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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this doctoral dissertation was to explore the role of frontal plane knee control as a risk factor for lower extremity injury among young team-ball-sport athletes. In addition, the goal was to investigate whether the single-leg squat test, analysed using a two-dimensional video analysis method, can be used to screen for athletes with an elevated risk of future lower extremity injury. Furthermore, another objective was to explore whether age, sex, and side-to-side differences exist in frontal plane knee control.

The first step in this process was to investigate the extent of physical activity-related injuries in an adolescent population in Finland (Study I). The results demonstrated that this is a major public health issue, with every third adolescent becoming injured at least once during a one-year period. The problem was most prevalent in the sports club setting, followed by leisure time physical activity and school sports.

Visual assessment of the single-leg squat performance is used as a clinical tool to assess frontal plane knee control. In Study II, the intra-rater and inter-rater reliability of the visual assessment were explored, as well as the agreement between the visual assessment and the two-dimensional video analysis of the single-leg squat performance. The intra-rater reliability improved during the three-year study period. The inter-rater reliability between a novice and an experienced observer was poor to fair. The findings indicate that the visual assessment on a 3-point graded scale can be used to detect differences in frontal plane knee control; however, the expertise of the person performing the visual assessment is crucial for reliability.

Frontal plane knee control as a risk factor was investigated among a cohort of young (mean age 15.7 years) basketball and floorball players (Study III) and 10- to 14-year-old football players (Study IV). Frontal plane knee control was described by the frontal plane knee projection angle (FKPMA) measured based on the single-leg squat performance using the two-dimensional video analysis method. Among the basketball and floorball players, athletes with poor frontal plane knee control were 2.7-times more likely to sustain acute lower extremity injury and 2.4-times more likely to sustain acute ankle injury compared to athletes with intermediate
knee control. Among the young football players, knee control was not associated with the risk of lower extremity injuries.

The potential of the single-leg squat performance, described by FPKPA, to be used as a screening tool to identify athletes with an elevated risk of lower extremity injuries was investigated in Study III. The poor combined sensitivity and specificity indicate that the FPKPA is not a suitable tool to screen for athletes at high risk.

The effects of sex, age, and leg dominance were investigated in Studies III and IV. There were no significant differences in the mean FPKPA between sexes when analysing the entire cohorts. Among floorball and basketball players, there were significant sex differences among the older (>15.7 years) players: boys displayed better knee control than girls. Age was associated with knee control among the 10 to 14-year-old football players: older players displayed better knee control. Among the basketball and floorball players, older boys displayed better knee control than did younger boys. There were no differences in knee control between younger and older girls. There were significant differences in knee control between the dominant and non-dominant leg among the young football players: knee control was better for the non-dominant leg. Side-to-side differences between dominant and non-dominant leg were not detected among the cohort of basketball and floorball players, but boys displayed significantly greater mean FPKPA on the right leg compared to the left.

The results in this doctoral dissertation highlight the importance of implementing more effective injury prevention methods to reduce the public health burden of adolescent physical activity-related injuries in Finland. Furthermore, the results indicate that adequate frontal plane knee control is essential to reduce the risk of lower extremity injuries in team-sport athletes. The single-leg squat can be used to assess frontal plane knee control to determine if an athlete requires further training. However, the single-leg squat performance does not predict whether an individual will experience an injury.
Tämän väitöskirjan tarkoituksena oli selvittää frontaalitason polvenhallinnan roolia alaraajavammojen riskitekijänä nuorilla palloilulajien harrastajilla. Lisäksi tavoitteena oli selvittää voiko yhden jalan kyykky -testiä, analysoituna kaksiulotteisella videoanalyysillä, käyttää seulontatestinä tunnistamaan urheilijat, joilla on kohonnut riski saada alaraajavammoja tulevaisuudessa. Edelleen tavoitteena oli selvittää polvenhallinnassa ilmenevää ikään ja sukupuoleen liittyviä eroja ja alaraajojen välisiä puolieroja.


Frontaalitason polvenhallintaa mahdollisena riskitekijänä tutkittiin nuorilla (keski-ikä 15,7 vuotta) salibandyn ja koripallon pelaajilla (osatyö III) ja 10–14-vuotiailla jalkapalloilijoilla (osatyö IV). Frontaalitason polvenhallintaa kuvattiin frontaalitason projektiokulmalla, joka mitattiin yhden jalan kyykky -testistä kaksiulotteista videoanalyysia käyttäen. Nuorilla salibandyn ja koripallon pelaajilla huono polvenhallinta oli yhteydessä vammoihin. Pelaajilla, joiden frontaalitason projektiokulma oli suuri, oli 2,7-kertainen todennäköisyys alaraajavammoihin ja 2,4-kertainen todennäköisyys nilkkavammoihin verrattuna pelaajiin, joilla projektiokulma

TIIVISTELMÄ
oli keskitasoa. Nuorilla jalkapalloilijoilla polvenhallinta ei ollut yhteydessä alaraajavammoihin.

Yhden jalan kyykky -testin potentiaalia seuloa nuorista urheilijoista ne, joilla on kohonnut riski vammoihin, selvitettiin kolmannessa osatyössä. Testin huono sensitiivisyys ja spesifisyys osoittavat, että yhden jalan kyykky -testissä mitattu frontaalitason projektiokulma ei ole toimiva seulontatyökalu kohonneen loukkaantumisriskin tunnistamiseen.
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CI confidence interval
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FMS™ Functional Movement Screen™
FPKPA frontal plane knee projection angle
IPEP injury prevention exercise program
LESS Landing Error Scoring System
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ROC receiver operating characteristics
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1 INTRODUCTION

Sports and physical activity (PA) are leading cause of adolescent injuries in many developed countries (Pickett et al., 2005). These injuries may lead to short-term disability and long-term health problems. There are economic and societal pressures on the field of sports medicine to develop and implement valid injury prevention strategies (Hewett, Myer, Ford, Paterno, & Quatman, 2016).

Fast-paced team sports are very popular among adolescents who participate in organised sports and/or leisure time PA. The most popular sports vary between countries; in Finland, football (soccer), floorball, ice hockey and basketball are among the most popular adolescent sports (Mononen, Blomqvist, Koski, & Kokko, 2016). These sports include frequent pivoting turns and quick accelerations and decelerations. In these sports, injury incidence is high and adolescents are injured more frequently than are adults (Pasanen et al., 2017, 2018; Stuart & Smith, 1995; Åman, Forssblad, & Henriksson-Larsén, 2016). It has been previously suggested that injury prevention efforts should target team-ball sports because of the high injury rates and the significant impacts on the injured participants (Finch & Cassell, 2006). In team-ball sports, most injuries affect the lower extremities (Agel et al., 2007; Clausen et al., 2014; Moller, Attermann, Myklebust, & Wedderkopp, 2012; Pasanen et al., 2008; Söderman, Adolphson, Lorentzon, & Alfredson, 2001). For these reasons, the focus of this doctoral dissertation is on lower extremity injuries in adolescent team-ball sports.

Given the need to reduce the burden caused by sports injuries, the ability to identify athletes with a higher risk of injury, who could then be targeted with suitable prevention strategies, is paramount. Hence, there is significant motivation to establish reliable screening tests with high specificity and sensitivity to identify athletes with an elevated risk of injury. While several potential screening tests have been studied, many are used without an understanding of their association with future injuries, such as the single-leg squat (SLS) test.

The frontal plane, also known as the coronal plane, is the plane of motion that divides the body into front and back sections (Hamill & Knutzen, 1995). Poor frontal plane knee control, which can manifest as extensive medial movement of the knee during athletic tasks, has been suggested as a risk factor for lower
extremity injuries (Hewett et al., 2005; Myer et al., 2010; O’Kane et al., 2015). The SLS is often used in clinical practice to assess frontal plane knee control. However, the associations between knee control during the SLS and the risk of future injuries has not been previously studied. The purpose of this doctoral thesis is to focus on this critical knowledge gap.
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Adolescent sports injuries as a public health issue

Adolescence is defined as a period of transition from childhood to adulthood (World Health Organization, 1986). The World Health Organization considers the age of adolescence to be from 10 to 19 years. However, there is typically considerable variation in the onset and termination of adolescence (Malina, Bouchard, & Bar-Or, 2004). In their work on youth athletic development, Lloyd and Oliver (2012) define adolescence as a period from 12 to 21 years for boys and 10 to 20 years for girls. Since both sexes are studied in this thesis, adolescence is defined as extending from 10 to 21 years of age.

Participating in organised sports in adolescence is associated with a cluster of positive health behaviours, including a higher likelihood of meeting the recommendations for PA, screen time, and fruit and vegetable consumption (Vella, Cliff, Okely, Scully, & Morley, 2013). Being physically active confers many benefits in terms of mental and physical health (Janssen & LeBlanc, 2010) and wellbeing, and it promotes scholastic performance (Bangsbo et al., 2016; Haapala et al., 2017). Adolescent PA participation has also been shown to lead to higher socioeconomic status (Kari et al., 2016; Koivusilta, Nupponen, & Rimpelä, 2012) and an increased likelihood of PA participation in adulthood (Kjonniksen, Anderssen, & Wold, 2009; Perkins, Jacobs, Barber, & Eccles, 2004). As sedentary lifestyle has become a large-scale problem (Tremblay et al., 2011), PA promotion among adolescents is considered a key public health issue. However, the promotion of physical activity does include potentially adverse effects (Verhagen, Bolling, & Finch, 2015).

Sports participation is a major cause of adolescent injuries in developed countries (Bijur et al., 1995; Burt & Overpeck, 2001; Conn, Annest, & Gilchrist, 2003; Dekker, Kingma, Groothoff, Eisma, & Ten Duis, 2000; Finch, Mitchell, & Boufous, 2011; King, Pickett, & King, 1998; Leadbeater, Babul, Jansson, Scime, & Pike, 2010; Mattila, Parkkari, Kannus, & Rimpelä, 2004; Michaud, Renaud, & Narring, 2001; Schwebel & Brezausek, 2014; Töräkainen, Lounamaa, Paavola, Kumpula, & Parkkari, 2008). In Finland, sports participation is the leading cause of hospitalisation during adolescence (Mattila, Parkkari, Koivusilta, Kannus, &
In addition to the short-term consequences of sports injuries, it is important to address the long-term outcomes. Sports injuries, especially knee injuries, can lead to a higher likelihood of overweight or obesity and reduced knee function (Whittaker, Woodhouse, Nettel-Aguirre, & Emery, 2015), as well as an increased risk of osteoarthritis later in life (Lohmander, Östenberg, Englund, & Roos, 2004).

It has been reported in Australia that among adolescents and children, the population-health burden of sports injuries is greater than that incurred by road traffic injuries (Finch, Wong Shee, & Clapperton, 2014). While road traffic injury prevention is incorporated into the public health agendas, sports injuries are not commonly acknowledged in those agendas, despite the magnitude of the problem (Finch, 2012). Although sports injuries are often overlooked as a public health issue (Parkkari, Kujala, & Kannus, 2001), in Finland, the National Action Plan for Injury Prevention among Children and Youth does address the importance of preventing adolescent PA-related injuries (Markkula & Öörni, 2010).

As participation in organised sports has become increasingly popular (Carter & Micheli, 2011), there has been a concomitant increasing prevalence of sedentary lifestyle (Tremblay et al., 2011), and we are witnessing the polarisation of PA. As PA promotion efforts are directed towards the less active and it is established that adolescent sports injuries create significant population-health burden (Collard, Verhagen, van Mechelen, Heymans, & Chinapaw, 2011; de Loës, Dahlstedt, & Thomée, 2000; Knowles et al., 2007), the cost incurred by PA-related injuries and injury-related health problems represent a major issue. For example, in Australia, direct hospital costs during a 7-year period were used as one measure of the population-health burden of sports injuries among children aged under 15 years (Finch et al., 2014). Costs of sports injuries were found to be 2.6-fold the cost of road traffic injuries.

Injury prevention strategies can reduce the number of injuries and lead to cost-savings overall. Use of an injury prevention exercise program (IPEP) has been shown to reduce the health care cost of youth football injuries by 43% (Marshall, Lopatina, Lacny, & Emery, 2016). A study on adolescent ice hockey demonstrated significant cost-savings related to a policy disallowing body checking in 11- and 12-year-old males (Lacny et al., 2014).
2.2 Sports injury risk factors in adolescence

Sports injuries occur as a result of interactions between multiple risk factors, which can be divided into extrinsic and intrinsic risk factors (Taimela, Kujala, & Osterman, 1990). Extrinsic factors occur independently of the individual and are related to the particular sport: how the sport is practiced, the environment, and the equipment (Lysens et al., 1984; Taimela et al., 1990). Intrinsic risk factors are the physical and psychosocial characteristics of the individual (Lysens et al., 1984). Both the extrinsic and intrinsic factors can be further divided into modifiable and non-modifiable risk factors. Modifiable risk factors are those that could potentially be modified by injury prevention strategies, and they are also referred to as potentially modifiable risk factors (Emery, 2003).

2.2.1 Non-modifiable extrinsic risk factors

Non-modifiable extrinsic risk factors include the type of sport, level of play, position played, weather, and time of season (Emery, 2003). In team sports, the risk of getting injured is highly related to the characteristics of the team, even more than to the features of an individual player (Inklaar, Bol, Schmikli, & Mosterd, 1996). There is general agreement among sports injury researchers that the risk of injury is greater during competition than in training (Murphy, Connolly, & Beynon, 2003).

There are discrepancies in the literature regarding the level of play as a risk factor among adolescents. While some studies have reported a higher risk of injury among the elite divisions compared to the lower divisions in certain age groups, this finding was not consistent among all of the studied age groups (Emery, Meeuwisse, & Hartmann, 2005; Emery & Meeuwisse, 2006). In football, the low-level youth players had a higher incidence of injuries compared to the high-level players in relation to exposure time (Peterson, Junge, Chomiak, Graf-Baumann, & Dvorak, 2000). This was hypothesised to be due to more training in the higher levels, which could enable the players to be more prepared to meet the requirements of the game.
The rules, coaching, training methods, and use of protective equipment are potentially modifiable extrinsic risk factors (Collard, Verhagen, Chin A Paw, & van Mechelen, 2008). Some environmental factors, like the playing surface, are also considered potentially modifiable.

Passive methods such as rule changes and the use of protective equipment have been shown to be very effective methods of injury prevention. For example, a change in rules to eliminate body checking in ice hockey among 11- and 12-year-olds led to reduced risk of overall injury and concussion (Black et al., 2016; Black, Hagel, Palacios-Derflingher, Schneider, & Emery, 2017). Moreover, the use of full or partial facial protection in junior ice hockey significantly reduced eye and face injuries compared to the players with no facial protection (Stuart, Smith, Malo-Ortiguera, Fischer, & Larson, 2002). In Finland, use of protective eyewear became mandatory in junior floorball after high rates of eye injuries were reported (Leivo, Puusaari, & Mäkitie, 2007). As a result, the incidence of floorball eye injuries has significantly declined (Leivo, Haavisto, & Sahraravand, 2015). Bicycle helmet use has been shown to significantly reduce the risk of head, brain, and facial injuries in all age groups (Thompson, Rivara, & Thompson, 1994).

Environmental aspects, such as the type and the condition of the playing surface are considered risk factors (Lysens et al., 1984), but there is very little research on this topic in adolescent sports. In female youth football, no differences in injury rates have been detected between grass and artificial grass (Hägglund & Waldén, 2015; Steffen, Andersen, & Bahr, 2007). In American football, playing on artificial turf has been associated with a higher injury rate (Ramirez M, Schaffer KB, Shen H, Kashani S, & Kraus JF, 2006).

The association between training load and the risk of injuries is complex. Most studies investigating the relationship between training load and injury risk have been done on adults (Drew & Finch, 2016). While higher training loads have been associated with higher injury rates in adults, high loads can also be protective against injury (Gabbett, 2016). In a study on adolescent rugby players, training injuries peaked early in the season (Gabbett, 2005). The highest training loads in midseason did not lead to an increase in training injuries. In elite youth handball, increases in the training load were associated with dominant arm shoulder injuries, and a greater than 60% increase in handball load was associated with a higher risk of shoulder injuries (Møller et al., 2017). A greater than 60% increase in handball load was associated with a higher risk of shoulder injuries. In volleyball, a high
training and competition load was associated with the risk of developing jumper’s knee (Visnes & Bahr, 2013). The athletes who developed jumper’s knee did approximately three more hours of volleyball training per week compared with the asymptomatic athletes. In elite youth football, both a high accumulated workload and a high acute workload were associated with a higher risk of sustaining a new injury (Bowen, Gross, Gimpel, & Li, 2017). Furthermore, in elite youth football, athletes with a history of low number of weekly training sessions had a higher incidence of groin injuries when they moved to a more intensive training program at a sports institute (Lovell, Galloway, Hopkins, & Harvey, 2006). In elite male youth football players, training load, as well as other measures of physical stress, including strain, weekly duration and monotony, were associated with the risk of injury (Brink et al., 2010). In adolescent female football, higher self-reported same day and previous day training loads were associated with the risk of injury (Watson, Brickson, Brooks, & Dunn, 2017). The ratio between acute and chronic training load was a significant predictor of injury. In addition to high training loads, low loads also seem to increase the injury risk. In adolescent female football players, players participating once a week or less were 3 to 10 times more likely to sustain a time-loss injury than were other players (Clausen et al., 2014). Among adolescents, it seems that both low and high exposure can increase the risk of injuries, as is suggested to be the case in adults (Gabbett, 2016). In general, very low exposure and significant increases in load should be avoided.

Early specialisation in one sport has become more common in recent years and retrospective studies have suggested that it may be associated with the risk of injuries (Bell et al., 2016; Jayanthi, LaBella, Fischer, Pasulka, & Dugas, 2015; Post, Bell, et al., 2017; Post, Trigsted, et al., 2017). A recent prospective study among high school athletes reported that athletes with a moderate or high level of primary sport Specialisation showed a higher risk of injury compared to athletes with a low level of specialisation (McGuine et al., 2017). Similarly, a study on National Basketball Association players reported that athletes who participated in other sports in addition to basketball in high school had fewer major injuries and longer careers than did players who only played basketball (Rugg, Kadoor, Feeley, & Pandya, 2018).
Non-modifiable intrinsic risk factors include age, sex, and previous injuries. Previous injury is the most well-established risk factor for sustaining a sports injury (Toohey, Drew, Cook, Finch, & Gaida, 2017; Witchalls, Blanch, Waddington, & Adams, 2012). Previous injury not only increases the risk of a subsequent injury to the same body part but also increases the risk of a range of subsequent lower extremity injuries (Toohey et al., 2017).

Generally, injury rates increase with age (Spinks & Mcclure, 2007). When analysing the period of adolescence, adolescents over the age of 13 years have a higher risk of injury compared to younger adolescents and children (Emery, 2003). The higher rate of injuries among older adolescents is related to their increased body mass, longer joint lever arms, and the ability to generate more power compared to prepubescent athletes (Fort-Vanmeerhaeghe et al., 2016). The increase in injuries with age is more prevalent among boys than among girls (Caine, Maffulli, & Caine, 2008). This is possibly because the gains in power and strength related to growth in girls are smaller than those in boys (Beunen & Malina, 1988).

In general, males have a higher risk of adolescent sport injuries than girls (Emery, 2003). However, before puberty the injury rates are similar between the sexes, and differences in injury risk between sexes can be sport-specific. In youth football, previous studies have reported no significant sex differences in injury risk (Emery et al., 2005; Faude, Rößler, & Junge, 2013; Kucera, Marshall, Kirkendall, Marchak, & Garrett Jr, 2005). Even though the injury incidence is somewhat similar between adolescent boys and girls, there are sex differences when it comes to injuries in specific body parts and injury types. Previous studies have reported no difference in overall injury incidence between sexes in basketball (Messina, Farney, & DeLee, 1999; Pasanen et al., 2017; Yde & Nielsen, 1990), though significant differences were detected in terms of in lower extremity injuries: there was a higher rate of injuries among girls than among boys (Messina et al., 1999). A higher risk of first-time ankle sprain among female high school basketball players compared to male players has been reported (Beynnon, Vacek, Murphy, Alosa, & Paller, 2005). In volleyball, males had a higher risk of developing jumper’s knee than females (Visnes & Bahr, 2013). Girls are reported to sustain more knee injuries in basketball and football compared to boys (Powell & Barber-Foss, 2000). Generally, girls are considered to have a higher risk of anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury (Agel, Arendt, & Bershadsky, 2005; Arendt & Dick, 1995; Shea,
Growth and maturation are relevant non-modifiable intrinsic factors, but their relationship with injury risk remains unclear. Growth and maturation are not interchangeable. Growth refers to the quantifiable change in body size, while maturation refers to structural and functional changes in the organism’s progress toward a fully mature state (Read, Oliver, De Ste Croix, Myer, & Lloyd, 2015). An adolescent growth spurt is the period of maximal gain of stature and weight during the pubertal period. In a study of elite youth football players (aged 11 to 19 years), a gain in stature of $\geq 0.6$ cm per month and $\geq 0.3$ kg/m$^2$ increase in body mass index (BMI) value per month were both associated with a higher risk of injury (Kemper et al., 2015). Years from peak height velocity (PHV) is a non-invasive maturity assessment that is based on the differential timings of growth of height, sitting height, and leg length (Mirwald, Baxter-Jones, Bailey, & Beunen, 2002). A study on the risk of injuries in different phases of the adolescent growth spurt in a small group (n=26) of talented male youth football players reported that the number of acute injuries was higher in the PHV year than in the year prior (van der Sluis et al., 2014). Among academy male football players, early maturation and higher training and match exposure together were associated with an increased injury incidence (Johnson, Doherty, & Freemont, 2009). However, Le Gall and colleagues (2007) detected no significant differences in injury incidence between early, normal, and late maturing male football players. Menarche is also considered a sign of maturation. In female youth ice hockey, menarche was identified as a risk factor among 11- to 12-year-olds, with players who had begun menstruating at preseason showing a higher risk of injury (Decloe, Meeuwisse, Hagel, & Emery, 2014).

Family history is a non-modifiable risk factor. In active adolescent females, family history of osteoporosis or osteopenia was associated with the risk of stress fracture (Loud, Micheli, Bristol, Austin, & Gordon, 2007). In adolescent female football, family history of ACL injury was associated with the risk of ACL injury and acute knee injury (Hägglund & Waldén, 2015).
Potential modifiable intrinsic risk factors

Potentially modifiable intrinsic risk factors are body composition (Collard et al., 2008), fitness level, training, strength, flexibility, joint stability, biomechanics, balance, and psychological and social factors (Emery, 2003). Heavier athletes need to absorb greater forces through soft tissue and joints, which may be why athletes are more susceptible to injury in some sports (Emery, 2003). In American football, while higher BMI has been associated with an elevated risk of ankle sprains (Gribble et al., 2015; McHugh, Tyler, Tetro, Mullaney, & Nicholas, 2006; Tyler, McHugh, Mirabella, Mullaney, & Nicholas, 2006), no association with the overall injury rate has been detected (Malina et al., 2006; Ramirez M et al., 2006; Turbeville, Cowan, Asal, Owen, & Anderson, 2003; Turbeville, Cowan, Owen, Asal, & Anderson, 2003). One proposed mechanism by which high BMI increases the risk of ankle sprain injury is the inability to control momentum during changes in direction (McHugh, 2010). When investigating only the linemen, a higher incidence of lower extremity injuries was noticed among athletes with a high BMI and high body fat percentage (Gomez et al., 1998). No association between BMI and injury risk was demonstrated in basketball (McGuine, Greene, Best, & LeVerson, 2000; McGuine & Keene, 2006) or football (Emery et al., 2005; McGuine & Keene, 2006). In volleyball, neither height, weight, body fat percentage, or waist circumference was associated with the risk of developing jumper’s knee (Visnes & Bahr, 2013). In basketball, volleyball, and football the variation in body size in a team of adolescent athletes is smaller than that in American football, in which some playing positions require increased body size. Body fat percentage as an injury risk factor in adolescent sports has not been extensively studied. Kemper and colleagues (2015) reported that a low body fat percentage was an injury risk factor among elite male youth football players. A body fat percentage <7% for males aged 11 to 16 years and <5% for males aged 16 to 19 years was associated with a higher risk of injury. An individual athlete’s skill level can also be associated with the risk of injuries. In female youth football, the more skilled players were at a greater risk of injury than were the players with a low skill level (Soligard, Grindem, Bahr, & Andersen, 2010). This was consistent with a similar finding in young male football players: the players with a higher skill level, according to the coach’s assessment, had a higher risk of injuries compared to the less skilled players (Schwebel, Banaszek, & McDaniell, 2007).
Psychosocial variables can affect the risk of injuries. A stress-injury relationship has been identified in high school football: athletes with more negative life changes had a higher risk of sustaining an injury (Gunnoe, Horodyski, Tennant, & Murphey, 2001). Moreover, perfectionism has been associated with an increased risk of injury in junior athletes (Madigan, Stoeber, Forsdyke, Dayson, & Passfield, 2018). However, when investigating the association between psychological factors assessed by the coach and the risk of football injuries, inhibition, aggression, and risk-taking were not associated with the risk of injury (Schwebel et al., 2007).

Strength measures have been associated with injuries in adolescents. Low levels of hip muscle (De Ridder, Witvrouw, Dolphens, Roosen, & Van Ginckel, 2016; Leetun, Ireland, Willson, Ballantyne, & Davis, 2004; O’Kane et al., 2017; Verrelst et al., 2014), hamstring, and quadriceps strength (O’Kane et al., 2017) have been associated with an elevated injury risk.

Joint laxity can contribute to injury risk, but the research on adolescent athletes is limited. In male collegiate athletes, tight ligaments have been associated with a higher risk of ankle injury (Krivickas & Feinberg, 1996). In young female athletes, knee hyperextension beyond normal has been associated with an elevated ACL injury risk (Myer, Ford, Paterno, Nick, & Hewett, 2008).

Deficits in dynamic stability can be witnessed as higher postural sway or instability. Poor single leg balance has been associated with a higher risk of ankle injuries in adolescent athletes (McGuine et al., 2000; Trojan & McKeag, 2006; Wang, Chen, Shiang, Jan, & Lin, 2006).

Neuromuscular imbalances are muscle strength or muscle activation patterns that lead to increased joint load (Myer, Ford, & Hewett, 2004). Neuromuscular imbalances, like quadriceps dominance, leg dominance, poor frontal plane knee control (ligament dominance), and core dysfunction (trunk dominance) have been associated with higher injury risk (Fort-Vanmeirhaeghe et al., 2016; Myer, Brent, Ford, & Hewett, 2011; Read, Oliver, De Ste Croix, Myer, & Lloyd, 2016). Quadriceps dominance refers to an imbalance in quadriceps and hamstring muscle activation patterns (Myer et al., 2004). Quadriceps dominant athletes rely on their knee extensors over knee flexors, which can manifest as landing with low knee flexion angles. In female collegiate athletes, a low hamstring-to-quadriceps ratio was associated with an elevated risk of overuse knee injuries (Devan, Pescatello, Faghri, & Anderson, 2004). Landing with a low knee flexion angle has been associated with an elevated risk of ACL injuries in young female athletes (Leppänen et al., 2017). Leg dominance refers to a side-to-side imbalance in lower extremity kinematics and muscular strength (Myer et al., 2004). Leg dominance has
been reported to be a risk factor for lower extremity injury (Read, Oliver, De Ste Croix, Myer, & Lloyd, 2018) and overall injury (Knapik, Bauman, Jones, Harris, & Vaughan, 1991). Trunk dominance is described as an imbalance between the inertial demands on the trunk and the ability of the core muscles to control for the excessive trunk motion (Myer, Brent, et al., 2011). Both the frontal plane and sagittal plane trunk motions can impact lower extremity alignment and affect the risk of injuries (Powers, 2010). Deficits in trunk control that lead to trunk displacement have been associated with an increased risk of knee, ligament, and ACL injuries in collegiate female athletes (Zazulak, Hewett, Reeves, Goldberg, & Cholewicki, 2007). According to a recent meta-analysis, poor core stability is a risk factor for lower extremity injuries (De Blaiser et al., 2018).

