengthening and/or aerobic exercises, having received any treatment for PFP within the previous three months, history of lower extremity surgery, lower extremity trauma in the past year, and/or fracture, presence of musculoskeletal diseases such as acute herniated disc or spondylolisthesis, any structural disturbances of the lower extremity (e.g. osteoarthritis in hip or knee joints, prosthesis), central or peripheral neurological pathology and any chronic disease (e.g. diabetes mellitus), presence of gall or kidney stones and intraocular lenses, smoking and excessive alcohol intake, malignancy, and pregnancy.</p>

Treatment	<p>Group1:</p> <p>Exercise therapy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.WBV training was performed on a triplanar (mostly vertical, Z axis) oscillating vibration platform (Power Plate® pro5™; Power Plate North America, Inc., Northbrook, IL, USA) for 20-30 minutes per session. WBV training was supervised and performed in a clinic three days a week with at least one day between each session for eight weeks (total of 24 sessions).</li> <li>2.Each session lasted approximately 40 minutes including a 10 minutes warm-up and flexibility training period, a 20-30 minutes period of WBV training and 5 minutes cooldown period.</li> </ol> <p>Exercise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Lunge-step position</li> <li>2.Semi-squat position</li> <li>3.Ball squeeze squat position</li> <li>4.Dynamic squat position</li> </ol> <p>Group2:</p> <p>Exercise therapy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The patients in the control group were instructed on how to perform the exercises at home and supervised individually once a week throughout the program</li> <li>2.Each session was performed bilaterally and lasted approximately 40 minutes including 10 minutes warm-up, 20-30 minutes period of strength exercises with three sets of 10-15 repetitions and 5 minutes cool-down.</li> </ol> <p>Exercise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.lower extremity stretching exercises</li> <li>2.isometric quadriceps setting, knee extensions, double-legged wall squat</li> <li>3.lower extremity stretching exercises</li> </ol>
25	
Study	F Revelles Moyano 2012
Methods	<p>Group1(n1=35): a classic stretching group received stretching intervention;</p> <p>Group2(n2=33): a proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation and aerobic exercise group received proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation stretching intervention;</p> <p>Group3(n3=26): a control treatment received educational materials (control group)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>We included subjects with a pain history more than six months, with no previous history of apophysitis or osteoarthritis and with positive results in the physical examination tests: patellofemoral grinding test and patellofemoral compression test</p>
Treatment	<p>Participants attended three appointments of 20–60 minutes duration per week for 16 weeks.</p> <p>❖Group1:Classic stretching group (CP)</p>

	<p>The classic stretching protocol consisted of active exercises and stretching exercises for hip and knee muscles. The soft tissue stretching protocol was replicated from the study published by Syme et al. including soft tissue stretches for the quadriceps, hamstrings, iliotibial band, gastrocnemius/soleus, and anterior hip structures. In the sequence, each stretch was maintained for 30 seconds and repeated three times.<sup>23</sup> Active exercises focused on quadriceps strengthening with and without resistance.</p> <p>❖Group2:PNF group</p> <p>The hold relax proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation stretching protocol consisted of passively moving the dominant leg into a position where the subjects felt mild discomfort and holding that position for 30 seconds.<sup>25</sup> Subjects were then asked to isometrically contract the stretched muscle for 10 seconds; this was followed by muscle relaxation in the same position for 30 seconds, before being stretched to a new point of mild discomfort. The leg was then released. Additionally, 45 minutes of aerobic exercise, controlled by a personal trainer, were included in each session after the fourth week.</p> <p>❖Group3:Control group</p> <p>Control group participants received only health educational materials regarding patellofemoral pain as previously described in Song et al. They were advised not to perform or receive any exercise program or intervention too. After the trial they were proposed conventional physiotherapy treatment.</p>
26	
Study	Nayra Deise Dos Anjos Rabelo 2017
Methods	Group1: patients in the S group; Group2: patients in the MC&S group
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria: This trial included women aged between 18 to 30 years who had history of anterior knee pain of at least 3 months while performing at least two of the following activities: remaining seated for a prolonged time; going up or downstairs; squatting; running, and jumping .They were also required to score at least 3pointson the Numerical Pain Rating Scale(NPRS)</p> <p>Exclusion criteria: Individuals were excluded if had history of surgery in the lower limbs, recurrent patellar instability, disorders associated with meniscal and/or ligamentous injuries, as well as cardiac or locomotor disorders that could affect the assessment and treatment.</p>
Treatment	<p>Group1: Patients in the S group underwent to a set of conventional weight-bearing and non-weight-bearing exercises emphasizing knee extensor, abductor, and lateral rotator hip strengthening. Non-weight-bearing exercises were initiated using ankle weights and elastic bands and progressed to a machine (for quadriceps muscles).</p>

	<p>Group2:</p> <p>Patients in the MC&amp;S group underwent the same strengthening program as the S group, but from the beginning of the treatment were informed about movement control disorders common in women with PFP (ipsilateral trunk lean, contralateral pelvic drop, adduction, and internal rotation of the hip and foot pronation) and were instructed to correct these abnormalities during the execution of the exercises and during daily living activities.</p> <p>All weight-bearing exercises in this group were performed in front of a mirror for the purposes of visual feedback. Also involved verbal feedback and different proprioceptive stimuli such as training in single leg balance for each of the lower limbs, which evolved progressively from stable to unstable surface. This was carried out in 3 sets of 20 seconds in the first week, 30 seconds in the second week, and 40 seconds in third week.</p> <p>The load during training was standardized at 70% of the single maximum Repetition, Maximum load was assessed during the first session, revised on a weekly basis, and adjusted when necessary. Exercises using elastic resistance were standardized for the maximum load that each patient could support while completing 15 repetitions of the exercise, assessed on a weekly basis for adaptations. These criteria were based on the protocol described in a previous study. Patients performed 3 sets of each exercise, with 15 repetitions. Resistance was increased as soon as the exercise became easy to execute.</p>
27	
Study	Alireza Motealleh 2019
Methods	<p>Group1: physical therapy exercise program</p> <p>Group2: core neuromuscular training + physical therapy exercise program</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Women between 18 and 40 years old with PFPS were included if they had anterior knee pain during at least 2 functional activities including step-up and step-down, squatting, kneeling, jumping, or running, of at least 2 months' duration. The diagnosis of PFPS was confirmed by a positive patellar grind test and tenderness of the medial and lateral patellar facets.<sup>24</sup> The patellar grind test has acceptable sensitivity (29%-49%) and specificity (67%-95%). Additional inclusion criteria were pain intensity of more than 3 on a Visual Analog Scale (VAS) and Kujala patellofemoral questionnaire score of 50 to 80 before the intervention. We included participants who did not get analgesic drugs from 2 weeks before the study commencement.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>Participants were excluded if they had knee meniscus, ligament, or tendon pathologies; subluxation or dislocation of the patella; Sinding-Larsen-Johansson syndrome; Osgood-Schlatter disease; or plica syndrome. Patients also were excluded if they had low back pain, previous pathology, or surgery of the spine or lower limb with or without referred pain. In addition, women with any neuromuscular, rheumatologic, or metabolic diseases (such as diabetic neuropathy) that might affect the outcome measures were excluded.</p>

Treatment	<p>The same treatment : physical therapy exercise program for 4 weeks, 3 exercise sessions per day. Patient attendance at the clinic for supervised exercise therapy was considered 1 of 3 exercise sessions per day. The quality and frequency of home exercise was the same as clinic program. To avoid fatigue, a 3-minute rest was allowed between exercises.</p> <p>The physical therapy exercise program focused mainly on strengthening the knee muscles (mainly quadriceps and hamstring) and flexibility exercises for the gastrocnemius, iliotibial band, and hamstring muscles.</p> <p>Group1: physical therapy exercise program</p> <p>©First (approximately 19 min)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Hamstring, ITB and gastrocnemius stretching (30-s hold, 5 repetitions)</li> <li>2.Quadriceps setting (10 repetitions, 10-s hold)</li> </ol> <p>©Second (approximately 21 min) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.SLR (3 sets, 10 repetitions, 10-s hold);</li> <li>2.Forward step-up (3 sets, 10 repetitions)</li> </ol> <p>©Last (approximately 25 min)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Squatting with 30° knee flexion (3 sets, 10-s hold);</li> <li>2. Lateral step-up (3 sets, 10-s hold);</li> </ol> <p>Group2: core neuromuscular training + physical therapy exercise program</p> <p>©First (approximately 19 min):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Hamstring, ITB, and gastrocnemius stretching (30-s hold, 5 repetitions);</li> <li>2. Quadriceps setting (10 repetitions, 10-s hold);</li> <li>3.Bridging while holding a small ball between knees (3 sets, 10-s hold);</li> <li>4. Side-lying hip abduction (clam exercise) (6 repetitions, 10-s hold)</li> </ol> <p>©Second (approximately 21 min):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SLR (3 sets, 10 repetitions, 10-s hold);</li> <li>2. Forward step-up (3 sets, 10 repetitions);</li> <li>3. Lateral SLR (3 sets, 10 s hold);</li> <li>4. Curl-up while holding a small ball between bent knees (5 repetitions, 10-s hold);</li> </ol> <p>©Last (approximately 25 min):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Squatting with 30° knee flexion (3 sets, 10-s hold);</li> <li>2. Lateral step-up (3 sets, 10-s hold);</li> <li>3. Isometric hip abduction in standing position (15 repetitions, 5-s hold);</li> <li>4. Intermittent shoulder flexion/extension while standing on affected limb (15 repetitions, 5-s hold);</li> </ol>
-----------	--

	<p>5. Trunk rotation toward healthy side while maintaining hip internal rotation in standing position on the afflicted leg (15 repetitions, 5-s hold);</p> <p>6. Curl-up while holding a small ball between straight knees (6 repetitions, 10-s hold);</p> <p>7. Lateral curl-up while holding a small ball between straight knees (6 repetitions, 10-s hold).</p>
28	
Study	Benjamin T Drew 2017
Methods	<p>Group1: MT group</p> <p>Group2: UC group</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Aged 18–40 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reported insidious (non-traumatic) onset of anterior or retropatellar knee pain</li> <li>• Pain on two or more of the following activities: prolonged sitting, kneeling, squatting, running, patella palpation, hopping, stair walking, stepping down or isometric quadriceps contraction</li> <li>• Peak hip abduction torque values: Females [18–29 years] <math>\leq</math> 94.1 Nm; Females [30–39 years] <math>\leq</math> 75.8 Nm; Males [18–29 years] <math>\leq</math> 144.1 Nm; Males [30–39 years] <math>\leq</math> 139 Nm</li> </ul> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presence of inflammatory arthritis; knee pain referred from the hip or lumbar spine; any history of significant knee surgery; other causes of knee pain such as, but not restricted to: meniscal pathologies, quadriceps tendon injuries, patella tendinopathy, tibial tubercle apophysitis; bursitis</li> <li>• Received any treatment within the last 3 months including physiotherapy, podiatry etc</li> </ul>
Treatment	<p>MT group:</p> <p>attend six supervised sessions of approximately 30 min in duration once per week for 6 weeks at a local hospital.</p> <p>Each week they also performed two additional sessions on non-consecutive days independently at home, with the intervening days allowing adequate rest.</p> <p>During these sessions, participants were given education and justification of the treatment followed by three exercises aimed at targeting coronal, sagittal and transverse strength of the hip using resistance bands. Each week at least one of the exercises would change with the aim of providing variation and minimising tedium. Fidelity was ensured by checking the exercise technique and making corrections to performance prior to these being performed independently at home. Subsequent visits ensured this instruction had been correctly applied or not. Tailoring the intervention based on progressive loading was in line with current recommendations.</p> <p>Participants were issued yellow (least resistance), red or green (most resistance) resistance tubing (66fit Ltd. <sup>TM</sup>) and were allowed to take it home. To progress the load and resistance, a Borg Rate of Perceived Exertion scale (RPE) was used based on the recommendations when using resistance band. An RPE of <math>&gt;6</math> was</p>

	<p>considered desirable and participants were monitored after a few repetitions to ensure this was what was being achieved.</p> <p>As participants were stratified for strength, the intervention required participants to perform 10 repetitions within three sets as recommended for strength training. Participants were advised to ensure the time under tension was 8 s (3 s concentric, 2 s isometric hold and 3 s eccentric contraction). Strengthening was performed on each leg alternatively providing a standardised rest between sets.</p> <p>Exercise diaries were issued to participants to provide a reminder of the exercises and to allow a measure of adherence. Participants were asked to document each time each exercise was performed on their diary sheet and return these at each visit.</p> <p>UC group:</p> <p>continued with the same management of their condition as they were planning to receive prior to the commencement of the study. This included planned physiotherapy, podiatry or no intervention, depending upon participant preference.</p> <p>Of the participants in the UC group, 55% received formal physiotherapy treatment, which may or may not have included a strengthening component. The remaining UC participants reported continuing with their normal self-management.</p>
29	
Study	G Syme 2008
Methods	<p>Group A: Selective “vastus medialis oblique activation” group (n1= 21);</p> <p>Group B: General “quadriceps femoris strengthening” group (n2= 22);</p> <p>Group C: Control “no treatment” group (n3= 20);</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Males and females to be included.</p> <p>Age range 16e40 years.</p> <p>Unilateral or bilateral patellofemoral pain longer than three months.</p> <p>Willing to complete an eight-week rehabilitation program and attend the hospital clinic for assessments.</p> <p>Anterior or retropatellar pain reported on at least two of the following activities: prolonged sitting, ascending or descending stairs, squatting, running, kneeling, and hopping/jumping.</p> <p>In addition to the above, at least two of the following clinical examination findings: Patellar pain with manual compression of the patella against the femur. Patellar tenderness with palpation of the posteromedial and posterolateral borders of the patella. Patellar pain during resisted dynamic knee extension. Patellar pain with manual compression of the patella against the femur during isometric knee extension contraction.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>Previous knee surgery or trauma.</p> <p>Ligamentous instability and/or internal derangement. (Subjects were referred for arthroscopy or Magnetic Resonance Imaging based on the criteria outlined by</p>

