

Forgotten Joint Score-12 (FJS-12)

Measures self-efficacy & lower extremity function

Phases

Post-acute
Active living



Activity



5 mins to complete
and score



Print



Quality



Validity

Convergent: TJA: Strong correlation with Oxford Hip Score ($r=0.79$), Oxford Knee Score ($r=0.85$), WOMAC ($r=0.7$) & KOOS Subscales: Quality of Life ($r=0.63$); Symptom ($r=0.33$); Pain ($r=0.68$); and ADL ($r=0.66$).⁵⁻⁷
THA: Strong correlation between FJS-12 and HOOS-JR at 1-yr follow-up ($r=0.74$)⁸



Reliability

Internal Consistency: TJA: Excellent (Cronbach alpha >0.9).⁴⁻⁶
Test-retest: TJA: Good to excellent (ICC ≥ 0.8).^{2,6,7}



Responsiveness

TJA: Small ES 6-12-mos post-TKA ($d=0.12$) & post-THA ($d=0.17-0.21$).⁵
TKA: Large ES and SRM 6-12-mos post-op ($d=0.99$, SRM=0.99) and medium ES and SRM 1-yr to 2-yr post-op ($d=0.5$, SRM=0.30).⁹



Floor/ceiling effects

THA/TKA: Low ceiling effect at 6 & 12-mos post-op^{5,10} but present at 2-yr post-op.¹¹ High floor effect in the first yr after TKA^{6,12}



Feasibility

Freely available for clinical use but requires registration to access. Quick and easy to complete and score.



Instructions

Ask the patient to rate their awareness of their artificial joint for 12 activities on a 0 (never) to 4 (mostly) scale.¹³ Recall period: unspecified but implied "today". See 'Relevant Links' for detailed instructions.

Scoring: Responses are summed & divided by number of completed items. Mean value then multiplied by 25 to obtain total score (0 to 100) & converted.⁴



Interpretation

Direction: Higher scores = better, less awareness of new joint

MDC₉₀: 6-mos post-op, THA=8 points¹³ & TKA=12 points¹⁴

MICID: THA=8.1 points (satisfaction-based anchor method), MIC=17.7 points for group & 18 points for an individual at 6-mos post-op¹³
TKA = 13.7 at 6-mos post-op¹⁴

MID: TKA: 10.8-13 points¹⁵

Cut points/Thresholds: THA: Thresholds for success at 1 & 2-yrs post-op=74 and 69.8 points respectively.¹¹

PASS: THA: At 3-mos (59 points)¹⁶ 1-yr (67-68 points)^{8,16} & 2-yrs (69 points) post-op¹⁶; TKA: 22 points at 6-mos post-op.¹⁴ At 1-yr post-op, PASS for satisfied patients with mild or no knee difficulties = 40 points (95% CI 31-47) & 76 points (95% CI 39–80) respectively.¹⁷

Normative/Reference values: Normative values available for US males & females aged ≥18 yrs¹⁸



Other

Key messages: Short tool that captures the best possible outcome from a THA or TKA - to 'forget' you have ever had it performed. Most appropriate for use 6+ mos post-op. Need to contact authors to request a copy (free for academic studies).

Translations: Available in 28+ languages¹⁹



Relevant Links

[Questionnaire & scoring manual \(BGGK GmbH\)](#)