Frontal plane knee control as a risk factor will be described in detail in the next chapter (2.3).

2.3 Knee valgus and frontal plane knee control

2.3.1 Frontal plane knee control

Poor frontal plane knee control refers to insufficient control of the medio-lateral knee motions. This neuromuscular deficit, also referred to as ligament dominance, can be displayed as excessive knee valgus and high ground reaction forces during athletic tasks (Ford, Myer, & Hewett, 2003; Hewett, Paterno, & Myer, 2002; Myer et al., 2004). Valgus refers to the outward angulation of a body segment from its proximal end to its distal end (Kreighbaum & Barthels, 1985). In the knee joint, valgus can be observed as medial positioning of the knee compared to the neutral lower extremity alignment (Figure 1). Knee valgus is often observed on the frontal plane but it can be a multi-planar motion. Knee valgus can result from femoral adduction or the combination of femoral adduction and tibial abduction (Powers, 2003). Tibial abduction can result from ankle pronation or be an accommodation to femoral adduction. In addition, internal and external rotations of the femur and/or tibia can be present (Quatman, Quatman-Yates, & Hewett, 2010). Femoral adduction can result from poor hip abductor strength, such as weak gluteus medius (Powers, 2003).
2.3.2 Factors contributing to frontal plane knee control

Reduced hip muscle strength is associated with greater knee valgus angles during athletic tasks (Claiborne, Armstrong, Gandhi, & Pincivero, 2006; Hollman et al., 2009; Willson, Ireland, & Davis, 2006). Several studies have established that hip abductors play an important role in controlling frontal plane knee motion (Claiborne et al., 2006; Crossley, Zhang, Schache, Bryant, & Cowan, 2011; DiMattia, Livengood, Uhl, Mattacola, & Malone, 2005; Stickler, Finley, & Gulgin, 2015). In addition, hip external rotation strength has been associated with frontal plane knee control in females (Willson et al., 2006) and hip extensor strength seems to be an important contributor to frontal plane control during landing tasks (Pollard, Sigward, & Powers, 2010). Not only muscle strength, but also the neuromuscular recruitment of hip muscles seems to contribute to maintenance of neutral lower extremity alignment. Hollman and colleagues (2009) concluded that among females, neuromuscular recruitment of the gluteus maximus is even more
important than muscle strength. This is supported by the work of Mizner and colleagues (2008), who demonstrated that collegiate female athletes can improve knee control in a single training session, when they are instructed as to technique. This improvement was not predicted by hip muscle strength, and it is likely that neuromuscular factors, such as muscle activation patterns, influence how well an athlete can control the lower extremity alignment (Mizner et al., 2008; Powers, 2010). In addition to muscle strength and neuromuscular activation, other lower extremity functions can contribute to frontal plane knee motions. Limited ankle dorsiflexion range of motion (ROM) can contribute to knee valgus (Lima et al., 2018). For example, when knee flexion is increased, such as during a squat, increased ankle dorsiflexion is needed to allow the tibia to move forward. If ankle dorsiflexion is limited, perhaps due to decreased extensibility of the gastrocnemius/soleus complex, subjects might try to compensate for this by moving the knee medially towards valgus (Dill, Begalle, Frank, Zinder, & Padua, 2014; Lima et al., 2018).

Previous studies suggest that there are sex differences in frontal plane knee control, as female athletes demonstrate greater valgus angles than do males. Greater frontal plane knee motion in females compared to males has been reported in running (Ferber, Davis, & Williams, 2003), landing (Ford et al., 2003; Holden, Boreham, & Delahunt, 2016; Jacobs, Uhl, Mattacola, Shapiro, & Rayens, 2007) and the SLS (Baldon et al., 2011; Willson et al., 2006). However, Claiborne and colleagues (2006) did not detect significant differences in frontal plane knee kinematics during the SLS between sexes. Previous studies have reported differences in muscle activation between males and females. It has been suggested that females depend on the abductor muscles (Baldon et al., 2011) and also utilise the rectus femoris (Dwyer, Boudreau, Mattacola, Uhl, & Lattemann, 2010; Zazulak et al., 2005; Zeller, McCrory, Kibler, & Uhl, 2003) more than males to control knee motions. A meta-analysis on sex differences in landing biomechanics in adolescents reported that the difference in knee control between male and female athletes increase with age (Holden et al., 2016).

### 2.3.3 Frontal plane knee control and injuries

Knee valgus can be harmful, since it alters the loads experienced by different tissues in the lower extremities. If the ability to control trunk, hip, and knee motions during athletic tasks is poor, the athlete can allow the ground reaction
forces to control the lower extremity alignment (Hewett et al., 2002). This may lead to high loads on the knee ligaments and be a mechanism that contributes to ACL injuries (Myer et al., 2004). Poor frontal plane knee control has also been associated with the development of patella-femoral pain syndrome (PFPS) (Holden, Boreham, Doherty, & Delahunt, 2017; Myer et al., 2010). When the knee is loaded in a valgus angle, the lateral forces acting on the patella-femoral joint increase, which may contribute to the development of PFPS (Powers, 2010). Knee valgus is also considered a potential risk factor for iliotibial band syndrome, the proposed mechanism for which is that the hip adduction causes an increase in the strain to the iliotibial band (Powers, 2010), especially when coupled with knee internal rotation (Ferber, Noehren, Hamill, & Davis, 2010). In a study on recreational female runners, excessive hip adduction and knee internal rotation during the stance phase of running predicted iliotibial band syndrome (Noehren, Davis, & Hamill, 2007).

The premise that extensive knee valgus is related to the risk of lower extremity injuries is based on the finding that valgus collapse is often observed in the context of ACL injury (Krosshaug et al., 2007; Olsen, Myklebust, Engebretsen, & Bahr, 2004). Valgus collapse is described as a combination of knee valgus, hip internal rotation, and tibial rotation (Quatman & Hewett, 2009). Since valgus collapse is often observed in ACL injuries, it is hypothesised that perhaps the presence of knee valgus during athletic tasks is associated with an elevated risk of lower extremity injuries. This hypothesis has served as the basis of studies seeking to determine the association between variables of knee control during movement control test and the risk of lower extremity injuries. Previous studies on adolescent female athletes have detected associations between increased knee abduction moment and ACL injuries (Hewett et al., 2005) and patella-femoral pain (Myer et al., 2010), high knee valgus displacement and patella-femoral pain (Holden et al., 2017), and low normalised knee separation and lower extremity and knee injuries (O’Kane et al., 2015). However, a recent study did not detect significant associations between knee valgus angle or knee abduction moment and ACL injuries (Leppänen et al., 2017).
2.4 Screening tools to predict lower extremity injuries in adolescent athletes

2.4.1 Screening as a concept

It is important to identify modifiable and non-modifiable sports injury risk factors and the concept of screening takes this goal one step further. The aim is to establish which tests can be used to screen for an elevated risk of future injuries. In medicine, screening is used to identify asymptomatic individuals with a disease. In Finland, population level screening tests are utilised to screen for breast cancer, cervical cancer, and colon cancer. The result of a screening test is dichotomous (yes/no): there are cancerous or precancerous cells or there are not. However, in sports injury research the attempt is not to screen for signs of injury but for a high-risk status (Myer, Brent, et al., 2011), which means screening for potentially modifiable intrinsic factors that are associated with the risk of injury, such as faulty movement patterns, inadequate strength levels, or joint hyper- or hypomobility. Therefore, the concept of sports injury screening differs from that of asymptomatic disease screening.

Guidelines for screening program evaluation are often based on the Willson-Jungner criteria (Wilson & Jungner, 1968). For a screening test to be reliable, it must provide enough true positives and true negatives and not too many false positives or false negatives. In addition, there needs to be a treatment or a cure for the condition.

When evaluating the potential of a screening test to predict sports injuries, sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value are usually assessed (Table 1). Sensitivity refers to the proportion of at-risk subjects who are correctly identified (Glover & Albers, 2007). Specificity refers to the proportion of subjects who are correctly identified as being not at-risk. Positive predictive value indicates what proportion of subjects who are identified as at-risk can be correctly categorised. Negative predictive value expresses the proportion of those identified as not at-risk, that can be correctly identified. When sensitivity is high, the results include only a few false negatives. When specificity is high, only a few false positives are included in the results. High specificity is important for correct positive detection of conditions that require an intervention but are not fatal, such as many sports injury risk factors. A clinical test with moderate to high specificity is useful to rule in a disorder when the results are positive (DiMattia et
High sensitivity is crucial for identifying a large proportion of the athletes who are most likely to be injured (Wilkerson, Giles, & Seibel, 2012). On the other hand, high specificity is valuable for the organisation to avoid wasting resources on players who have a lower risk of becoming injured. The relationship between the true status and screening test results is presented in Figure 2. The values in the fourfold table can be used to calculate the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value (Portney & Watkins, 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening test result</th>
<th>True status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive test result</td>
<td>True positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative test result</td>
<td>False negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** The relationship between screening test results and true status of a disorder. Adapted from Portney & Watkins (2009).

Athletic trainers, physiotherapists and physicians utilise movement assessments in clinical work with the intent to identify high-risk athletes. It is hypothesised that based on the results of the screening, the training program could be tailored to the individual athlete in order to prevent injuries (Myer, Brent, et al., 2011). Over the past few decades there has been considerable interest in research on screening tests. In a recent systematic review, Dallinga and colleagues (2012) identified screening tools to predict injuries in team sports, but most of the studies were done on adults. In addition the reliability and predictive value of movement screenings were recently assessed in a critical review (McCunn, aus der Fünten, Fullagar, McKeown, & Meyer, 2016). The following chapters will summarise the findings of prospective studies exploring the associations between a screening test score and the risk of lower extremity injury in adolescent team sport athletes. Studies on collegiate students are included even though not all subjects are considered adolescents.
Table 1. Considerations and questions for evaluating sports injury risk screening methods – adapted from Bahr (2016a), Fox et al. (2016), Glover and Alberts (2007), and Wilson and Jungner (1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness for the intended use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with injury risk</td>
<td>Are the measured variables relevant for determining individual risk status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and empirical support</td>
<td>Has the procedure of the screening method been validated in previous research? Is there a predetermined cut-off value for the test from a previous prospective cohort study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population fit</td>
<td>Is the screening method appropriate for the population of interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical adequacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest/intra-rater reliability</td>
<td>Are the results of the screening method consistent over time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>Are the results of the screening method consistent across raters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive validity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Does the test capture all those with an injury?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>Does the test capture only those with an injury?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive predictive value</td>
<td>What proportion of athletes with a positive test are injured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative predictive value</td>
<td>What proportion of athletes with a negative test are injured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of cost and benefit</td>
<td>Are the costs of the screening method reasonable? Does screening lead to savings on injury-related costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility of implementation</td>
<td>Are the personnel able to administer the screening method?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of outcomes</td>
<td>Can athletes and coaches understand the implications of the screening method outcomes? Are the outcomes useful? Is there an intervention programme that has been validated in a randomised controlled trial?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2 Star excursion balance test

The star excursion balance test (SEBT) is a dynamic balance test in which the subject stands on one foot and uses the non-weight-bearing leg to perform maximal reach. Originally, the test included eight reaching directions. Later, after significant correlations between the reaching directions were detected, it was
concluded that only three reaching directions (anterior, posteromedial, and posterolateral) are needed (Gribble, Hertel, & Plisky, 2012). In addition, there is also another simplified SEBT protocol in use, utilising the anteromedial, medial, and posteromedial reaching directions (Hertel, Braham, Hale, & Olmsted-kramer, 2006; Steffen et al., 2017).

Previous studies on collegiate athletes have detected significant associations between SEBT scores and lower extremity injuries. In collegiate athletes, anterior asymmetry ≥4 cm was associated with a higher risk of non-contact injury (C. A. Smith, Chimera, & Warren, 2015). Among high school and collegiate American football players, the SEBT-anterior score normalised to leg length was associated with a higher risk of lateral ankle sprain (Gribble et al., 2015).

In high school basketball players, displaying an anterior side-to-side reach distance difference ≥4 cm or having a sum of the three directions that was ≤94% of leg length was associated with an elevated risk of lower extremity injuries (Plisky, Rauh, Kaminski, & Underwood, 2006). Studies reporting significant associations between SEBT scores and injuries are presented in Table 2.

2.4.3 Vertical drop jump

The vertical drop jump (VDJ) is commonly used to analyse lower extremity kinetics and kinematics during landing. Among adolescent athletes, both three-dimensional (3D) and two-dimensional (2D) analyses of the VDJ have been utilised.

A study by Hewett and colleagues (2005) on the 3D analysis of the VDJ among female high school athletes is considered the first to report an association between knee valgus and a higher risk of ACL injuries. The study demonstrated that greater knee valgus and abduction load were significant risk factors for ACL injury. The subjects suffering an ACL injury during the follow-up demonstrated 2.5-times greater knee abduction moment and 20% higher ground reaction force during the VDJ than the uninjured subjects. In a recent study on female youth basketball and floorball players, Leppänen and colleagues (2017) reported significant associations between greater peak knee flexion angle and higher peak vertical ground reaction force and the risk of ACL injury. Knee valgus angle, peak knee abduction moment, knee flexion at initial contact, and medial knee displacement were not significantly associated with the risk of ACL injuries. Receiver operator characteristics (ROC) curve analysis indicated failed sensitivity and specificity for the peak knee flexion
angle and fair sensitivity and specificity for the vertical ground reaction force. In a study on young female basketball players, the athletes who developed patella-femoral pain during the follow-up demonstrated greater knee abduction moments in the pre-season VDJ compared to the healthy controls (Myer et al., 2010).

Using the 2D analysis of the VDJ in a study on female high school athletes, knee valgus displacement $\geq 10.6^\circ$ predicted patella-femoral pain (Holden et al., 2017) with a sensitivity of 0.75 and specificity of 0.85. The 2D analysis has also been utilised among adolescent female football players (O’Kane et al., 2015, 2017). For the post-menarchal players only, low normalised knee separation was associated with a higher risk of acute lower extremity injuries and knee injuries (O’Kane et al., 2015) and lower extremity overuse injuries and knee overuse injuries (O’Kane et al., 2017). However, the sensitivity and specificity were not determined in those two studies.

The Landing Error Scoring System (LESS) is a field-assessment tool used to identify potential high-risk movement patterns during the VDJ (Padua et al., 2009). To yield the LESS score, errors during the VDJ are calculated. There are 17 scored items in the LESS, and a lower score indicates fewer movement errors. In a study on high school and collegiate athletes, there was no association between the LESS score and the risk of ACL injuries in the entire cohort or the subgroups of collegiate athletes, high school athletes, males, or females (H. C. Smith et al., 2012). In elite youth football, the uninjured participants had lower (better) pre-season LESS scores than those sustaining an ACL injury during the follow-up (Padua et al., 2015). Based on the ROC curve analysis, a score of 5 was the optimal cut off point, generating a sensitivity of 86% and a specificity of 64%. The contrasting results of the two studies can be partly linked to the different ages of the subjects, in that the subjects in the study by Smith and colleagues were older compared to the subjects of Padua and colleagues. There is a natural decline in the LESS score with age; therefore, the LESS might have a limited ability to predict injuries among older adolescents. Studies reporting significant associations between VDJ performance and injuries are presented in Table 3.

2.4.4 Functional movement screen

The functional movement screen (FMS™) consists of seven fundamental movements that are scored on a scale of 0 to 3, with 3 being the best score for and individual test and 21 being the best composite score. The seven movements are
the deep squat, in-line lunge, hurdle step, shoulder mobility, active straight leg raise, trunk stability push-up, and quadruped rotary stability (Teyhen et al., 2012). A recent meta-analysis found the inter-rater and intra-rater reliability of the FMSTM to be excellent (Bonazza, Smuin, Onks, Silvis, & Dhawan, 2017).

Several studies have explored the association between an FMSTM composite score of 14 or less and the risk of injury. This cut-off value was detected by Kiesel and colleagues (2007) in their study on professional American football players. Among adolescent athletes, the results have been inconsistent. Three studies on collegiate athletes have investigated the FMSTM composite score of 14 or less but found no significant associations with injury risk (Chorba, Chorba, Bouillon, Overmyer, & Landis, 2010; Mokha, Sprague, & Gatens, 2016; Warren, Smith, & Chimera, 2015). In addition, an FMSTM composite score \( \leq 14 \) was not associated with injury risk in male ice hockey players (Dossa, Cashman, Howitt, West, & Murray, 2014) or Australian football players (Chalmers et al., 2017). However, the combination of an FMSTM score \( \leq 14 \) and self-reported past injury was associated with a higher risk of injury in collegiate athletes (Garrison, Westrick, Johnson, & Benenson, 2015).

Side-to-side asymmetry was associated with a higher risk of injury in Australian football players (Chalmers et al., 2017) but the finding was not repeated in the replication study (Chalmers et al., 2018). In collegiate football, volleyball, and rowing athletes, side-to-side asymmetry or a score of 1 in an individual test were both associated with a higher risk of musculoskeletal injury (Mokha et al., 2016).

The modified FMSTM was used to study the risk of lateral ankle sprains among high school and collegiate American football players (Gribble et al., 2015). Based on their pilot study, the researchers left out the push-up test, the shoulder mobility test and the trunk stability test. The modified FMSTM, including the in-line lunge, deep squat, hurdle step, and straight-leg raise, was not associated with the risk of lateral ankle sprains.

While the FMSTM composite score does not seem to predict injuries among adolescent athletes, it should be kept in mind that the FMSTM may provide valuable information on side-to-side asymmetries and movement deficits. Studies reporting significant associations between FMSTM scores and injuries are presented in Table 4.
2.4.5 Strength measures

Some lower extremity strength measurements have been explored to study the association between strength and the risk of injury. In adolescent male football players, reduced hip extension strength, adjusted to body size, was associated with a higher risk of sustaining a lateral ankle sprain (De Ridder et al., 2016). Hip abduction, adduction, flexion, external rotation, and internal rotation strength have not been associated with the risk of ankle injuries (De Ridder et al., 2016; McHugh et al., 2006). In addition, no association was detected between the isokinetic ankle strength measures and the risk of ankle injuries in high school basketball players (Wang et al., 2006).

Among young female football players, greater hamstring, quadriceps, hip flexor, and hip external rotation strength measures were associated with a lower risk of knee overuse injury (O’Kane et al., 2017). Sensitivity and specificity were not evaluated.

Four core stability measures (hip abduction, hip external rotation, side bridge, back extension) were used in a study on collegiate basketball and track athletes (Leetun et al., 2004). Greater hip external rotation strength at baseline was significantly associated with a lower risk of sustaining a back or lower extremity injury. Sensitivity and specificity were not evaluated. Studies reporting significant associations between strength measures and injuries are presented in Table 5.

2.4.6 Predictive value of screening tests

As the information presented in Tables 2–5 demonstrates, there are several studies on adolescent athletes reporting significant associations between a screening test outcome and the risk of injuries, all of which provide valuable information on sports injury risk factors. However, it must be kept in mind that association does not equal prediction. Some studies attempted to validate previous cut-offs on different cohorts with mostly inconclusive results, as is the case with the FMS™. It must be taken into account that several studies in Tables 2–5 did not set out to study the predictive value of the test and therefore the sensitivity and specificity values are not available.

As mentioned previously, for a screening tool to be useful, it should have high sensitivity and specificity and low negative and high positive predictive value. However, thus far, most studies on screening tests show significant overlap between the injured and uninjured athletes (Bahr, 2016a). This is demonstrated by
the data of Chalmers and colleagues (2017) presented in Figure 3. No matter where the cut-off line is drawn, the test fails to create two distinctively different groups.

Figure 3. Representation of the data from Chalmers et al. (2017) illustrates the association between FMS composite score and lower extremity injury. Uninjured athletes are shown in grey, and athletes who suffered a lower extremity injury are shown in black.
Table 2. Characteristics of studies reporting significant associations between star excursion balance test (SEBT) results and the risk of injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Significant risk factors</th>
<th>Sensitivity and specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gribble et al. 2015</td>
<td>• Reach distance normalised (%) to leg length (A, PM, PL, composite)</td>
<td>American football (high school, collegiate)</td>
<td>539 subjects (injured 17.3±2.3 years, uninjured 17.3±2.3 years)</td>
<td>Lateral ankle sprain</td>
<td>Normalised anterior reach distance (OR 2.84, 95% CI:1.58 to 5.10, P&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>For the normalised anterior reach distance: AUC 0.674. For the cut-off point of 67.2% of leg length: positive likelihood ratio 1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plisky et al. 2006</td>
<td>• Mean reach distance (cm) right/left (A, PM, PL, composite)</td>
<td>Basketball (high school)</td>
<td>130 M, 105 F (grades 9 to 12)</td>
<td>Lower extremity</td>
<td>• Anterior reach distance difference &gt;4 cm (all players: OR 2.7, 95% CI: 1.4-5.3; M: OR 3.0, 95% CI: 1.1-7.7)</td>
<td>ROC curve analysis performed to determine cut-off values. For girls: normalised composite right reach distance, 65.5% of uninjured subjects and 25% of injured subjects were below the cut-off. Other sensitivity and specificity values were not reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al. 2015</td>
<td>• Side-to-side difference in reach distance (cm) (A, PM, PL)</td>
<td>Variety of collegiate sports</td>
<td>184 athletes (injured 20.6±1.6 years, uninjured 20.0±1.4 years)</td>
<td>Non-contact musculoskeletal</td>
<td>Side-to-side difference in anterior reach distance &gt;4 cm (OR 2.20, 95% CI: 1.09 to 4.46, P=0.03)</td>
<td>Sensitivity 59%, specificity 72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A=anterior, PM=posteromedial, PL=posterolateral, M=male, F=female, OR=odds ratio, AUC=area under the curve, ROC=receiver operating characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Subject characteristics</th>
<th>Injuries studied</th>
<th>Significant risk factors</th>
<th>Sensitivity and specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hewett et al. 2005</td>
<td>• Knee abduction angle (°) (at IC and maximum)</td>
<td>Football, basketball, volleyball</td>
<td>205 F (injured 15.8±1.0 years, uninjured 16.1±1.7 years)</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>• Greater knee abduction moment (P&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>For knee abduction moment: sensitivity 78%, specificity 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knee flexion angle (°) (at IC and maximum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater knee flexion angle (IC and peak) (P&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peak knee flexion and abduction moments (Nm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peak hip adduction and flexion moments (Nm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peak vertical ground reaction force (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knee valgus displacement (°)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden et al. 2017</td>
<td>• Knee valgus displacement (°)</td>
<td>Variety of sports</td>
<td>76 F (12.9±0.4 years)</td>
<td>Patella-femoral pain</td>
<td>Knee valgus displacement &gt;10.6° (P&lt;0.002)</td>
<td>For knee valgus displacement &gt;10.6°: sensitivity 0.75, specificity 0.85, associated positive likelihood ratio 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knee valgus and knee flexion angle at IC (°)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peak knee abduction moment (Nm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peak knee flexion angle (°)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peak vertical ground reaction force (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Medial knee displacement (mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leppänen et al. 2017</td>
<td>• Low peak knee flexion angle (HR for each 10° increase 0.55, 95% CI: 0.34 to 0.88, P=0.01)</td>
<td>Basketball, floorball</td>
<td>171 F (15.4±1.9 years)</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>• High peak vertical ground reaction force (HR for each 100-N increase 1.26, 95% CI: 1.09 to 1.45, P&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>For peak knee flexion angle: AUC 0.6 For peak ground reaction force: AUC 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Outcome measures</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Subject characteristics</td>
<td>Injuries studied</td>
<td>Significant risk factors</td>
<td>Sensitivity and specificity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Kane et al. 2015</td>
<td>• Normalised knee separation (prelanding, landing, take-off)</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>351 F (11 to 14 years)</td>
<td>Acute lower extremity Acute knee</td>
<td>For post-menarchal players: • Normalised knee separation ≤ 10th percentile (lower extremity: RR 1.92, 95% CI 1.17-3.15, knee: RR 3.62, 95% CI: 1.18 to 11.09) • 1 SD decrease in normalised knee separation in landing (knee: RR 1.80, 95% CI: 1.01 to 3.23) and in take-off (knee RR 1.66, 95% CI: 1.04 to 2.64)</td>
<td>Sensitivity and specificity not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Kane et al. 2017</td>
<td>• Normalised knee separation (prelanding, landing, take-off)</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>351 F (12 to 15 years)</td>
<td>Lower extremity overuse Knee overuse</td>
<td>Normalised knee separation at landing &lt; 10th percentile (lower extremity: RR 2.24, 95% CI: 1.20 to 4.19, knee: RR 3.2, 95%. CI 1.52 to 6.7)</td>
<td>Sensitivity and specificity not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua et al. 2015</td>
<td>• LESS score</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>348 M, 481 F (13.9±1.8 years)</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>The 1-season risk difference between LESS score ≥ 5 and LESS score &lt; 5 was 1.24% (95% CI: 0.12 to 2.36, P=0.01)</td>
<td>ROC curve analysis performed to determine cut-off values. For LESS score 5.17: sensitivity 86%, specificity 71%, AUC 0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=female, M=male, ACL=anterior cruciate ligament, AUC=area under the curve, HR=hazard ratio, RR=risk ratio, CI=confidence interval, IC=initial contact, LESS=Landing Error Scoring System, ROC=receiver operating characteristics
Table 4. Characteristics of studies reporting significant associations between functional movement screen (FMS™) scores and injury risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Subject characteristics</th>
<th>Injuries studied</th>
<th>Significant risk factors</th>
<th>Sensitivity and specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers et al. 2017</td>
<td>• The FMS™ composite score</td>
<td>Australian football</td>
<td>237 athletes (16.6±0.8 years)</td>
<td>Trauma or medical condition (not illness) causing player to miss match</td>
<td>Presence of side-to-side asymmetry (adjusted to previous injury)</td>
<td>For asymmetry in ≥1 sub-tests: sensitivity 78.4%, specificity 41.0%, negative likelihood ratio 0.53, positive likelihood ratio 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presence of an asymmetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥1 sub-tests (HR 2.2, 95% CI: 1.0 to 4.8, P=0.048)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presence of painful sub-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥2 sub-tests (HR 3.7, 95% CI: 1.6 to 8.6, P=0.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison et al. 2015</td>
<td>• The FMS™ composite score</td>
<td>Several collegiate sports</td>
<td>160 subjects (17 to 22 years)</td>
<td>Musculoskeletal injury</td>
<td>FMS™ composite score ≤14 combined with self-reported past injury was associated with a higher risk of injury (OR 15.11, 95% CI: 6.60 to 34.61)</td>
<td>For an FMS™ composite score of ≤14 combined with self-reported past injury: sensitivity of 65%, specificity of 89%, positive likelihood ratio 5.88, negative likelihood ratio 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokha et al. 2016</td>
<td>• Scores for individual FMS™ component tests</td>
<td>Football, volleyball, rowing (collegiate)</td>
<td>20 M, 64 F M 20.4±1.3 years F 19.1±1.2 years</td>
<td>Musculoskeletal injury</td>
<td>Side-to-side asymmetry or individual score of 1 were associated with a higher risk of injury (RR 2.73, 95% CI 1.36 to 5.4, P=0.001)</td>
<td>Sensitivity 81.5%, specificity 54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presence of asymmetry in a bilateral test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The FMS™ composite score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren et al. 2015</td>
<td>• The FMS™ composite score</td>
<td>Several collegiate sports</td>
<td>89 M, 78 F 18 to 24 y (injured 20.6±1.6years; uninjured 20.0±1.4 years)</td>
<td>Non-contact or overuse injury requiring intervention from athletic trainer</td>
<td>Score of 2 in the inline lunge was associated with a lower risk of injury compared to score of 3 (OR 0.21, 95% CI: 0.08 to 0.59, P&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>Sensitivity and specificity not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scores for individual FMS™ component tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presence of asymmetry in a bilateral test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=female, M=male, OR=odds ratio, RR=risk ratio, CI= confidence interval
Table 5. Characteristics of studies reporting significant associations between strength measures and the risk of injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Subject characteristics</th>
<th>Injuries studied</th>
<th>Significant risk factors</th>
<th>Sensitivity and specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Ridder et al. 2016</td>
<td>- Isometric hip flexion, extension, abduction, adduction, external rotation and</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>133 M (10 to 16 years)</td>
<td>Lateral ankle sprains</td>
<td>Increase in hip muscle extension force was associated with a significant decrease in the</td>
<td>Sensitivity and specificity not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internal rotation strength (Absolute (N) and normalised to body size (N/(body weight x body height)))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hazard of ankle sprain injury (HR 0.3, 95% CI: 0.1 to 0.9, P=0.028).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leetun et al. 2004</td>
<td>- Isometric hip abduction and hip external rotation strength relative to bodyweight (%)</td>
<td>Basketball, track</td>
<td>60 M, 80 F (M 19.0±0.90 years, F 19.1±1.37 years)</td>
<td>Lower extremity Back</td>
<td>Hip external rotation strength (OR 0.86, 95% CI: 0.77 to 0.97, P=0.013)</td>
<td>Sensitivity and specificity not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Side bridge (s)</td>
<td>(collegiate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Back extension (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Kane et al. 2017</td>
<td>- Isometric hip flexion, extension, abduction, adduction and external rotation</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>351 F (12 to 15 years)</td>
<td>Lower extremity overuse</td>
<td>For knee overuse injury, 1 SD increase in the following strength measures was associated</td>
<td>Sensitivity and specificity not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strength (Nm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knee overuse</td>
<td>with a decreased risk:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concentric hamstring and quadriceps strength (Nm) at an angular speed of 180 °/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hamstring strength (RR 0.65, 95% CI: 0.46 to 0.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quadriceps strength (RR 0.70, 95% CI: 0.50 to 0.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hip flexor strength (RR 0.72, 95% CI: 0.51 to 1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hip external rotation strength (RR 0.65, 95% CI: 0.46 to 0.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=female, M=male, RM=repetition maximum, OR=odds ratio, CI= confidence interval, RR=risk ratio, AUC=area under the curve, SD=standard deviation
2.5 The single-leg squat test

The single-leg squat (SLS) test is commonly used in clinical practice to assess knee control. Several different SLS protocols have been utilised, with differences in knee flexion and hand and non-weight-bearing leg placement. In addition to using subjective assessment of frontal plane knee control during the test, SLS performance has been analysed utilising 2D and 3D analysis methods.