	<p>Acton and Craig (2000).)</p> <p>History of patella subluxation or dislocation or patella laxity.</p> <p>Traumatic lesions.</p> <p>Joint effusion when the midpatellar girth was 105% or more than the non-involved knee, where applicable.</p> <p>True knee joint locking and/or giving way.</p> <p>Concurrent medical illness.</p> <p>Inflammatory joint pathology.</p> <p>Infection.</p> <p>Confirmed osteoarthritis of tibiofemoral and/or patellofemoral joints.</p> <p>Knee radiograph abnormalities.</p> <p>Circulatory or neurological abnormalities.</p> <p>Pre/inferior or pes anserine bursitis, patella tendonitis, iliotibial tract tendonitis, Osgood Schlatter’s disease, Sinding-Larsen Johansson Syndrome, muscle tears or knee plica.</p> <p>Subjects unable or unwilling to give informed to written consent.</p> <p>Subjects awaiting surgery for another lower limb joint problem(s).</p> <p>History of low back, sacroiliac or ankle/feet problems longer than 3 days duration.</p> <p>Subjects already involved in active lower limb training programs.</p> <p>Malignancy.</p> <p>Pregnancy or breast feeding.</p> <p>Ongoing litigation related to lower limb injuries.</p> <p>No patient could be under the care of or have been under the care of another physiotherapist out with the study in the previous one-year prior to the study commencing.</p>
Treatment	<p>Selective group:</p> <p>Physiotherapists were instructed that they could use all components of the ‘McConnell’ approach, such as VMO muscle re-education, flexibility stretching exercises, patella mobilization, patella taping, electromyographic biofeedback and commercially available prefabricated orthotics.</p> <p>©Exercises</p> <p>Lower limb exercises emphasising selective activation and retraining of the VMO muscle relative to the VL muscle was undertaken by using a dual channel surface electromyographic biofeedback unit, suggested that a minimum of six sessions should be given during the eight-week treatment period</p> <p>Correction of any dynamic lower limb malalignment and gluteus medius muscle retraining was also encouraged</p> <p>Participants were prescribed daily home exercises and provided with standardised home exercise information sheets .</p> <p>©Taping</p> <p>Patella taping for pain relief in Group A was as advocated by McConnell.</p>

Non-rigid hypoallergic tape was used to provide skin protection and rigid zinc oxide tape was used for taping corrections. The aim, if possible, was to achieve an immediate reduction in pain intensity of at least 50% . Participants were taught to independently apply the taping corrections and were instructed to reapply the tape daily and wear the tape during all waking hours until the pain subsided and exercises could be undertaken pain free.

#### ©Stretching

Soft tissue stretches were included for the quadriceps, hamstrings, iliotibial band, gastrocnemius/soleus and anterior hip structures, The aim was to maintain the stretches for 30 s and repeat each three times over.

The patella was mobilised by the physiotherapist and combined with deep frictional massage where necessary. The aim was three repetitions of 60 s each per treatment session .

#### ©Restrictions

Physiotherapists were informed not to use isokinetic training, electrotherapy, acupuncture or place the subject on a regular gymnasium based on training program for the lower limb(s).

#### ©Advice

All patients were supplied with an advice sheet about patellofemoral pain prior to the start of their treatment.

#### General group:

Lower limb exercises were based on widely accepted concentric, eccentric and proprioceptive rehabilitation principles .

#### ©Exercises

The strengthening protocol aimed for 3-5 exercises consisting of 1-3 exercise sets of 10 repetitions, at 60-70% of the one repetition maximum intensity . This strengthening protocol was suggested as a guideline and physiotherapists were advised to instruct patients to stop any prescribed exercise if pain intensity exceeded 5 on a 0-10 verbal rating scale,(0 ¼ ‘no pain’ and 10 ¼ ‘worst possible pain’) and to adjust training loads accordingly.

Correction of any dynamic lower limb malalignment was encouraged during the exercises.

#### ©Taping

A ‘knee sling’ U shaped strapping was applied if necessary, which uses 2.5 cm wide zinc oxide Elastoplast to support the knee and patellofemoral joints. The strapping was only applied during the initial pain control stages.

#### ©Stretching

	<p>Soft tissue stretches were included for the quadriceps, hamstrings, iliotibial band, gastrocnemius/soleus and anterior hip structures. The aim was to maintain the stretches for 30s and repeat each three times over. The patella was mobilised by the physiotherapist and combined with deep frictional massage where necessary. The aim was three repetitions of 60 s each per treatment session.</p> <p>©Restrictions</p> <p>Physiotherapists were informed not to use isokinetic training, electrotherapy, acupuncture, electromyographic biofeedback training or to specifically try and rehabilitate the VMO muscle during the treatment of this group.</p> <p>©Advice</p> <p>All patients were supplied with an advice sheet about patellofemoral pain prior to the start of their treatment</p> <p>Control group: no treatment</p>
30	
Study	Farzin Halabchi 2015
Methods	Group1: n=26 in the intervention (according to the identified risk factors); Group2: n=27 in the control group
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Inclusion criteria were (1) age between 18 and 40 years,(2) presence of at least 3 of the following symptoms and signs: peri-/retropatellar pain by walking up or down the stairs, squatting, running, cycling, sitting with knees flexed for a prolonged period, grinding of the patella, and a positive clinical patellar test (such as Clarke test or patellar femoralgrinding test), and (3) pain persisted for more than 2 months.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>The exclusion criteria, however, were (1) known severe knee osteoarthritis, diagnosed based on clinical and/or radiographic assessment, (2) known rheumatological disease,(3) defined pathological conditions of the knee including patellar tendinopathy, Osgood-Schlatter disease, SindingLarsen-Johansson disease, knee ligamentous injury/instability, (4) a history of knee injuries or knee surgery (ligament reconstruction or medial patellofemoral ligament/other patellar instability surgeries), (5)intake of psychotherapeutic drugs, and (6) previous treatment with exercise therapy, orthosis, and taping in the past 12 months.</p>
Treatment	<p>Both groups:</p> <p>Stage 1 (first 6 wk):</p> <p>CKC exercises:</p> <p>Semisquat with 408 knee flexion; 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p> <p>Progressive step-up (10 cm high); 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p> <p>OKC exercises:</p> <p>Straight leg rising in leg external rotation (supine); 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p> <p>Sitting leg extension (108 flexion to full extension); 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p>

	<p>Stage 2 (second 6 wk):</p> <p>CKC exercises</p> <p>Squat with 90° knee flexion; 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p> <p>Progressive step-up (20 cm high); 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p> <p>OKC exercises</p> <p>Straight leg rising in leg external rotation (supine); 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p> <p>Sitting leg extension (90° flexion to full extension); 3 sets, 10 repetitions, daily</p> <p>Intervention group (according to the identified risk factors):</p> <p>☉Hamstring tightness:</p> <p>Passive static stretching exercises (unilateral standing, bilateral standing, bilateral sitting) Three alternating repetitions, held for 15 s, daily; continue until the end of the 12-wk program</p> <p>☉Hip flexor tightness:</p> <p>Passive modified lunge stretch and the active prone leg lifts with the knee bent and then straight 10 repetitions, held for 30s, with up to a 30s rest period between repetitions, daily.</p> <p>☉Iliotibial band tightness:</p> <p>Standing stretches in 3 positions of upright standing, overhead clasped hands, and diagonally lowered arms Three alternating repetitions, held for 30 s, daily.</p> <p>☉Gastrosoleus tightness :</p> <p>Static stretching in forward lunge position 2 repetitions, held for 60 s, daily.</p> <p>☉Excessive foot pronation:</p> <p>Custom-made foot orthoses with the use of foot scan technology.</p> <p>☉Limb length inequality:</p> <p>Correction with lifts no greater than one-half of the difference between limb lengths an interval of 2 weeks between lift therapy adjustments, each lift increment not more than 3-6 mm.</p> <p>☉Patellar malalignment:</p> <p>Patellar taping using the Grelsamer and McConnell technique Nonrigid, hypoallergenic underwrap for skin protection and rigid poly cotton zinc-oxide tape for taping corrections.</p> <p>☉Patellar hypermobility:</p> <p>Patellar taping: The patella will be usually tilted first. A medial glide tape will be then applied to the patella followed by an external rotation tape applied superiorly and inferiorly to improve the seating of the patella in the trochlea.</p>
--	---

31	
Study	R van Linschoten 2009
Methods	Group1: n1=65 in the intervention group: received as standardized exercise program; Group2:n2=66 in the control group: usual care, which comprised a“wait and see”approach of res;
Recruitment of participants	Inclusion criteria: Inclusion criteria comprised the presence of at least three of the following symptoms: pain when walking up or down stairs; pain when squatting; pain when running; pain when cycling; pain when sitting with knees flexed for a prolonged period of time; grinding of the patella; and a positive clinical patellar test (such as Clarke’s test or patellar femoral grinding test). Symptoms had to have persisted for longer than 2 months but not longer than 2 years. Exclusion criteria: Patients were excluded if they had knee osteoarthritis, patellar tendinopathy, Osgood-Schlatter disease, or other defined pathological conditions of the knee, or had previous knee injuries or surgery. Patients were also excluded if they had already been treated with supervised exercise therapy.
Treatment	The intervention group : received as standardised exercise programme for 6 weeks tailored to individual performance and supervised by a physical therapist, and were instructed to practice the tailored exercises at home for 3 months. -The programme consisted of a general warm up on a bicycle ergometer followed by static and dynamic muscular exercises for the quadriceps, adductor, and gluteal muscles. -The programme also included balance exercises and flexibility exercises for major thigh muscles. -Patients exercised for 25 minutes supervised by the physical therapist. -The load of the exercise programme was increased every 2 weeks during the first 6 weeks by increasing the number of repetitions or the intensity of the exercises. The increment of the exercise protocol was monitored by the physical therapist who was guided by pain reaction on exertion. -Patients visited the therapist nine times in 6 weeks. -In addition, they were instructed to practice the exercises daily for 25 minutes over a period of 3 months.  The control group : were assigned usual care, which comprised a“wait and see”approach of rest during periods of pain and refraining from pain provoking activities.  Both the intervention group and the control group received standardised information and advice from their GP or sport physician about the background of patellofemoral pain syndrome and its good prognosis as well as advice to refrain from all sports activities that provoke pain. Patients were recommended to use a simple analgesic such as paracetamol when pain was severe and to find

	<p>alternative ways to keep in shape.</p> <p>Other interventions—like the use of bandages or braces, insoles, or ice applications, or consumption of medication other than simple analgesics—were allowed in both groups.</p>
32	
Study	Erik Witvrouw 2004
Methods	<p>Group1: CKC group: only closed kinetic chain exercises</p> <p>Group2: OKC group: only open kinetic chain exercises</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>To be eligible for the study, subjects had to experience anterior knee pain for more than 6 weeks and exhibit 2 of the following criteria on initial assessment: pain on direct compression of the patella against the femoral condyles with the knee in full extension, tenderness on palpation of the posterior surface of the patella, pain on resisted knee extension, and pain with isometric quadriceps contraction against suprapatellar resistance with the knee in slight flexion.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>Patients with knee problems other than patellofemoral pain were excluded from the study. Patients with visually marked cartilage damage on MRI were excluded from this study. Also excluded from this study were patients with a history of a knee operation. None of our patients had a history of trauma, nor did they have a history of subluxation or dislocation</p>
Treatment	<p>Prior to the beginning of the OKC and CKC exercise program, a 10-repetition maximum (10 RM) was determined.</p> <p>On that information, patients were instructed to train at 60% of the 10 RM. A new 10 RM was established at the end of a week of training. Each exercise in both training groups was repeated for 3 sets of 10 repetitions. The patient rested 1 minute after the conclusion of each set.</p> <p>In the OKC exercise protocol, each exercise was held isometrically for a count of 6 seconds with a 3-second rest between repetitions.</p> <p>Each exercise in the CKC protocol was performed dynamically with a 3-second rest between repetitions.</p> <p>The exercise protocols were as follows:</p> <p>Therapeutic OKC Exercise Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Maximal static quadriceps contractions (quadriceps setting) with the knee in full extension.</li> <li>•Straight leg raisings with the patient in the supine position.</li> <li>•Short arc movements from 10° of knee flexion to terminal extension.</li> <li>•Leg adduction exercises in the lateral decubitus position.</li> </ul> <p>Therapeutic CKC Exercise Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Seated leg press.</li> <li>•Double or single one-third knee bend.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Stationary biking.</li> <li>•Rowing machine exercise.</li> <li>•Step up and down exercise.</li> <li>•Progressive jumping exercises on mini trampoline.</li> </ul> <p>In both training protocols, the patients were instructed to perform the conventional static quadriceps, hamstrings, and gastrocnemius stretching exercises after each training session. All subjects were instructed to perform 3 repetitions of a 30-second static stretch of these muscle groups</p>
33	
Study	Alexandra Hott 2020
Methods	<p>Group1: The hip exercise group</p> <p>Group2: The knee exercise group</p> <p>Group3: The control group receive no prescribed exercise regime but are encouraged to be physically active according to their own wishes.</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>patients should be 16-40 years of age and have at least three months history of peri- or retropatellar pain with worst pain intensity during previous week of VAS 3 or more. The pain should be provoked by at least two of the following activities: Stair ascent or descent, hopping, running, prolonged sitting, squatting or kneeling. On clinical exam, pain should be present during one of the following: Compression of the patella, palpation of the patellar facets. In patients with bilateral pain the worst knee will be included, and presence of bilateral pain will be documented. One specialist in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation (PM&amp;R) will perform clinical examinations of all patients. Possible candidates will have a plain x-ray and MRI of the knee joint performed, if this has not already been performed within the previous six months.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <p>clinical, x-ray and MRI findings indicative of meniscal or other intra-articular injury, injury to or increased laxity of cruciate or collateral ligaments, or other pathology including: osteoarthritis, Osgood-Schlatter or Sinding-Larsen-Johanssen syndrome, jumpers knee, or of significant knee joint effusion, significant pain from hip or lumbar spine on clinical evaluation, with potential for causing referred pain to the knee, or hindering the patient's ability to perform the prescribed exercises, recurrent patellar subluxation or dislocation, previous surgery to the knee joint, NSAID or cortisone use over an extended period of time, having suffered trauma to the knee joint judged during clinical evaluation to have a significant effect on the presenting clinical condition. Patients having received physiotherapy or other similar treatment for patellofemoral pain syndrome within the previous three months will also be excluded.</p>
Treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖Guiding principles</li> <li>■ Dosage is chosen in which the last repetitions are challenging but quality of movement is</li> </ul>

maintained.