References

- Longo UG, De Salvatore S, et al. Total hip arthroplasty: Minimal clinically important difference and patient acceptable symptom state for the Forgotten Joint Score 12. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(5):2267. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7956707/>
- Thienpont E, Vanden Berghe A, et al. Joint awareness in osteoarthritis of the hip and knee evaluated with the 'Forgotten Joint' Score before and after joint replacement. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2016;24(10):3346-51. PMID: [26740088](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26740088/)
- Eichler D, Beaulieu Y, et al. Perception of a natural joint after total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2020;35(2):358-63. PMID: [31629623](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31629623/)
- Behrend H, Giesinger K, et al. The "forgotten joint" as the ultimate goal in joint arthroplasty: validation of a new patient-reported outcome measure. *J Arthroplasty*. 2012;27(3):430-6.e1. PMID: [22000572](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22000572/)
- Hamilton DF, Loth FL, et al. Validation of the English language Forgotten Joint Score-12 as an outcome measure for total hip and knee arthroplasty in a British population. *Bone Joint J*. 2017;99-B(2):218-24. <https://boneandjoint.org.uk/article/10.1302/0301-620X.99B2.BJJ-2016-0606.R1>
- Adriani M, Malahias MA, et al. Determining the validity, reliability, and utility of the Forgotten Joint Score: A systematic review. *J Arthroplasty*. 2020;35(4):1137-44. PMID: [31806559](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31806559/)
- Thompson SM, Salmon LJ, et al. Construct validity and test re-test reliability of the Forgotten Joint Score. *J Arthroplasty*. 2015;30(11):1902-5. PMID: [26027525](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26027525/)
- Singh V, Bieganowski T, et al. The Forgotten Joint Score patient-acceptable symptom state following primary total hip arthroplasty. *Bone Jt Open*. 2022;3(4):307-13. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9044089/>
- Giesinger K, Hamilton DF, et al. Comparative responsiveness of outcome measures for total knee arthroplasty. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2014;22(2):184-9. [https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1063-4584\(13\)01006-6](https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1063-4584(13)01006-6)
- Hamilton DF, Giesinger JM, et al. Responsiveness and ceiling effects of the Forgotten Joint Score-12 following total hip arthroplasty. *Bone Joint Res*. 2016 ;5(3):87-91. <https://boneandjoint.org.uk/article/10.1302/2046-3758.53.2000480>
- Rosinsky PJ, Chen JW, et al. Can we help patients forget their joint? Determining a threshold for successful outcome for the Forgotten Joint Score. *J Arthroplasty*. 2020;35(1):153-9. PMID: [31506184](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31506184/)
- Lee QJ, Chang WYE, et al. Forgotten Joint Score for early outcome assessment after total knee arthroplasty: Is it really useful? *Knee Surg Relat Res*. 2020;29;32(1):37. <https://kneesurgrelatres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s43019-020-00049-0>
- Robinson PG, MacDonald DJ, et al. Changes and thresholds in the Forgotten Joint Score after total hip arthroplasty: minimal clinically important difference, minimal important and detectable changes, and patient-acceptable symptom state. *Bone Joint J*. 2021;103-B(12):1759-65. PMID: [34847716](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34847716/)
- Clement ND, Scott CEH, et al. Meaningful values in the Forgotten Joint Score after total knee arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J*. 2021;103-B(5):846-54. PMID: [33934639](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33934639/)
- Holtz N, Hamilton DF, et al. Minimal important differences for the WOMAC Osteoarthritis Index and the Forgotten Joint Score-12 in total knee arthroplasty patients. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2020;21(1):401. <https://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12891-020-03415-x>
- Galea VP, Ingelsrud LH, et al. Patient-acceptable symptom state for the Oxford Hip Score and Forgotten Joint Score at 3 months, 1 year, and 2 years following total hip arthroplasty: a registry-based study of 597 cases. *Acta Orthop*. 2020;91(4):372-7. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8023959/>
- Heijbel S, Dahl, AW, et al. Substantial clinical benefit and patient acceptable symptom states of the Forgotten Joint Score 12 after primary knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthopaedica*. 2022;93:158–63. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1634497/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Giesinger JM, Behrend H, et al. Normative values for the Forgotten Joint Score-12 for the US general population. *J Arthroplasty*. 2019;34(4):650-5. PMID: [30612834](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30612834/)
- Behrend H, Giesinger JM, et al. The Forgotten Joint Score. BGGK GmbH. 2023. Accessed December 7 2023. <http://www.forgotten-joint-score.info/contact/>