2.5.1 Validity and reliability of the two-dimensional analysis

The 2D analysis of frontal plane knee motion has been validated against the 3D motion capture method utilising the side step, side jump, and shuttle run tasks (McLean et al., 2005). The authors concluded that the 2D method provides valid descriptions of frontal plane knee motion for movements in which the joint centres are easily identified. The within-day reliability of the 2D analysis of the frontal plane knee projection angle (FPKPA) during the SLS is reportedly fair to good, while the between-sessions reliability is good to excellent (Munro, Herrington, & Carolan, 2012; Stensrud, Myklebust, Kristianslund, Bahr, & Krosshaug, 2010). According to Stensrud and colleagues (2010), the difference between the first and second 2D video analysis was 3.3°±2.9°. The 2D FPKPA can provide a reliable and valid measurement of frontal plane knee motions when the 3D analysis is not available.

2.5.2 Frontal plane knee control during the single-leg squat

Greater FPKPA has been directly associated with greater hip adduction, contralateral posterior pelvic rotation, femoral internal rotation, knee external rotation, and tibial abduction and inversely associated with contralateral pelvic drop during the SLS (Willson & Davis, 2008). As previously mentioned in chapter 2.3.2, hip muscle strength plays a significant role on frontal plane knee control. Improvement in hip abduction strength has been associated with a smaller FPKPA: for every 1% improvement in hip abductor strength normalised to body weight, the FPKPA would improve by 0.2° (Crossley et al., 2011). Individuals displaying medial knee displacement during the SLS have been reported to have
significantly lower gluteus medius to hip adductor and gluteus maximus to hip adductor ratios (Mauntel et al., 2013). This indicates greater hip adductor activation during the SLS, demonstrating that individuals with poor frontal plane knee control use a hip adductor dominant movement strategy. However, there are results demonstrating that hip abductor strength alone might not be a good predictor of FPKPA. Instead, the interaction between decreased hip abductor isometric torque and increased range of passive hip internal rotation contributes to a greater FPKPA (Bittencourt, Ocarino, Mendonça, Hewett, & Fonseca, 2012). The results suggest that individuals with adequate hip stiffness may exhibit better frontal plane knee control. In addition, reduced knee flexion and extension (Claiborne et al., 2006), trunk side flexion (Stickler et al., 2015), and hip external rotation (Willson et al., 2006) strength have been associated with poor frontal plane knee control during the SLS.

The associations between medial knee displacement and hip rotations have been explored in previous studies. Subjects displaying medial knee displacement during the SLS have demonstrated 6° to 7° more peak knee valgus during the SLS compared to subjects without medial knee displacement (Ageberg et al., 2010; Mauntel, Frank, Begalle, Blackburn, & Padua, 2014). Subjects with a knee-medial-to-foot position in the SLS displayed more hip internal rotation in the 3D data compared to subjects with knee-over-foot position (Ageberg et al., 2010). This is contradicted by the findings of Willson and Davis (2008), who detected an unexpected inverse association between FPKPA and hip internal rotation: as FPKPA increased, the hip internal rotation decreased. In addition, one study did not find any association between medial knee displacement during the SLS and hip rotations (Mauntel et al., 2014). The inverse association between FPKPA and hip internal rotation could be explained by contralateral posterior pelvic rotation, that led to a resultant hip external rotation. The authors hypothesised that if the pelvis and trunk were constrained during the SLS, there would be a more significant association between FPKPA and hip internal rotation (Willson & Davis, 2008). The results of the previous studies suggest that no single joint or segment rotation is predominantly responsible for knee valgus during the SLS and that several combinations of hip and knee rotations may result in knee valgus.
2.5.3 Visual assessment

The SLS is a slower movement than, for example the VDJ, and is therefore easier to assess visually (Maclachlan, White, & Reid, 2015). Several studies have investigated the inter- and intra-rater reliability of the visual assessment of the SLS performance. Previous studies have reported the inter-rater reliability of the SLS to be moderate to excellent (Ageberg et al., 2010; Crossley et al., 2011; Harris-Hayes et al., 2014; Junge, Balsnes, Runge, Juul-Kristensen, & Wedderkopp, 2012; Weeks, Carty, & Horan, 2012; Whatman, Hume, & Hing, 2013). However, some studies have found that the inter-rater reliability does not attain the value considered adequate for clinical use (Chmielewski et al., 2007; Poulsen & James, 2011). The intra-rater agreement of the visual assessment has been reported to be substantial to excellent in some previous studies (Crossley et al., 2011; Weeks et al., 2012; Whatman et al., 2013). Poulsen and James (2011) demonstrated a large range in intra-rater reliability (0.38 to 0.94), with two out of the six novice raters not reaching the reliability necessary for clinical use. When comparing the overall and specific rating method, neither rating method produced high intra-rater agreement (Chmielewski et al., 2007).

The experience level of the observers affects inter- and intra-rater reliability. Three previous studies reported that the inter-rater reliability was higher for the more experienced physiotherapists (Crossley et al., 2011; Whatman, Hing, & Hume, 2012; Whatman et al., 2013). Weeks and colleagues (2012) concluded that both the experienced physiotherapists and the students were capable of reliably assessing SLS movement quality, but the clinical experience enhanced inter-rater and intra-rater reliability.

The scale used of the rating affects the reliability. Previous reliability studies have used dichotomous (Ageberg et al., 2010; Whatman et al., 2013), three-point (Chmielewski et al., 2007; Crossley et al., 2011; Stensrud et al., 2010), four-point (DiMattia et al., 2005; Junge et al., 2012) and ten-point ordinal scales (Weeks et al., 2012). In addition, a rating method in which three segments (trunk, pelvis and thigh/hip) were rated separately and the sum of segment scores was used for reliability, has been used (Chmielewski et al., 2007; Poulsen & James, 2011). The use of dichotomous rating improves both the inter- and intra-rater agreement (Whatman et al., 2012).

Previous studies have considered the contributions of different body segments to the visual assessment. Peak knee flexion explained 33% of the variance in the physiotherapist ratings of the SLS performance (Weeks et al., 2012). The prediction
was strengthened by 21% when peak hip adduction was added and by 10% with the addition of knee medio-lateral displacement. The physiotherapy students did not seem to consider hip movement in their rating as did the experienced physiotherapists. Junge and colleagues (2012) reported that the inter-rater agreement was best for trunk displacement and that the body component most difficult to judge was the knee.

The correlation between the 2D video analysis and the visual assessment of SLS has been studied previously (Harris-Hayes et al., 2014; Stensrud et al., 2010). Harris-Hayes and colleagues (2014) classified the lower extremity motions during the SLS as dynamic valgus, no change, or dynamic varus. In the study by Stensrud and colleagues (2010), the SLS performance was rated to be “good”, “reduced”, or “poor”. The agreement between the 2D analysis and the visual assessment of the SLS performance was reported as good to excellent (Stensrud et al., 2010) and substantial (Harris-Hayes et al., 2014). DiMattia and colleagues (2005) evaluated the validity of visual assessment as compared to the 2D analysis. Two raters observed the SLS performances on a four-point graded scale. The two raters agreed as to knee valgus 66.6% of the time and hip adduction 71.3% of the time. For knee valgus, the specificity was moderate to high and the sensitivity was low to moderate. For hip adduction, the specificity was high and the sensitivity was low.

Using a dichotomous rating of visual assessment by grading the subjects as “good” and “poor” performers has been used in several studies to explore the differences between the performances. Typically, the poor performers demonstrate a greater hip adduction angle (Hollman, Galardi, Lin, Voth, & Whitmarsh, 2014; Horan, Watson, Carty, Sartori, & Weeks, 2014) and less hip abduction torque (Crossley et al., 2011). Poor performance has also been associated with a greater hip flexion angle (Hollman et al., 2014), smaller knee flexion angle (non-standardised squat depth) (Horan et al., 2014), reduced trunk side flexion force (Crossley et al., 2011) and greater medio-lateral knee displacement (Horan et al., 2014). The good performers had an earlier onset timing of both the anterior gluteus medius and the posterior gluteus medius compared to the poor performers (Crossley et al., 2011). Frontal and transverse plane hip motion and gluteus maximus recruitment contribute significantly to the variance in frontal plane knee kinematics (Hollman et al., 2014).
2.5.4 Range of motion

ROM in the joints of the lower extremity could contribute to frontal plane knee movements during the SLS. Maunte and colleagues (2013) set out to study whether subjects displaying medial knee displacement have different passive ROM than those without medial knee displacement. Joint angles for passive ROM were measured for the hip external rotators, hip internal rotators, hamstrings, iliotibial band, iliopsoas, and femoral anteversion. The valgus group displayed less dorsiflexion passive ROM and greater posterior movement of the talus. Limited dorsiflexion could contribute to excessive rear foot pronation and result in increased frontal plane knee motion. In another study, the hip internal rotation ROM alone was not a significant factor, but the interaction between hip abductor isometric torque and passive hip internal rotation ROM was associated with the FPKPA (Bittencourt et al., 2012).

2.5.5 Single-leg squat performance in adolescents

Most studies on the SLS have been performed on adult populations. Agresta and colleagues (2016) investigated the influence of maturation on the SLS performance in physically active children and adolescents aged 8 to 17 years (mean age 13.3 years). Maturity level was defined using the peak height velocity (PHV) maturity offset (Mirwald et al., 2002). Although maturity status or sex did not influence the visually assessed SLS scores, chronological age was associated with the SLS performance: the SLS score improved by 0.4 points for every one-year increase in age. The authors hypothesised that the large variation in the SLS performance might explain why there is no association between maturity status and the SLS performance. Ugalde and colleagues (2015) studied the SLS performance of adolescent athletes with a mean age of 13.8 ± 1.8 years. The SLS performance was visually assessed by a single observer and rated to be “positive” (signs of abnormal response) or “negative”. Among the 142 subjects, 51% displayed signs of abnormal responses (arms flailing, the Trendelenburg sign, and/or knee valgus collapse) during the SLS. Comparing the groups rated positive or negative, there were no differences in age, sex or BMI.
2.5.6 Differences related to sex

As previously presented in chapter 2.3.2, poor frontal plane knee control is more prevalent in females. Previous studies have reported several sex-related differences in the SLS performance, but the findings are partly contradictory. It has been reported that in the SLS, females demonstrate significantly more ankle dorsiflexion, ankle pronation (Zeller et al., 2003), hip adduction (Baldon et al., 2011; Graci, Van Dillen, & Salsich, 2012; Nakagawa, Moriya, Maciel, & Serrão, 2012; Zeller et al., 2003), hip flexion and external rotation (Zeller et al., 2003), ipsilateral trunk lean (Nakagawa et al., 2012), knee abduction (Baldon et al., 2011; Graci et al., 2012; Nakagawa et al., 2012), contralateral pelvic drop (Baldon et al., 2011), and less trunk lateral flexion (Zeller et al., 2003) compared to males. In addition, females demonstrate less hip flexion during the SLS than males (Dwyer et al., 2010). Females have also been reported to exhibit greater peak pelvis rotation, peak hip internal rotation, hip adduction range, hip rotation range, and, at the knee, greater medio-lateral distance compared to males (Weeks, Carty, & Horan, 2015). Graci and colleagues (2012) noticed that females rotated the pelvis toward the weight-bearing leg while males rotated toward the non-weight-bearing leg during the SLS. In adolescents, previous studies have reported that no sex-related differences in the SLS were identified (Agresta et al., 2016; Ugalde, Brockman, Bailowitz, & Pollard, 2015).

During the SLS, females have been found to activate their gluteus medius and gluteus maximus muscles at a greater percent of their maximum effort compared to males (Dwyer et al., 2010; Nakagawa et al., 2012). In addition, greater rectus femoris activation levels in females compared to males have been reported (Dwyer et al., 2010; Zeller et al., 2003). Taken together with the greater hip adduction range, it appears that females were attempting to use the rectus femoris to control their knee during the SLS.

2.5.7 Patients with patella-femoral pain syndrome

Poor frontal plane knee control is considered to be a risk factor for patella-femoral pain syndrome (PFPS). Previous studies have identified reduced frontal plane knee control in patients with PFPS compared with healthy controls (Herrington, 2014; Levinger, Gillead, & Coleman, 2007; Scholtes & Salsich, 2017; Willson & Davis, 2008). Subjects with PFPS have been shown to demonstrate significantly greater ipsilateral trunk lean, contralateral pelvic drop, hip adduction and knee abduction.
during the SLS compared to the healthy controls (Nakagawa et al., 2012). There was 18% less hip abduction and 17% less hip external rotation strength in the PFPS group than in the healthy controls. The effect of movement instruction on trunk and lower extremity kinematics during the SLS in females with dynamic knee valgus and patella-femoral pain has also been studied (Graci & Salsich, 2015). In the corrected condition, subjects demonstrated increased lateral flexion of pelvis toward the weight-bearing leg and decreased femoral adduction and internal rotation. Lower pain levels were associated with decreased femoral adduction.

### 2.5.8 Patients with an ACL injury

Return to unrestricted activity after an ACL reconstructive surgery is often based on time instead of being based on the function of the operated leg. The SLS can be used to identify neuromuscular deficits in the operated leg which can be used to assess the progress of the rehabilitation process and readiness for unrestricted activity. SLS to 60° knee flexion has been used for neuromuscular evaluation six months after an ACL reconstruction on adults (Hall, Paik, Ware, Mohr, & Limpisvasti, 2015). A single observer graded the performance using the video footage. The performance was rated to be “poor” or “good”. Out of the 33 patients, 15 (45%) demonstrated poor performance on the operated leg. The poor performers were significantly older than the good performers. Patients with poor performance had significantly lower hip abduction strength in the operated leg compared to the non-operative leg. Authors concluded that the visual assessment of SLS performance can be used to identify neuromuscular deficits after ACL reconstruction and may be used to assess whether the patient is ready for unrestricted activity.

The differences in the SLS performance between ACL-injured patients and healthy controls before an ACL reconstruction have also been investigated (Yamazaki, Muneta, Ju, & Sekiya, 2010). Males demonstrated significantly less knee and hip external rotation, less knee flexion, and more varus on the injured leg compared to the uninjured leg. Females demonstrated more knee varus on the injured leg compared to the uninjured leg. Comparing ACL-injured females and males, females demonstrated more external hip rotation and knee valgus on both the injured and uninjured legs than males. Comparing the uninjured leg of the ACL-injured to the dominant leg of the controls, ACL-injured males demonstrated significantly less external knee rotation and ACL-injured females demonstrated
significantly more external hip rotation and knee flexion and less hip flexion compared to the controls.

2.5.9 Correlation with other screening tests

Previous studies have compared the SLS performance to other screening tests to investigate if the tests identify the same individuals as “high-risk” subjects. In a previous study, the performance between the SLS, vertical drop jump (VDJ), and single-leg vertical drop jump (SLVDJ) were compared using both the visual assessment and 2D analysis (Stensrud et al., 2010). The agreement of the visual assessment between the three tests was poor, while the agreement of the 2D analysis was low to moderate. The authors suggested that the SLVDJ is an inadequate tool to evaluate knee control, since less than 10% of the subjects were assessed as having poor knee control in this test while the proportion was much higher in the other two tests. Since the SLS and VDJ identify different subjects, both tests should be used to screen for poor knee control. Approximately 20% of the subjects displaying poor knee control would not have been identified using only one test. The SLS to 30° knee flexion and VDJ were used in a study on middle school and high school athletes (Ugalde et al., 2015). One observer rated the SLS performance as positive (displaying signs of poor lower extremity biomechanics, reduced core strength, or hip abductor weakness) or negative. Among the athletes with positive SLS score, 51% displayed more dynamic valgus in the VDJ compared to the athletes with negative scores.

2.5.10 Differences in the SLS test protocols and interpretation

The specific SLS test procedure that is used greatly impacts the findings. In previous studies, the squat depth used in the test protocol, measured by knee flexion angle, has varied between 30° (Ugalde et al., 2015) and 90° (Stensrud et al., 2010). Studies have also used non-standardised squat depth (Horan et al., 2014; Weeks et al., 2012) or have instructed the participants to squat down as far as possible while maintaining balance (Boudreau et al., 2009; Crossley et al., 2011; Zeller et al., 2003). Most studies have utilised knee flexion angle of 60° (Agresta et al., 2016; Bittencourt et al., 2012; Chmielewski et al., 2007; Claiborne et al., 2006; DiMattia et al., 2005; Hall et al., 2015; Harris-Hayes et al., 2014; Mauntel et al., 2013, 2014; Stickler et al., 2015). Horan and colleagues (2014) did not standardise
the knee flexion to resemble clinical conditions. However, the authors concluded that future studies should apply a standardised knee flexion angle.

In addition to squat depth, there are also other differences in the test protocols, such as the positioning of the non-stance leg and arms. Comparing three different positions of the non-stance leg: in the front of, next to and behind the weight-bearing leg, Khuu and colleagues (2016) noticed that leg position affects the mechanics of the trunk, pelvis, and lower extremity. When comparing studies on SLS it must be considered that different SLS protocols may yield different results even in the same cohort.

2.6 Limitations in previous prospective injury risk factor studies

There are several methodological aspects in the previous sports injury risk factor studies, which might influence the level of evidence of these studies. The variability in injury definitions and injury and exposure data registration methods not only make comparisons between injury risk factor studies difficult, but also contribute to the value of these studies.

Capturing all sports injuries is complex. It has been previously reported that there are discrepancies in the number of injuries (Nilstad, Bahr, & Andersen, 2014) and time loss (Emery et al., 2005) between different registration methods. Utilising weekly text messaging has been shown to capture more injuries than team medical staff reports, but not all. Møller et al. (2018) reported some false-negative answers in their study among adolescent handball players utilising text messaging. This was hypothesised to be related to the burden related to the phone interview which followed when the athlete reported an injury. Schiff and colleagues (2010) reported that injury rates reported using Internet-based surveys completed weekly by parents were very similar to those reported by athletic trainers. However, there was discrepancy between the two methods and both methods missed some injuries due to the different interpretations of injury definition.

Several different injury registration methods have been utilised in the previous studies. In high school and collegiate sports, athletic trainers (Butler, Lehr, Fink, Kiesel, & Plisky, 2013; Gribble et al., 2015; Hewett et al., 2005) and coaches (Plisky et al. 2006) have collected the injury data. Weekly visits from the research staff (Padua et al., 2015) and data recorded by team designates (a volunteer coach or parent) (Emery et al., 2005) have been utilised in football clubs. The validated
Internet-based survey e-mailed to the parent each week has also been utilised in youth football (O’Kane et al., 2015, 2017).

Injury definition is a potential source of bias and can affect the validity of injury data collection. To capture all musculoskeletal injuries and complaints is more complex than collecting all ACL injuries: ACL injury is a major injury and would not go unreported by the athlete, athletic trainer, parent, or coach. In adolescent athletes, only collecting injuries which require medical attention would exclude a large share of injuries, since youth teams don’t always have medical staff and many injuries are treated at home. Using time-loss as a criterion can reduce the different interpretations of injury definition, which has been reported as a limitation of data collection (Schiff et al., 2010).

In sports injury studies, selection bias is a common methodological issue as participants are not selected randomly; instead teams, athletic departments, school boards, or individual athletes are recruited, and usually from the geographic area of the research facility. It is possible that teams or athletes that consider injury prevention a priority are more willing to participate. This is a concern in many studies, but especially when a convenience sample including only one team or volunteers from one college is recruited. For assessment of internal validity, it is important to report how well the study cohort represents the population. Usually the number of recruited teams/schools/clubs/athletes is reported, in addition to the number that agreed to participate. However, Hewett and colleagues (2005) only reported the number of athletes participating in the study but the number of high schools and the number of eligible female football, basketball, and volleyball players was not reported. External validity can be limited by limitations in internal validity (Emery, 2005). However, the generalisability of the results is also related to the sport, age, level of competition, and type of injury.

In risk factor studies, establishing a healthy cohort at baseline is important in order to avoid the risk of reverse causality (Asker et al., 2018). For example, Gribble and colleagues (2015) had all their participants cleared for full participation by physician. Most studies have excluded athletes with a recent injury or have reported being injury free at baseline as an inclusion criteria (Chalmers et al., 2017; Garrison et al., 2015; Holden et al., 2017; Leetun et al., 2004; Mokha et al., 2016; O’Kane et al., 2015, 2017; Padua et al., 2015; Plisky et al., 2006; C. A. Smith et al., 2015; Warren et al., 2015). However, recording the status of recent injury or injury at baseline is not always reported (Hewett et al., 2005).

Reporting injury incidence as the number of injuries/1000 hours of training and/or match play instead of number of injuries/1000 athlete exposures or
number of athletes is preferred. However, collecting individual exposure data is troublesome. Coaches or team designates reporting the length of the practise and athlete participation is often used, as well as self-reports. Lack of exposure measures has been reported as a limitation in some studies (Garrison et al., 2015; Gribble et al., 2015). Gathering valid exposure data is difficult. Recruiting volunteer team designates, Emery and colleagues (2005) were able to collect weekly exposure sheets from 97% of the team weeks. Comparing exposure measures collected via text messages to the data collected by on-field observers, Møller and colleagues (2018) reported an average difference of 1.1 hour in weekly training exposure and 0.2 hours in weekly match exposure. Since some “response fatigue” was observed in the text message data collection, there is a chance that the validity of this measurement tool is lower for longer data collection periods.

Large cohorts are needed to examine the associations between risk factors and injuries. For small to moderate associations, about 200 injured subjects and for moderate to strong associations, 20–50 injury cases are needed (Bahr & Holme, 2003). This means that the size of the cohort is hundreds of athletes or even over 1,000 if the incidence of the analysed injury type in the population is low. If the cohort is too small, it is possible to commit type II error. It should be taken into consideration that non-significant outcome does not always confirm that no association exist, instead the statistical power could be too low. For example, Leppänen and colleagues (2017) considered that their non-significant findings on knee valgus as a risk factor could be due to limited power. The limited statistical power could also be the case in the work of Bardenett et al. (2015). They reported non-significant findings on the association between the FMS component and total scores and musculoskeletal injury in a cohort of 167 high school athletes from several individual and team sports. However, no power calculation or other argument for how the study size was arrived at was reported. It is recommended that statistical power analysis is performed a priori (Portney & Watkins, 2009). However, when exploring new potential risk factors, there is no previous on the effect size, which is needed for the power calculation. Power calculations are not commonly reported in the previous studies. Smith and colleagues (2015) performed power calculations a priori based on the findings of a previous study on the SEBT (Plisky et al., 2006). In the screening test studies reporting statistically significant findings (Tables 2–5), the number of subjects ranges from 76 (Holden et al., 2017) to 539 (Gribble et al., 2015).

Since large cohorts are essential in order to identify risk factors, usually multiple investigators are needed to complete baseline testing (Chalmers et al., 2017;
Gribble et al., 2015; Leppänen et al., 2017; C. A. Smith et al., 2015). This is a potential source of measurement bias. Education of investigators is usually reported as a method of controlling the reliability of the measurements between testers. Addressing the reliability and validity of the selected screening tests is important for the interpretation of the results. Some studies fail to report whether baseline testing was completed by a single tester or multiple investigators. This information is valuable and should be reported.

One limitation of the studies can be the limited translation of the test results to sporting tasks (De Ridder et al., 2016). For research purposes, the tests need to be standardised and therefore do not reflect the real-life movements, such as double-legged landing from heading in football and single-leg stance phase in direction change in floorball. However, as we need to identify more risk factors and research their interaction, the use of these tests, when reliable and valid, is justified.

Sports injuries are multifactorial and there are several confounding factors. For example, for ACL injuries in female team sport athletes, Hewett and colleagues (2005) acknowledged that school, team, age/grade, aggressiveness, foot pronation, quadriceps angle, femoral notch width, reliable menstrual status reporting, and blood hormone levels could be potential confounders. The known and potential risk factors which may be unevenly distributed among the injured and uninjured athletes should be chosen as confounders before risk factor analysis are performed (Asker et al., 2018). However, this is not always the case in risk factor studies. With the list of potential confounders being as long as the one for ACL injuries, controlling for confounders is difficult.
3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In order to reduce the rates of adolescent sports injuries, we must identify risk factors associated with an elevated risk of injury in different sports and age groups. To estimate the efficiency of injury prevention methods, we must have current knowledge as to the extent of the problem (van Mechelen, Hlobil, & Kemper, 1992). The potential for the SLS to be developed into a screening tool has been previously hypothesised (Mauntel et al., 2014; Ugalde et al., 2015). However, there are no previous studies on the association between the SLS performance and the risk of future injuries. This is somewhat surprising considering the number of previous studies investigating different aspects of the SLS. In light of the clinical application of the SLS test as a knee control test, this knowledge gap is significant and therefore must be addressed by prospective risk factor studies.

This doctoral dissertation focuses on the first two steps in van Mechelen’s sequence of injury prevention (van Mechelen et al., 1992). Firstly, in Study I, the extent of the problem of PA-related injuries among Finnish adolescents is determined. Next, reliability (Study II) and risk factors (Studies III and IV) are investigated.

The aims of this thesis were as follows:

1) to determine the prevalence of physical activity-related injuries among adolescents in Finland in organised sports, school sports, and leisure time PA (I);

2) To examine the correlation between the visual assessment and 2D video analysis of the single-leg squat performance and determine the intra-rater and inter-rater reliability of the visual assessment of knee control (II);

3) To investigate the association between the frontal plane knee projection angle measured during the single-leg squat and new acute lower extremity injury among young team sport athletes (III and IV);
4) To determine the suitability of the single-leg squat test as a screening tool to predict future injury in adolescent team sport athletes (III and IV);

5) To explore the age, sex, and side-to-side differences in frontal plane knee control (III and IV);

6) To explore the association between side-to-side difference in frontal plane knee control and the risk of lower extremity injuries in young football players (IV).
4 MATERIALS AND METHODS

This doctoral thesis and the related original publications are based on three separate studies: the Adolescent Health and Lifestyle Survey (Study I), the Predictors of Lower Extremity Injuries in Team Sports study (Studies II and III) and the Sports Injury Prevention in Youth Football study (Study IV). The structure of the thesis is presented in Figure 4.