■ Dosage individually adjusted once per week by physiotherapist.

❖Progression (all exercises):

■ Number of repetitions is increased from 3 sets of 10 repetitions to a maximum of 3 sets of 20 repetitions.

■ Thereafter resistance is increased using weight cuff or resistance tubing (see individual exercise).

o Weight cuffs are available in 0.5 kg increments.

o Resistance tubing<sup>b</sup> is selected from 3 possible variants. In order of increasing resistance: red (medium), green (heavy), black (special heavy)

❖Other details:

■ Repetitions performed dynamically over 2-3 seconds

■ 2-second pause between repetitions.

■ 30 second pause between sets.

■ Minimum one rest day between sessions

❖Hip exercises:

●Hip abduction:

Side-lying; Abduct hip, lifting the straight leg upward. Pelvic stabilization emphasized. Weight cuff fastened at ankle;

●Hip external rotation (clam-shell):

Side-lying; Clam-shell position, hip flexed approx. 60°. Pelvic stabilization emphasized. Weight cuff fastened directly below knee;

●Hip extension:

Prone; Extend hip, lifting the straight leg upward. Weight cuff fastened at ankle.

❖Knee exercises:

●Straight leg raising:

Supine Pelvic stabilization emphasized. Weight cuff fastened at ankle.

●Terminal knee extension:

Supine Knee supported over a cylinder (ø15cm). Knee extends from 10° to 0°. Weight cuff fastened at ankle

●Mini-squat to 45°:

Standing Back supported against low-friction wall to reduce stabilizing requirements from hip muscles.

Feet placed shoulder-width apart and 1 foot-length from wall.

Bend knees to 45°.

Elastic tubing (length: 2 times distance from lateral femoral epicondyle to medial malleolus) held with one end in each hand, passing beneath both feet.

34	
Study	Marcelo Camargo Saad 2018
	Group1: Quadriceps strengthening group (QG); Group2: HIP strengthening group (HG); Group3: Stretching group (SG) Group4: Control group (CG)
Recruitment of participants	Inclusion criteria: Subjects were included in the study if they were female and had anterior knee pain with a minimum intensity of 3 or greater on the 10-cm visual analog scale (VAS) for at least three months before the study assessment. (1) insidious onset of symptoms; (2) retropatellar or peripatellar pain with at least 2 of the following activities (ascending/descending stairs, running, kneeling, squatting, prolonged sitting or jumping). Exclusion criteria: (1) previous history of knee surgery; (2) history of back, hip, or ankle joint injury or pain; (3) patellar instability; (4) lesion or pain during palpation or test of any structure of knee and (6) any neurological involvement that would affect gait.
Treatment	Patients included in the treatment groups participated in two sessions per week for eight weeks with a minimum break of 24 h between sessions. Each treatment session was approximately 50 min in duration, and all sessions were performed individually and supervised by the same physical therapist. For all groups of treatment the weights were increasing as the patient's reported changes in their following the Rating of Perceived Exertion (RPE) scale based on Borg's Scale of effort.  ❖Quadriceps strengthening group (QG). The exercises in this group focused specifically on quadriceps strengthening.  ❖HIP strengthening group (HG). This group performed exercises to strengthen hip stabilizing muscles.  ❖Stretching group (SG). In this group, the physical therapist monitored and stabilized the patients during the stretching exercises for all muscles involved in knee and hip stabilization.  ❖Control group (CG). Patients included in this group did not have any kind of intervention for eight weeks, but they were tested at the start of the program & at the end like the other 3 groups. At the end of the experiment, a rehabilitation program was made available to all patients.
35	
Study	Alexandra Hott 2019
Methods	Group1: education combined with isolated hip-focused exercise (n = 39); Group2: traditional knee-focused exercise (n = 37);

	Group3: free physical activity (n = 36)
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion Criteria:  Patients were considered eligible if they were 16 to 40 years old with a minimum 3-month history of PFP (pain, 3 of 10) reproduced by at least 2 activities (stair ascent/descent, hopping, running, prolonged sitting, squatting, kneeling) and present on at least 1 clinical test (compression of the patella, palpation of the patellar facets). For patients with bilateral pain, the worst knee was included.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:  (1) clinical, radiographic, or MRI findings indicative of other specific pathology, including meniscal, ligament, or cartilage injury, as well as osteoarthritis, epiphysitis, significant knee joint effusion, or recurrent patellar subluxation or dislocation; (2) significant pain from hip or back hindering the ability to perform the prescribed exercises; (3) previous surgery to the knee joint; (4) nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug or cortisone use over an extended period; (5) previous trauma to the knee joint with an effect on the presenting clinical condition; and (6) physiotherapy or other similar exercises for PFP syndrome within the previous 3 months.</p>
Treatment	<p>Three sessions per week were performed for 6 weeks: 1 under supervision of the physiotherapist and 2 home sessions, with at least 1 day between sessions. Initial dosage was 3 sets of 10 repetitions for each exercise, with progression to a maximum 3 3 20 repetitions. Each repetition was performed dynamically over 2 to 3 seconds, with a 2-second pause between repetitions and a 30-second pause between sets. Additional resistance thereafter was achieved through weights or elastic tubing depending on the exercise.</p> <p>❖Hip-Focused Exercises:  The hip-focused exercises were based on previous studies and consisted of side-lying hip abduction, hip external rotation (clam shell), and prone hip extension. These exercises were intended to maximally isolate the hip abductors, extensors, and external rotators without stimulating the quadriceps muscles.</p> <p>❖Knee-Focused Exercises.:  The knee-focused exercise regimens were based on previous studies and was intended to maximally isolate the quadriceps muscles. The exercises consisted of straight-leg raises in the supine position, supine terminal knee extensions (from 10of flexion to full extension), and a mini-squat (45of flexion) with the back supported against the wall (to reduce stabilizing requirements from the hip muscles).</p>

	<p>❖Control Group (Free Physical Activity):</p> <p>At randomization, the control group was encouraged by the study physiotherapist to be physically active in accordance with standardized information.</p>
36	
Study	Reed Ferber 2014
Methods	<p>Group1:HIP treatment group(n=111)</p> <p>Group2:KNEE treatment group(n=88)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion Criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Visual analog score rating of pain during activities of daily living during the previous week at a minimum of 3 cm on a 10-cm scale</li> <li>2. Insidious onset of symptoms unrelated to trauma and persistent for at least 4 wk</li> <li>3. Pain in the anterior knee associated with at least 3 of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. During or after activity</li> <li>b. Prolonged sitting</li> <li>c. Stair ascent or descent</li> <li>d. Squatting</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Pain with palpation of the patellar facets or pain during step down from a 20-cm box or during a double-legged squat</li> <li>5. Recreationally active (30 min/d, 3–4 d/wk for the past 6 mo and exclusive of pain)</li> </ol> <p>Exclusion Criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meniscal or other intra-articular injury</li> <li>2. Cruciate or collateral ligament laxity or tenderness</li> <li>3. Patellar tendon, iliotibial band, or pes anserine tenderness</li> <li>4. Positive patellar-apprehension sign</li> <li>5. Osgood-Schlatter or Sinding-Larsen-Johansson syndrome</li> <li>6. Evidence of effusion</li> <li>7. Hip or lumbar referred pain</li> <li>8. History of recurrent patellar subluxation or dislocation</li> <li>9. History of surgery to the knee joint</li> <li>10. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug or corticosteroid use within 24 hours before testing</li> <li>11. History of head injury or vestibular disorder within the last 6 months</li> <li>12. Pregnancy</li> </ol>
Treatment	<p>For rehabilitation progression, each patient with PFP visited the AT up to 3 times/wk during the 6-week period. The AT asked all patients with PFP to perform their prescribed exercises a minimum of 6 d/wk (including the visits with the AT) for 6 weeks. Compliance was monitored and recorded within the home-exercise rehabilitation booklet.</p> <p>Group1: HIP treatment group(n=111)</p>

	<p>Patients with PFP in the HIP treatment group initially performed non-weight-bearing, muscle-strengthening exercises that focused on activating the hip musculature. Those exercises progressed to weight-bearing exercises, including core-strengthening and balance exercises that were designed to target the core musculature, with specific emphasis placed on stabilizing the core musculature before initiating any of the movements.</p> <p>Week1:  Hip abduction—standing, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Hip external rotator—standing, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Hip external rotator—seated, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions</p> <p>Week2:  Hip abduction—standing, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Hip internal rotator—standing, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Hip external rotator—standing, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions</p> <p>Week3:  Hip abduction—standing, 3 Sets, 10 (w/ stronger band) Repetitions  Hip internal rotator—standing, 3 Sets, 10 (w/ stronger band) Repetitions  Hip external rotator—standing, 3 Sets, 10 (w/ stronger band) Repetitions  Balancing 2 feet—Airex<sup>a</sup> pad, 3 Sets, 30–45s Seconds.</p> <p>Week4-6:  Hip extension at 45°—standing, 3 Sets, 10-15 Repetitions  Hip internal rotator—standing, 3 Sets, 10-15 Repetitions  Hip external rotator—standing, 3 Sets, 10-15 Repetitions  Balancing 1 foot—Airex<sup>a</sup> pad, 3 Sets, 45-60s Seconds.</p> <p>Group2: KNEE treatment group(n=88)  Patients in the KNEE treatment group initially performed non-weight-bearing quadriceps strengthening and then progressed to weight-bearing quadriceps-strengthening exercises.</p> <p>Week1:  Isometric quadriceps setting, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Knee extensions—standing, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Double-legged, one-quarter squats, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions</p> <p>Week2:  Isometric quadriceps setting, 3 Sets, 15 Repetitions  Double-legged, one-half squats, 3 Sets, 15 Repetitions  Terminal knee extension w/ TheraBanda, 3 Sets, 15 Repetitions  Double-legged, one-quarter squats, 3 Sets, 30 Seconds.</p> <p>Week3:  Double-legged, one-half squats, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Single-legged, one-quarter squat, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Double-legged, one-quarter wall squats, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Terminal-knee extension w/ TheraBand, 3 Sets, 10 (w/ stronger band) Repetitions</p>
--	--

	<p>Week4:  Single-legged, one-half squats, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Forward, one-quarter lunge, 3 Sets, 10 Repetitions  Lateral step-down (4-inch [3.6 cm] step), No. 3 Sets,10 Repetitions  Forward step-down (4-inch [3.6 cm] step), No. 3 Sets,10 Repetitions  Double-legged, one-half wall squats, 3 Sets, 30 Seconds.</p> <p>Week5-6:  Double-legged wall squat (to max 90° knee flexion), 3 Sets, 30 Seconds.  Lateral step-down (6–10 in [5.6–9.6 cm] step), 3 Sets, 15 Repetitions  Forward step-down (6–10 in [5.6–9.6 cm] step), 3 Sets, 15 Repetitions  Forward one-half full lunge (to maximum 90° of knee flexion), 3 Sets, 15 Repetitions  Single-legged one-half full squat (to maximum 90° of knee flexion), 3 Sets, 15 Repetitions</p>
37	
Study	Kimberly L Dolak 2011
Methods	Group1: initial hip strengthening (hip group n1 = 17); Group2: initial quadriceps strengthening (quad group n2=16)
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:  The inclusion criteria were that participants needed to exhibit or report (1) anterior or retropatellar knee pain during at least 2 of the activities of stair climbing, hopping, running, squatting, kneeling, and prolonged sitting, (2) an insidious onset of symptoms not related to trauma, (3) pain with compression of the patella, and (4) pain on palpation of patellar facets.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:  Participants were excluded if they had (1) symptoms present for less than 1 month, (2) self-reported other knee pathology, such as cartilage injury or ligamentous tear, (3) a history of knee surgery within the last year, (4) a self-reported history of patella dislocations or subluxations, and (5) any other concurrent significant injury affecting the lower-extremity</p>
Treatment	<p>Following the initial testing session, all women were taught and supervised on the first phase of rehabilitation, based on their assignment to either the hip group or quad group. Both groups received the same flexibility exercises. A seated hamstring stretching, standing quadriceps stretch, and standing wall stretch for the triceps were performed throughout the 8-week program. Flexibility exercises were performed 3 times for 30 seconds each, prior to strengthening exercises. Participants performed rehabilitation exercises 1 day a week with an investigator and 2 days a week at home, for a total of 3 exercise sessions each week.</p> <p>❖Group1:The hip group</p> <p>Week1:  Sidelying combination hip abduction and external rotation,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Standing hip abduction,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Seated hip external rotation,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p>

	<p>Week2:  Standing hip abduction with 3% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Sidelying hip abduction with 3% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Seated hip external rotation with 3% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week3:  Sidelying hip abduction with 5% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Seated hip external rotation with 5% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Quadruped hydrant (combined hip abduction and external rotation), 3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week4:  Sidelying hip abduction with 7% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Seated hip external rotation with 7% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Quadruped hydrant with 3% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week5:  Single-leg balance with front pull,3 sets of 30 seconds  Wall slides with resistance,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Lateral step-downs off a 10-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions  2-leg calf raises,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week6:  Single-leg balance with diagonal pull,3 sets of 30 seconds  Single-leg mini-squats,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Lateral step-downs off a 15.25-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Single-leg calf raises,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week7:  Single-leg standing on Airex pad,3 sets of 30 seconds  Lunges to a 20.3-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Lateral step-downs off a 15.25-cm step with resistance,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Single-leg calf raises off a step,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week8:  Single-leg standing on Airex pad with diagonal pull,3 sets of 30 seconds  Lunges to a 10-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Lateral step-downs off a 20.3-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Single-leg calf raises on Airex pad,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>❖Group2:The knee group</p> <p>Week1:  Quad sets,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Short-arc quads,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Straight leg raises,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week2:  Short arc quads with 3% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Straight leg raises with 3% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions  Terminal knee extensions with 3% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week3:</p>
--	--

	<p>Short-arc quads with 5% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Straight leg raises with 5% body weight,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Terminal knee extensions with 5% body weight 3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Terminal knee extensions with 7% body weight 3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week4:</p> <p>Short-arc quads with 7% body weight 3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Straight leg raises with 7% body weight 3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Terminal knee extensions with 7% body weight 3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week5:</p> <p>Single-leg balance with front pull,3 sets of 30 seconds</p> <p>Wall slides with resistance,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Lateral step-downs off a 10-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>2-leg calf raises,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week6:</p> <p>Single-leg balance with diagonal pull,3 sets of 30 seconds</p> <p>Single-leg mini-squats,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Lateral step-downs off a 15.25-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Single-leg calf raises,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week7:</p> <p>Single-leg standing on Airex pad,3 sets of 30 seconds</p> <p>Lunges to a 20.3-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Lateral step-downs off a 15.25-cm step with resistance,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Single-leg calf raises off a step,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Week8:</p> <p>Single-leg standing on Airex pad with diagonal pull,3 sets of 30 seconds</p> <p>Lunges to a 10-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Lateral step-downs off a 20.3-cm step,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p> <p>Single-leg calf raises on Airex pad,3 sets of 10 repetitions</p>
38	
Study	Mehtap Şahin 2016
Methods	Group1: knee-only exercise (Group A) programs; Group2: hip-and-knee exercises (group B)
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) sedentary female patients ranging from age 20 to 45;</li> <li>2) patients with a full range of motion of the knee joints;</li> <li>3) presence of anterior or retropatellar knee pain during at least 3 of the following activities: ascending/descending stairs, squatting, hopping/running, and prolonged sitting;</li> <li>4) insidious onset of symptoms unrelated to a traumatic incident and persistence of symptoms for at least 4 weeks;</li> <li>5) a score of at least 3 on the visual analog scale (VAS);</li> <li>6) presence of pain on palpation of the patellar facets;</li> <li>7) presence of pain on stepping down from a 25-cm step or double-legged squat</li> </ol>

	<p>Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) current significant injury affecting lower limb joints;</li> <li>2) surgery of the knee joint;</li> <li>3) signs or symptoms or MRI findings of intraarticular pathologic conditions such as effusion, meniscal, or cruciate or collateral ligament involvement;</li> <li>4) tenderness of the patellar tendon or iliotibial band or pesanserinus tendon;</li> <li>5) patellar subluxation or dislocation;</li> <li>6) signs of patellar apprehension;</li> <li>7) referred pain with hip pain, or back pain, or sacroiliac joint pain;</li> <li>8) acute strain or sprain;</li> <li>9) current use of nonsteroid anti-inflammatory drugs or corticosteroids.</li> </ol>
Treatment	<p>❖Patient education of both groups</p> <p>Patient education consisted of recommendations to both groups, such as avoiding prolonged sitting, low-chair sitting, cross-legged sitting, kneeling, stair-climbing, and squatting. Only a cold pack was prescribed for pain control. Other pain medications were restricted.</p> <p>❖Exercise program for both groups</p> <p>A therapist-supervised exercise program of thirty sessions (5 days a week for 6 weeks) was given to both groups. Each session started with a 5-min warm-up, continued with 20 min of lower extremity stretching and strengthening exercises, and concluded with a 5-min cool-down. Elastic resistance exercises were performed using green TheraBand latex exercise bands (TheraBand, USA). Exercises utilizing elastic resistance were standardized to the maximum resistance at which each patient was able to perform 10 repetitions of the exercise. The maximum load and resistance for all strengthening exercises were evaluated during the first treatment session.</p> <p>❖Exercise program for the knee-only exercise group :</p> <p>Group 1 = knee exercise (n=25)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lower extremity stretches <p>Patients were asked to perform 3 repetitions of supine hamstring stretching and standing quadriceps, iliotibial band, and gastrocnemius stretching exercises twice a day. Patients were asked to hold the muscle in contraction for 10 s in each exercise.</p> </li> <li>2. Isometric quadriceps-strengthening exercise <p>A towel was placed under the knees in the supine position. Patients were asked to repeat the exercise twice a day with 20 initial repetitions, after which 5 repetitions were added every following week. Patients were asked to hold the muscle in contraction for 10 s in each exercise.</p> </li> <li>3. Straight leg raise exercise <p>Patients were instructed to perform the exercise twice a day with 10 repetitions.</p> </li> </ol>

	<p>Patients were asked to hold the muscle in contraction and work up to holding the contraction for 3.5 s in each exercise.</p> <p>❖Exercise program for the hip-and-knee exercise group</p> <p>Group 2= hip plus knee exercises(n=25)</p> <p>1. Hip abductor-strengthening exercises</p> <p>Patients were instructed to perform 5 repetitions of 30°–35 standing hip abductions with an elastic resistance exercise twice a day ; 5 repetitions were added every following week. Patients were asked to hold the muscle in contraction for 3.5 s in each exercise.</p> <p>2. Hip external rotator-strengthening exercises</p> <p>A towel was placed between the thighs. Patients were instructed to externally rotate the hip to approximately 30° and then hold the contraction for 3.5 s. Patients were instructed to perform this exercise twice a day with an initial 5 repetitions; 5 repetitions were added every following week. After five sessions a week for 6 weeks (30 sessions) with the supervised exercise program at the clinic, patients were instructed to continue with 6 weeks of an at-home exercise program and follow-up visits.</p>
39	
Study	Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2012
Methods	Group1: KE group Group2: KHE group
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion Criteria:</p> <p>The study sample included women 20 to 40 years of age who had a history of anterior knee pain for at least 3 months and reported increasing pain in 2 or more activities that commonly provoke PFPS.</p> <p>These activities included ascending and descending stairs, squatting, kneeling, jumping, long sitting, isometric knee extension contraction at 60° of knee flexion, and pain on palpation of the medial and/or lateral facet of the patella. All patients included in the trial were sedentary, defined as not having practiced physical activity (aerobic and strengthening exercises) any day of the week for at least 6 months previously.</p> <p>Exclusion Criteria:</p> <p>Participants were excluded if they had a neurological disorder; injury to the lumbosacral region, hip, or ankle; rheumatoid arthritis, a heart condition, or previous surgery involving the lower extremities; or were pregnant or using corticosteroids or anti-inflammatory medication. Women who had other knee pathologies, such as patellar instability, patellofemoral dysplasia, meniscal or ligament tears, osteoarthritis, or tendinopathies, were also excluded.</p>
Treatment	The KE and KHE groups completed 12 treatment sessions, provided 3 times per week for 4 weeks. The patients performed exercises solely during physical therapy and did not perform exercises at home. After the 4-week treatment program, the patients were instructed to maintain their normal daily activities

	<p>without performing a home exercise program.</p> <p>KE group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stretching (hamstrings, plantar flexors, quadriceps, and iliotibial band), 3 repetitions of 30 s</li> <li>• Seated knee extension from 90° to 45°, 3 sets of 10 repetitions*</li> <li>• Leg press from 0° to 45°, 3 sets of 10 repetitions*</li> <li>• Squatting from 0° to 45°, 3 sets of 10 repetitions*</li> <li>• Single-leg calf raises, 3 sets of 10 repetitions*</li> <li>• Prone knee flexion, †3 sets of 10 repetitions*</li> </ul> <p>KHE group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same protocol as the KE group</li> <li>• Hip abduction with weights (sidelying), 3 sets of 10 repetitions*</li> <li>• Hip abduction against elastic band (standing), 3 sets of 10 repetitions‡</li> <li>• Hip lateral rotation against elastic band (sitting), 3 sets of 10 repetitions‡</li> <li>• Hip extension (machine), 3 sets of 10 repetitions*</li> </ul>
40	
Study	Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2011
Methods	<p>Group1: knee group;</p> <p>Group2: knee + hip group</p> <p>Group3: no-treatment group</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion Criteria:</p> <p>All the females included in this trial were sedentary, defined as individuals who had not practiced physical activity any day of the week, both aerobic and strengthening exercises, for at least the past 6 months.</p> <p>Exclusion Criteria:</p> <p>Females were excluded if they were pregnant or had any neurological disorders, hip or ankle injuries, low back or sacroiliac joint pain, rheumatoid arthritis, used corticosteroids and/or anti-inflammatory drugs, a heart condition that precluded performing the exercises, or previous surgery involving the lower extremities. We also excluded females who had other knee pathologies such as patellar instability, patellofemoral dysplasia, meniscal or ligament tears, osteoarthritis, tendinopathies, and epiphysitis.</p>
Treatment	<p>The females of the KE and KHE groups completed 3 treatment sessions per week for 4 weeks, totaling 12 sessions. The treatment for the individuals in the KE group emphasized stretching and strengthening of the knee musculature. Individuals in the KHE group were treated using the same protocol, with the addition of performing exercises to strengthen the hip abductor and lateral rotator muscles.</p> <p>Group1: knee group</p> <p>Stretching (HM, PF, quadriceps, and ITB), 3*30 s</p> <p>Iliopsoas strengthening in non-weight bearing, 3*10 repetitions*</p>

	<p>Seated knee extension 90°-45°, 3 *10 repetitions*</p> <p>Leg press 0°-45°, 3*10 repetitions*</p> <p>Squatting 0°-45°, 3 *10 repetitions*</p> <p>Group2: knee + hip group</p> <p>Same protocol as the knee exercise group</p> <p>Hip abduction against elastic band (standing), 3*10 repetitions*</p> <p>Hip abduction with weights (sidelying), 3*10 repetitions†</p> <p>Hip external rotation against elastic band (sitting), 3*10 repetitions*</p> <p>Side-stepping against elastic band, 3*1 min</p>
41	
Study	Theresa Helissa Nakagawa 2008
Methods	<p>Group1: knee exercise</p> <p>Group2: hip + knee exercise</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>The inclusion criteria were anterior or retropatellar knee pain during at least three of the following activities: ascending/descending stairs, squatting, running, kneeling, hopping/jumping and prolonged sitting; the insidious onset of these symptoms being unrelated to a traumatic incident and persistent for at least four weeks; and the presence of pain on palpation of the patellar facets, on stepping down from a 25-cm step, or during a double-legged squat.</p> <p>The participants were excluded if they showed signs or symptoms of any of the following: meniscal or other intra-articular pathologic conditions; cruciate or collateral ligament involvement; tenderness over the patellar tendon, iliotibial band, or pesanserinus tendons; sign of patellar apprehension; Osgood-Schlatter or Sinding-Larsen-Johansson syndromes; hip or lumbar referred pain; a history of patellar dislocation; evidence of knee joint effusion; or previous surgery on the patellofemoral joint</p>
Treatment	<p>The exercise protocol for the control group consisted of patellar mobilization, stretching of the quadriceps, gastrocnemius, iliotibial band and hamstrings and open and closed kinetic chain exercises for quadriceps strengthening.</p> <p>The intervention group received the same exercise protocol as the control group as well as additional time for strengthening and functional training exercises focused on the transversus abdominis muscle, hip abductors and lateral rotator muscles.</p> <p>All the patients performed the rehabilitation exercises once a week under the supervision of the principal investigator and four times a week at home, for a total of five sessions a week for six weeks.</p> <p>❖Intervention group:</p> <p>Weeks 1 and 2 exercises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Transversus abdominis muscle contraction in the quadruped position, 2 sets of 15 repetitions/10-second hold</li> </ul>

- Isometric combined hip abduction–lateral rotation in sidelying with the hips and knees slightly flexed elastic resistance, 2 sets of 15 repetitions/10-second hold
- Side-lying isometric hip abduction with extended knee, 2 sets of 15 repetitions/10-second hold
- Isometric combined hip abduction–lateral rotation in the quadruped position, 2 sets of 15 repetitions/10-second hold

Weeks 3 and 4 exercises:

- Pelvic drop exercise on a 20-cm step, 2 sets of 15 repetitions/10-second hold
- Upper extremity extension of the contralateral arm with elastic resistance performed in a single-leg stance, 3 sets of 10 repetitions
- Rotation of the body in the direction of the contralateral side, holding an elastic resistance with the ipsilateral arm while maintaining the lower extremity static, 2 sets of 15 repetitions/10-second hold

Weeks 5 and 6 exercises, as for weeks 3 and 4

Additional elastic resistance around the affected leg in the forward lunges to encourage lateral rotation and abduction of the hip

❖ Control group:

- Stretches (all exercise sessions), 3 repetitions/30-second hold
  - Sitting hamstring stretch
  - Sitting patellar mobilization
  - Standing quadriceps stretch
  - Standing calf stretch
  - Standing iliotibial band stretch

Weeks 1 and 2 exercises:

- Isometric quadriceps contractions while sitting with 90 °of knee flexion, 2 sets of 10 repetitions/10-second hold
- Straight-leg raise in supine position, 3 sets of 10 repetitions
- Mini squats to 40° of knee flexion, 4 sets of 10 repetitions

Weeks 3 and 4 exercises:

- Wall slides (0–60° of knee flexion), 3 sets of 10 repetitions
- Steps-up and steps-down from a 20-cm step, 3 sets of 5 repetitions
- Forward lunges (0–45° of knee flexion), 3 sets of 10 repetitions

Weeks 5 and 6 exercises, as for weeks 3 and 4 plus:

- Balance exercises: unilateral stance on the floor and on an air-filled disc, with opened and closed eyes, 3 sets of 30-second hold each exercise