Figure 4. The studies comprising this doctoral dissertation.

4.1 Adolescent physical activity-related injuries (I)

4.1.1 Study design and subjects

The first study is a retrospective survey study. This study is part of the Adolescent Health and Lifestyle Survey (AHLS), a nationwide survey system that monitors the health and health-related lifestyle of 12-, 14-, 16- and 18-year-old Finns. The AHLS
was established in 1977, and the survey is carried out every second year. Questions regarding PA-related injuries in sports club activities, school sports, and leisure time PA were included in the survey in 2009 and 2013. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Tampere Region (reference Lausunto 2/2010) and the Ethics Committee of the Pirkanmaa Hospital District (reference ETL code R06226). Written informed consent was not required.

For each study year, a nationally representative sample of 12-, 14-, 16-, and 18-year-old Finns was obtained from the Population Register Centre. The dates of birth used in the sample were different for each study year to secure a sample consisting of different subjects each year.

In 2009, a total of 5,516 out of the sample of 9,920 adolescents responded. In 2013, 4,158 out of 9,398 responded. The response rate for the combined data of 2009 and 2013 was 50%. Due to inconsistencies in the responses, 212 subjects were excluded. A total of 9,462 subjects were included in the analysis, among which 59% were girls and 41% were boys.

### 4.1.2 Outcomes and data collection

The data was collected by a 12-page structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was mailed in February of the study year. Enclosed with the questionnaire were a personal user name and a password which could be utilised to answer the questionnaire online. Three follow-up enquiries were sent to non-respondents.

Injury prevalence in sports club activities, school sports, and leisure time PA was measured separately. For the sports club activities, prevalence refers to the proportion of subjects reporting at least one injury during the past 12 months among the subjects who reported participating in sports club activities. For school sports, prevalence was defined as the proportion of injured subjects among those who reported being students. For leisure time PA, prevalence was defined as the proportion of subjects injured during leisure time PA among the subjects reporting participation in leisure time PA.

Three separate questions were used to collect injury data in the three settings: “During the past year, have you suffered an injury while participating in sports club activities/physical education class, or instructed student sports/other leisure time physical activities (not in a sports club)?” In 2009, the answer options were “No”, “Once”, and “Twice or more”. In 2013, the options were “No”, “Once”, “Twice”, and “Three times or
more”. To combine the 2009 and 2013 data, a dichotomous variable of injury status was created with the categories “Not injured” and “Injured at least once”.

Frequency of participation in sports club activities and leisure time PA was determined. Exercise intensity was determined from the following question: “When I participate in sports or other physical activity, I usually experience: no sweating or getting out of breath/some sweating or getting out of breath/moderate sweating or getting out of breath/extensive sweating or getting out of breath/ I do not exercise.” To record the number of students, information as to student status was requested.

4.2 Visual assessment of the single-leg squat performance (II)

4.2.1 Study design and subjects

The second study is a reliability study on a cohort of young male and female basketball, floorball, ice hockey, and volleyball players. This study is part of the Predictors of Lower Extremity Injuries in Team Sports (PROFITS)-study. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Pirkanmaa Hospital District (ETL code R10169). Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects when they entered the study. For subjects younger than 18 years, written consent was obtained from the parent/legal guardian. A total of 478 subjects participated in the baseline SLS. Among them, 378 formed the study group (249 females, 129 males) and 100 (32 females, 68 males) were randomly assigned to the inter-rater reliability group. The number of subjects in each stage is presented in Figure 5.
Figure 5. Number of subjects in each stage of Study II

4.2.2 Outcomes and data collection

The subjects participated in the baseline SLS during pre-season in 2011, 2012 or 2013. The SLS test procedure was based on the work of Stensrud and colleagues (2010). The subjects wore indoor sporting shoes and shorts and females wore a sports top. Square pieces of sports tape were placed on the right and left anterior superior iliac spine (ASIS) and the right and left tuberositas tibiae. Next, a warm-up consisting of 2 x 8 repetitions of 2-legged squats and 2 x 5 repetitions of 2-legged
jumps was performed. As a modification of the original procedure, calf stretches were not included in the warm-up. To standardise the knee flexion angle to 90°, the subjects performed a 2-legged squat and knee flexion was measured using a plastic goniometer (Baseline). When the subject reached the 90° knee flexion, a string with a small metal object in the end was attached to the lateral side of the thigh. The length of the string was adjusted so that the metal object would slightly touch the metal plate on which the subject was standing. This was performed on the right and left leg. To perform the SLS, the subject would stand on a metal plate on one leg, holding their hands on the waist and focusing eyes straight forward and squat until they heard the metal object touch the metal plate (Figure 6). Each subject practiced the SLS once before attempting to perform three valid trials on each leg, starting on the right leg. A trial was deemed invalid if the non-weight-bearing leg was held in the front or on the side or if it touched the ground, if the subject looked down, lost balance or removed hands from the waist.

![Figure 6](image.png)

**Figure 6.** An athlete demonstrating the single-leg squat test. The metal object on the lateral side of the weight-bearing leg touches the ground when 90° knee flexion is achieved. The frontal plane knee projection angle measured in the 2D analysis is displayed. From Räisänen et al. 2018, reproduced in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution licence.

For the study group, the SLS performance on each leg was visually assessed by a single physiotherapist and recorded using a high definition digital video camera (HXR-NX70E, Sony, Japan). The camera was placed 4.5 meters from the front edge of the metal plate, and the physiotherapist was seated behind the camera. The
performance was graded on a 3-point scale as “good”, “reduced”, or “poor”. Good performance was described as no significant lateral tilt of the pelvis, no obvious valgus motion of the knee, and no medial/lateral movement or shivering during a trial. Reduced performance was described as some lateral tilt of the pelvis, and/or slight valgus movement of the knee, and/or some medial/lateral movement or shivering during a trial. Poor performance was described as lateral tilt of the pelvis, and/or knee moving clearly into a valgus position, and/or clear medial/lateral movements of the knee. The performance was rated based on the poorest performance. Each leg was rated separately.

To establish the intra-rater reliability of the visual assessment, a random sample of 20 subjects per each of the three test years was drawn. The SLS performances of these 60 subjects were re-assessed by the physiotherapist six months after the conclusion of the last test period. The physiotherapist viewed each video recording once on a 22-inch screen without stopping it and rated the performance using the same scale as that used in the initial assessment.

For the inter-rater reliability, the subjects entering the study during the third year were randomised into two groups: the inter-rater reliability group and the study group. The SLS performances of the inter-rater reliability group were assessed by a non-experienced observer and the physiotherapist assessed the performances of the study group. Before the assessments, the physiotherapist trained the non-experienced observer. Firstly, they studied the written instructions. Secondly, they viewed video recordings of 10 subjects performing the SLS and assessed the performances, then compared the results and discussed discrepancies. Thirdly, the non-experienced observer and the physiotherapist simultaneously assessed the SLS performances of 15 subjects. Again, the results were compared and discussed. Among the 100 subjects in the inter-rater reliability group, a random sample of 20 subjects was drawn. The physiotherapist viewed these performances from the video recordings and graded them.

In the 2D video analysis, Java-based computer software (ImageJ, National Institutes of Health) was used to estimate the FPKPA. The FPKPA was calculated as the intersection of a line created by the ASIS and knee joint centre and the line created by the knee joint centre and the ankle joint centre (Figure 6). Neutral alignment was considered 0°, positive values represented valgus alignment and negative values represented varus alignment. The FPKPA was calculated at the point of the greatest knee flexion angle, which was assessed as the lowest point of the pelvis height during the SLS. The 2D video analysis was performed by the primary investigator (A.R.).
At baseline, the height and weight of each subject were measured and subjects filled out a questionnaire. The information regarding dominant leg was derived from the questionnaire. Dominant leg was defined as the preferred leg to kick a ball or take off.

4.3 Knee control and injury risk in young floorball and basketball players (III)

4.3.1 Study design and subjects

The third study is a prospective cohort study that is part of the PROFITS study, similarly to Study II. The previously described cohort was narrowed down to floorball and basketball players, aged 21 years and under when they entered the study. The subjects participated in a baseline SLS and a 12-month injury registration. A total of 367 subjects, who were free from injury, participated in the baseline SLS. Six subjects were excluded from the study for not performing a sufficient number of valid trials, and 55 subjects dropped out during the follow-up. The number of subjects in each stage of the study is presented in Figure 7.

4.3.2 Outcomes and data collection

The baseline measurements and the 2D video analysis have been described in detail in chapter 4.2.2. For previous injury status, the acute time-loss injuries the athletes had sustained during the past 12 months were derived from their baseline questionnaire, as well as the information regarding the dominant leg.

Injury definition was based on the work of Fuller and colleagues (2006), and injury was defined as an acute lower extremity (hip, groin, thigh, knee, lower leg, ankle, foot) injury that resulted in the player being unable to fully participate in training or match play for at least 24 hours. The injuries were recorded by the team coach or another designated member of the coaching staff or team. To register the injuries, study physicians and study assistants contacted the teams weekly. When an injury was reported, the study physician contacted each injured player and collected details in a standardised phone interview regarding the time, place, cause, type, location, and the time-loss due to injury. Team coaches recorded athlete
participation in team practice and games and e-mailed the participation records to the study group each month for exposure registration.

Figure 7. Number of participants in each stage of Study III
4.4 Knee control and injury risk in youth football players (IV)

4.4.1 Study design and subjects

This study is a cohort study on the control group of a cluster-randomised controlled trial, the Sports Injury Prevention in Youth Football (ISRCTN14046021). The participants were football players aged 10 to 14 years. They were official members of teams participating in the Sami Hyypiä Academy, a player development monitoring program of the Eerikkilä Sports Institute. The control group consisted of 737 subjects. Subjects had to be free of a major injury at baseline to be eligible. Subjects who did not participate in the baseline SLS (n=163) or injury surveillance (n=6) were excluded. In addition, subjects who dropped out during the injury surveillance (n=10) were excluded. A total of 558 subjects were included in the analysis. Among them, 445 were boys and 113 were girls. Written informed consent was acquired from the participating player and their parent/legal guardian. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Pirkanmaa Hospital District (ETL-code R13110). The players were categorised into age groups of less than 11 years (U11), less than 12 years (U12), less than 13 years (U13), and less than 14 years (U14) according to their age at the time of the baseline test. The 18 players who had not yet turned 10 years old were included in U11.

4.4.2 Outcomes and data collection

The SLS test procedure and the 2D video analysis have been described in chapter 4.2.2. A small alteration to the test procedure was made in that the warm-up was excluded. In this study, the high-definition video camera (Panasonic HDC-SD9C, Panasonic, Japan) used to capture knee joint kinematics was different from that in Studies II and III. In addition to the FPKPA, side-to-side difference in the mean FPKPA between the two lower extremities, and the ability to perform valid SLS (yes/no) were explored as potential risk factors.

The players participated in the baseline SLS and height and weight measurements during their team’s player development monitoring event at the Eerikkilä Sports Institute. Using height and weight, BMI (kg/m²) was calculated. Each player completed a questionnaire with information regarding date of birth, sex, years of playing football, dominant leg, family history of musculoskeletal
disorders, chronic illnesses, orthopaedic surgeries, menstrual cycle, and previous injuries.

An injury was defined based on the consensus statement by Fuller and colleagues (2006) as “any physical complaint sustained by a player that result from football training or playing, causing a need for medical attention or time loss from fully football activities.” This study was limited to acute lower extremity (hip/groin/thigh/knee/shin/calf/ankle/foot) injuries, which were categorised as contact or non-contact according to the injury situation. Non-contact injury was defined as an injury that occurred without direct contact to the injured body part. During the 20-week injury registration, from January to June, a text message was sent at the end of the week to each player’s parent/legal guardian with the question “Has your child had any musculoskeletal complaints or injuries during the previous seven days?” Options provided for reply were “Yes” and “No”. When an injury or a musculoskeletal complaint was reported, the research assistants contacted the injured player’s parent/legal guardian to collect details of the injury using a standardised phone interview. The player was defined as injured until he/she was able to return to normal training and match play.

4.5 Statistical methods

In Study I, McNemar’s test for two related samples was used to analyse the differences in injury prevalence between sports club activities, school sports, and leisure time PA. To analyse the differences in injury prevalence between age groups, Pearson’s chi-square test was used. Odds ratios obtained from multivariate logistic regression analysis were used to analyse the association between the prevalence of sports club injuries and sports club participation frequency, between leisure time injury prevalence and leisure time PA frequency, and between the prevalence of PA-related injuries and exercise intensity. Age and sex were entered into each multivariate model to adjust for their potential confounding effect.

In Study II, one-way analysis of variance was used to test the differences in the mean FPKPA between the subjectively assessed groups (good/reduced/poor performance). To determine intra- and inter-rater reliability of the subjective assessment, Cohen’s kappa test was utilised. To determine the correlation between the subjective knee control assessment scale (good/reduced/poor performance) and the FPKPA, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was used. The kappa values and the correlation coefficient were interpreted as very good (0.81 to 1.00),
good (0.61 to 0.80), moderate (0.41 to 0.60), fair (0.21 to 0.40), and poor (<0.20) (Altman, 1991).

In Study III, to compare the injured and uninjured players, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to test the variables that were not normally distributed (age, BMI, exposure variables) and independent samples t test was used for normally distributed variables (height, weight, FPKPA). The chi-square test was used for categorical variables (sex, sport). To consider the possible non-linear relationship between intrinsic factors and the risk of injury, categorical variables were formed based on the continuous variables utilising the cohort mean and standard deviation (SD) (Bahr & Holme, 2003). Age, height, weight, BMI, FPKPA, training exposure, match exposure, and total exposure (training exposure + match exposure) were categorised as above normal (+1 SD above the mean), normal (within 1 SD of the mean), and below normal (-1 SD below the mean) with respect to the mean value for that risk factor in the cohort. A generalised linear mixed model for binary data with injury/no injury as the dependent variable was used to analyse the associations between the potential risk factors and the risk of acute non-contact lower extremity injury/ankle injury/knee injury. Leg was used as a unit of analysis and team and leg were used as random effects. First, the potential risk factors were analysed using a univariate model. Then, all the variables achieving P <0.20 in the univariate analysis were entered into a multivariate model. For the significant risk factors, ROC curve analysis was performed to establish the AUC, which was used to classify the combined sensitivity and specificity as outstanding (0.90–1), excellent (0.80–0.89), acceptable (0.70–0.79), poor (0.51–0.69) and no discrimination (0.50) (Hosmer, Lemeshow, & Sturdivant, 2013). The paired samples t test was used to analyse differences in the mean FPKPA between legs. The mean age of the cohort (15.7 years) was used to divide the players into age categories. The independent samples t test was used to analyse differences in FPKPA between older and younger players of the same sex. To compare the mean FPKPA between sexes, a univariate model with age as a covariate was used.

In Study IV, to compare the injured and uninjured subjects, the Mann–Whitney U test was used to test the variables that were not normally distributed (age, height, weight, BMI), the independent samples t test was used for the normally distributed variables (right FPKPA, left FPKPA), and the chi-square test was used for the categorical variables (sex). Similarly to Study III, categorical variables were formed based on the continuous variables utilising the cohort mean and SD. Age, height, weight, FPKPA, and FPKPA asymmetry were categorised as above normal, normal and below normal. For the subgroups of boys and girls, the categorised
variables were calculated based on the mean values of each subgroup. BMI was categorised into healthy, low, and overweight based on the cut-off values for adolescents (Cole, Bellizzi, Flegal, & Dietz, 2000; Cole, Flegal, Nicholls, & Jackson, 2007). A generalised linear mixed model for binary data with injury/no injury as the dependent variable was used to analyse the potential risk factors. Leg was used as a unit of analysis and team and leg were used as random effects. The independent samples t test was used to investigate the differences in the mean FPKPA between sexes. To analyse the differences in the mean FPKPA between the right and left leg and dominant and non-dominant leg, the paired samples t test was used. One-way analysis of variance was used to investigate the differences in the mean FPKPA between age groups.

In all four studies, statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (IBM SPSS Statistics Version 21 for Windows in Study II, v 23 in Studies I and III, and v 24 in Study IV). In all four studies, the significance level was set at P<0.05.

4.6 Contribution statement

In addition to being the first author and the corresponding author in all of the four manuscripts comprising this doctoral dissertation, the doctoral candidate has also been involved with several other aspects of the PROFITS study and the Sports Injury Prevention Youth Football study.

In the PROFITS study, the doctoral candidate was involved with the third year data collection. This included the collection of 3D (not used in this dissertation) and anthropometric data, as well as assisting the study coordinator by contacting the athletes to schedule test sessions, preparing the test sites, and checking baseline questionnaires for inconsistencies. In addition, the doctoral candidate contributed to data management and data preparation, such as calculating exposure times from match records.

In the Sports Injury Prevention Youth Football study the doctoral candidate was involved with the development of the research project. This included significant contributions to the planning, piloting, and managing the test events during the two-year test period. The doctoral candidate contributed to the training of the research assistants performing the field tests, as well as to teaching the study physiotherapists how to collect the injury data. The doctoral candidate carried out most of the single-leg squat tests before the intervention phase began. She distributed, checked, and managed the consent forms together with another
researcher. The doctoral candidate contributed to the coding and cleaning of the baseline questionnaire data as well as the test data. During the intervention phase, the doctoral candidate visited the teams on site to observe training sessions. In addition, she contributed to the education of the coaches of the intervention teams.

The doctoral candidate contributed to the injury registration during the first year of the Sports Injury Prevention Youth Football study. The data from this pilot year is not used in this dissertation. The doctoral candidate did not contribute to the second year injury registration beyond being involved with the recruiting and educating the study physiotherapist prior to the registration began, as it was necessary for the doctoral candidate to be blinded of the injury status during the 2D video analysis.
5 RESULTS

5.1 Adolescent physical activity-related injuries (I)

5.1.1 Subjects

Among the 9,462 subjects, 41% (3,881) were boys and 59% (5,581) were girls. The proportions of boys and girls by age are presented in Figure 8. Proportions of subjects reporting participation in sport club activities, school sports and leisure time PA are presented in Figure 9.

Figure 8. Proportion of boys and girls in each age category.
5.1.2 Injury prevalence in sports club activities, school sports, and leisure time PA

Among the subjects reporting PA participation, 32% (95% CI: 31.0–33.0) had sustained at least one PA-related injury during the one-year period. The injury prevalence in sports club activities, school sports, and leisure time PA for boys and girls was 27.5%, 9.8%, and 17.6% and 23.8%, 10.0%, and 13.3%, respectively. Injury prevalence was higher in sports club activities compared to school sports (P<0.001 for boys and for girls) and leisure time PA (P<0.001 for boys and for girls). In leisure time PA, injury prevalence was significantly higher than in school sports for boys (P<0.001) and for girls (P<0.001).

Injury prevalence varied significantly between age groups in sports club activities (boys P<0.003, girls P<0.004), school sports (P<0.001 for boys and for girls), and leisure time PA (P<0.001 for boys and for girls). Among the boys, the injury prevalence in sports club activities was highest among the older (aged 16 and 18 years) subjects (30.8% and 32.3%, respectively). Among the girls, the 14-year-olds had the highest prevalence of sports club injuries (26.7%). In school sports and leisure time PA, the injury prevalence was highest among the younger (aged 12 and 14 years) subjects in both boys and girls. Injury prevalence in the three settings by age group is presented in Figure 10.

Figure 9. Proportions of subjects participating in sports club activities, school sports (being students), and leisure time physical activity (PA) by sex.
5.1.3 PA participation frequency, intensity, and injury prevalence

Frequency of PA participation was associated with injury prevalence. In sports club activities, subjects participating 2 to 3 times per week had three-fold odds of injury.
compared to subjects participating less than once a month (OR 3.1, 95% CI: 2.0–4.6). For subjects participating in sports club activities 4 to 5 times per week or approximately daily, odds ratios were 6.9 (95% CI: 4.5–10.5) and 10.4 (95% CI: 6.7–16.3), respectively.

For leisure time PA, significant association between injuries and participation frequency were detected in subjects participating in leisure time PA at least once per week. Those participating approximately once per week had 1.7 (95% CI: 1.1–2.6) times higher odds of injury compared to those participating less than once a month. The odds of injury increased along with participation frequency, up to 3.1 (95% CI: 2.0–4.7) times among those participating approximately daily.

Exercise intensity, described as sweating and/or getting out of breath during PA, was associated with PA-related injury. Odds of injury were two-fold in subjects reporting moderate intensity (OR 2.2, 95% CI: 1.6–3.2) and four-fold in subjects reporting extensive (OR 4.1, 95% CI: 2.9–5.8) sweating/getting out of breath compared to the reference group reporting no sweating/getting out of breath during exercise.

5.2 Visual assessment of single-leg squat performance (II)

5.2.1 Subjects

A total of 378 players participated in the SLS test. Among them, 248 were female (age 17.7±4.0 years, height 168.2±7.0 cm, weight 62.7 kg±8.1 kg, BMI 22.1±2.5) and 129 were male (age 16.6±1.5 years, height 179.4±8.2 cm, weight 70.1 kg±10.4 kg, BMI 21.7±2.5). The number of players by sport is presented in Figure 11.
Figure 11. Number of players by sport.

5.2.2 Correlation between visual assessment and 2D video analysis

The proportions of players in the groups based on the visual assessment of knee control are presented in Figure 12. There were significant differences in the mean FPKPA between the groups of good, reduced, and poor performers on the dominant (P<0.001) and non-dominant leg (P<0.001). The mean values of FPKPA are presented in Table 6. The correlation between the visual assessment and the FPKPA was good for both the dominant and non-dominant leg (0.64 and 0.63, respectively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual assessment</th>
<th>Good mean (SD)</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>Reduced mean (SD)</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>Poor mean (SD)</th>
<th>range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant leg</td>
<td>2.2 (7.3)</td>
<td>-10.1 to 20.2</td>
<td>7.9 (7.6)</td>
<td>-16.2 to 31.0</td>
<td>18.7 (8.1)</td>
<td>-4.0 to 56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dominant leg</td>
<td>1.2 (6.4)</td>
<td>-14.1 to 15.2</td>
<td>7.5 (6.5)</td>
<td>-13.8 to 24.1</td>
<td>18.1 (8.7)</td>
<td>-6.0 to 38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. The frontal plane knee projection angle (°) mean with standard deviation (SD) and range for the groups based on the visual assessment of knee control.
5.2.3 Intra- and inter-rater reliability

The intra-rater agreement for the physiotherapist’s visual assessment was fair for the first-year sample, moderate to good for the second-year sample, and good to very good for the third-year sample. The inter-rater agreement between the physiotherapist’s and the non-experienced observer’s assessments was fair on the dominant leg (kappa=0.32) and poor on the non-dominant leg (kappa=0.16).

5.3 Knee control and injury risk in young floorball and basketball players (III)

5.3.1 Subjects

Complete data consisting of the FPKPA and prospective 12-month injury data were obtained from 306 players (age 15.7±1.8 years, height 173.3±9.1 cm, weight 64.6±10.0 kg). Among them, 52% were male, 48% were female, 50% played basketball, and 50% played floorball. The dominant leg was the right leg in 68% and the left leg in 29%. Nine players (3%) did not have or could not name a preferred leg. A total of 146 lower extremity injuries were recorded, and 110 players sustained at least one injury during the 12-month follow up. These players did not differ from the 196 uninjured athletes by age, height, weight, BMI, sex, sport, training exposure, match exposure, or match and training exposure.

The ankle was the most commonly injured body part (50% of injuries), followed by the knee (21%). The number of injuries to different lower extremity locations is presented in Figure 13. Only the players who had been free from acute lower extremity injury for the 12 months prior to baseline were included in the lower extremity injury risk factor analysis. Similarly, players had to be free from ankle injury for 12 months before the study to be included in the analysis of ankle injury risk factors and free from knee injury for the knee injury risk factor analysis. Among the 306 players, 155 of them had been free from lower extremity injury and 47 were injured during the follow-up. A total of 207 players had been free of an ankle injury and 41 of them sustained at least one ankle injury. In addition, 269 players had been free from knee injury and 18 of them sustained a knee injury.
5.3.2 Lower extremity injury risk factors

In the univariate analysis of lower extremity injury risk factors, a high FPKPA (>23.8°) during the SLS and a low match exposure (<3.9 hours) achieved P<0.20, and the categorical variables of FPKPA and match exposure were then entered into the multivariate model. In the multivariate analysis, high FPKPA (>23.8°) was a significantly associated with lower extremity injury (adjusted OR 2.67, 95% CI: 1.23 to 5.83, P=0.01). The odds ratios for the univariate analysis and the adjusted odds ratios for the multivariate analysis are presented in Table 7.

In the univariate analysis of acute ankle injury risk factors, only high FPKPA (>23.8°) achieved P<0.20 and therefore multivariate analysis was not performed. Athletes displaying a high FPKPA (>23.8°) during the SLS were 2.4 times more likely to sustain an ankle injury than were athletes in the reference group (OR 2.37, 95% CI: 1.13 to 4.98, P=0.02).

For the knee injury risk factor analysis, only higher age (>17.5 years) achieved P<0.20 in the univariate analysis, and no multivariate analysis was performed. Age was not a significant risk factor for acute knee injury (OR 2.22, 95% CI: 0.89 to 5.53).
Table 7. The odds ratios (OR) for potential risk factors for lower extremity injuries presented with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floorball</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.52-1.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.58-1.99</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;13.9 years)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.72-3.50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;17.5 years)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.55-3.35</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;164.2 cm)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.35-1.87</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;182.4 cm)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.37-2.22</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;54.7 kg)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.28-1.79</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;74.6 kg)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.17-1.50</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low (&lt;19.0)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.42-2.30</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, high (&gt;23.9)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.49-2.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;2.7°)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.43-2.90</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;23.8°)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.18-5.51</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure, low (&lt;162.4 h)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.58-3.02</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure, high (&gt;346.0 h)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.30-2.28</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure, low (&lt;3.9 h)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.13-1.49</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure, high (&gt;15 h)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.29-1.65</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, intermediate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, low (&lt;169.6 h)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.51-2.78</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, high (&gt;357.7 h)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.29-2.23</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.87-1.24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97-1.04</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97-1.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m2)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.90-1.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (*)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.98-1.05</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure (h)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00-1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure (h)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.94-1.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure (h)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00-1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;23.8)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.23-5.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variables with a P value <0.20 in the univariate analysis were entered into the multivariate model.
† Only variables with a P value <0.05 in the multivariate model are presented.
5.3.3 Sensitivity and specificity analyses

ROC curve analyses were performed to determine the value of the FPKPA as a screening tool for acute lower extremity and ankle injury. The AUCs for lower extremity injury and ankle injury were 0.59 and 0.58, respectively, which indicate poor combined sensitivity and specificity. As is presented in Figure 14 for lower extremity injuries, the FPKPA values overlap between the injured and uninjured lower extremities.

**Figure 13.** Distribution of injured and uninjured lower extremities by frontal plane knee projection angle. The vertical line represents the cut-off point for the high frontal plane knee projection angle (>23.8°). From Räisänen et al. 2018, reproduced in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution licence.
5.3.4 Age, sex, and side-to-side differences

The age, sex, and side-to-side differences in the FPKPA have not been published previously. The mean FPKPA was 12.1±11.4° for males and 14.5±9.4° for females. There were no significant differences in the FPKPA between sexes when adjusted for age. Mean FPKPA did not differ significantly between the dominant and non-dominant leg in any of the analysed groups (Table 8). Among males, the left leg FPKPA was significantly smaller than that of the right. Among males, the older athletes displayed significantly smaller FPKPAs compared with the younger athletes. The differences were significant on the right (P=0.006), left (P=0.001), dominant (P=0.001), and non-dominant (P=0.01) leg. Among females, there were no differences in the mean FPKPA between the older and younger athletes. Between male and female players, there were significant differences in the FPKPA on the left (P=0.005) and the non-dominant leg (P=0.03) among the older players.