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Progressive walking or running programme,3 sets of 30-second hold each exercise</li> </ul>
42	
Study	Khalil Khayambashi 2012
Methods	<p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p>Group1: exercise group (n1=14)</p> <p>Group2: no-exercise control group (n2=14)</p>
Recruitment of participants	<p>Included criteria:</p> <p>To be considered for the study, patients had to be female and have a diagnosis of PFP. The diagnosis of PFP was based on the location of symptoms (peripatellar and/ or retropatellar) and the reproduction of pain with activities commonly association with this condition, such as stair descent, squatting, kneeling, and prolonged sitting. Patients were screened by physical examination to rule out ligamentous laxity, meniscal injury, pes anserine bursitis, iliotibial band syndrome, and patellar tendinitis as possible causes of current symptoms. Patients were invited to participate in the study if they had a diagnosis of bilateral PFP lasting at least 6 months (both knees), and had not previously received physical therapy.</p> <p>Excluded criteria:</p> <p>Patients were excluded from participation if they reported a history of previous patella dislocation, patellar fracture, or knee surgery.</p>
Treatment	<p>Twenty-eight females with PFP were sequentially assigned to an exercise (n = 14) or a no-exercise control group (n = 14). The exercise group completed bilateral hip abductor and external rotator strengthening 3 times per week for 8 weeks.</p> <p>Group1:</p> <p>The exercise group completed supervised hip-strengthening exercises 3 times per week for 8 weeks. Each session consisted of a 5-minute warm-up (walking around the gym at a self-selected pace), 20 minutes of hip-strengthening exercises, and a 5-minute cool-down (walking at a self-selected pace). All strengthening exercises were completed bilaterally. Each participant in the exercise group followed a standardized exercise program.</p> <p>Group2:</p> <p>As with the control group, individuals in the exercise group were asked to refrain from exercise-related activity beyond that of the supervised program and were allowed to take over-the-counter pain and/or anti-inflammatory medication as needed.</p>
43	
Study	Chen-Yi Song 2009
Methods	<p>randomized controlled trial</p> <p>Group1: hip adduction combined with leg-press exercise (LPHA group, n1=29)</p> <p>Group2: leg-press exercise only (LP group, n2=30)</p> <p>Group3:no exercise (control group, n3=30)</p>
Recruitment of	Inclusion criteria

<p>participants</p>	<p>(1) experience of anterior or retropatellar knee pain after performing at least 2 of the following activities: prolonged sitting, stair climbing, squatting, running, kneeling, hopping and jumping, and deep knee flexing; (2) insidious onset of symptoms unrelated to traumatic accident; (3) presence of pain for more than 1 month; and (4) age of 50 years and under (to eliminate the possibility of osteoarthritis). In addition, participants had to exhibit at least 2 of the following positive signs of anterior knee pain during the initial physical examination: (1) patellar crepitus, (2) pain following isometric quadriceps femoris muscle contraction against suprapatellar resistance with the knee in slight flexion (Clarke’s sign), (3) pain following compression of the patella against the femoral condyles with the knee in full extension (patellar grind test), (4) tenderness upon palpation of the posterior surface of the patella or surrounding structures, and (5) pain following resisted knee extension.</p> <p>Excluded criteria</p> <p>(1) self-reported clinical evidence of other knee pathology; (2) patellar tendinitis or knee plica; (3) a history of knee surgery; (4) central or peripheral neurological pathology; (5) knee radiographic abnormalities (eg, knee osteoarthritis) or lower-extremity malalignment (eg, foot pronation); (6) severe knee pain (visual analog scale [VAS] score of &gt; 8); or (7) received nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, injections, or physical therapy intervention in preceding 3 months.</p>
<p>Treatment</p>	<p>Participants were randomly assigned to the LP group, LPHA group, or control group and participated in 3 weekly exercise sessions for 8 weeks.</p> <p>Simple LP exercise:</p> <p>Leg-press exercise was performed unilaterally starting from 45 degrees of knee flexion to full extension using an ENDynamic Track machine. Exercise within the functional range was considered safe for patients with PFPS. A blue Thera-Band†was tied to each patient’s thigh (without resistance) to maintain consistent tactile stimulation among groups. Prior to the beginning of exercise training, the unilateral 1-repetition maximum (RM) strength of the lower extremity was determined by Odvar Holten Pyramid diagram with repetition-tofatigue testing. Patients were unilaterally trained at 60% of 1 RM for 5 sets of 10 repetitions. The 1 RM was re-measured every 2 weeks, and the exercise intensity was adjusted accordingly. A 60-Hz metronome was used to control the exercise pace at 2-second concentric and eccentric contractions from 45 degrees of knee flexion to full extension. There were 2-second breaks between repetitions and 2-minute breaks between sets. Limbs were alternatively trained between exercise sets.</p> <p>LPHA:</p> <p>This exercise was performed as per the LP, except that a 50-N hip abduction force was applied to the distal one third of the thigh. This force was achieved by tying a blue Thera-Band to an arm of the EN-Dynamic Track machine (Fig. 2). Therefore, this exercise was a combination of LP and 50-N isometric hip adduction.</p> <p>A hot pack was applied to the quadriceps femoris muscle for 15 minutes before</p>

	<p>exercise was commenced. After exercise completion, participants were asked to stretch the quadriceps, hamstring, iliotibial band, and calf muscle groups and were given a cold pack to apply for 10 minutes. Stretches were maintained for 30 seconds and were repeated 3 times for each muscle group. All study participants were asked not participate in any form of sport or exercise during the intervention period.</p> <p>Control group: Control group participants did not receive any exercise intervention, but were provided with health educational material regarding patellofemoral pain. They were advised not to perform or receive any exercise program or intervention. Neither tape nor brace was used. Exercise training was implemented after the 8-week control period.</p>
44	
Study	Mahsa Emamvirdi 2019
Methods	Group1: VCI exercise training Group2: Written instructions + heat or ice treatment
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria: Patients were included in the study if they had anterior knee pain of 3 or greater on a 10-cm visual analog scale (VAS) for a minimum of 8 weeks before the assessment or anterior or retropatellar knee pain during at least 3 of the following activities: ascending/descending stairs, squatting, running, kneeling, jumping, and prolonged sitting. Patients also must have presented with an insidious onset of symptoms unrelated to trauma and positive Clark test.</p> <p>Exclusion Criteria: intra-articular pathology, patellar instability, Osgood-Schlatter or Sinding-Larsen-Johansson syndrome, hip pain, knee joint effusion, and previous surgery in the lower limb. Patients were also excluded if palpation of the patellar tendon, iliotibial band, or pes anserinus tendons reproduced the pain.</p>
Treatment	<p>Group1: VCI intervention</p> <p>1.feedback methods and neuromuscular training: use verbal and visual (a mirror) feedback methods to control movement of the pelvis and the knee in the frontal plane. Feedback was eliminated during the last 4 sessions.</p> <p>2.Each training session included 15 minutes of simple aerobic movements to warm up and cool down and about 45 minutes of prescribed exercise time. 3 times per week for 6 weeks, with at least 24 hours between intervention sessions.</p> <p>3.The intensity of exercise was increased every 2 weeks. Each exercise was performed in 3 sets, and for the first week, each new exercise was repeated 6, 8, and 4 times.</p> <p>Following exercise were done:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·Squat in front of mirror (0°-60° of knee flexion, performed in front of mirror to ensure the knee does not exceed the midfoot)</li> <li>·Squat (0°-60° of knee flexion)</li> <li>·Lateral walk with elastic resistance around the forefoot</li> <li>·Strengthening the hip abductors with weightbearing (Trendelenburg)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·Squat with elastic resistance (0°-60° of knee flexion, resistance placed around the knees, stimulating the constant activation of the hip abductors and lateral rotators during task execution; relatively stable terrain)</li> <li>·Squat on BOSU ball (BOSU) (0°-60° of knee flexion)</li> <li>·Forward lunge in front of mirror (exercise performed in front of the mirror, single-leg balance at 30° of knee flexion on stable terrain)</li> <li>·Forward lunge (single-leg balance at 30°of knee flexion on stable terrain)</li> <li>·Balance exercise on BOSU ball</li> <li>·Single-leg balance at 30° of knee flexion (performed on stable terrain)</li> <li>·Squat with elastic resistance around the knees</li> <li>·Unipodal squat on BOSU ball (keep the pelvis balanced and avoid excessive pronation of the foot)</li> <li>·Modified forward lunge with elastic around the knee that is ahead (constant muscle activation of abductors and lateral rotators of the hip and training of motor control during the execution of the activity, performed on stable terrain)</li> <li>·Romanian deadlift</li> <li>·Lateral sliding without jumping</li> <li>·Hip lateral rotation</li> </ul> <p>Group2: control group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Received written instructions that included postural corrections and tips for improving general health.</li> <li>2.They were asked to come to the clinic once or twice a week and received heat or ice treatment according to their needs.</li> </ol>
45	
Study	Lori A Bolgla 2016
Methods	Group1: hip/core rehabilitation program, n1=105; Group2: knee rehabilitation program, n2=80
Recruitment of participants	<p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <p>Briefly, subjects were recreationally-active (exercised a minimum of 30 minutes three times a week for at least 6 months prior) and between the ages of 18 and 35 years. Additional inclusion criteria were an insidious onset of PFP for at least 1 month, self-reported pain during activity of at least 3-cm on a 10-cm VAS, and pain during activities that required loading on a flexed knee (e.g., running, jumping, squatting, or stair ambulation).</p> <p>Exclusion Criteria:</p> <p>Exclusion criteria included a history of back or lower extremity pathology (including patella tendinopathy, patella instability, and/or iliotibial band stress syndrome) other than PFP.</p>
Treatment	<p>Group 1: The hip/core program + the rehabilitation specialist supervised exercises sessions</p> <p>Group 2: The knee program + the rehabilitation specialist supervised exercises sessions</p> <p>The rehabilitation specialist supervised exercises sessions:</p>

All subjects met with a trained rehabilitation specialist up to three times a week over a six-week period.

Subjects were instructed to perform the exercises at least six times a week (e.g., a subject who attended three supervised sessions completed at least three additional sessions independently at home) and used Theraband® (The Hygenic Corp, Akron, OH) for resistance. Subjects performed all exercises bilaterally.

The hip/core program:

·non-weight bearing exercises.

·weight bearing exercises.

1 week:

Hip abduction-standing ; Hip external rotator-standing ; Hip external rotator-seated

2 week:

Hip abduction-standing ; Hip internalrotator-standing ; Hip external rotator-standing

3 week:

Hip abduction-standing; Hip internal rotator-standing; Hip external rotator-standing; Balancing 2 feet-Airex pad

4 week:

Hip extension@45°-standing; Hip internal rotator-standing; Hip external rotator-standing; Balancing 1 foot-Airex" pad

The knee program:

·non-weight bearing knee extensor exercises

·weight bearing.

1 week:

Isometric quadriceps setting; Knee extensions -standing; Double-legged, one-quarter squats

2 week:

Isometric quadriceps setting; Double-legged, one-half squats; Terminal knee extension with Theraband; Double-legged, one-quarter squats

3 week:

Double-legged, one-half squats; Single-legged, one-quarter squats  
Double-legged, one-quarter squats; Terminal-knee extension with Theraband.

4 week:

Single-legged, one-half squats; Forward, one-quarter lunges; Lateral step-down (4-in [3.6-cm] step); Forward step-down (4-in [3.6-cm] step) ; Double-legged, one-half wall squats

5-6 week:

Double-legged wall squats (to maximum 90°knee flexion); Lateral step-down (6-10-in [5.6-9.6-cm] step); Forward step-down (6-10-in [5.6-9.6-cm] step); Forward one-half full lunge (to maximum 90°knee flexion); Single-legged one-half full lunge (to maximum 90°knee flexion)



## **WEB APPENDIX 6. RISK OF BIAS FINDINGS**

### **Contents:**

- **Table 1. Domain-based risk of bias judgements for each outcome per study**
- **Table 2. Support for risk of bias judgement for each outcome per study**

**Table 1: domain-based risk of bias assessment**

Study	Selection bias		Performance bias		Detection bias	Attrition bias	Reporting bias	Other bias
	Sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Participants	Personnel				
Jean-Francois Esculier 2017	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk
Jason Bonacci 2017	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Jenevieve L Roper 2016	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk
Henrik Riel 2018	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk
Selina L M Yip 2006	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
N Dursun 2001	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Gustavo Telles 2016	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
James W Brantingham 2009	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Carsten M Mølgaard 2017	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Liliam B Priore 2019	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk

Victor M Y Lun 2005	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk?	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Mastour S Alshaharani 2019	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk				
Serdar Demirci 2017	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Eda Akbaş 2011	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Lucas Simões Arrebola 2019	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk					
Martin Whittingham 2004	Low risk;	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Jehoon Lee 2014	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Marjon Mason 2011	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk				
Jyrki A Kettunen 2007	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
M S Rathleff 2015	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Lachlan Giles 2017	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Angel Yañez-Álvarez 2020	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk

Ebrahim Rasti 2020	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear	Unclear risk
Mustafa Corum 2018	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
F Revelles Moyano 2012	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Nayra Deise Dos Anjos Rabelo 2017	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Alireza Motealleh 2019	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Benjamin T Drew 2017	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
G Syme 2008	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Farzin Halabchi 2015	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
R van Linschoten 2009	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Erik Witvrouw 2004	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Alexandra Hott 2020	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk
Marcelo Camargo Saad 2018	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk
Alexandra Hott	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk

2019								
Reed Ferber 2014	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Kimberly L Dolak 2011	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	High risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Mehtap Şahin 2016	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2012	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2011	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Theresa Helissa Nakagawa 2008	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	High risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Khayambashi, Khalil 2012	High risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Song, Chen-Yi 2009	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Emamvirdi, Mahsa 2019	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	High risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk
Bolgla, Lori A 2016	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Low risk	Low risk	Unclear risk	Unclear risk

**Table2: Risk of bias judgements + support for their judgements**

<b>Study: Jean-Francois Esculier 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	A scientist not involved in data collection generated randomisation lists using a random number generator (block randomisation; block size of 3–12).	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Group allocations were concealed in sequentially numbered sealed opaque envelopes, which were opened by one member of the research team not involved in data collection following baseline assessment.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“A single-blind (evaluator only) parallel-group RCT was conducted.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“Participants were instructed not to reveal the content of their programme to the evaluator.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Seven participants dropped out of the study before week 8 (follow-up rate=89.9%), and three additional runners failed to return their follow-up questionnaires at week 20 (follow-up rate=85.5%).” At 20-week, the numbers of the three groups were 20/23; 21/23; 18/23. Intention-to-treat and per-protocol analyses were used for symptoms and function outcomes.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	“Trial registration number ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02352909). secondary outcome Global rating of change (GRC) were not reported.”	High risk
<b>Other bias</b>		

Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
-----------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