Table 8. The mean frontal plane knee projection angle (FPKPA) for the right, left, dominant, and non-dominant leg by sex and age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and age group</th>
<th>FPKPA right</th>
<th>FPKPA left</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>FPKPA dominant</th>
<th>FPKPA non-dominant</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13.9 (11.9)</td>
<td>10.3 (10.6)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>12.8 (11.9)</td>
<td>11.4 (10.8)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 15.7 years</td>
<td>17.4 (10.4)</td>
<td>13.5 (10.1)</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>16.1 (11.1)</td>
<td>14.8 (9.7)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15.7 years</td>
<td>12.6 (12.1)</td>
<td>9.2 (10.6)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>11.6 (12.0)</td>
<td>10.2 (10.9)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.4 (9.3)</td>
<td>14.5 (9.6)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>14.3 (8.9)</td>
<td>14.1 (9.4)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 15.7 years</td>
<td>14.6 (9.2)</td>
<td>15.0 (10.0)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>14.9 (8.9)</td>
<td>13.7 (9.3)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15.7 years</td>
<td>14.2 (9.4)</td>
<td>13.9 (9.0)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>13.6 (9.0)</td>
<td>14.5 (9.5)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Knee control and injury risk in youth football players (IV)

5.4.1 Subjects

A total of 558 players (445 boys, 113 girls) participated in the baseline SLS and completed the injury surveillance. The basic characteristics of the players by sex and age group are presented in Table 9. The dominant leg, defined as the preferred leg for kicking the ball, was the right leg for 88% and the left leg for 12%. Two players did not name a preferred leg. During the follow-up, 285 acute lower
extremity injuries were registered, 142 (50%) of which were non-contact injuries. Among the 558 players, 37% (n=205) sustained at least one lower extremity injury.

Table 9. Mean (SD) values for basic characteristics by sex and age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>BMI</th>
<th>Playing football (years)</th>
<th>FPKPA (°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>151.6 (9.9)</td>
<td>41.1 (8.7)</td>
<td>17.7 (1.9)</td>
<td>6.5 (1.7)</td>
<td>16.5 (12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>143.3 (6.5)</td>
<td>34.9 (5.3)</td>
<td>16.9 (1.6)</td>
<td>5.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>17.6 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>148.5 (6.5)</td>
<td>38.0 (5.1)</td>
<td>17.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>6.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>17.5 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>154.0 (7.8)</td>
<td>43.3 (6.6)</td>
<td>17.8 (1.8)</td>
<td>6.8 (1.5)</td>
<td>17.0 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>161.7 (8.3)</td>
<td>49.9 (9.2)</td>
<td>18.9 (2.2)</td>
<td>8.0 (1.3)</td>
<td>14.2 (11.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>151.7 (9.2)</td>
<td>41.6 (7.7)</td>
<td>17.9 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.3 (1.6)</td>
<td>15.4 (10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>140.5 (4.1)</td>
<td>33.1 (3.9)</td>
<td>16.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>4.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>15.0 (9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>149.1 (6.4)</td>
<td>39.9 (5.8)</td>
<td>17.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>5.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>19.2 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>157.3 (5.9)</td>
<td>45.6 (5.9)</td>
<td>18.3 (1.6)</td>
<td>5.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>14.2 (11.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>159.6 (5.9)</td>
<td>47.8 (5.3)</td>
<td>18.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>6.2 (1.8)</td>
<td>12.2 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the injuries were minor, causing 1 to 3 days of absence from training and/or match play (Figure 15). The ankle was the most commonly injured body part (32% of injuries), followed by the knee (20%) (Figure 16). The dominant leg was injured in 51% and the non-dominant leg in 48% of the injury cases. In three slight injuries, the player was unable to identify which leg had been injured.

Figure 14. Severity of lower extremity injuries. From Räisänen et al. in press.
In the baseline SLS test, 40 players were unable to perform enough valid squats on either leg and an additional 92 players only performed the required number of squats on one leg. When comparing the injured players to the uninjured, there were no significant differences in the mean age, height, weight, BMI, number of years playing football, or the proportion of boys and girls.

### 5.4.2 Lower extremity injury risk factors

The intrinsic factors analysed in the univariate analysis are presented in Table 10. Based on the univariate analysis, the categorical variables of weight, BMI, and continuous height were entered into a multivariate model. None of the analysed variables were associated with lower extremity injuries (Table 11).

To examine the lower extremity risk factors in boys, categorical height, weight, and continuous age were entered into the multivariate model. None of the analysed variables were associated with lower extremity injuries. For the girls, none of the analysed intrinsic factors achieved P<0.20 in the univariate analysis.

**Figure 15.** Locations of lower extremity injuries. From Räisänen et al. in press.
## Table 10. Univariate analyses of the potential risk factors for acute lower extremity injuries presented with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>884 (183)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>226 (47)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.63 to 1.40</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>650 (133)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;10.8 years)</td>
<td>236 (46)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.64 to 1.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;13.2 years)</td>
<td>224 (51)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.78 to 1.63</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>726 (152)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;142.3 cm)</td>
<td>186 (33)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.53 to 1.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;161.1 cm)</td>
<td>172 (40)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.76 to 1.68</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>702 (148)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;33.9 kg)</td>
<td>204 (34)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.49 to 1.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.3 kg)</td>
<td>178 (43)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.79 to 1.73</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>984 (211)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>58 (7)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.24 to 1.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>40 (7)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.36 to 1.92</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>622 (126)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;4.0°)</td>
<td>154 (36)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.78 to 1.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;28.4°)</td>
<td>163 (34)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.67 to 1.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>938 (196)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>162 (31)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.59 to 1.38</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>574 (124)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.6°)</td>
<td>132 (25)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.53 to 1.39</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;18.8°)</td>
<td>148 (28)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.53 to 1.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>1110 (230)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>1084 (225)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1082 (225)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>1082 (225)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (°)</td>
<td>938 (196)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99 to 1.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry (°)</td>
<td>898 (164)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.20

n refers to the number of legs in the analysis
Table 11. Multivariate analyses of the potential risk factors for all acute lower extremity injuries for all subjects and the subgroups of boys and U13–U14 age groups presented with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>1084 (225)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1082 (225)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.06</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>984 (211)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>58 (7)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.25 to 1.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>40 (7)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.245 to 1.74</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>614 (128)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;141.7 cm)</td>
<td>128 (19)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.44 to 1.68</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;161.5 cm)</td>
<td>126 (31)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.59 to 2.14</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>636 (133)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;32.4 kg)</td>
<td>104 (14)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.31 to 1.34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.8 kg)</td>
<td>128 (31)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.58 to 2.07</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>884 (183)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.85 to 1.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the variables achieving P<0.20 in the univariate analyses were analysed. n refers to the number of legs in the analysis.

5.4.3 Non-contact lower extremity injury risk factors

In the univariate analysis of potential non-contact lower extremity risk factors low BMI and high FPKPA asymmetry achieved P<0.20. In the multivariate analysis, neither of the factors was significantly associated with non-contact lower extremity injuries. For the boys, low BMI and high FPKPA asymmetry achieved P<0.20 in the univariate analysis. For the girls, weight and ability to perform a valid SLS test were entered into the multivariate model but were not associated with the risk of non-contact lower extremity injury.

5.4.4 Age, sex, and side-to-side differences in the FPKPA

There were no significant differences in the mean FPKPA between boys and girls. There were significant differences in the FPKPA between age groups among boys (F=3.09, P=0.03) and girls (F=4.22, P=0.006). Among boys, the mean FPKPA decreased as age increased. Among girls, the greatest mean FPKPA was measured in the U12 age group. The oldest girls (U14) demonstrated the best frontal plane
knee control with a mean FPKPA of 12.2±8.3°. The mean FPKPAs by age and sex are presented in Table 9.

There were significant differences in the mean FPKPA between the right and left leg and between the dominant and non-dominant leg in boys and girls. In both sexes, the FPKPA was greater on the right leg compared to the left (P<0.001 for boys and girls) and greater on the dominant compared to the non-dominant leg (P<0.001 for boys, P=0.001 for girls). When further analysed according to age group, the differences were significant in all age groups among boys and U11 girls.
6 DISCUSSION

6.1 Physical activity-related injuries as a public health issue

According to the present findings, every third adolescent participating in sports club activities was injured during a 12-month period, and the prevalence of injuries increased along with the frequency and intensity of activity. Healthy life years and valuable training time are lost due to injuries during critical developmental years (Rumpf & Cronin, 2012).

6.1.1 Injury prevalence in different settings

It has been previously established that physical activity is the leading cause of adolescent injuries in many developed countries (Michaud et al., 2001). The purpose of Study I was to increase our understanding of the settings in which PA-related injuries occur. The results show that injury prevalence was higher in sports club activities compared to school sports and leisure time PA. Furthermore, the injury prevalence in leisure time PA was higher than prevalence in school sports.

A comparisons of these results to those of previous studies is somewhat limited by different data collection methods. A previous study on 9-, 12-, and 15-year-old Swedes utilised a 3-month recall period (Sundblad, Saartok, Engström, & Renström, 2005). Injury was defined as a traumatic injury that caused an interruption in PA participation and the need for medical attention by an adult. Most injuries occurred during leisure time PA (29%), followed by physical education classes (25%), and organised sports (19%). The remainder of the injuries occurred during break (16%), travel to or from school (3%), or in unknown circumstances (8%). More injuries were reported by girls than by boys in physical education classes, and the oldest students, who were in the 9th grade, reported more injuries from sports practices compared to the younger subjects. Overall, equal proportions of boys and girls reported injuries. In a study on 10- to 12-year-olds, injury incidence was highest in sports (0.66 injuries/1000 hours of participation), followed by physical education classes (0.50 injuries/1000 h), and
leisure time PA (0.39 injuries/1000 h) (Verhagen, Collard, Chin A Paw, & van Mechelen, 2009). Among a slightly younger cohort of 6- to 12-year-olds, injury incidence was highest in sports (1.57 injuries/1000 h), followed by leisure time PA (0.57 injuries/1000 h) and physical education classes (0.14 injuries/1000 h) (Jespersen et al., 2015). Even though there discrepancy between the studies on in which environment the injury prevalence or incidence is highest, we can gather that the injury prevalence in sports club activities is high. However, it must be noted that due to the large proportion of adolescents participating in leisure time PA, the absolute number of leisure time PA injuries is high (Nauta, Martin-Diener, Martin, van Mechelen, & Verhagen, 2015). Furthermore, given that physical education in schools is mandatory in the Finnish educational system, it should be fundamentally safe for the pupils. More effective injury prevention efforts are needed in all of the three PA settings.

6.1.2 Physical activity promotion and injury prevention

PA promotion is an important health promotion tool that is of great value to public health. However, there is a need to promote safe physical activity. While the harm caused by injuries may be very small at the population level in relation to the significant benefits of PA, ignoring the risk of injuries in PA promotion does not help to prevent injuries or increase the safety of PA (Verhagen et al., 2015). Annually, up to 8% of adolescents drop out of PA participation due to injury or fear of injury (Grimmer, Jones, & Williams, 2000). In addition, the long-term consequences of PA-related injuries need to be considered: adolescents dropping out due to injury lose the health benefits engendered by continuous participation.

The present findings indicate that the odds of injury increase along with frequency of participation and intensity. As regular and more frequent participation is promoted, efforts need to be made to enhance the safety of the participation. Moreover, it has been previously reported that a low level of PA is significant risk factor for PA-related injuries among 9- to 12-year-olds (Bloemers et al., 2012). If an adolescent who is not so interested in PA becomes injured, that could potentially give rise to a very negative attitude towards PA and lead to dropping out completely. To reduce the adverse effects of PA participation, it is very important that PA promotion also focuses on injury prevention (Bloemers et al., 2012; Finch & Owen, 2001; Verhagen et al., 2015).
6.1.3 Importance of surveillance and monitoring

One purpose of Study I was to update the knowledge on adolescent PA-related injury prevalence in Finland. Since 1977, the AHLS has been used to monitor many adolescent health and health-related behaviours, such as smoking and alcohol consumption. PA-related injuries were a part of the initial survey in 2007 and were included again in 2009 and 2013.

Injury surveillance is the first step toward injury prevention in the Translating Research into Injury Prevention framework (Finch, 2006). In Finland, new monitoring methods are necessary to collect reliable information regarding injury incidence. It has been shown previously that injury prevention reduces injury-related costs (Lacny et al., 2014; Marshall et al., 2016). Before the benefits of injury prevention efforts can be measured on national level, a national injury surveillance system is needed. Monitoring for injuries at the population level is a challenge (Finch et al., 2017), and surveillance of PA-related injuries should be incorporated into public health strategies (Finch & Owen, 2001). In Finland, the importance of adolescent PA-related injury prevention is acknowledged in the national action plan of injury prevention, but surveillance and monitoring methods have not been established (Markkula & Öörni, 2010).

For surveillance to provide sufficient sports injury data, multiple strategies of continuous data collection are needed. One possible level is the modification of coding in hospital emergency departments that allows sports to be identified as a cause of injury (Finch et al., 2014). With such coding, the hospital registry data could be used to assess the role of sports participation as a cause of injury, which would allow the public health burden to be estimated. Furthermore, by recording which sport the patient was participating in, it would be possible to assess the role of different sports and evaluate the need for injury prevention methods. However, emergency department visits only represent one aspect of the sports injury problem. In addition, the coding systems do have their weaknesses: the coding can be considered overly time-consuming by physicians and the same injuries can be coded differently (Rae, Britt, Orchard, & Finch, 2005). Therefore, other injury monitoring strategies are also needed.

National sports federations should be interested in injury prevention and continuous injury data collection, as it would provide important information regarding injury incidence in the sport. Furthermore, when injury prevention methods, such as changes in rules or safety equipment, are introduced, the data could be used to quantify the change in injury incidence. However, since sports
injury records are medical records, the requirements to ensure ethical use are very extensive. In Norway, an online questionnaire has been used for the injury and illness surveillance of Olympic and Paralympic athletes (Clarsen, Rønsen, Myklebust, Florenes, & Bahr, 2014).

6.1.4 Injury prevention

Previous studies have shown that it is possible to prevent adolescent PA-related injuries. Simply participating in sport club activities does not seem to provide the adolescents with the adequate movement control skills to correct faulty movement patterns. In a study on adolescent basketball and floorball players, basketball players did not demonstrate better knee control in a jump-landing task compared to floorball players, even though their sport includes jumping and landing (Leppänen et al., 2016). In the sport club environment, injury prevention exercise programs (IPEPs) have been shown to be effective in many team sports (Emery, Roy, Whittaker, Nettel-Aguirre, & van Mechelen, 2015; Rössler et al., 2014). Use of an IPEP has also been shown to produce good results in the school environment, although the results are still limited (Richmond, Kang, Doyle-Baker, Nettel-Aguirre, & Emery, 2016). However, the adoption and regular use of IPEPs in sports are challenging, and further studies on the optimal implementation strategies are needed (Lindblom, Carlfjord, & Hägglund, 2018; Lindblom, Waldén, Carlfjord, & Hägglund, 2014). In leisure time PA, injuries can be prevented by providing safe environments (Embree et al., 2016) and by non-legislative interventions regarding bicycle helmet use (Royal, Kendrick, & Coleman, 2007), for example. In conclusion, it is possible to prevent adolescent PA-related injuries.

6.2 Single-leg squat as a tool to assess frontal plane knee control

The results of Study II demonstrate that it is possible to detect differences in frontal plane knee control during the SLS using visual assessment. In addition, the results indicate that for an experienced observer, the intra-rater reliability of the visual assessment is good to very good.
6.2.1 Visual assessment of knee control

Significant differences in FPKPA between the SLS performances rated to be “good”, “reduced”, or “poor” were found. The FPKPA increased from the mean value of 1.2° to 2.2° in the good performers to 18.1° to 18.7° in the poor performances. Overall, the correlation between the visual assessment and the FPKPA was good. The results of this study are in accordance with a previous study, in which the same 3-point graded scale was used and significant differences between the three groups were detected (Stensrud et al., 2010). Harris-Hayes and colleagues (2014) also utilised a 3-point scale for knee control assessment, but with different criteria. They concluded that the agreement between the visual assessment and the 2D method is excellent. Using electromyography (EMG) to analyse differences in performance between the groups formed by visual assessment, Crossley and colleagues (2011) demonstrated that the “poor” performances differed from the “good” according to muscle activation patterns. The good performers had significantly earlier onset timing of the anterior gluteus medius and posterior gluteus medius compared to the poor performers. They concluded that the visual assessment may be utilised to identify individuals with hip muscle dysfunction.

The results indicate that the visual assessment of knee control can be a useful tool to identify athletes with reduced knee control in the field setting. From a practical point of view, the visual assessment gives a crude estimate of knee control that may enable clinicians to determine whether the athlete might benefit from exercises aimed to improve knee control.

6.2.2 Intra- and inter-rater reliability

The intra-rater reliability between the initial assessment during the test and the reassessment from the video image was calculated separately for each of the three years of testing. The kappa value increased from fair during the first year to good to very good during the third year. These results underline the importance of the observer’s experience, which further supports the findings of previous studies (Weeks et al., 2012; Whatman et al., 2012). Weeks and colleagues (2012) reported excellent intra-rater reliability for the experienced observers and good for the novice. The novice observers focused on the knee and did not consider the hip movement in their rating unlike the experienced observers. In the present study, inter-rater reliability during the third year for the more experienced and novice
observers was poor to fair. This is slightly lower than that reported in previous studies (Crossley et al., 2011; Whatman et al., 2012, 2013).

6.2.3 2D analysis of knee control in comparison to the 3D analysis

The main advantages of the 2D movement analysis compared to the 3D method are the ease of use and lower costs. The 2D analysis can be performed in a field setting with minimal equipment, since it requires only a video camera to capture the kinematics and a computer to calculate the FPKPA. For the 3D analysis, more equipment is needed, such as several high-speed cameras. The 3D data is therefore typically captured in a laboratory setting, as it is not as easily transported and set up as the 2D equipment. The 3D method is also more time consuming than the 2D method, which also contributes to the higher cost of the analysis. The value of the 3D method is that three dimensions are measured at once, instead of two. In the SLS performance, 3D analysis allows for the measurement of the knee flexion angle, which cannot be measured using the one-camera 2D method. From the 3D data, it is also possible to analyse the joint rotations, which is not possible in 2D. In the case of the SLS, quantifying the role of hip rotations in the frontal plane knee motion is of interest.

In previous studies on the SLS, both the 3D (Ageberg et al., 2010; Baldon et al., 2011; Claiborne et al., 2006; Graci & Salsich, 2015; Hollman et al., 2014; Horan et al., 2014; Mauntel et al., 2014; Weeks et al., 2012; Willson & Davis, 2008) and 2D (Bittencourt et al., 2012; DiMattia et al., 2005; Harris-Hayes et al., 2014; Herrington, Munro, & Comfort, 2015; Herrington, 2014; McLean et al., 2005; Munro et al., 2012; Stensrud et al., 2010; Stickler et al., 2015) movement analysis methods have been used. The 3D studies on SLS have been small, ranging from 20 to 41 subjects. For a prospective injury risk factor study, a much larger cohort is needed. Previously, two prospective studies investigating the role of knee control as an injury risk factor utilised the 3D analysis method (Hewett et al., 2005; Leppänen et al., 2017) to analyse vertical drop jump performances. It is possible that large cohort studies utilising 3D analysis could become more common in the future, as the cost of the technology decreases. However, since field-based testing makes it easier to recruit participants, it is possible that prospective risk factor studies could utilise the 2D method, while the 3D method could be used in the laboratory to further analyse the findings. For example, the finding of this dissertation that a large FPKPA during the SLS is associated with injuries among
young basketball and floorball players could be further analysed in 3D: for example, a sample of athletes presenting large FPKPA in SLS could be analysed in a 3D laboratory to quantify the joint angles of the SLS. This could enhance our understanding of which joint motions contribute most significantly to poor knee control.

In the SLS test procedure utilised in this doctoral dissertation, the 90° knee flexion angle requires substantial degree of hip flexion. One limitation of this procedure is that the ASIS markers are not always visible at the lowest point of the SLS owing to the combination of hip flexion and trunk forward lean. It may also be related to the body composition or size of the athlete: fat in the abdominal area can obscure the markers when the athlete squats to 90° knee flexion. However, this is a limitation not only in the 2D but also in the 3D method. In the 3D method, each marker has to be visible to at least two cameras at any given point in the movement. Therefore, non-visible markers create a gap in the 3D data. When considering which method to use, the limitations of that both methods must be taken into account.

### 6.3 Reduced knee control as a lower extremity injury risk factor

In Studies III and IV, the aim was to investigate whether frontal plane knee control during the SLS is associated with lower extremity injuries among young team sport athletes. In Study III, an increased FPKPA during the SLS was associated with higher odds of acute lower extremity injury and acute ankle injury. In Study IV, significant associations between the FPKPA and lower extremity injuries were not detected. To our knowledge, these are the first two prospective risk factor studies investigating the association between the FPKPA and lower extremity injuries.

#### 6.3.1 Frontal plane knee control as a lower extremity injury risk factor

Due to the lack of prospective studies on the SLS, comparisons are limited to studies applying other movement control tests. Utilising the VDJ, Hewett and colleagues (2005) established that among female high school athletes, subjects sustaining an ACL injury during the follow-up demonstrated a 2.5-times greater knee abduction moment upon landing compared to uninjured subjects. In young female floorball and basketball players, Leppänen and colleagues (2017) did not
detect associations between knee control in the VDJ and ACL injuries. In female football players, low normalised knee separation during the VDJ has been associated with a higher risk of acute lower extremity injuries (O’Kane et al., 2015). While the studies on frontal plane knee control in adolescent athletes are not in agreement, there are indications that reduced knee control may increase the risk of acute lower extremity in young team sport athletes.

Reduced knee control during the SLS is associated with reduced hip abductor strength (Crossley et al., 2011). Individuals with reduced frontal plane knee control utilise a hip adductor dominant movement strategy during the SLS, as indicated by their lower gluteus medius to hip adductor and gluteus maximus to hip adductor ratios (Mauntel et al., 2013). The gluteus medius is an important pelvic stabiliser, and adequate gluteus medius strength is required for good frontal plane knee control. Therefore, athletes demonstrating reduced knee control during the SLS should add gluteus medius strengthening to their training. Other strength measurements associated with reduced frontal plane knee control include lower knee flexion and extension (Claiborne et al., 2006), trunk side flexion (Stickler et al., 2015), and hip external rotation strength (Willson et al., 2006). In addition to strength measurements, hip joint stiffness may contribute to frontal plane knee control (Bittencourt et al., 2012). The combination of increased passive hip internal rotation ROM and reduced hip abductor strength contributes to a greater FPKPA.

Knee valgus does not refer to a simple motion, but instead to a combination of various lower extremity motions. Knee valgus may result from femoral adduction and tibial abduction, and there may be concomitant tibial and/or femoral rotations, tibial translation, and ankle eversion (Hewett et al., 2005; Powers, 2003; Quatman et al., 2010). The same FPKPA can arise from very different movements. Nilstad and colleagues (2015) explored the degree of which anatomical characteristics, knee laxity, and muscle strength can explain knee valgus during landing in female football players. Only 11% of the variance in knee valgus could be explained by their model, and further studies are needed to better elucidate the factors associated with knee valgus, since this knowledge could be used to design better training programs for knee control.

The risk of sports injury increases with age, and the risk of injury is higher among the adolescents over 13 years than among the younger adolescents (Emery, 2003). Therefore, it is more difficult to identify injury risk factors among the younger adolescents. During adolescence, knee control seems to improve with age: in Study IV, the oldest players displayed the smallest mean FPKPA, indicating the least valgus movement during the SLS. It is possible that poor frontal plane knee
control becomes a risk factor with increasing age. As size and strength increase with age, greater loads affect the joints and therefore greater valgus can be more problematic.

The lack of association between the FPKPA and future injuries in Study IV does not mean that knee control training is not important among younger adolescents. On the contrary, it seems relevant to start using IPEPs before the injury risk begins to increase with age. The IPEPs are often designed to be used as a warm-up and from a practical standpoint, it makes sense to start learning proper warm-up techniques at a young age (Froholdt, Olsen, & Bahr, 2009).

### 6.3.2 Improving knee control and physical performance

Acknowledging the need for further information on the factors contributing to knee valgus, there are indications that improving knee control requires increases in hip muscle strength and neuromuscular patterns. Furthermore, if ankle dorsiflexion ROM is limited, it should be addressed to allow the tibia to move forward during knee flexion in athletic tasks (Dill et al., 2014; Lima et al., 2018). Teaching correct movement strategies has been shown to yield improvements in knee control in collegiate female athletes (Mizner et al., 2008). Among adult females, significant improvements in knee control were measured in both the hip muscle strengthening group and technique training group (Watson et al., 2017).

Knee control training can also provide performance gains. It has been shown that among young football players, trunk stabilisation training improves measures of physical performance (Hoshikawa et al., 2013). In addition, other neuromuscular training programs have shown that improved knee control is not the only benefit and that the training also improves performance measures (Chappell & Limpisvasti, 2008; Distefano et al., 2010; Kilding, Tunstall, & Kuzmic, 2008; Noyes, Barber-Westin, Smith, & Campbell, 2011). In contrast, three studies on adolescent female football players reported no effect on performance tests after IPEP intervention (Lindblom, Waldén, & Hägglund, 2012; Steffen, Bakka, Myklebust, & Bahr, 2008; Vescovi & VanHeest, 2010).

Even though injury prevention is important for both public and individual health, preventing future injuries is not necessarily of interest to young athletes, though improving their athletic performance usually is. In efforts to increase implementation and compliance with IPEPs, it may be useful to emphasise the connection to potential performance enhancements and to develop IPEPs that,
both reduce injury risk and improve performance. However, further studies on this topic are needed.

6.4 The 2D analysis of the single-leg squat as a screening test

6.4.1 The predictive value of FPKPA

In Study III, significant associations between the FPKPA and acute lower extremity injuries and acute ankle injuries were detected. To examine the predictive value of the FPKPA, a ROC curve analysis was performed. The area under the curve (AUC) was 0.59 for lower extremity injuries and 0.58 for ankle injuries, which can be interpreted as poor combined sensitivity and specificity. The obstacle is the overlapping FPKPA between the injured and uninjured players. The test is unable to separate two distinctly different groups, which seems to be the issue with all potential screening tools (Bahr, 2016a). For a screening test to accurately identify the athletes who are likely to become injured, high sensitivity is essential. In previous studies on adolescent athletes, highest sensitivity values have been reported for LESS at 86% (Padua et al., 2015), FMSTM at 78% (Chalmers et al., 2017), knee valgus displacement at 75% (Holden et al., 2017), and knee abduction moment at 73% (Hewett et al., 2005). However, none of these results have been repeated in other cohorts. The FPKPA is less sensitive than the previously studied screening tests, and the present findings indicate that the 2D analysis of the single-leg squat is not predictive of injury.

6.4.2 The practical value of movement control tests

It has been previously suggested that one goal of sports injury research is to develop and validate screening tools, that can be used to identify high-risk athletes (Shultz et al., 2010). Since then, several studies on this topic have been published, some of which were presented earlier in chapter 2.4. Recently, several articles, editorials and letters to the editor have been published discussing the value of screening tests (Bahr, 2016a, 2016b; Clarsen & Berge, 2016; Cook, 2016; McCunn et al., 2016; McCunn & Meyer, 2016). A number of experts in the field of sports medicine were asked about their views on the future research priorities in terms of
attempts to reduce the rates of injury and illness is sports. In the report, it was predicted that over the next 10 years,

“We will have realized that attempting to predict injury risk from pre-participation screening tests is futile.” (Finch et al., 2017)

If we accept this and discard the goal of predicting injury risk using specific tests, it does not mean that we must discard the valid and reliable tests that are in fact associated with injury risk, as these tests can be used to measure the development of neuromuscular control (Herrington et al., 2015; Noyes, Barber-Westin, Fleskenstein, Walsh, & West, 2005). Preliminary results suggest that the SLS can be used to measure improvement in frontal plane knee control after neuromuscular training (Herrington et al., 2015). The authors compared two programs, strength training and jump-landing, to examine their effects on the FPKPA. The strength training program produced significant improvements in the FPKPA among healthy female participants compared to both the jump-landing program group and the control group. However, future studies on this topic are needed. In addition, the possibility of using the FPKPA during the SLS in return-to-play assessments should be explored.