<b>Study: Jason Bonacci 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“Allocation was done according to a computer-generated randomisation schedule.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Group allocation was sealed in opaque, consecutively numbered envelopes by an independent researcher and stored in a central locked location. ”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Unclear, no information.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Unclear, no information.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Sixteen participants were randomised and 14 (7 (88%) gait retraining and 7 (88%) foot orthoses) completed follow-up assessment. One participant in the gait retraining group withdrew due to an ankle sprain and one participant in the foot orthoses group was no longer interested. Neither of the participants who withdrew had started treatment. ”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Jenevieve L Roper 2016</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“Protocol Research personnel randomized subjects using a random numbers generator to either the control group or experimental group using blocked randomization so that there were an equal number (n=8) of subjects in each group. ”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The sequence was kept in a locked filing cabinet in the Gait Analysis lab until interventions were assigned. ”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinging of participants and personnel	“Protocol Research personnel randomized subjects to either the control group or experimental group, subjects were not blinded to what group they were in.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“All randomized subjects completed all trials. Analyses were performed on all subjects in both the experimental (n=8) and control (n=8) groups.”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	This trial was registered at the US National Institutes of Health (Clinicaltrials.gov) #NCT02567123.	Low risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Henrik Riel 2018</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“Randomisation Adolescents were block randomised using a random number generator on www.random.org. A researcher not involved in the data collection or analysis generated the allocation sequence and was the only person who knew the block sizes. ”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“After all baseline measurements were made, the assessor took a sequentially numbered opaque sealed envelope in which allocation was indicated.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“Participant-blinded. The primary investigator was not blinded towards group allocation. The adolescents attended separate group training sessions based on their randomisation and had no contact with the participants of the opposite group.”	Low risk High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Two adolescents failed to participate in the follow-up. Statistical analysis the primary intention-to-treat analysis tested the between-group difference of mean deviation from the prescribed contraction time per repetition using an independent t-test.”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		

Selective reporting	superiority trial (NCT02674841) with a 2-group parallel design conducted in Aalborg, Denmark. Recruitment The trial was approved by the Ethics committee of North Denmark Region (project ID: N20150070).	Low risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Selina L M Yip 2006</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The subjects were then randomly assigned into two groups by drawing lots.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinging of participants and personnel	“This study involved repeated measurements with a double-blinded design.” Insufficient information about the blinging of participants and personnel.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“the assessor was blinded to the subject grouping throughout the whole study.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome date	“All subjects completed the home programme and the assessment sessions. Assessments were performed at weeks 0, 4 and 8, respectively . A study period of eight weeks was chosen so as to study the effect of a training programme.”	Low risk

<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: N Dursun 2001</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	Support for judgement	Review authors' judgement
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“Patients were randomized to biofeedback and control groups, each consisting of 30 patients.”	Unclear risk
Allocation concealment	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Unclear the blinding of participants. The conventional exercise program for both groups was supervised by the same physical therapist	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“No dropouts occurred during the trial and all subjects in both groups regularly participated in the treatment.” No sufficient information about follow-up.	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		

Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
-----------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

<b>Study: Gustavo Telles 2016</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“Randomization was performed electronically on <a href="http://graphpad.com/quickcalcs/index.cfm">http://graphpad.com/quickcalcs/index.cfm</a> using simple random sampling.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“A physiotherapist was responsible for the screening of eligible patients and the random allocation of participants.”	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“.....participants were referred for an initial evaluation consisting of medical history and physical examination performed by a blinded physiotherapist.” No sufficient information about blinding of participants.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“22 met the eligibility criteria of the study after the evaluation. Among these, four participants were excluded because they started the treatment and then dropped out. All 18 subjects who continued in the study.” No information on reasons for loss to follow-up.	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	No protocol/analysis plan could be retrieved in trial registers.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: James W Brantingham 2009</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“A computer-generated list of random numbers was allocated into either group “A” or “B.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“These letters were written on slips of paper, folded over, and sealed in envelopes that had no marking on them on the outside and the folded numbers inside were undetectable. These envelopes placed in a locked cabinet were requested for assignment only after a patient was fully accepted into the study and given out by a researcher who had no contact with the patients.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	<b>Unclear, insufficient information.</b>	<b>Unclear risk</b>
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“If the blind assessor became aware of the subject's group assignment (ie, became unblinded), the assessor was to, without delay, leave the room and immediately report to the project coordinator/or another supervising clinical faculty member. Another blind assessor was then located to make the assessment.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	A total of 47 people was included, including 25 in group A and 22 in group	High risk

	B. In the end, 22 people in group A received the intervention, and 21 people in group B received the intervention. Finally, 13 people in group A and 18 people in group B were followed up.	
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Carsten M Mølgaard 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The randomisation was managed by an independent secretary not involved in assessment of participants, who generated a simple randomisation sequence a priori.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“Allocation was sealed in opaque and consecutively numbered envelopes held in a central location. Envelopes were opened in sequence by a person not involved in the study after recruitment and baseline testing of participants.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“The participants and the physiotherapists responsible for delivering the interventions were not blinded.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“Assessor-blinded. The physiotherapist, responsible for collecting outcome measures at follow-up was blinded to the randomisation.”	Low risk

<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Between-group comparison was analyzed on an intention-to-treat basis and included all individuals who responded to the self-report questionnaire at that time point.”	Low risk
Selective reporting	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Liliam B Priore 2019</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“Randomization codes were generated in blocks of 4 and 6 using a custom list at the website ( <a href="https://www.sealedenvelope.com/">https://www.sealedenvelope.com/</a> ).”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“Sealed opaque envelopes, sequentially numbered, were used to hide the allocation. ”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“As the participants were informed about the type of intervention they were receiving, the study was not considered double-blind.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“The assessments were performed by a third investigator who was blinded to group allocation.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Intention-to-treat analyses were used for all outcomes.”	Low risk

<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Trial Registration: ensaiosclinicos.gov.br/: RBR-2DY25R. Unclear. No protocol/analysis plan could be retrieved in trial registers	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Unclear, insufficient information.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Victor M Y Lun 2005</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“a random number generator with block design”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“a second research assistant used a random number generator with block design to assign subjects to 1 of 4 treatment groups”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“The investigators were blinded to the treatment group of each subject.”	Low risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Insufficient information: “The study coordinator then obtained background demographic data and measured subject. Baseline assessment of the study’s outcome measurements was then performed.” “These journals were submitted to the second research assistant on a monthly basis.”	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Reasons for missing outcome data unlikely to be related to true outcome:	Low risk

	<p>“Subjects who withdrew from the study were not followed (non–intention-to-treat analysis).”</p> <p>“Three hundred five subjects were initially screened for the study. Of these, 152 met the study inclusion criteria. Twenty-one subjects withdrew from the study because of a job transfer or lack of interest. Two subjects were crossed over to another treatment group before 3 months and considered to be withdrawals from the study.”</p> <p>“Therefore, a total of 129 subjects (76 females and 53 males with a total of 186 affected knees; mean age, 35; range, 18–60) were included in the final analysis (Fig. 1). A summary of the baseline characteristics of these 129 subjects, within their respective treatment group, is seen in Table 2. It can be seen that subjects in each treatment group were very similar with respect to age, height, weight, leg length difference, Q angle, affect side, and duration of symptoms.”</p>	
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Mastour S Alshaharani 2019</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	There is not enough information to determine whether a random sequence is at high or low risk.	Unclear risk

Allocation concealment	There is not enough information.	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	The generation of missing data is unlikely to be related to the true outcome. "One subject was excluded as they had a meniscus lesion that prohibited them from participating in the study, and another subject voluntarily left the study due to personal time constraints, therefore only data from the 41 remaining subjects who completed the prescribed intervention was analyzed."	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	No protocol/analysis plan could be retrieved in trial registers.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	There is insufficient information to assess whether there are other significant risks of bias.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Serdar Demirci 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	"a computer-generated randomization"	Low risk

Allocation concealment	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Eda Akbaş 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“Using a random number generator.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Insufficient information to determine low or high risk.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“Evaluations were performed by two experienced physiotherapists.”	Low risk

	Examiner 1 was blinded and positioned the patient. While taking the measurements, it was not possible for Examiner 2 to remain blinded. ... There are some limitations to this study. As in other researches in this area, the examiners were not blinded to the participants' group status. However, with the aim of reducing any bias this might cause, Examiner 1 was blinded. The subjects were measured without warm-up or pre-stretching, which may have affected flexibility. However, as this was standardized, any effect would be spread across all participants.”	
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Lucas Simões Arrebola 2019</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“A draw of opaque and sealed envelopes containing a group number.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The participants were randomized into three groups by a draw of opaque and sealed envelopes containing a group number.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“Design: Double-blind, randomized, controlled pilot study.”	Low risk

<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	<p>“all the evaluations were conducted with the participant wearing a long T-shirt, opaque gym pants, 3/4-length stockings or gaiters, and sneakers. The clothing was selected to cover the entire trunk and lower limb region, thereby making it impossible for the physiotherapist to see the participants KT® placement.”</p> <p>“The evaluations were performed by a physiotherapist blinded to the randomization.”</p>	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	<p>“During the treatment protocol, 21% of the sample dropped out after 6 weeks and 35% did not attend the final assessment at 12 weeks. Also, 63% did not attend the 12-weeks follow-up. We hypothesized that the high drop-out rate was related to the improvement of pain and function observed at 6 weeks. Also, these patients had a low socioeconomic condition and could not afford the transportation to the ambulatory clinic where the study took place, through the 12 weeks.”</p>	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	<p>“Other limitations to this pilot study include the fact that the first evaluation after baseline was performed late, the fact that a PROM and a quality of life evaluation were not performed, and the fact that only women were recruited. Perhaps the KT method® has a greater short-term effect on decreasing pain and improving function compared to the methods</p>	Unclear risk

	administered to the CG (Morris et al., 2013; Freedman et al., 2014) that were not detected on a late 6-week evaluation. In the full RCT, weekly NPRS at rest and during effort measurements will be performed to detect this short-term effect, and the PROM and the brief World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (WHOQOL-BREF) (The WHOQOL Group, 1998) will be added to the outcome measures. The reason for only including women is related to the higher incidence of PFPS in the female sex (Rothermich et al., 2015). ”	
--	---	--

<b>Study: Martin Whittingham 2004</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“3 labeled envelopes.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“A block randomization process was used, where subjects randomly chose 1 of 3 labeled envelopes to determine their group allocation. The next subject chose 1 of the remaining 2 envelopes and the third subject was then assigned to the remaining group before the process was repeated.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinging of participants and personnel	<p>“All subjects remained in the group to which they were originally assigned. All subjects were placed on restricted duties (similar for all individuals) throughout the treatment period.”</p> <p>Personnels were not blind:  “ A second physiotherapist (therapist 2), who was aware of group</p>	<p>Low risk</p> <p>High risk</p>

	allocation, applied adhesive tape to the affected knee of subjects in the taping group and placebo taping group.”	
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	<p>“Another physiotherapist (therapist 3), who was blinded to group allocation, took all outcome measures. Subjects wore tracksuit bottoms to hide the presence of tape during assessment.”</p> <p>“Outcome measures were visual analog scales for pain and the functional index questionnaire, recorded at weekly intervals by a therapist who was blinded to group allocation.”</p>	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	<p>“There was also a limited age range and the study sample had a majority of men. The external validity of the findings should, therefore, be considered within these limitations. Outcomes were taken over a 4-week period in the present investigation, so it is not possible to comment on the long-term success of treatment.”</p>	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Jehoon Lee 2014</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“A computer using a basic random number generator.”	Low risk

Allocation concealment	Insufficient information to determine low or high risk.	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Insufficient information to determine low or high risk.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Insufficient information to determine low or high risk.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Insufficient information to determine low or high risk.	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information to determine low or high risk.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information to determine low or high risk.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Marjon Mason 2011</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“a selected, sealed and prenumbered envelope”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The latter was blind to the treatment grouping of the subjects who were randomly allocated to one of four groups according to a selected, sealed and prenumbered envelope.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	“A prospective double-blind randomized control study was designed” “Two physiotherapists were involved in this study, namely a treating and	Low risk

	an assessing physiotherapist. The latter was blind to the treatment grouping of the subjects”	
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“All subjects were asked to wear long pants for the end of the first week assessment so that the assessing physiotherapist remained blinded towards the single modality treatment during that week.” “the assessor was blind to the subject groupings.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Jyrki A Kettunen 2007</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The randomization process was carried out using a computer-generated randomization list stratified by gender.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“Sealed, sequentially numbered envelopes containing information on the treatment group were prepared and given to the assisting nurse, who opened the envelopes in numerical order after recruitment so that concealment of allocation was successful in all cases.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		

Blinding of participants and personnel	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	The data collector was not blinded: “Outcome measures were collected using self-administered questionnaires. This data collection was organized by the study coordinator (JAK). As the coordinator did not have any presuppositions as to which of the groups would show better results and because he was not a treatment provider, the data collector was not, for practical reasons, blinded to the treatment groups.”	High risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“In addition, we carried out 'a worst-case scenario' analysis of the data. In this analysis, we assumed that the Kujala score would have been the same as the baseline score (no change), if follow-up data were not available.” “One patient in the arthroscopy group and three in the control group were lost to the follow-up.” Figure 1 illustrates the details of lost follow-up.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information	Unclear risk

<b>Study: M S Rathleff 2015</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>

<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“computer-generated sequence developed by the main investigator (MSR).”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The four schools were randomised either to patient education or patient education and exercise therapy using a computer-generated sequence developed by MSR. Cluster randomisation was chosen to minimise the contamination between individuals, which could occur if more than one adolescent in each class were diagnosed with PFP, but randomised to different treatment groups.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Participants were blinded: “Cluster randomisation was chosen to minimise the contamination between individuals, which could occur if more than one adolescent in each class were diagnosed with PFP, but randomised to different treatment groups.”	High risk
	Physiotherapists were blinded: “One physiotherapist delivered the patient education in the two clusters randomised to patient education alone.” “One of two physiotherapists delivered the exercise therapy and patient education in each cluster.”	Low risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“Self-report questionnaires were completed at baseline, 3, 6, 12 and 24 months after inclusion and collected by blinded project personnel.” “The first author and a statistician not involved in the study performed all analyses. They were not blinded to group allocation during the analyses.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Follow-up rate ranged from 73% to 91% with a 91% follow-up rate at the	Unclear risk

	primary endpoint at 12 months.” Appendix 2a illustrates the number of adolescents available for follow-up at each time-point at the four clusters. But the reason is not given for the loss of follow-up.	
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Lachlan Giles 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	The randomisation was performed by a person independent to the study in lots of 20 at a 1:1 ratio by drawing group allocation from a concealed box; the box was replenished before each lot had been used.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Assessments conducted by a physiotherapist blinded to treatment allocation.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Participants conducted by a physiotherapist blinded to treatment allocation. Participants were blinded to group allocation, and both groups were informed they were receiving BFR.	Low risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		