It is important to differentiate between a risk factor and the predictive value of a test. Due to the multifactorial nature of sports injuries, attempts to predict who will become injured do not seem feasible. Moreover, if such a test existed, would it cause harm? Would it cause athletes to give up their sport due to fear of injury? Despite the lack of predictive value, identifying and correcting movement control deficits, as well as other risk factors, is important. The results of this doctoral thesis further support the previous findings that movement control deficits can increase the risk of lower extremity injuries and should be directly addressed with training.

6.5 Age, sex, and side-to-side differences in frontal plane knee control

In Studies III and IV, age, sex, and side-to-side differences in frontal plane knee control were investigated.
6.5.1 Leg dominance

Leg dominance can be defined as an imbalance of muscular strength, flexibility, and/or joint kinematics between the lower extremities (Myer et al., 2004). Overly relying on the stronger leg is considered to place the dominant leg under greater stress, whereas the weaker, non-dominant leg becomes unable to effectively absorb even the average forces generated during athletic tasks (Ford et al., 2003). A difference of over 15% is considered to predispose the athlete to injuries (Hewit, Cronin, & Hume, 2012). In collegiate athletes, elevated injury risk was detected in athletes with asymmetries in strength and flexibility (Knapik et al., 1991). Injury risk increased when the isokinetic right knee flexion strength or the passive right hip extension ROM was 15% greater compared to the left side. The authors hypothesised that the greater force generated by the right leg could result in damage to the left leg knee flexors if the muscles are not able to adequately absorb or transfer the force. In high school and collegiate athletes, asymmetry between the right and left leg reach distance during the star excursion balance test (SEBT) has been associated with a higher risk of injury (Plisky et al., 2006; C. A. Smith et al., 2015). In male youth football players, peak landing force asymmetry in the single-leg countermovement jump was associated with a higher risk of injuries (Read et al., 2018). The IPEPs can be useful in reducing the side-to-side differences between lower extremities. Utilising an IPEP has been shown to generate more significant improvement in the strength of the non-dominant leg compared to the dominant leg, thereby correcting leg dominance (Hewett, Stroupe, Nance, & Noyes, 1996).

It has been previously reported that leg dominance is prevalent in male youth football players (Atkins, Bentley, Hurst, Sinclair, & Hesketh, 2013; Daneshjoo, Rahnama, Mokhtar, & Yusof, 2013). The results of Study IV are in agreement with the previous findings on boys, and significant side-to-side differences were also detected in girls in the present study. One interesting finding is that the side-to-side differences in the FPKPA between the dominant and non-dominant leg were detected in the youngest girls (U11) and the oldest boys (U13 and U14). This could indicate that side-to-side asymmetry increases during pubertal growth. It has been previously reported that adolescent girls demonstrate poorer knee control during compared to before pubertal growth (Ford, Shapiro, Myer, Van Den Bogert, & Hewett, 2010). However, this cannot be validated using our data since no maturity estimates suitable for both sexes were utilised. However, our results further support the finding of Atkins and colleagues (2013) that side-to-side imbalances
considerably increase during the age that typically aligns with a period of rapid growth. Prepubescent athletes possess great potential to develop optimal biomechanical movement patterns and decrease the risk of injury by regular neuromuscular training (Hewett et al., 2016). Therefore, it is important to implement injury prevention protocols as part of regular training in childhood and early adolescence, prior to the start of the pubertal growth spurt (Myer, Faigenbaum, et al., 2011; Rumpf & Cronin, 2012).

### 6.5.2 Age and sex

Among the young football players, the mean FPKPA decreased with age, indicating age-related improvements. In the older cohort of basketball and floorball players, age-related differences were only prevalent in males, with older males displaying better knee control compared to the younger. It has been previously reported that frontal plane knee control in landings declines with age in female but not in male athletes (Sasaki et al., 2013). In Study III, significant sex differences in the FPKPA were detected among the older players. This is in agreement with a previous meta-analysis concluding that in adolescent athletes, sex differences in knee control increase with age (Holden et al., 2016). It has been suggested that boys can regain and improve their neuromuscular control after the adolescent growth spurt, but that this regain is not observed in girls (Hewett, Myer, & Ford, 2004). It has been reported that after the cessation of pubertal growth, female athletes do not make great gains in strength levels (Beunen & Malina, 1988), which may be related to the reduced knee control seen in females. These results indicate that including regular knee control exercises in training programs is critical for adolescent female athletes.

The mean FPKPA did not differ between males and females in young football players or in the cohort of basketball and floorball players. When comparing the older basketball and football players (>15.7 years), males displayed significantly better knee control on the left and the non-dominant leg compared to females. In a previous study utilising visual assessment of frontal plane knee control during the SLS test, no differences were detected between sexes. However, sex differences in frontal plane knee control have been reported in landing kinematics. A meta-analysis investigating landing biomechanics in adolescent athletes reported that females demonstrate significantly greater knee valgus compared to males (Holden et al., 2016). It is possible that the ground reaction forces during landing contribute...
to the sex differences in knee control: compared to males, females may be unable to absorb the force as well. The fact that the SLS is a slower movement without impact might explain the low prevalence of sex differences in the FPKPA during the SLS in adolescent athletes.

6.6 Strengths and limitations

The main purpose of this doctoral dissertation was to address a knowledge gap regarding the predictive value of the single-leg squat (SLS) test. Several observational studies describing different aspects of the SLS have been previously published. While some of these studies have indicated that the SLS has the potential to be developed into a screening tool, this topic had not been directly investigated. Addressing this knowledge gap is considered a major strength of this doctoral dissertation.

The part of this doctoral dissertation involving an examination of the role of the frontal plane as a lower extremity risk factor is based on two large prospective studies. These prospective studies, with their large cohorts and low drop-out rates, represent another strength of this work.

Previous studies have explored the validity and within-day and between-days reliability of the 2D FPKPA, and it has been reported to be a valid and reliable tool to measure frontal plane knee motions (McLean et al., 2005; Munro et al., 2012). The use of a single person, who was blinded to the future injury status, to perform all the 2D video analysis used in this dissertation is a strength since it can be considered valuable for the reliability of the measurements. However, since the inter-tester reliability of the 2D video analysis has not been determined, it is difficult to predict if similar results would be reproduced by another person, which limits the generalisability of the results. In addition, there are potential sources of measurement bias in the 2D video analysis. Some athletes performed the SLS with a significant trunk forward lean, limiting the visibility of the ASIS markers in some cases. In these cases, the last point at which the markers were visible was determined, and the marker movement was assessed based on the movement of the pelvis. This is a limitation of the 2D video analysis method. Another potential source of measurement bias occurred due to always performing the SLS test on the right leg first, which could have been eliminated by randomising the starting leg.

The results of this thesis provide important practical value to physiotherapists, athletic trainers, and physicians working with young athletes, as well as to coaches,
athletes, and parents. Based on this work, we know that the single-leg squat can be a useful tool to identify movement control deficits. We also have more evidence that improving frontal plane knee control is important for young athletes. These practical implications are considered definitive strengths of this work.

However, there are some additional limitations. In Study I, the use of a non-validated questionnaire is a limitation. In addition, the retrospective method may have introduced a recall bias. While the large nationally representative sample is a strength, the low response rate is a potential cause of selection bias. For these reasons, the results of Study I should be interpreted with caution.

In Study IV, the SLS procedure was too demanding for some of the participants. This was somewhat surprising since the test procedure was piloted on a team of young floorball players and no issues with the test procedure were recorded. Subjects who were unable to perform an adequate number of SLS on either leg had to be excluded from the risk factor analysis, which most likely affected the results. It is unfortunate that these subjects could not be analysed because they had trouble with knee control, and it should be considered a source of bias.

The possibility of type II error in Studies III and IV must be considered. Statistical power calculations were performed for the PROFTTS study and the Sports Injury Prevention in Youth Football study. However, in Study III only the players with no self-reported injury during the 12 months prior to the study were included in the analysis; in Study IV, only the control group of the cluster-randomised controlled trial was included. These limitations to the included subjects may have weakened the statistical power.

The injury registration methods are a potential source of bias. In Study III, a coaching staff-based registration was employed. It is possible that the coaching staff was not aware of minor injuries, which may have limited the validity of the results. In addition to the registration method, injury definitions are another potential source of bias. In the self-administered questionnaire in Study I, no definition of injury was given. In Study III, only time-loss injuries were recorded, whereas in Study IV, slight injuries that did not result in missed training or match play were also recorded.

Attempts were made to control for the potentially confounding factors. In Studies III and IV, before the risk factor analysis, the mean values of the basic characteristics of the injured and uninjured players were compared to identify potential confounding factors. The potentially confounding effects of the team were controlled for in the risk factor analysis by incorporating them as random
effects. In Study I, age- and sex-adjusted analyses were used. However, it is still possible that certain confounders were not identified.

6.7 Future implications

Going forward, an interesting future study would be to replicate Study III in another cohort of young team sport athletes to investigate if the same associations between the FPKPA and lower extremity injuries could be detected.

In the future, it is important to use validated tools to continuously monitor the incidence of adolescent PA-related injuries in Finland. Currently the information is limited to retrospective studies is mostly self-reported. Surveillance methods need to be established to monitor the trend of PA-related injuries and its population burden.

As more and more injury risk factors are identified, the interaction between the risk factors can be explored further. In the future, it would be interesting to study the interaction between frontal plane knee control and training loads, anatomical characteristics, range of motion and strength measurements. This may reveal clusters of factors that together increase the risk of injury, as has been done in the context of handball (Møller et al., 2017).

Further research might also explore if the 2D analysis of the SLS is a suitable tool to measure improvements in knee control after training, as some previous studies have suggested. With advancements in technology, such as movement analysis tools for smart phones, calculating the FPKPA could be done quickly in a field setting. For an athlete, quantitative feedback on knee control could be a valuable motivational tool.

To take this even further and to collect more data than just the FPKPA, the use of wearable sensors in knee control research would be an interesting future step. Wearable sensors carry the potential to measure knee control in real-time sporting events, such as games and practice. This could represent a very valuable contribution to sports injury research. It is conceivable that the use of wearable sensors might enable data sets similar to those currently collected in 3D laboratories to be collected in the field setting.
7 CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of the present thesis are the following:

1) The prevalence of adolescent physical activity injuries is highest in sports club activities. More preventative measures are needed to reduce the injury burden.

2) The visual assessment of frontal plane knee control on a 3-point graded scale correlates relatively well with the frontal plane knee projection angle measured by 2D video analysis. For clinical practice, the visual assessment may be a suitable tool for crude knee control assessment when performed by experienced observers.

3) Among older adolescents, a large frontal plane knee projection angle during the single-leg squat is associated with higher odds of acute lower extremity injuries.

4) 2D analysis of the single-leg squat test is not predictive of future injuries in young team sport athletes.

5) Young football players display significant side-to-side differences in frontal plane knee control between the dominant and non-dominant leg. The side-to-side differences are significant among boys and girls. Sex-related differences were present among older adolescents, with males displaying superior knee control.

6) Side-to-side difference in frontal plane knee control but is not associated with lower extremity injuries among young football players.
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Adolescent physical activity-related injuries in sports club, school sports and other leisure time physical activities
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Abstract: Background: The objective was to study physical activity (PA)-related injuries in sports club, school sports, and other leisure time PA, and the associations between injuries and PA participation frequency and intensity. Methods: A nationally representative sample was obtained and a structured questionnaire was sent. A total of 9,462 Finns (12–18 years) completed the survey. Prevalence of PA-related injuries was gathered by separate questions about sports club injuries, school sports injuries and other leisure time PA injuries. Results: Injury prevalence was higher in sports club activities than in other leisure time PA or school sports for boys (p < 0.001) and girls (p < 0.001). The prevalence of other leisure time injuries was higher than the prevalence of injuries in school sports for boys (p < 0.001) and girls (p < 0.001). Injuries were associated with higher frequency (OR 10.4, 95% CI 6.7–16.3) and intensity (OR 4.1, 95% CI 2.9–5.8) of PA. Conclusions: Out of the three settings, injury prevalence was highest in sports club activities. Higher PA participation frequency and intensity increased the risk of injury. There seems to be a need for further preventative measures to reduce the risks of PA-related injuries, especially in the sports club setting.
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PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

Participation in physical activity (PA) provides positive effects on health and wellbeing. The downside of PA is the risk of injury. Adolescents are active in different setting: in sports clubs, schools, and in unorganised activities during leisure time. In sports clubs the proportion of adolescents who get injured is higher than in other settings. But on the other hand, other leisure time PA is more widely practiced. This leads to a high number of injuries even though the proportion of injured adolescents is lower than in sports clubs.

Higher frequency and higher intensity of PA is associated with a higher risk of injuries. There is an urgent need to introduce proven injury prevention measures, such as neuromuscular training, safe equipment and environment in different PA settings.
1. Introduction

Physical activity (PA) in adolescence is associated with various positive outcomes on health, well-being, and socio-economic factors. Adolescent PA provides health benefits such as improved bone health (Hallal, Victora, Azevedo, & Wells, 2006), lower blood pressure (Janssen & LeBlanc, 2010), positive changes on the markers of metabolic syndrome (Janssen & LeBlanc, 2010), and lower odds of overweight and obesity (Janssen, Katzmarzyk, Boyce, King, & Pickett, 2004). Adolescent PA also promotes self-esteem (Biddle & Asare, 2011; Hallal et al., 2006) and mental health (Biddle & Asare, 2011). In addition to the positive health effects, PA participation in adolescence predicts higher educational level, higher socio-economic status and higher earnings in adulthood (Kari et al., 2016; Koivusilta, Nupponen, & Rimpelä, 2011). Other important benefits of PA participation are relaxation (van Mechelen et al., 1996), fun, enjoyment, social support, social interaction (Allender, Cowburn, & Foster, 2006) it provides.

Even though sports and recreational activities are generally safe and promote good health, it has been recognized that PA-related injuries have a significant impact on public health (Finch, Wong Shee, & Clapperton, 2014; Schwebel & Brezausek, 2014). The incidence of PA-related injuries is higher among adolescents than adults (Schmikli, Backx, Kemler, & van Mechelen, 2009), and in the past decades, injury occurrence among young people has increased (Tiirikainen, Lounamaa, Paavola, Kumpula, & Parkkari, 2008). Participation in sports and recreational activities has been identified as a major cause of adolescent injuries (Pickett et al., 2005). In Finland, adolescent sports club participation is the strongest risk factor for injury hospitalization throughout adolescence and early adulthood (Mattila, Parkkari, Koivusilta, Kannus, & Rimpelä, 2009). PA-related injuries also have long term consequences since they can lead to sub-optimal health in later life (Drawer & Fuller, 2001; Kujala, Kaprio, & Sarno, 1994).

Injuries have been reported to be the leading cause why people stop participating in PA (National Center for Disease Control & Prevention, 2002). It has been estimated that annually 8% of adolescents drop out of recreational sporting activities because of injuries or the fear of getting injured (Grimmer, Jones, & Williams, 2000). Reducing the risk of injury increases the likelihood of the continued health benefit (MacKay et al., 2004).

The first step in the sequence of prevention of PA-related injuries is establishing the extent of the injury problem (van Mechelen, Hlobil, & Kemper, 1992). Studies on adolescent PA-related injuries often focus on the individuals who participate in sports in the elite level, while relatively little is known about the injuries that occur in other PA settings. Some prior studies have investigated PA-related injuries in different settings among 6–12-year-old children (Bloemers et al., 2012; Jespersen et al., 2015; Verhagen, Collard, Paw, & van Mechelen, 2009), but we are not aware of previous studies on sports club, school sports and leisure time PA-related injuries on adolescent populations.

In sports club the activities are usually structured and often the focus is on improving the performance in a single sport. In this study school sports cover both the mandatory and self-selected physical education classes (these are mandatory in Finland) and possible student sport activities organised by the school, for example ball games organised during the recess or after school. Other leisure time PA consists of unorganised physical activities, which in Finland can vary by the season, since winter offers very different opportunities for PA summer.

The main objective of this study was to compare the injury rates of 12–18-year-olds in three settings: sports club, school sports and leisure time physical activities. The second aim was to study the association between age and injury prevalence in different settings. Thirdly this study set out to investigate the association between PA-related injuries and PA-participation frequency and exercise intensity. Based on previous studies on younger populations, we hypothesized that there would be more injuries in sports clubs than in other PA settings.
2. Materials and methods

2.1. Data collection
This study is part of the Adolescent Health and Lifestyle Survey (AHLS). The AHLS is a nationwide survey system monitoring the health and health-related lifestyle of young people in Finland. The survey has been conducted every second year since 1977. The survey covers several topics related to adolescent health. Some of the topics alternate and the questions about PA-related injuries were included in the survey in 2009 and 2013. This study reports the combined data from those two years.

In each study year, a nationally representative sample of 12, 14, 16, and 18-year-old Finns born on certain days in June, July, and August was obtained from the Population Register Centre. The dates of birth used in the sampling were selected to ensure the sample included different subjects for each study year. A 12 page structured questionnaire was mailed in February of both study years. Enclosed with the questionnaire the subjects received personal user names and passwords, and information about the option of completing the questionnaire online. Up to three follow-up enquiries were sent to non-respondents. The questionnaire was sent to a total of 19,318 subjects: 9,920 subjects in 2009 and 9,398 subjects in 2013.

2.2. Study participants
In 2009 the number of respondents was 5,516, out of which 2,288 were boys and 3,228 were girls. In 2013, 4,158 responded (1,687 boys and 2,471 girls). For the combined data of 2009 and 2013, the response rate was 50%. A total of 212 subjects were excluded from the analysis due to inconsistencies between their injury information and their PA participation information or information about their student status. In these cases the subject reported no PA participation or being a student but reported an injury in that setting, or vice versa. Out of the 9,462 subjects included in the study, 59% were girls and 41% were boys. The distributions for age groups for boys and girls are presented in Table 1. Participation rates in sports club activities, school sports, and other leisure time PA are presented in Table 2.

2.3. Measurements

2.3.1. PA-related injuries
The injury prevalence refers to the proportion of subjects who had been injured in physical activities during the past twelve months. The injury prevalence’s in three settings were based on three questions: “During the past year, have you suffered an injury while participating in sports club activities?”, “During the past year have you suffered an injury while participating in a physical education class or instructed student sport?”, and “During the past year have you suffered an injury while participating in other leisure time physical activities (not in a sports club)”? In 2009, three options were provided: “No”, “Once”, and “Twice or more”. In 2013, there were four options: “No”, “Once”, “Twice”, and “Three times or more”. Due to the different answer options in 2009 and 2013, the injury data were combined to create a dichotomous variable consisting of classes “Not injured” and “Injured at least once”. Information about student status was inquired with the question “At the moment, are you a student?” Three options were provided: “No, I’m not a student”, “Yes, I am a full time student”, and “Yes, I’m a student alongside going to work”. In the Finnish education system, physical education is mandatory in comprehensive schools, general upper secondary schools, and vocational schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Proportions of subjects in age groups by gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CI = confidence interval.
Based on this, it was assumed that all the subjects, who reported being students, participate in school sports (physical education classes and student sports).

The injury prevalence in sports club activities was calculated as a percentage of subjects reporting at least one sports club injury out of subjects reporting participation in sports club activities. The injury prevalence in school sports activities was calculated as a percentage of subjects reporting at least one school sports injury out of subjects reporting being students. The injury prevalence in other leisure time PA was calculated as a percentage of subjects reporting at least one leisure time PA injury out of subjects reporting participation in other leisure time PA.

2.3.2. PA participation and exercise intensity

PA participation levels were derived from two questions: “How often do you participate in sports in your leisure time through sports club training, competitions or games?” and “How often do you participate in PA in other ways in your leisure time?” Seven alternatives were provided: “not at all”, “less often than once a month”, “1–2 times a month”, “approximately once a week”, “2–3 times a week”, “4–5 times a week”, and “approximately every day”. Exercise intensity was determined from the question “When I do sports or PA, usually I experience: no sweating or getting out of breath/some sweating or getting out of breath/moderate sweating or getting out of breath/extensive sweating or getting out of breath/I do not exercise in my leisure time”.

To determine whether exercise intensity was related to injuries, the injuries in sports club, school sports, and other leisure time PA were combined into a new dichotomous variable: “Suffered at least one PA-related injury”. The injury prevalence was calculated as the proportion of subjects reporting at least one injury out of all the subjects.

2.4. Ethics

The study follows the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Subjects were informed of the aims, methods, voluntary participation, privacy and confidentiality of the collected information. The study protocol has been approved by the Ethics Committee of Tampere Region (reference Lausunto 2/2010) and the Ethics Committee of the Pirkanmaa Hospital District (reference ETLR06226). Written informed consent was not required.

2.5. Statistical methods

Statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS software (IBM SPSS Statistics Version 23 for Windows). Since some subjects had been injured in more than one PA setting, the groups were not considered to be independent when comparing the injury prevalence between the sports club activities, school sport activities, and other leisure time PA. Therefore McNemar’s test for two related samples was used to test the differences in injury prevalence between PA settings. Pearson’s χ² test was used to test differences in the injury prevalence between age groups. Odds ratios (ORs) were used to test for differences in the injury prevalence by sport club participation frequency, other leisure time PA participation frequency and exercise intensity. ORs were obtained from multivariate logistic regression analysis. Age and gender where entered into each multivariate model to adjust for their potential confounding effect. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

### Table 2. Proportions of subjects participating in sports club activities, school sports and other leisure time physical activities by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical activity setting</th>
<th>Boys (n = 3,881)</th>
<th>Girls (n = 5,581)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports club activities</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>50.8–54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sports</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>96.7–97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure time PA</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>94.9–96.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CI = confidence interval.
3. Results

3.1. Injury prevalence in different settings
Out of the subjects who reported participating in PA in any of the three settings, 32.0% (95% CI, 31.0–33.0) had suffered at least one PA-related injury in the past 12 months. The injury prevalence in sports club activities was 27.5% (95% CI, 25.4–29.6) for boys and 23.8% (95% CI, 22.0–25.6) for girls. In school sports activities, the injury prevalence was 9.8% (95% CI, 8.8–10.8) for boys and 10.0% (95% CI, 9.2–10.8) for girls. In other leisure time PA, the injury prevalence was 17.6% (95% CI, 16.3–18.9) for boys and 13.3% (95% CI, 12.3–14.3) for girls.

According to the McNemar’s test for two related samples, the injury prevalence in sports club activities was significantly higher than the injury prevalence in school sports and in other leisure time PA for boys (p < 0.001) and girls (p < 0.001). The prevalence of other leisure time PA injuries was higher than the prevalence of school sport injuries for boys (p < 0.001) and girls (p < 0.001).

Pearson’s χ² test was used to test for differences between age groups. The injury prevalence in sports club, school sports and other leisure time PA by age groups are shown in Figure 1. The injury prevalence varied significantly between the age groups in sports club injuries for boys (p < 0.05) and girls (p < 0.05). The sports club injury prevalence was highest in the 16 and 18-year-olds among boys.

![Figure 1. Injury prevalence (%) in sports club activities, school sports and other leisure time physical activities in the past 12 months by age group for boys and girls presented with 95% confidence interval (CI).](image-url)
and in the 14-year-olds among girls. In school sports and other leisure time PA, the injury prevalence was lowest in the older age groups among boys ($p < 0.001$) and girls ($p < 0.001$).

### 3.2. Associations between injuries and PA participation and intensity

Multivariate logistic regression analysis was used to test for the associations between injuries and PA participation and intensity. Sports club injuries were associated with the frequency of sports club activities. The odds ratio was highest for those who participated in sports club activities approximately every day (OR 10.4, 95% CI 6.7–16.3). Participating in sports club activities 2–3 times per week or more often significantly increased the risk of sports club injury. The ORs for sports club injuries by participation frequency are presented in Table 3.

The risk for other leisure time PA injuries increased when participation frequency was once a week or higher. The ORs for other leisure time injuries by participation frequency are presented in Table 4.

### Table 3. Age and gender-adjusted ORs and 95% CIs for sports club injuries by frequency of sports club activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of sports club activity</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 Times a month</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0–3.1</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately once/week</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9–2.3</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 Times/week</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0–4.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 Times/week</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.5–10.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately daily</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.7–16.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ORs were derived from multivariate logistic regression analysis.

*Statistical significance based on $p < 0.05$.

### Table 4. Age and gender-adjusted ORs and 95% CIs for other leisure time injuries by frequency of leisure time physical activity (PA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of other leisure time PA</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 Times a month</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8–2.2</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately once/week</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1–2.6</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 Times/week</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4–3.1</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 Times/week</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.7–3.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately daily</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0–4.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ORs were derived from multivariate logistic regression analysis.

*Statistical significance based on $p < 0.05$.

### Table 5. Age and gender-adjusted ORs and 95% CIs for all physical activity-related injuries by intensity of physical activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity (sweating/getting out of breath)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1–2.3</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6–3.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.9–5.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ORs were derived from multivariate logistic regression analysis.

*Statistical significance based on $p < 0.05$. 
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Exercise intensity was associated with the risk of PA-related injury. Those reporting moderate or extensive sweating/getting out of breath when exercising had 4.1 times higher risk of injury compared to those, who didn’t sweat/get out of breath when exercising. The ORs for all PA-related injuries by intensity level are presented in Table 5.

4. Discussion
To our knowledge, this is the first study to compare the injury prevalence in sports club activities, schools sports and other leisure time PA among adolescents. The findings of this study demonstrate that the injury prevalence was significantly higher in sports club activities than in school sports activities and other leisure time PA. In addition, the prevalence of other leisure time PA injuries was higher than the prevalence of school sports injuries. One possible explanation to these differences could be the intensity of PA, since our results also show that exercise intensity was associated with the risk of injury. The sports club PA is structured and the goal is to improve sports performance, therefore it is possibly more intense than other leisure time PA. In school sports the goal is mainly educational and the intensity is likely to be lower than in the other PA settings.

Previous studies on injuries in sports clubs, school sports and other leisure time injuries have been done on school children, aged 12 years and under. Jespersen et al. (2015) studied musculoskeletal injuries among 6–12-year-old Danish school children. They reported the highest rate of traumatic injuries in sports (1.57 injuries/1,000 PA units), followed by leisure time PA (0.57 injuries/1,000 PA units) and PE lessons (0.14 injuries/1,000 PA units). In the iPlay study Verhagen et al. (2009) studied injuries among 10–12 years old Dutch children. The injury incidence density was highest in sports (0.66), followed by PE (0.50) and leisure time PA (0.39). The differences between settings were not significant. Besides these studies focusing on children, direct comparisons are difficult to make due to differences in injury definitions and data collection methods. The common trend in the results of this study and the work of Jespersen et al. (2015) and Verhagen et al. (2009) is that in all the three studies, the prevalence of injuries is highest among sports club activities. Therefore it can be suggested that preventative measures should be introduces more extensively to sports club activities, especially to the sports popular among adolescents.

Among boys the prevalence of sports club injuries increased with age. It has been previously reported that in adolescent sports the intensity and training load increase progressively with age (Malisoux, Frisch, Urhausen, Seil, & Theisen, 2013b). Intensity being associated with the risk of injury, the increase in intensity could explain the increase in boys’ injury prevalence. Previous studies suggest that the relation between injuries and age is sport-specific. In a soccer injury study the 16- and 18-year-old boys had lower injury incidence than the 14-year-olds (Emery, Meeuwisse, & Hartmann, 2005). In a hockey injury study the injury incidence increased significantly with age (Emery & Meeuwisse, 2006). In the current study the prevalence of sports club injuries among girls was highest in the 14-year-olds. This is in line with the results of Emery et al. (2005) reporting a higher incidence of soccer injuries among the 14-year-olds than the 16 and 18-year-olds. Sport is one possible factor contributing to the differences in injury prevalence between age groups in this study.

In this study, risk of PA-related injuries increased when the frequency of PA increased. The increase of risk was highest in sports club injuries, where those participating approximately daily had 10.4 times higher risk of injury than those participating less than once a month. This high increase in the risk is somewhat surprising, since there is evidence that training has a protective effect against injury (Gabbett, 2016). In sports, both overtraining and under-training could be linked with a high incidence of injuries (Gabbett, 2016). Under-training is possibly associated with injuries in other PA settings also. In the iPlay-study, Bloemers et al. (2012) studied injuries in leisure time PA, sports and physical education classes in 10–12-year-old children. They demonstrated that the least active children had the highest risk of injury and identified the cut-off level to be 5 h of PA per week. The results of the current study do not support the theory that low levels of participation or under-training increase the risk of injury. It is important to bear in mind that in this study the frequency of sports club activities and other leisure time PA were analysed separately and this could yield different results than using weekly total exposure.
In this study intensity was defined as the level of sweating/getting out of breath during exercise. Sweating and getting out of breath are recommended for adolescents since they need both moderate and vigorous exercise (World Health Organization, 2010). Participating in intense exercise should not be limited by the fear of injury. One possible approach to lowering the risk of injury in intense exercise is developing better movement skills. Neuromuscular training programs aimed to improve movement skills have produced lower injury rates in high intensity sports among adolescent populations (Hägglund, Atroshi, Wagner, & Waldén, 2013; Rössler et al., 2014; Soligard et al., 2008; Wedderkopp, Kaltoft, Lundgaard, Rosendahl, & Froberg, 1999). School-based injury prevention program consisting of neuromuscular training has also been used successfully to reduce the injury risk and at the same time to improve health factors like adiposity and fitness (Richmond, Kang, Doyle-Baker, Nettel-Aguirre, & Emery, 2016). In organized settings, such as sports clubs, another method to lower the injury incidence is implementing an injury surveillance system. Implementing a surveillance system can improve awareness of the problem and further motivate coaching staff to implement preventative measures (Malisoux, Frisch, Urhausen, Seil, & Theisen, 2013).

In the Finnish education system, physical education classes are mandatory in comprehensive schools, general upper secondary schools, and vocational schools. In this study, the injury prevalence was lower in school sports activities than in other PA settings. However, it could be argued that when participation is mandatory and the goal is educational, the risk of injury should be as low as possible. This result could indicate that further preventative measures should be implemented to lower the injury risk in school sports activities.

The coaches in the sport club activities and the teachers in school sports possess an important role in injury prevention. The coaches, support staff and teachers must enforce rules and the use of safety equipment, such as helmets and protective eye wear when applicable. They must also assess the environmental factors, like weather conditions, and evaluate of the conditions in which equipment are used, such as the apparatus in gymnastics. In addition to these factors load needs to be considered. In sports club coaches should monitor the load individually and make adjustments to training and competition loads if necessary (Soligard et al., 2016). In school sports the teachers should consider that the students most active in physical education lessons are usually active also in sports clubs, other leisure time PA (Trifonov Rexen et al., 2014). Children with low habitual levels of PA are at an increased risk of injury (Nauta, Martin-Diener, Martin, van Mechelen, & Verhagen, 2015). Mandatory physical education classes can be the only form of PA for these children. The teacher has a responsibility to keep the lessons safe for all children and insure that the load is manageable for everyone.

The large, randomly drawn sample can be considered a strength of this study. The response rate to this study was 50%. It has been reported that in survey studies the non-respondents have poorer health behaviour, health and socio-economic background (Pietilä, Rantakallio, & Lääri, 1995). The aim of this study was to compare injury rates in different PA settings in girls and boys of different age groups. Physically active adolescents were expected to respond at a higher rate, and thus, the total response rate was not considered to have a major impact on the reported comparisons.

This study has some limitations. Retrospective, self-reported injury history has the potential for recall bias. However, Gabbe, Finch, Bennell, and Wajswelner (2003) reported that participants were able to correctly indicate whether they had been injured or uninjured in the past 12 months. To minimize the impact of recall bias on the results, we only asked for the injury status and did not request more details, such as the number of injuries, the injured body region, the injury type, the severity or the diagnosis.

In the survey the word “injury” was not defined. It was up to the subject how they perceived the word. Since the purpose of this study was to compare the injury rates in different settings, we believe the lack of detailed injury definition was not necessary, since the subject probably defined injuries similarly in the different settings. It is possible that some minor injuries and overuse injuries have not been reported, and thus, the reported injury rates might slightly underestimate the situation. This is a possible limitation of the study.
Since physical education is mandatory, we interpreted that all subjects reporting to be students participated in schools sports. Since the students in general upper secondary schools and vocational schools have some freedom to choose when they participate in physical education classes, it is possible that all the 18-year-old students had not participated in PE during the past 12 months. Hence the rate of school sport injuries might be slightly underestimated. This can be seen as a limitation of the study.

According to the “sequence of prevention” the next should be establishing aetiology and mechanisms of injuries (van Mechelen et al., 1992). Therefore in the future it would be beneficial to study in which sports and physical activities the injuries occur. This would provide further information for those working on implementing injury prevention methods. To evaluate the effectiveness of implementation measures and programmes, we recommend regular monitoring of injury prevalence among adolescent population.

5. Conclusions
This study suggests that the rate of PA-related injuries is higher in sports club activities than in other settings of PA among adolescents. Since injury in adolescence can have implications for future participation in PA and also for future health, it is important to introduce preventative measures more extensively, most urgently to the sports club setting. Some caution should be used when interpreting these results since this study is based on self-reported injuries.

This study also suggests that injury rates are associated with PA participation frequency and intensity. It is recommended for health benefits that adolescents participate in PA daily. However our results indicate that participating in PA as little as 2–3 times a week increases the risk of PA-related injury. Since PA participation generates several benefits for health and wellbeing, adolescent PA participation should not be limited due to fear of injury. Instead, the results of this research support the idea that further preventative measures are needed to lower the risk of injury in different settings. To evaluate the effect of preventative measures, it is important to monitor adolescent PA-related injury prevalence and injury settings in regular basis. In the future, it is important to follow PA-related injuries regularly so that a potential increase in injuries can be revealed and preventive measures can be started.
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ABSTRACT

Objective: To determine the agreement between 2D video analysis and subjective visual assessment by a physiotherapist in evaluating young athletes’ knee control, and to determine the intra- and inter-rater reliability of the single-leg squat test.

Design: Frontal plane knee control was assessed by a physiotherapist on a three-point scale. Frontal plane projection angles were calculated from video images. To determine the intra-rater reliability, a physiotherapist re-assessed 60 subjects’ performances from a video. For the inter-rater reliability, 20 subjects were assessed by both the physiotherapist and a non-experienced tester. The study continued for three test years.

Setting: Research institute.

Participants: 378 floorball, basketball, ice hockey and volleyball players.

Assessment of variables: Knee control was assessed to be good, reduced or poor.

Main outcome measures: Agreement between the video analysis and subjectively assessed frontal plane knee control. Intra- and inter-rater reliability.

Results: There were statistically significant differences in the mean frontal plane knee angles between subjects rated as having ‘good’, ‘reduced’ or ‘poor’ knee control. Intra-rater reliability was fair for the assessments in the first year, moderate (dominant leg) and good (non-dominant leg) for the second year, and very good (dominant leg) and good (non-dominant leg) for the third year. Inter-rater reliability was fair/poor.

Conclusions: This study suggests that by using the subjective assessment of the single-leg squat task, it is possible to detect differences in frontal plane knee control in young team sport athletes. The assessment can be considered to be reliable for clinical use when performed by an experienced tester.

Keywords: knee, physiotherapist, evaluation, screening, reliability
INTRODUCTION

Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) injury will often have major consequences in an athlete’s life, such as temporary and permanent disability, long-term pain, functional limitations, and absence from school, work or sports (1-3). Post-operative rehabilitation of an ACL injury takes several months and even though many athletes can return to their sport, they return with a higher risk of both re-injury and early retirement from sports (3,4). Furthermore, an ACL injury will also increase the risk of knee instability, meniscus rupture and knee osteoarthritis later in life (5).

In team sports, most ACL injuries occur without player-to-player contact (6-9). Video studies of handball and basketball suggest that the knee valgus collapse may play an important role in ACL rupture (10,11). The dynamic knee valgus is often a combination of knee valgus, hip internal rotation and adduction, tibial rotation and anterior translation, and ankle eversion (12). In a previous study, knee valgus angles and moments have been identified as the primary predictors of ACL injury (13). Individuals with greater strength in hip abductors, knee flexors and knee extensors demonstrate a lower amount of knee valgus in a single-leg squat task (14).

Neuromuscular training programs (which include balance and body control training, strengthening and agility exercises, stretching and running, and cutting and landing techniques) can be effective in reducing the injury incidence among athletes in pivoting sports such as basketball, soccer, team handball and floorball (15-20). It is recommended that programs planned to enhance knee control should focus on avoiding valgus motion. Athletes who demonstrate poor knee control might benefit more from neuromuscular training (21). To screen athletes with poor dynamic knee stability, it is important to test the reliability and validate simple field tests used for screening purposes.
The single-leg squat test is used to screen athletes for poor knee control, for example in pre-participation physical examinations (22). The single-leg squat test simulates an athletic position that requires control of the body over a planted leg that is common in pivoting ball games (23). The visual analysis of knee control during single-leg tasks is used to assess lower limb neuromuscular control (24). Subjective assessment of the single-leg squat performed by a physiotherapist has been found to be a useful screening tool among elite-level and national team handball players (25). In this study, our aim was to find out if this test procedure could also be used reliably among young team sport athletes.

The aim of this study was to determine the agreement between 2D video analysis and subjective visual assessment by a physiotherapist in evaluating knee control among young basketball, floorball, ice hockey and volleyball players. The second aim was to determine the intra-rater reliability of the subjective assessment. Finally, we wanted to determine the inter-rater reliability of the subjective assessment of knee control between a physiotherapist and a non-experienced tester.

METHODS

The single-leg squat test was part of baseline measurements in a prospective cohort study. In this study, one single physiotherapist (I.L.) tested 378 floorball, basketball, ice hockey and volleyball players, out of which 249 were female and 129 were male. The basic characteristics of the subjects and number of subjects from each of the four sports are presented in Table 1.

Subjects participated in the single-leg squat test in spring 2011, spring 2012 or spring 2013. If the subject participated in the test during more than one test period, only the first test was included in the study. Thirteen subjects were unable to name their dominant leg and two subjects were unable to perform the test on their dominant leg due to injury. Subjects’ height and weight were measured and the dominant leg was assessed by asking which leg they
would use for take-off in a jump. Participants wore shorts and indoor shoes; female subjects also wore sport tops.

To determine the inter-rater reliability of the subjective assessment between a physiotherapist and a non-experienced tester, we had an inter-rater reliability group of 100 basketball and floorball players who were assessed by the non-experienced tester. This group was formed by randomly dividing the subjects entering the study in 2013 into two groups: the study group and the inter-rater reliability group.

**Measurements**

The single-leg squat test procedure used in this study is based on the procedure used by Stensrud et al. (25). First, small pieces of sports tape were attached to the left and right anterior superior iliac spine and tuberositas tibiae. All subjects performed 2 x 8 repetitions of two-legged squats and 2 x 5 repetitions of two-legged jumps as a warm-up. A small alteration was made to the original warm-up by leaving out the calf stretches. To standardize the knee flexion angle to 90°, subjects performed a two-legged squat down to 90° of knee flexion. This was measured with a plastic goniometer (Baseline, USA). While the subject was holding this position, a thin rope with a small metallic object in the end was attached to the lateral side of the thigh. The length of the string was adjusted so that in a 90° knee flexion angle, the metallic object was slightly touching the ground. When the subject performed a single-leg squat standing on a metal plate, they could hear the sound of the object touching the plate when they reached 90° knee flexion. All participants were allowed one practice attempt on each leg. The subjects were instructed to hold their hands at their waist and keep their eyes focused straight forward while performing the squat. The trial was deemed invalid if the other leg was held in the front or to the side or if it touched the ground, if the subject fell, if the
subject moved their hands from their waist or if the subject looked down during the trial. All subjects were asked to perform two to three valid trials.

**Subjective assessment**

The subject’s ability to control the knee during the single-leg squat was assessed by the physiotherapist seated in front of the subject. An ordinal scale from 0 to 2 was used. The scale used here has been introduced in a previous study (25). A score of 0 is used for ‘good performance’ and it was given if the subject displayed no significant lateral tilt of the pelvis, no obvious valgus motion of the knee and no medial/lateral movements or shivering during the performance. A score of 1 corresponds with ‘reduced knee control’. Subjects were rated 1 if they displayed some lateral tilt of the pelvis and/or slight valgus movement of the knee and/or some medial/lateral movement or shivering during a trial. Score 2 stands for ‘poor performance’. Subjects scored 2 if they displayed lateral tilt of the pelvis and/or a knee moving clearly into a valgus position and/or clear medial/lateral movements of the knee. The subjects were scored by their poorest performance: If only one of the two to three valid trials were assessed as ‘poor knee control’, the performance was rated 2.

**Video analysis**

Frontal plane knee angles were assessed for each valid trial. The trials were recorded by the physiotherapist with a digital video camera (HXR-NX70E, Sony, Japan) placed 4.5 meters in front of the metal plate. The video images were analyzed using Java-based computer software (ImageJ, National Institutes of Health, USA). Video analyses were performed by a single researcher (A.R.). From the video image, the greatest knee flexion angle was identified by assessing the subject’s lowest pelvis height during the trial. The frontal plane knee angles were then estimated by marking the estimated ankle, knee and hip joint centers in the image.
The mean frontal plane knee angle was calculated from the two to three valid trials for each leg.

**Intra-rater and inter-rater reliability of the subjective assessment**

Since this study was carried out over three years, the intra-rater reliability was assessed separately for each study year. A sample of 20 subjects per test year was randomly drawn from the video database by a statistician (K.T.), who was not involved in the assessments. These 60 performances were evaluated again by the physiotherapist six months after the third test period had ended. The physiotherapist viewed each performance once from the video recording and rated them using the same ordinal scale used in the initial assessment.

Prior to the study, the physiotherapist trained the non-experienced tester to perform the assessments. First, they went through the written instructions of the test. Secondly, they viewed video recordings of ten subjects, compared their assessments and discussed them. Thirdly, the non-experienced tester assessed performances of 15 subjects simultaneously with the physiotherapist, and the assessments were compared and discussed.

To determine the inter-rater reliability, 20 randomly drawn subjects were assessed by both the non-experienced tester and the physiotherapist. During the third test year, the new subjects entering the study were randomly put in the study group or the inter-rater reliability group. Subjects in the study group were tested by the physiotherapist and subjects in the inter-rater reliability group were tested by the non-experienced tester. The non-experienced tester performed the subjective assessment for 100 subjects. The random sample of 20 subjects was randomly drawn from these subjects. The physiotherapist used the video recordings and viewed the performances of the 20 random subjects once on a 22-inch screen and rated the performances.
Statistical methods

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (IBM SPSS Statistics Version 21 for Windows). One-way ANOVA was used to compare the mean frontal plane knee angles between the subjectively assessed groups. Cohen’s kappa test was used to determine the intra-rater and inter-rater reliabilities. Kappa values were defined to be poor if kappa was < 0.20, fair for values 0.21–0.40, moderate for 0.41–0.60, good for 0.61–0.80 and very good for 0.81–1.00 (26). Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was used to determine the correlation between the subjective assessment of knee control with the scale of ‘good’, ‘reduced’ or ‘poor’ and the mean frontal plane projection angle (FPPA) measured from the video. A p value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Ethical considerations

All subjects provided written informed consent when entering the study. For subjects younger than 18 years, consent was sought from the legal guardian. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Pirkanmaa Hospital District (ETL-code R10169).

RESULTS

Correlation between the FPPAs and subjective assessment

Mean FPPAs measured from the video for the dominant leg for subjects rated ‘good’, ‘reduced’ or ‘poor’ were 2°, 8° and 19° respectively (p<0.001). For the non-dominant leg, mean angles were 1°, 7° and 18° respectively (p<0.001). The mean FPPAs are presented in Table 2. Spearman rank correlation coefficients evaluating the association between the subjective assessment and the FPPAs were 0.64 (p<0.001) for the dominant leg and 0.63 for the non-dominant leg (p<0.001).
Intra-rater reliability for the subjective assessment

The kappa values for the agreement between the physiotherapist’s initial assessment and the assessment made using the video recordings were 0.28 (fair) for the dominant leg and 0.29 (fair) for the non-dominant leg for the random sample of 20 subjects from the first test year (Table 3). For the second year sample, the values were 0.60 (moderate) for the dominant leg and 0.64 (good) for the non-dominant leg. For the third year sample, values were 0.89 (very good) for the dominant leg and 0.78 (good) for the non-dominant leg.

Inter-rater reliability for the subjective assessment

Kappa values for the agreement between the assessments by the physiotherapist and the non-experienced tester were 0.32 (fair, p=0.06) for the dominant leg (Table 4) and 0.16 (poor, p=0.35) for the non-dominant leg (Table 5).

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to determine the agreements between 2D video analysis of FPPAs and subjective knee control assessment performed by a physiotherapist. In addition, we wanted to determine the intra-rater reliability of the subjective assessment and the inter-rater reliability between a physiotherapist and a non-experienced tester.

We found that using the subjective assessment of the single-leg squat, it is possible to detect differences in the frontal plane knee angles. The mean FPPAs measured from the video images were statistically different between the subjects rated as ‘good’, ‘reduced’ or ‘poor’ in the physiotherapist’s subjective visual assessment.

We also noticed an improvement in the physiotherapist’s ability to detect the differences in knee control during the three-year test period. Kappa values for the intra-rater reliability increased from fair in the first year to very good (dominant leg) and good (non-dominant leg)
in the third year. We have estimated that during the first test year, the physiotherapist viewed over 1,000 single-leg squats (each subject performing two to three trials per leg and practice attempts), and the intra-rater reliability for the first year was fair. After the second test year, the physiotherapist had viewed over 2,000 single-leg squats and the intra-rater reliability was moderate/good. Based on this, we could make an estimate that for the non-experienced tester to become experienced enough for the intra-rater reliability to rise to moderate, they need to view and assess over 2,000 single-leg squats. This estimation is based on the data from one physiotherapist, which can be considered a limitation to this study.

We were interested in finding out how well the subjective assessment could be done by a non-experienced tester. The aim was to get information about how well this test could be executed by a person without a physiotherapy degree, for example a coach or an athletics trainer working with young athletes. The inter-rater reliability between the physiotherapist and the non-experienced tester was fair for the dominant leg and poor for the non-dominant leg. Our findings differ from those of a previous study, which concluded that both physiotherapists and inexperienced physiotherapy students can reliably assess the single-leg squat on a ten-point scale (27).

Previous studies with different single-leg squat procedures have been conducted to assess the reliability of the test. The agreement between a physiotherapist and a consensus panel consisting of five clinicians was found to be excellent or substantial depending on the experience level of the physiotherapist (24). When a physiotherapist performed two ratings with a week in between, both times using a video image, the agreement varied from excellent to substantial, again depending on the experience level (24). In a study using a single-leg squat to 60° knee flexion, two investigators rated separately hip adduction and knee valgus during the task. For knee valgus assessment, sensitivity was low to moderate and specificity was moderate to high (28). It seems that the tester’s experience level plays an important role...
when performing the subjective assessment. This is important to consider when introducing the test for screening use in the field.

A study among Norwegian handball players indicates that the visual assessment of the single-leg squat may be a helpful tool when screening for poor knee control among elite-level athletes (25). The test-retest reliability of single-leg squats was fair for the right leg and moderate for the left leg. The tests were done during the same day so the retest took place after the subjects had performed several maximal strength tests. Consequently, fatigue might have influenced performance in the second test. The intra-rater reliability for the 2D video analysis was assessed in the same study (25). The knee angle difference in measurements done 30 days apart by the same tester was 3.3° (SD 2.9).

In all the subjectively assessed groups, both varus and valgus angles were detected. When assessing the knee control, the observer did not only assess the valgus motion of the knee, but also the medial/lateral movement and shivering. In the greatest knee flexion angle, the knee can be in a varus angle, but during the performance there is clear medial/lateral movement. The subject is assessed as having reduced knee control, but from the video image a very small FPPA is detected. In this study, the FPPA was calculated at the point of the greatest knee flexion angle. This is not necessarily the point of the greatest FPPA, and this can be considered as a limitation to the study. Subjects often demonstrated quite a lot of medial/lateral movement of the knee when descending to the squat but the maximal knee valgus angle can be part of the ascending phase.

In this study, we did not verify the maximal knee flexion angle with an additional video camera. In most cases, the subjects lowered themselves to the squat slowly and began to ascend as soon as they heard the object touching the metal plate. In some cases, subjects performed the single-leg squat task quite fast so that by the time they heard the sound, the
knee flexion angle was slightly smaller than 90°. This could be considered as a limitation to the study.

As mentioned earlier, dynamic knee valgus is a multiplanar motion. In this study, we focused on the frontal plane motion of the knee to allow for easier assessment in the field setting. In the future, we will study if observing and measuring the frontal plane motion is enough to detect the athletes at greater risk of injury.

**Conclusions**

This study suggests that the subjective assessment of knee control during a single-leg squat task is a suitable tool to screen for athletes with reduced knee control among young team sport athletes, when performed by an experienced tester. In future analyses, we will examine whether those athletes assessed as having poor or reduced control are at greater risk of knee injury.
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Table 1. Basic characteristics of subjects and number of participants by sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Females (n=249) mean (SD)</th>
<th>Males (n=129) mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>18 (4)</td>
<td>17 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>168 (7)</td>
<td>179 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>63 (8)</td>
<td>70 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>22 (2)</td>
<td>22 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floorball</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice hockey</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2.** The distribution of athletes in the subjectively assessed groups and the corresponding frontal plane projection angles (°) measured from the video analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) dominant leg</th>
<th>Subjective assessment</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of athletes (%)</td>
<td>35 (10)</td>
<td>175 (48)</td>
<td>153 (42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured angles</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>2.2 (7.3)</td>
<td>7.9 (7.6)</td>
<td>18.7 (8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>-10.1 to 20.2</td>
<td>-16.2 to 31.0</td>
<td>-4.0 to 56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) non-dominant leg</th>
<th>Subjective assessment</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of athletes (%)</td>
<td>33 (9)</td>
<td>173 (47)</td>
<td>159 (44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured angles</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>1.2 (6.4)</td>
<td>7.5 (6.5)</td>
<td>18.1 (8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>-14.1 to 15.2</td>
<td>-13.8 to 24.1</td>
<td>-6.0 to 38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.001
Table 3. Kappa values for agreement between the physiotherapist’s initial assessment and re-assessment (intra-rater reliability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test year</th>
<th>Dominant leg</th>
<th>Non-dominant leg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kappa</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All years</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. The agreement between the physiotherapist’s and non-experienced tester’s assessment of knee control of the dominant leg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant leg</th>
<th>Physiotherapist</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-experienced tester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s kappa 0.32, p=0.06
Table 5. The agreement between the physiotherapist’s and non-experienced tester’s assessment of knee control of the non-dominant leg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-dominant leg</th>
<th>Physiotherapist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-experienced tester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohen’s kappa 0.16, p=0.35
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ABSTRACT

Background/aim Poor frontal plane knee control can manifest as increased dynamic knee valgus during athletic tasks. The purpose of this study was to investigate the association between frontal plane knee control and the risk of acute lower extremity injuries. In addition, we wanted to study if the single-leg squat (SLS) test can be used as a screening tool to identify athletes with an increased injury risk.

Methods A total of 306 basketball and floorball players participated in the baseline SLS test and a 12-month injury registration follow-up. Acute lower extremity time-loss injuries were registered. Frontal plane knee projection angles (FPKPA) during the SLS were calculated using a two-dimensional video analysis.

Results Athletes displaying a high FPKPA were 2.7 times more likely to sustain a lower extremity injury (adjusted OR 2.67, 95% CI 1.23 to 5.83) and 2.4 times more likely to sustain an ankle injury (OR 2.37, 95% CI 1.13 to 4.98). There was no statistically significant association between FPKPA and knee injury (OR 1.49, 95% CI 0.56 to 3.98). The receiver operating characteristic curve analyses indicated poor combined sensitivity and specificity when FPKPA was used as a screening test for lower extremity injuries (area under the curve of 0.59) and ankle injuries (area under the curve of 0.58).

Conclusions Athletes displaying a large FPKPA in the SLS test had an elevated risk of acute lower extremity and ankle injuries. However, the SLS test is not sensitive and specific enough to be used as a screening tool for future injury risk.

INTRODUCTION

In fast-paced team sports such as football, basketball, handball and floorball, injury incidence is high and adolescents are injured more frequently than children or adults.1-6 In these sports, most injuries occur in the lower extremities.1-7 To reduce the burden of sports injuries, it is essential to identify modifiable risk factors, which can be targeted with injury prevention strategies. Neuromuscular deficiencies, such as poor frontal plane knee control, are potentially modifiable intrinsic factors and possibly associated with a higher risk of lower extremity injury.8,9 Inadequate ability to control knee movement on the frontal plane can manifest as high knee valgus.

To our knowledge, there are no previous studies investigating the association between frontal plane knee projection angle (FPKPA) and lower extremity injuries. Some previous studies have examined the associations between other measurements of knee control and lower extremity injuries. Hewett et al demonstrated that among female high school athletes, athletes suffering an anterior cruciate ligament injury during the follow-up demonstrated 2.5 times greater knee abduction moment during a baseline vertical drop jump than athletes who remained uninjured.10 However, this finding was not supported by studies on adult female football and handball players and young female floorball and basketball players.11,12 In young female football players, low normalised knee separation in the vertical drop jump test was associated with a higher risk of acute lower extremity injuries.13 The previous studies on knee control are not in agreement but they indicate that the role of knee control on injury risk should be investigated.
The single-leg squat (SLS) is a movement control test often used in clinical practice and research to assess frontal plane knee control, but it has not been previously studied as a potential screening test.\textsuperscript{14–18}

Two-dimensional (2D) video analysis of the SLS is a reliable tool to measure knee valgus, and it has been validated against the gold standard, three-dimensional (3D) motion analysis.\textsuperscript{19,20} Whereas the 3D analysis is usually costly and performed in a laboratory environment, the 2D method is easy to set up in a field setting. This ease of use, coupled with the lower cost of the analysis, makes the 2D method more feasible for large-scale screenings and was therefore chosen.

The objective of this study was to investigate the association between FPKPA and acute lower extremity injuries in young, previously healthy athletes. In addition to lower extremity injuries, we wanted to explore the association between FPKPA and ankle injuries and knee injuries specifically, as these are the most commonly injured body parts in team sports. Furthermore, we set out to investigate if the SLS test is a suitable screening tool to identify athletes with increased risk of injury.

Figure 1  Number of athletes included in the analysis of lower extremity injury risk, ankle injury risk and knee injury risk. Athletes sustaining knee and ankle injuries were also included in the analysis of all lower extremity injuries. SLS, single-leg squat.
subjects were young basketball and floorball players aged 21 years and under. The data set comprised their personal details (sex, height, weight, exposure, sport played, etc), baseline SLS test results and prospective 1-year injury data. The number of subjects at each stage is presented in figure 1.

Subjects free of lower extremity injury participated in the baseline measurements. A total of 367 athletes participated in the SLS test. Of this number, six athletes were excluded since they did not perform enough valid trials. Subjects provided written informed consent. For subjects younger than 18 years, consent was also sought from a legal guardian.

Baseline measurements
Athletes entered the study during the preseason of 2011, 2012 or 2013. Athletes’ height and weight were measured, and body mass index (BMI, kg/m²) was calculated. Athletes filled out a questionnaire on the time-loss injuries they had sustained during the past 12 months. The SLS test was based on the work of Stensrud et al, and the detailed test protocol has been published previously. Subjects performed three SLS to 90° knee flexion on each leg. Trials were recorded with a high-definition digital video camera (HXR-NX70E, Sony Japan). The mean FPKPA for each leg from a minimum of two valid squats was calculated from the video footage by the primary investigator (AMR) using a Java-based computer software (ImageJ, National Institutes of Health). The squat was deemed invalid if the non-weight-bearing leg was held in the front or to the side or it touched the floor or if the player fell, looked down or moved their hands from the waist. The video analysis was conducted blind to past and future injury status. The FPKPA was calculated as the intersection of a line created by the anterior superior iliac spine and knee joint centre and the line created by the knee joint centre and the ankle joint centre. Neutral alignment was considered 0°, positive values represented valgus alignment and negative values represented varus alignment. The measurement of FPKPA is presented in figure 2. The video analysis method has been described in detail previously.