Incomplete outcome date	87%participants all of whom completed follow-up at 6 months. Of the non-completers. The last reported scores of the non-completers were carried forward.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	This randomised controlled trial was registered with the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry Trial Number 12614001164684	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Angel Yañez-Álvarez 2020</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	Those participants who met the inclusion criteria were randomly assigned by a member of the research team to the experimental or control group following simple randomization procedures using a random-number generator website <a href="http://www.randomization.com">http://www.randomization.com</a> , and considering a 1:1 ratio distribution of participants in the study groups”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Unknow	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Unknow	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	This study was a single-blind prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. A blind evaluator performed all measurements.	Low risk

<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	All patients who received the intervention were followed up	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04031248).	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Ebrahim Rasti 2020</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	Then an online randomization application (www.randomization.com) was used to randomly assign the patients to two group.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	For group concealment we used a sealed envelope.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Patients were aware of the existence of two different groups, but did not know whether they had been assigned to the treatment or control group.	Low risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	The outcome assessor was unaware of the group allocation of the participants.	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	All patients who received the intervention were analyzed.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	this research was registered in the Iranian Registry of Clinical Trials	Unclear

	(IRCT20090831002391N39).	
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Mustafa Corum 2018</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	Patients were randomly assigned equally to a WBV plus home exercise (intervention) group or a home exercise only (control) group using a computer-generated programme.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
	“informed the non-blinded administering physician (C. Basoglu) about the allocation of the study patients to the WBV or control groups.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	All assessments and data collection were performed by a single assessor (M. Corum) who was blind to the groups.	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	The final study sample consisted of 34 patients (n=18 in the WBV and n=16 in the control groups). 6 patients were excluded from the final analysis due to attendance failure. An intention-to-treat analysis was not performed because the dropout patients were not included in the statistical	Low risk

	analysis.	
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: F Revelles Moyano 2012</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	The randomization sequence was drawn up and kept off-site by an independent body, using a random number generator in blocks of eight with no stratification.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	To ensure concealment of allocation, eligibility was determined by a blinded assessor not involved in the randomization process.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“To ensure concealment of allocation, eligibility was determined by a blinded assessor not involved in the randomization process”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	a total of 74 patients were enrolled in the study and 2 patients lost to follow up. Lost to follow-up (N=2) , No specific reason	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		

Selective reporting	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Nayra Deise Dos Anjos Rabelo 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	The randomization codes were generated using the RAND function of Excel.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Patients were randomized to the two groups using opaque, sealed, sequentially numbered envelopes.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	<p>“Participants were informed that they would receive one of two different forms of treatment but were unaware of the exercises performed by the other group.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the interventions, it was not possible to blind the physiotherapists who carried out the interventions.” One of the two therapists, who carried out the treatment, opened the envelopes with the random codes on the first day of treatment.</p>	<p>Low risk</p> <p>High risk</p>
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Statistical analysis was conducted on an intention-to-treat basis. Patients	Low risk

	were treated and assessed after the 4 weeks of intervention (0% loss to post-intervention). All patients from both groups completed the 12 sessions without adverse effects.	
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01804608).	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Alireza Motealleh 2019</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The participants then were assigned randomly to the intervention or the control group with a block randomization method (14 blocks, 2 block sizes), using a random number generator in randomization software.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	The results of group allocation were concealed via drawing from a sealed opaque envelope.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	The participants in each group were not aware of the treatment plan of the other group.	Low risk
	Insufficient information about personnel.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	The physiotherapist who measured the outcome measures was blinded to the patient's allocation group.	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		

Incomplete outcome date	A total of 28 women participated in this study. All patients who received the intervention were analyzed.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	This study was registered in the Iranian Registry of Clinical Trials (IRCT2014021315932N2).	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Benjamin T Drew 2017</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	Randomisation The random allocation sequence was made according to the output from a random number generator.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	The random allocation sequence was concealed within pre-sealed, opaque envelopes.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Insufficient information	Unclear risk
	Intervention blinding is not possible for a physiotherapeutic intervention of this nature.	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“The outcome assessor was unblinded, however, patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) were completed in a separate room with no input from the assessor. The biomechanical outcomes were acquired in accordance to a	Low risk

	strict study protocol to minimise variation and bias. Furthermore, the biomechanical outputs are automated so the lack of blinding is less of an issue.”	
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	<p>“At post-treatment follow up, two participants did not complete the study, an attrition rate of 8%. In the MT group, one participant did not attend their second treatment session and was then lost to contact. In the UC group, one participant was unable to complete the post-treatment analysis due to work commitments.”</p> <p>Conversion to consent (100%), missing data (0%), attrition rate (8%) and adherence to both treatment and appointments (&gt;90%) were deemed successful endpoints.</p>	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	This study was registered retrospectively. ISRCTN74560952.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: G Syme 2008</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	One independent physiotherapist carried out the individual randomisation procedure out of view of the researcher.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Block randomisation (in blocks of three) was employed through assigning numbers to permutations of the ABC sequence with each letter representing	Low risk

	an arm of the study (Altman and Bland, 1999). These sequence blocks were placed in opaque sealed envelopes and randomly shuffled.	
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of participants was not possible owing to the nature of the study. Insufficient information	High risk Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	The researcher (blind assessor) was not involved in the management of the study participants until their involvement in the study had been completed.	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“69 patients were randomised into three groups (Selective n = 23, General n =23 and Control n =23).Two (withdrew owing to work Commitments ) from the Selective group, one (withdrew no further contact with department ) from the General group and three from the Control group failed to complete the study for various reasons (1 withdrew no further contact with department; 1 withdrew owing to pregnancy; 1 withdrawn owing to undisclosed insurance claim) ”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Farzin Halabchi 2015</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>

<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	Patients were allocated to the intervention or control group using the balanced block randomization with random block sizes of 4, 6, and 8. The sequence was generated by a data collector using opaque envelopes and the other researcher, who was not aware of this sequence.	Low risk
Allocation concealment	the other researcher, who was not aware of this sequence, enrolled the participants and assigned them to intervention or control groups.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“During the 12-week period, 7 participants lost to follow-up (3 in the control and 4 in the intervention groups) and 53 patients completed the trial.”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Study protocol was registered in the Iranian Trial Registry ( <a href="http://www.irct.ir">http://www.irct.ir</a> , trial No. 201010305050N1).	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: R van Linschoten 2009</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		

Random sequence generation	“The randomisation was done by an independent researcher who used a computer-generated list in which patients were stratified by age (14-17 years or 18 years and older) and by recruiting physician (GP or sport physician)”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“...patients were randomly allocated to the intervention (exercise therapy) or the control (usual care). The randomisation was done by an independent researcher who used a computer-generated list...”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	Patients could not be blinded. “...patients in the intervention group cannot be blinded for the exercise therapy and, therefore, may be biased for positive outcome (placebo effect)”	High risk
Blinding of personnel	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“...a blinded external observer could be used to provide objective and observational measures of functional outcomes.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Outcomes at 3 and 12 months were missing for some patients, but available data from other time points were included in the analyses. This approach meant that the number of patients was not always equal for the different outcome measures.” For continuous outcome data, plausible effect size (difference in means or standardized difference in means) among missing outcomes enough to induce clinically relevant bias in observed effect size.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		

Selective reporting	Trial registration ISRCTN83938749. Secondary outcome measures, as cost-utility (economical evaluation), was not reported. ISRCTN - ISRCTN83938749: Exercise therapy for patello-femoral pain syndrome (PFPS): a randomised clinical trial in general practice and sports medicine	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	"...the use of an exercise diary in the intervention group to assess compliance may have caused a bias owing to awareness of being involved in a study (Hawthorne effect)"	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Erik Witvrouw 2004</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	"60 PFPS patients...were randomized (by opening a sealed and numbered envelope) into a 5-week conservative rehabilitation protocol."	Low risk
Allocation concealment	"...by opening a sealed and numbered envelope"	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
Blinding of personnel	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	"In this study, all tests at all evaluation periods were performed by the same examiners, who were blinded to the study and familiar with the different tests."	Low risk

<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	The number of missing data was similar in all intervention groups, and the causes of missing data were similar in each group. “Fifty-one of these 60 patients (85%) attended the 5-year follow-up evaluation. Two (1 from each treatment group) of these 51 patients underwent surgical intervention (1 patellar release and 1 shaving of the patellar surface). Therefore, the results of these patients were not used in the statistical analysis of this follow-up study. Of the 9 patients who were not evaluated at the 5-year follow-up, 2 were injured (1 had a fracture of the tibia, and 1 had an ear operation) at the time of the evaluation and were unable to attend the evaluation, 1 had died in a car accident, 3 had moved (1 to the United States, 2 to France), and 3 could not be traced. Twenty-five of 49 included patients (16 women and 9 men) who were initially treated by a CKC exercise program, whereas 24 (16 women and 8 men) followed the OKC exercise protocol. The mean age of the patients was 24.8 years (range, 19-36 years).”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Alexandra Hott 2020</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>

<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The randomization sequence was computer-generated, stratified by sex and consisted of blocks of a variable size, unknown to any of the research team.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The sequence was concealed in opaque envelopes and stored by an independent nurse, who delivered them sequentially to the study physiotherapist at randomization.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	“It was not possible to blind the patients or physiotherapists who provided the interventions.”	High risk
Blinding of personnel	“The physiotherapists providing the interventions were blinded to baseline measures...It was not possible to blind the patients or physiotherapists who provided the interventions.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“All outcome measures were collected by blinded observers.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“There were generally few missing data (<5% for all patient-reported outcomes), with the exception of muscle strength testing at 12 months, which 14 patients (Hip, n=6; knee, n=3; control, n=5) were unable to attend and thus only submitted patient-reported outcomes. Missing data analysis found no systematic differences between those attending muscle strength testing compared to those who did not. Thus, no imputation was performed.”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	“All outcome measures are explained in detail in the published	Unclear risk

	protocol.” “...registered with the ClinicalTrials.gov database (reference number: NCT02114294)”	
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Marcelo Camargo Saad 2018</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The randomization schedule was generated using R 2.7.2 statistical software.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The allocation was concealed by the use of consecutively numbered, sealed and opaque envelopes.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
Blinding of personnel	“Only LVOM, MSBM and RFL (authors) were blinded to the group allocation, because MCS (author) provided all treatments to the groups.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“All kinematic assessments were performed by RFL (author)... LVOM, MSBM and RFL (authors) were blinded to the group allocation... LVOM and MSBM were also responsible for the administration of the questionnaires, intensity of pain assessment and muscle strength assessment tests.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		

Incomplete outcome data	The generation of missing data is unlikely to be related to the true outcome. “lost at end of intervention, n=1”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	This study was approved by Brazilian Clinical Trials Registry registration number: RBR-6tc7mj ( <a href="http://www.ensaiosclinicos.gov.br/rg/RBR-6tc7mj/">http://www.ensaiosclinicos.gov.br/rg/RBR-6tc7mj/</a> ).	Low risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	“...participants’ baseline characteristics seemed to be different, especially for pain, probably as a consequence of low number of participants.”	High risk

<b>Study: Alexandra Hott 2019</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The randomization sequence was computer generated with blocks of a variable size, stratified by sex, and unknown to anyone in the research team. ”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The sequence was concealed in opaque envelopes, stored by a nurse not otherwise involved in the study, and delivered sequentially to the study physiotherapist at randomization.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	“Although blinding of the participants to group allocation was not possible, expectations of the effects of the different interventions were investigated at inclusion and were not significantly different among groups.”	Low risk

Blinding of personnel	“Physiotherapists providing the interventions were blinded to baseline measures.” “It was not possible to blind the participants or the physiotherapists who provided the interventions.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“Members of the research team who handled outcome measures were blinded to treatment allocation.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“Missing values in the AKPS, Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, Knee Self-efficacy Scale, and Hopkins Symptom Checklist were treated as follows: If < 25% of items were missing, the values were substituted with the arithmetic mean of values from the available items. If ≥25% of items were missing, the outcome was regarded as missing for the patient.” “The trial was adequately powered, with good compliance and a low rate of dropout (7%) and missing data.”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	“NCT02114294 (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier).” Secondary outcome measures are incomplete.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	“The standardization of written and oral communication with all patients regardless of group allocation, including presentation of the control group as an active treatment group, also likely reduced bias.” “Data analysis and the first draft of the manuscript were performed blinded to group allocation to avoid bias at this stage of the study.”	Low risk

<b>Study: Reed Ferber 2014</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The randomization sequence was developed and kept at the University of Calgary (Alberta, Canada) by the research coordinator, using a random number generator, and the same sequence of randomization was used at each site.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Insufficient information to permit judgement of ‘Low risk’ or ‘High risk’. “Next, the patients with PFP were randomly assigned to receive 1 of 2 treatment protocols (HIP or KNEE).”	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
Blinding of personnel	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“Only the athletic trainer (AT) at each site communicated with the research coordinator to ensure that the investigators, who were responsible for outcomes measurement and data analysis, remained blinded to group allocation.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	The rate of lost follow-up is high. “At the post rehabilitation follow-up, we collected outcomes and clinical data from 146 of the 199 patients (73.4%) with PFP.”	High risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		

Selective reporting	Insufficient information to permit judgement of 'Low risk' or 'High risk'.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient rationale or evidence that an identified problem will introduce bias.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Kimberly L Dolak 2011</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	"...group allocation for each participant was made with a random-number generator in Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redwood, WA)."	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Insufficient information to permit judgement of 'Low risk' or 'High risk'. "Prior to initiation of the study, group allocation for each participant was made with a random-number generator in Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redwood, WA)...participants were randomly assigned to a hip strengthening program (hip group) or a quadriceps-strengthening program (quad group) for 4 weeks."	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
Blinding of personnel	"The researcher responsible for setup and testing was blinded to participants' group assignment during the initial testing session." "Testers were not blinded to participants' group assignment after	High risk

	baseline testing, mostly due to the large number of patient exercise sessions supervised.”	
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“The researcher responsible for setup and testing was blinded to participants’ group assignment during the initial testing session.” “Blinding of the investigators after initial testing was a further limitation of the study.”	High risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	No missing data processing instructions. “Three women did not complete this phase. Two removed themselves from the study due to time constraints and 1 withdrew because of injuries sustained during an unrelated motor vehicle accident.” “Three women did not complete this phase. Two removed themselves for unknown reasons and 1 was withdrawn by investigators for increased pain.” “One woman (hip group) did not complete this phase due to time constraints.”	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT00445224.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient rationale or evidence that an identified problem will introduce bias.	Unclear risk

**Study: Mehtap Şahin 2016**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“At the beginning of the program, a nurse prepared 56 small pieces of opaque paper numbered as 1 or 2, which were folded with the treatment on the inside, and patients picked these small papers from the box.”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“Group allocation was hidden from observers using empty patient files prepared by a nurse. The success of masking was checked by asking verbal questions about group allocation.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	“Patients were not blind to the treatment group because of the nature of the exercise programs.”	High risk
Blinding of personnel	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	No missing data processing instructions. “Losses (N3): 2, 1: transport problems, 1: surgery; Losses (N3) : 3, 1: transport problems, 2: trauma”	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	This was not described in the study.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient rationale or evidence that an identified problem will introduce bias.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2012</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“The assignment of subjects to the 2 groups was performed randomly using opaque, sealed envelopes, each containing the name of one of the groups (KE or KHE).”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“The assignment of subjects to the 2 groups was performed randomly using opaque, sealed envelopes, each containing the name of one of the groups (KE or KHE). The envelopes were picked by an individual not involved in the study.”	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	Insufficient information to permit judgement of ‘Low risk’ or ‘High risk’.	Unclear risk
Blinding of personnel	Insufficient information to permit judgement of ‘Low risk’ or ‘High risk’.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“The examiner was blind to the group assignment of the patients and did not participate in the intervention.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“An intention-to-treat analysis was performed using the last value-carried-forward method to impute values for all missing data.”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information to permit judgement of ‘Low risk’ or	Unclear risk

	'High risk'.	
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information to assess whether an important risk of bias exists.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Thiago Yukio Fukuda 2011</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	"The assignment of patients in the 3 groups was performed randomly using opaque and sealed envelopes containing the names of the groups: CO, KE, and KHE."	Low risk
Allocation concealment	"The assignment of patients in the 3 groups was performed randomly using opaque and sealed envelopes containing the names of the groups: CO, KE, and KHE. The envelopes were picked by an individual not involved in this study."	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	Insufficient information to permit judgement of 'Low risk' or 'High risk'.	Unclear risk
Blinding of personnel	Insufficient information to permit judgement of 'Low risk' or 'High risk'.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	"This examiner was blind to the group assignment of the patients and did not participate in the intervention."	Low risk

<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“We performed an intention-to-treat analysis, 24 and the results were consistent with the per-protocol analysis as presented above. This parallel method was based on the imputation of the group mean to each missing value for each of the 3 groups (CO, KE, and KHE).”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information to permit judgement of ‘Low risk’ or ‘High risk’.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information to assess whether an important risk of bias exists.	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Theresa Helissa Nakagawa 2008</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors’ judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	“...14 preprinted cards in opaque sealed envelopes from a box (seven labelled ‘intervention group’ and seven labelled ‘control group’) ...”	Low risk
Allocation concealment	“After baseline assessment, participants blindly drew one of 14 preprinted cards in opaque sealed envelopes from a box (seven labelled ‘intervention group’ and seven labelled ‘control group’) and were placed in the intervention or control group in accordance with the card drawn.”	Low risk

<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants	“Participants were blind to treatment allocation; both groups received therapeutic exercises as intervention in individual sessions.”	Low risk
Blinding of personnel	“The principal investigator remained blind to treatment allocation until all baseline assessment had been completed. After this point, blinding of the principal investigator was not feasible.”	High risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	“...two blind assessors conducted the assessments to minimize any communication between the participant and the researcher that might interfere with the results.”	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	“All the participants completed the rehabilitation protocol and assessment sessions.”	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	Insufficient information to permit judgement of ‘Low risk’ or ‘High risk’.	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	Insufficient information to assess whether an important risk of bias exists. “It cannot be ignored that a larger sample size could have altered some of the results of the study; and therefore further research is required before definite conclusions can be drawn.”	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Khayambashi, Khalil 2012</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	28 participants were sequentially assigned in an alternating fashion to the exercise or control group	High risk
Allocation concealment	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	Participants were aware of an alternative treatment group in the study but had no knowledge of intervention details.	Unclear risk
	Insufficient information to judge.	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	the investigator who was responsible for obtaining the functional outcome and strength measures was not blinded to the participants group assignment. While this lack of blinding would have had no influence on the self-reported outcomes, potential bias must be acknowledged regarding the strength testing.	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	No patients dropped out of the study.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

**Study: Song, Chen-Yi 2009**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	A single physical therapist, unaware of the purpose of the study, was responsible for randomization and interventions. Stratified allocation was carried out with regard to the number of affected sides (unilateral or bilateral) and symptom severity (Lysholm scale scores $\geq 65$ or $< 65$ ).	Low risk
Allocation concealment	chosen through numbered opaque envelopes	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Two assessment sessions were performed by another physical therapist (blinded to each patient's grouping) before and after the 8-week intervention.	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	Ten participants later dropped out of the study due to personal factors (not knee pain) or work. LPHA Group: dropped out 2; LP Group: dropped out 3; Control Group: dropped out 5. Data were subjected to an intention-to-treat analysis and included all dropouts. Unclear is whether the missing data were estimated using appropriate methods.	Unclear risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study:</b> Emamvirdi, Mahsa 2019		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	a computer-generated table of random numbers	Low risk
Allocation concealment	Randomization was performed in blocks of 4. Consecutively numbered, opaque envelopes were randomly assigned by a computer-generated table of random numbers.	Low risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	An individual blinded to patient data performed the randomization and provided the group assignment to a physical therapist. To ensure that participants were unaware of the exercises performed by the other group, the groups were given program instructions separately.	Low risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	No	High risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	The VCI and control groups had a participation rate of 100% during the study period.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

<b>Study: Bolgla, Lori A 2016</b>		
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>	<b>Review authors' judgement</b>
<b>Selection bias</b>		
Random sequence generation	A random number generator was used to assign subjects to either the hip/core or knee program	Low risk
Allocation concealment	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Performance bias</b>		
Blinding of participants and personnel	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Detection bias</b>		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Subjects were randomly assigned to exercise group and examiners were blinded to subject group assignment.	Low risk
<b>Attrition bias</b>		
Incomplete outcome data	An intention-to-treat analysis, using a conservative method where missing data were replaced with the last score carried forward, was used.	Low risk
<b>Reporting bias</b>		
Selective reporting	unknown	Unclear risk
<b>Other bias</b>		
Other sources of bias	unknown	Unclear risk

## **Web Appendix7. GRADE assessment for primary outcomes**

The five GRADE criteria below that are deemed most significant for down rating the quality in NMAs by rating -1 (serious concern) or -2 (very serious concern) for the following reasons:

1. Risk of Bias criteria: Downgraded when comparisons failed to conceal 'random allocation' or 'blinding of outcome assessors' within RoB assessment for the eligible trials.
2. Inconsistency (or heterogeneity): For heterogeneity, we looked at the common tau and compared to the expected value as reported in the literature (Turner RM et al (2012) Int J Epidemiol, 41, 818-827: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3396310/>) which was reported as 75% (95% CI: 58-95%).  
For inconsistency, we looked at the results of the node-splitting analysis and we downgraded the comparisons with important inconsistency ( $p < 0.10$ ).
3. Indirectness (PICO and applicability): we downgraded single connected nodes for indirectness because evaluation of transitivity for such nodes is unclear.
4. Imprecision: Using Cohen's probably of benefit we chose the comparison that reported a wide 95% confidence interval and include or are close to null effect, otherwise they were not necessary for downgrading.
5. Publication bias: The comparison-adjusted funnel plots did not suggest presence of overall publication bias. We are confident that we have all available information that is possible to capture from the bibliographic databases. However, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that some studies are still missing. Due to this we decide to downgrade all studies for potential publication bias by one level.

Comparison	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Quality of evidence
Pain intensity measured with VAS						
Nontreatment VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Nontreatment VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Hip Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Nontreatment VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Nontreatment VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Target Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Nontreatment VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Nontreatment VS Manipulation Treatment +Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Education + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Motor Control Training	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS General Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Nontreatment VS Kinetic Chain Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Feedback Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Manipulation Treatment + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Education + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Feedback Exercise VS Motor Control Training	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS General Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Feedback Exercise VS Kinetic Chain Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Manipulation Treatment +Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Education + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS Motor Control Training	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Kinetic Chain Exercise VS General Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
General Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate

General Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Target Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Manipulation Treatment +Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Education + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Motor Control Training	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate

Motor Control Training VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Motor Control Training VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Manipulation Treatment +Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Motor Control Training VS Education + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Education + Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Education + Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education + Exercise VS Manipulation Treatment +Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment +Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment +Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment +Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment +Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment +Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment +Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Manipulation Treatment VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Manipulation Treatment VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Target Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Keen Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Keen Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Keen Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Keen Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Keen Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Keen Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Keen Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Keen Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Keen Exercise VS Gait Retraining Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Gait Retraining Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Gait Retraining Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Gait Retraining Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Gait Retraining Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Gait Retraining Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Gait Retraining Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Gait Retraining Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Supervised Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Supervised Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Supervised Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Supervised Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Supervised Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Supervised Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Brace + Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Brace + Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Brace + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Knee Brace + Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Brace + Exercise VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Foot Orthoses + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Foot Orthoses + Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Foot Orthoses + Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Foot Orthoses + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Knee function measure with AKPS

Nontreatment VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Moderate
Nontreatment VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Target Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Moderate
Nontreatment VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Education	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Nontreatment VS General Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Moderate

Nontreatment VS Knee Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Moderate
Nontreatment VS Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Education	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Hip Exercise VS General Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Hip Exercise VS Knee Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Knee Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Education	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Knee Exercise VS General Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
General Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
General Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Target Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
General Exercise VS Education	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
General Exercise VS Whole Body Vibration Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Whole Body Vibration Exercise VS Education	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Very serious	No	No	Yes	?	Modorate
Education VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Education VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Education VS KinesioTaping + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
KinesioTaping + Exercise VS Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise VS Blood Flow Restriction	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Supervised Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Feedback Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Blood Flow Restriction Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Feedback Exercise VS Target Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Target Exercise VS Knee Brace + Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low
Knee Brace + Exercise VS Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise	Serious	No	No serious indirectness	Yes	?	Low

Abbreviations: GRADE = Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation


a

Populations, treatments and outcomes measures followed those used in clinical practice, hence there was no indication of indirectness in the evidence.

## Web appendix8 Data analyses, treatment level results


Figure1 Ranking of treatment strategies

Figure1A Primary outcome, VAS



Ranking of treatment strategies based on probability of their protective effects on outcome of VAS according to the cumulative ranking area (SUCRA). Larger probability, stronger protective effects

Figure1B Secondary outcomes, AKPS



Ranking of treatment strategies based on probability of their protective effects on outcome of VAS according to the cumulative ranking area (SUCRA). Larger probability, stronger protective effects.

GE=General Exercise; GRE=Gait Retraining Exercise; E+E=Education + Exercise; FO+E=Foot Orthoses + Exercise; FE=Feedback Exercise; MT+E=Manipulation Treatment +Exercise; KE=Keen Exercise; KB+E=Knee Brace + Exercise; KT+E=KinesioTaping + Exercise; NT=Nontreatment; KA+E=Knee Arthroscopy + Exercise; E=Education; BFRE=Blood Flow Restriction Exercise; WBVE=Whole Body Vibration Exercise; PNF+E=Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation + Exercise; MCT=Motor Control Training; TE=Target Exercise; SE=Supervised Exercise; KCE= Kinetic Chain Exercise; HE=Hip Exercise; KE+HE=Knee Exercise + Hip Exercise

## Web appendix9. A recommended exercise prescription

	Recommended exercise therapy	
Risk factor	Treatment	
Muscle weakness	<p>❖Hip-Focused Exercises</p> <p>The hip-focused exercises were based on previous studies and consisted of side-lying hip abduction, hip external rotation (clam shell), and prone hip extension. These exercises were intended to maximally isolate the hip abductors, extensors, and external rotators.</p> <p>❖Knee-Focused Exercises</p> <p>The knee-focused exercise regimens were based on previous studies and were intended to maximally isolate the quadriceps muscles. The exercises consisted of straight-leg raises in the supine position, supine terminal knee extensions (from 10 of flexion to full extension), and a mini-squat (45 of flexion) with the back supported against the wall (to reduce stabilizing requirements from the hip muscles).</p>	
PFJ alignment	Individual evaluation	❖Foot orthoses
		❖Kinesiotaping
		❖Knee brace
Lack of self-management	<p>❖Education</p> <p>It covered: pain management; how to modify physical activity using pacing and load management strategies; information on optimal knee alignment during daily tasks; and responses to questions from the adolescent or the parents.</p>	
Tips	<p>❖Guiding principles</p> <p>●Dosage is chosen in which the last repetitions are challenging but</p>	

	<p>the quality of movement is maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Dosage is individually adjusted once per week by the physiotherapist.</li></ul> <p>❖ Progression (all exercises):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The number of repetitions is increased from 3 sets of 10 repetitions to a maximum of 3 sets of 20 repetitions.</li><li>● Thereafter resistance is increased using a weight cuff or resistance tubing (see individual exercise).<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Weight cuffs are available in 0.5 kg increments.</li><li>○ Resistance tubing is selected from 3 possible variants. In order of increasing resistance: red (medium), green (heavy), black (special heavy)</li></ul></li></ul> <p>❖ Other details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Repetitions performed dynamically over 2-3 seconds</li><li>● 2-second pause between repetitions.</li><li>● 30-second pause between sets.</li><li>● Minimum one rest day between sessions</li></ul>
<p>The need for an individual exercise therapy approach to PFP treatment. Clinicians can devise an individual prescription. Personalized exercise prescriptions should be further studied by clinicians or therapists in the future.</p>	