Injury definition, and injury and exposure registration
‘Injury’ was defined as any acute lower extremity (hip, groin, thigh, knee, lower leg, ankle, foot) injury that resulted in an athlete being unable to fully participate in training or match play for at least 24 hours. The injuries were recorded by a team coach or another designated team member. For injury registration, the study physicians and study assistants contacted the teams on a weekly basis. The study physicians contacted the athlete after each injury and collected information about the injury time, place, cause, type, location and the time-loss due to the injury in a standardised phone interview. For exposure registration, the team coaches recorded athlete participation in team practice and match play. After each follow-up month, the coach emailed the participation records to the study group.

Statistical methods
Injury risk does not necessarily increase or decrease linearly; therefore, categorical variables were used in addition to continuous variables. To account for the possibly non-linear association between a variable and injury risk, continuous variables were transformed into categorical variables using the mean averages and SD of the entire cohort. Age, height, weight, BMI, FPKPA, training exposure, match exposure and total exposure were each categorised into three groups: the intermediate reference group (mean±1SD), the low group (values lower than 1 SD below the mean) and the high group (values higher than 1 SD above the mean). Analyses were performed using SPSS (V.23, SPSS). To compare the athletes injured during the follow-up with the uninjured athletes, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to test the variables that were not normally distributed (age, BMI, exposure variables), the independent samples t test was used for the normally distributed variables (height, weight, FPKPAs) and the χ² test was used for the categorical variables (sex, sport).

A generalised linear mixed model for binary data with injury/no injury as the dependent variable was used to analyse the potential risk factors. The generalised linear mixed model was chosen as it allows the use of random effects. Team and leg were used as random
effects. The analyses were performed using each leg as a unit of analysis. To ensure the equal length of exposure period, only athletes who completed the 12-month follow-up were analysed. Only athletes free from lower extremity injuries during the previous year were included in the lower extremity injury risk factor analysis. Similarly, only athletes without ankle or knee injuries were included in the ankle and knee injury risk factor analyses, respectively. The number of athletes included in each analysis is presented in figure 1. ORs, derived from the univariate and multivariate analysis, quantify the association between the factor and the occurrence of injury. First, the baseline risk factors were analysed using the univariate model. All the variables with a P value<0.20 in the univariate analysis were entered into a multivariate model to generate the adjusted ORs. In the multivariate analysis, the significance level was set at P<0.05. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analyses were performed to analyse the sensitivity and the specificity of the identified risk factors. Area under the curve (AUC) was used to classify the combined sensitivity and specificity as outstanding (0.90–1), excellent (0.80–0.89), acceptable (0.70–0.79), poor (0.51–0.69) and no discrimination (0.50).24

RESULTS

Subjects
Complete data were obtained from 306 athletes (age 15.7±1.8 years, height 173.3±9.1 cm, weight 64.6±10.0 kg), of which 52% were male. The proportions of basketball and floorball players were equal. The mean FPKPA was 13.3°±10.5°. Of the 306 subjects, 155 were free from acute lower extremity (hip, groin, thigh, knee, lower leg, ankle, foot) injury, 207 were free from acute ankle injuries and 269 were free from acute knee injuries for 12 months before entering the study. The 110 injured athletes did not differ from the 196 uninjured athletes by age, height, weight, BMI, gender, sport, training exposure, match exposure or match and training exposure. Athletes sustaining ankle or knee injuries were also analysed in the analysis of all acute lower extremity injuries. The number of athletes at each stage of the study is presented in figure 1.

Risk factors for acute lower extremity injuries
During the 12-month follow-up, 47 of the 155 athletes sustained acute lower extremity injuries. Two athletes had sustained injuries to both legs during the follow-up. In the multivariate model, only a FPKPA greater than 1 SD above the mean (>23.8°) in the SLS test was associated with lower extremity injuries (adjusted OR 2.67, 95% CI 1.23 to 5.83). The ORs from the univariate analysis and the adjusted ORs from the multivariate analysis are presented in table 1.

Risk factors for acute ankle injuries
Of the 207 athletes, 41 suffered acute ankle injuries during the follow-up. Four athletes injured both ankles. Displaying a FPKPA greater than 1 SD above the mean (>23.8°) in the SLS test was associated with a higher risk of ankle injury (OR 2.37, 95% CI 1.13 to 4.98). Since none of the other variables achieved P<0.20 in the univariate analysis, no multivariate analysis was performed. The ORs for the variables in the univariate analysis are presented in table 2.

Risk factors for acute knee injuries
During the follow-up, 18 knee injuries were recorded for the 269 athletes. No statistically significant associations between the analysed variables and knee injuries were detected. The OR for displaying a FPKPA greater than 1 SD above the mean (>23.8°) in the SLS test was 1.49 (95% CI 0.56 to 3.98), but this was not statistically significant. Since only the categorical variable of age achieved P<0.20 in the univariate analysis, no multivariate analysis was performed. The ORs for the variables in the univariate analysis are presented in table 3.

Specificity and sensitivity analyses
The ROC curve analysis for the FPKPA and lower extremity injuries showed an AUC of 0.59, which indicates poor specificity and sensitivity. For the FPKPA and knee injuries, the AUC was 0.58, indicating poor specificity and sensitivity. The distribution of the injured and uninjured lower extremities by FPKPA is presented in figure 3. The figure illustrates that there is substantial overlap between the injured and uninjured athletes.

DISCUSSION

FPKPA and injury risk
This study focused on a previously established knowledge gap in the association between the results of a functional movement control test and the risk of lower extremity injury. Our results demonstrate that excessive knee valgus motion during the SLS is associated with lower extremity injuries: athletes displaying a large FPKPA were 2.7 times more likely to sustain a lower extremity injury compared with the athletes displaying intermediate values.

To our knowledge, there are no previous studies examining the association between FPKPA and lower extremity injury risk. Previous studies have hypothesised that knee valgus motion during the SLS test could be related to injury risk and have acknowledged the need to study this association.16 20 25 A previous study has linked knee valgus motion during the vertical drop jump test to an increased risk of ACL injuries in adolescents female athletes, but this finding has not been confirmed in later studies.10–12 In this study, none of the variables were associated with the risk of knee injuries. However, the small number of injured knees (n=18) could have a considerable influence on why no potential risk factors were identified.

Knee control is a modifiable risk factor
Due to the multifactorial nature of sports injuries, athletes with good knee control do also sustain injuries. However, athletes with poor knee control would...
benefit most from neuromuscular training planned to improve knee control. In previous studies, poor frontal plane knee control has been associated with reduced hip muscle strength. Hip abduction strength and hip external rotation strength, in particular, are valuable predictors of frontal plane knee control. Crossley et al demonstrated that for every 1% improvement in hip abduction strength normalised to body weight, the FPKPA would improve by 0.2°. Delayed gluteus medius activation was measured in subjects who performed poorly in the SLS compared with those who performed well. Mauntel et al suggested that knee valgus motion is an issue of muscular coactivation. They reported that subjects displaying valgus motion during the SLS had smaller coactivation ratios of the gluteus medius to hip muscles.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical variables</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floorball</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.52 to 1.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.58 to 1.99</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous variables</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.87 to 1.24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.90 to 1.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (°)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.05</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match exposure, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;15 hours)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match exposure, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;169.6 hours)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;357.7 hours)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.29 to 2.23</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match exposure (hour)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure (hour)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.94 to 1.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multivariate analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPKPA (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;23.8)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;23.8)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.23 to 5.83</td>
<td>0.01†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All variables are presented for the univariate analysis, but only variables with a P value < 0.05 are presented for the multivariate analysis. Variables achieving P < 0.20 in the univariate analysis were entered into the multivariate model. Only variables achieving P < 0.05 in the multivariate model are presented.

BMI, body mass index; FPKPA, frontal plane knee projection angle.

adductor and the gluteus maximus to hip adductor, suggesting that subjects displaying knee valgus used a hip adductor-dominant strategy. These neuromuscular factors contributing to frontal plane knee control can be targeted with training.

Since previous research indicates that athletes are able to improve their knee control through training, neuromuscular training programmes should be used to improve knee control.26 29–34 Previously, the effects of neuromuscular training have been measured using the vertical drop jump test.34 Using the visual assessment of frontal plane knee control, the SLS and vertical drop jump identified different subjects and approximately 20% of the subjects displaying reduced knee control would not have been identified using only one of the two tests.17 The SLS test could be used in addition to the vertical drop jump test to quantify the effects of neuromuscular training. However, this should be studied in future research.

Several studies have shown that the incidence of lower extremity injuries among adolescent athletes can be reduced by neuromuscular injury prevention programmes.35–45 In a recent meta-analysis, Hübscher et al reported that multi-intervention training programmes reduced the risk of lower extremity injuries by 39%, the risk of acute knee injuries by 54% and the risk of ankle sprains by 50%.36 However, lack of intervention programme uptake in sports is a concern.36 Currently, little is known about how much of the reduction in injury

| Table 2 ORs for potential ankle injury risk factors |
| Univariate analysis | OR | 95% CI | P value |
| Categorical variables | | | |
| Basketball | 1 | | |
| Floorball | 0.72 | 0.39 to 1.34 | 0.29 |
| Female | 1 | | |
| Male | 0.84 | 0.45 to 1.55 | 0.58 |
| Age, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| Age, low (<1 SD below mean, <13.9 years) | 1.08 | 0.45 to 2.56 | 0.87 |
| Age, high (>1 SD above mean, >17.5 years) | 0.92 | 0.37 to 2.29 | 0.85 |
| Height, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| Height, low (<1 SD below mean, <164.2 cm) | 1.03 | 0.46 to 2.26 | 0.95 |
| Height, high (>1 SD above mean, >182.4 cm) | 0.91 | 0.38 to 2.16 | 0.83 |
| Weight, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| Weight, low (<1 SD below mean, <54.7 kg) | 0.82 | 0.31 to 2.20 | 0.70 |
| Weight, high (>1 SD above mean, >74.6 kg) | 0.94 | 0.40 to 2.23 | 0.89 |
| BMI, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| BMI, low (<1 SD below mean, <19.0) | 0.80 | 0.32 to 1.98 | 0.63 |
| BMI, high (>1 SD above mean, >23.9) | 0.93 | 0.39 to 2.21 | 0.87 |
| FPKPA, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| FPKPA, low (<1 SD below mean, <2.7°) | 1.18 | 0.46 to 2.98 | 0.73 |
| FPKPA, high (>1 SD above mean, >23.8°) | 2.37 | 1.13 to 4.98 | 0.02* |
| Training exposure, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| Training exposure, low (<1 SD below mean, <162.4 hours) | 1.14 | 0.50 to 2.60 | 0.76 |
| Training exposure, high (>1 SD above mean, >346.0 hours) | 0.71 | 0.25 to 2.03 | 0.52 |
| Match exposure, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| Match exposure, low (<1 SD below mean, <3.9 hours) | 0.57 | 0.20 to 1.62 | 0.29 |
| Match exposure, high (>1 SD above mean, >15 hours) | 0.80 | 0.34 to 1.88 | 0.61 |

**Continued**

### Table 2 Continued

| Univariate analysis | OR | 95% CI | P value |
| Match and training exposure, intermediate (mean±SD) | 1 | | |
| Match and training exposure, low (<1 SD below mean, <169.6 hours) | 1.02 | 0.43 to 2.42 | 0.96 |
| Match and training exposure, high (>1 SD above mean, >357.7 hours) | 0.84 | 0.31 to 2.23 | 0.72 |

**Continuous variables**

| Age (years) | 1.00 | 0.84 to 1.20 | 0.97 |
| Height (cm) | 0.99 | 0.96 to 1.03 | 0.65 |
| Weight (kg) | 0.99 | 0.96 to 1.03 | 0.65 |
| BMI (kg/m²) | 0.99 | 0.87 to 1.12 | 0.85 |
| FPKPA (°) | 1.02 | 0.99 to 1.05 | 0.24 |
| Training exposure (hour) | 1.00 | 1.00 to 1.00 | 0.87 |
| Match exposure (hour) | 1.01 | 0.96 to 1.06 | 0.79 |
| Match and training exposure (hour) | 1.00 | 1.00 to 1.00 | 0.86 |

Since only one variable achieved P<0.20 were identified in the univariate analysis, no multivariate analysis was performed.

*P<0.05.

BMI, body mass index; FPKPA, frontal plane knee projection angle.
risk is a result of improved knee control. It would be worthwhile to assess this by a randomised controlled trial with pretraining/post-training knee control measurements.

Ankle injury risk factors

Large FPKPA was associated with the risk of ankle injuries. It is known that ankle function contributes to knee valgus movement, but knee valgus has not previously been linked to ankle injuries. Mauntel et al found that subjects displaying valgus during the SLS had a limited dorsiflexion range of motion. They proposed that during the SLS, the limited dorsiflexion range of motion causes neuromuscular compensation, which is observed as hip adduction. However, this is not supported by the findings of Zeller et al. They compared the kinematics of men and women during the SLS and detected significantly more knee valgus, ankle dorsiflexion and ankle pronation in women. Our results indicate an association between frontal plane knee control and the risk of ankle injuries, but our data do not provide further insight to the role of ankle function on knee valgus.

SLS test as a screening tool

The ROC curve analyses indicate that the 2D analysis of the SLS test is not a suitable screening tool for lower extremity injuries or ankle injuries due to poor combined specificity and sensitivity. Bahr suggested that the main challenge with athletic screening tests is the overlap between the groups of injured and uninjured athletes.

Table 3 ORs for potential knee injury risk factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Univariate analysis</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.69 to 3.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.31 to 1.52</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;13.9 years)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.43 to 4.26</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;17.5 years)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.89 to 5.53</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;164.2 cm)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.42 to 3.28</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;182.4 cm)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.27 to 2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;54.7 kg)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.26 to 3.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;74.6 kg)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.25 to 2.31</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;19.0)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.27 to 3.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;23.9)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.42 to 3.12</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;2.7°)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.20 to 2.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;23.8°)</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.56 to 3.98</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;162.4 hours)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.54 to 3.77</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;346.0 hours)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.13 to 2.72</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;3.9 hours)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.36 to 3.49</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;15 hours)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.27 to 2.57</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Univariate analysis</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, intermediate (mean±SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, low (&lt;1 SD below mean, &lt;169.6 hours)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.44 to 3.42</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure, high (&gt;1 SD above mean, &gt;357.7 hours)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.12 to 2.63</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.90 to 1.39</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.95 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.87 to 1.19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (°)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.05</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training exposure (hour)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99 to 1.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match exposure (hour)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.94 to 1.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match and training exposure (hour)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99 to 1.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only one variable achieved P<0.20; therefore, no multivariate analysis was performed.

BMI, body mass index; FPKPA, frontal plane knee projection angle.
Bahr’s conclusion is supported by our data, as illustrated in figure 3. The FPKPA fails to divide the athletes into two distinctive groups, which would be necessary for a screening tool. Our results demonstrate the SLS alone is not specific and sensitive enough to be used as a screening tool.

**Study strengths and weaknesses**

The size of the cohort can be viewed as a strength of the study: complete data were obtained from 306 athletes. In addition, the prospective nature of the injury collection and careful video assessment of the SLS test by a single researcher were study strengths.

However, our study has also some limitations. The purpose of this study was to analyse the predictive value of the FPKPA on future injuries, and therefore the analysis was performed on athletes who had been free from injury for 12 months prior to the study. Previous injuries were collected using a questionnaire with a 12-month recall period; therefore, recall bias could have influenced the prevalence of previous injuries. Additionally, the information on injured athletes was collected from the coaches. It is possible that the coaches were not aware of all minor injuries and this could have led to under-reporting. For this reason, we excluded all injuries that did not result in time-loss from the analyses.

During the study, 55 athletes did not complete the 12-month follow-up, making the drop-out rate 15%. In most cases, the subject quit the sport. The decline in physical activity during adolescence is well documented.

---

**Figure 3** Representation of the distribution of injured and uninjured lower extremities by frontal plane knee projection angle. Each full icon represents two lower extremities, not necessary of the same athlete. The vertical line represents the cut-off point for the high frontal plane knee projection angle (>23.8°).
Therefore, we consider the drop-out rate in this study to be typical of the population.

CONCLUSIONS

This study provides further understanding of the role of knee control on injury risk. The findings demonstrate that a large FPKPA during the SLS test is associated with an elevated risk of lower extremity injuries. However, the results indicate that the FPKPA measured during the SLS test is not by itself a sufficient screening tool for the risk of future injuries.
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ABSTRACT

This prospective study in youth football examined the relationship between frontal plane knee projection angle (FPKPA) during the single-leg squat and sustaining an acute lower extremity injury or acute non-contact lower extremity injury. Secondly, side-to-side asymmetry in FPKPA and sex as injury risk factors were explored. In addition, we investigated the influence of age, sex and leg dominance on the FPKPA. A total of 558 youth football players (U11 to U14), participated in the single-leg squat and prospective injury registration. FPKPA was not found as a risk factor for injuries at this age. There was no difference in the mean FPKPA between sexes. However, FPKPA was associated with age; oldest subjects displayed the smallest FPKPA. Among boys, the frontal plane knee control improved by age. Among girls, the relationship between age and FPKPA was not as clear but the oldest girls displayed the smallest mean FPKPA in the study (12.2°± 8.3°). The FPKPA was greater on the dominant kicking leg compared to the non-dominant support leg (P<0.001 for boys, P=0.001 for girls). However, side-to-side asymmetry in FPKPA was not associated with future injuries. In conclusion, frontal plane knee control in the single-leg squat was not associated with lower extremity injuries among young football players.
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INTRODUCTION

With football (soccer) being the most popular sport in the world, football injuries have been an interest of sports medicine research for several decades.\textsuperscript{1,2} Among the young football players under the age of 14 years, the knowledge of potentially modifiable lower extremity injury risk factors is still limited.

Sports participation is a major cause of injuries among youth.\textsuperscript{3} In addition to short term consequences of sports injuries, it is important to address the long-term outcomes. Sports injuries, especially knee injuries, can lead to higher likelihood of overweight or obesity and reduced knee function\textsuperscript{4}, and higher risk of osteoarthritis later in life.\textsuperscript{5} Acute lower extremity injuries are the most common injuries in youth football, with ankle, knee and thigh being the most frequently injured body parts.\textsuperscript{2} Among children, football is a safe sport and injuries are rarely serious.\textsuperscript{6} However, in academy youth football (ages 9 to 19 years), each injury, on average, stopped the player from participating in normal activities for 21.9 days.\textsuperscript{7} The youth players miss about 6\% of their development time through injuries.\textsuperscript{7} There is a clear need to prevent injuries during the valuable developmental years. Neuromuscular control is modifiable through training\textsuperscript{8} and neuromuscular training has been shown to improve knee control\textsuperscript{9,10} and reduce injuries.\textsuperscript{11–13}

The single-leg squat (SLS) is commonly used in clinical practice to identify reduced frontal plane knee control, which can manifest as knee valgus. Knee valgus can be harmful, since it alters the loads experienced by different tissues in the lower extremities. If the ability to control trunk, hip and knee motions during athletic tasks is poor, the athlete can allow the ground reaction forces to control the lower extremity alignment.\textsuperscript{14} This may lead to high loads on the knee ligaments and could be a mechanism contributing to lower extremity injuries.\textsuperscript{15} In addition to strength and neuromuscular activation of hip and trunk muscles, ankle function can also contribute to frontal plan knee motions. If ankle dorsiflexion is limited, for example due to decreased extensibility of the
gastrocnemius/soleus complex, athlete might try to compensate for this by moving their knee medially towards valgus during athletic tasks.\textsuperscript{16,17}

The two-dimensional (2D) video analysis method of the SLS is a valid\textsuperscript{18} and reliable\textsuperscript{19,20} tool for measuring frontal plane knee control. Previous studies have associated greater frontal plane knee projection angle (FPKPA) during the SLS with reduced hip abduction strength.\textsuperscript{21–23} For every 1\% improvement in hip abduction strength normalized to body weight, the FPKPA would improve by 0.2°.\textsuperscript{22} The reduced hip abduction strength interacting with increased range of passive hip internal rotation contributes to a greater FPKPA.\textsuperscript{24} Individuals with poor frontal plane control use a hip adductor dominant strategy during the SLS.\textsuperscript{25} Other strength measurements associated with frontal plane knee control are knee flexion and knee extension\textsuperscript{21}, trunk side flexion\textsuperscript{26} and hip external rotation.\textsuperscript{27} A recent study on children and adolescents found no differences between boys and girls in the SLS performance scores based on visual assessment.\textsuperscript{28} In our previous study, greater FPKPA during the SLS was associated with a higher risk of acute non-contact lower extremity injury and acute non-contact ankle injury in young (mean age 15.7 years) team sport athletes\textsuperscript{29} but there are no previous studies on this topic in subjects under the age of 14 years.

The specific objective of this study was to investigate the association between FPKPA during the SLS and acute contact and non-contact lower extremity injuries in youth football players. The secondary aim was to investigate if sex or side-to-side asymmetry of FPKPA is associated with acute lower extremity or acute non-contact lower extremity injury. In addition, we set out to study the effects of age, sex and leg dominance on FPKPA.

**METHODS**

**Study design and participants**
This study is part of a cluster-randomized controlled trial on sports injury prevention in youth football (RCT ISRCTN14046021). The cohort in the present study consists of the control group of this RCT (n=737). Players who did not participate in the baseline SLS (n=163) or the injury registration (n=6) were excluded. In addition, the players who dropped out during the follow-up (n=10) were excluded from the current study since equal length of follow-up was necessary for the analysis. Numbers of subjects in each stage of the study are presented in Figure 1. The study was carried out in collaboration with Sami Hyypiä Academy, the training and research centre of Finnish football. Every second year, the Sami Hyypia Academy selects about 20 youth clubs to participate in the player development monitoring system in which the talented U11 to U14 boys and girls participate on a three-day player development monitoring event twice a year. Every player who was an official member of the participating team and had no major injury at baseline was eligible to enter the study. All players and their parent/legal guardian provided written informed consent. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Pirkanmaa Hospital District (ETL-code R13110).

**Baseline measurements**

During their team’s player development monitoring event in the fall 2014 (end of September to the beginning of December), the subjects participated in the SLS and height and weight measurements. From height and weight, body mass index (BMI, kg/m$^2$) was calculated. Each subject completed a baseline questionnaire, which included questions about the subject’s age, sex, years of playing football, dominant leg, family history of musculoskeletal disorders, chronic illnesses, orthopaedic surgeries, menstrual cycle and previous injuries. The players were categorised into age groups of under 11 years (U11), under 12 years (U12), under 13 years (U13) and under 14 years (U14) by their age at the baseline test. The 18 players, who had not yet turned 10 years, were included in U11.
The test protocol for the SLS and the 2D video analysis method is based on the work of Stensrud et al. and has been described in detail previously. An alteration to the previous protocol was made by cutting out the warm-up. The warm-up was not considered necessary since in the present study the SLS test was not followed by the vertical drop jump test, as had been the case in previous studies. First, square pieces of sports tape were attached to the left and right anterior superior iliac spine and tuberositas tibiae. Secondly, to standardize the knee flexion, the player performed a two-leg squat to 90° knee flexion, measured with a plastic goniometer (Baseline, USA). At 90° knee flexion, a string with a metal object at the distal end was attached to the lateral side of the thigh. The string was adjusted to the length in which the metal object would slightly touch the ground. This was repeated on the other leg. When the player performed the SLS on a metal plate, they could hear the metal object touching the plate when they reached the 90° knee flexion. Each player was allowed one practice attempt before they performed three SLSs to 90° knee flexion on right leg and repeated the procedure on left leg. The players were instructed to hold their hands at their waist and keep their eyes focused straight ahead during the trial. To capture the 2D frontal plane knee joint kinematics, the trials were recorded by a high definition video camera (Panasonic HDC-SD9C, Panasonic, Japan) positioned 4.5 m in front of the metal plate.

The 2D video analysis was performed by the primary investigator (A.M.R) using a Java-based computer software (ImageJ, National Institutes of Health). In the 2D video analysis, the FPKPA was measured from each valid squat. The squat was deemed invalid if the non-weight-bearing leg was held in the front or to the side or it touched the floor or if the player fell, looked down or moved their hands from the waist. The mean FPKPA for the right and the left leg were calculated and a minimum of two valid squats per leg were required. The FPKPA was calculated as the intersection of a line created by the anterior superior iliac spine and knee joint centre and the line created by the knee joint centre and the ankle joint centre. Neutral alignment was considered 0°, positive values
represented valgus alignment, and negative values represented varus alignment. The measurement of FPKPA is presented in Figure 2. In addition to mean FPKPA, side-to-side difference in the mean FPKPA between the two lower extremities was calculated (FPKPA asymmetry).

**Injury definition and injury registration**

Injury registration was carried out by text messaging. The follow-up period lasted for 20 weeks, from January to June. After each follow-up week, the player’s parent/legal guardian received a text message regarding new injuries: “Has your child had any musculoskeletal complaint or injuries during the previous seven days (yes/no).” After each complaint or injury, the study physiotherapists contacted the injured player and/or their parent/legal guardian and collected details of the injury by standardized phone interview.

An injury was defined according to Fuller et al.32 ‘any physical complaint sustained by a player that result from football training or playing, causing a need for medical attention or time loss from fully football activities.’ The player was defined as injured until he/she was able to train and play normally again. The present study focused on the acute lower extremity (hip/groin/thigh/knee/shin/calf/ankle/foot) injuries. Non-contact injuries were defined as injuries that resulted without direct contact to the injured body part.

**Statistical methods**

To consider the possibly non-linear relationship between intrinsic factors and the risk of injury33, categorical variables were formed based on the continuous variables utilizing the cohort mean and standard deviation (SD). Age, height, weight, FPKPA, and FPKPA asymmetry were categorised as above normal (+1 SD above the mean), normal (within 1 SD of the mean), and below normal (-1 SD below the mean) of the mean value for that risk factor in the cohort. For the subgroup analyses
by sex, the categorised variables were calculated based on the mean values of each subgroup. BMI was categorised as healthy, low and overweight based on the cut-off values for adolescents.\textsuperscript{34,35}

The statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (v 24, SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois, USA). To compare injured and uninjured subjects, the Mann–Whitney $U$ test was used to test the variables that were not normally distributed (age, height, weight, BMI), the independent samples $t$ test was used for the normally distributed variables (right FPKPA, left FPKPA), and the $\chi^2$ test was used for the categorical variables (sex). The independent samples $t$ test was used to investigate the differences in mean FPKPA between sexes. To analyse the differences in mean FPKPA between right and left leg and dominant and non-dominant leg, the paired samples $t$ test was used. One-way ANOVA was used to investigate the differences in the FPKPA between age groups. The significance level was set at $P<0.05$.

A generalized linear mixed model for binary data with injury/no injury as the dependent variable was used to analyse the potential risk factors. The analyses were performed using each leg as a unit of analysis. Team and leg were used as random effects. First, the intrinsic factors were analysed using the univariate model. All the variables with a $P$-value <0.20 in the univariate analysis were entered into a multivariate model. If both the categorical and the continuous version of the same variable achieved $P<0.20$, the variable with a smaller $P$-value was entered into the multivariate model. In the multivariate analysis, the significance level was set at $P<0.05$.

RESULTS

A total of 558 players participated in the baseline SLS and completed the injury surveillance. Out of the 558 players, 445 were boys and 113 girls. Player characteristics by sex and age group are presented in Table 1. Dominant leg (preferred leg for kicking the ball), was right for 88\% and left
for 12% of the players. Two players did not name a preferred leg. During the follow-up, 285 acute lower extremity injuries were reported, out of which 142 (50%) were non-contact injuries. Out of the 558 players, 37% (n=205) were injured at least once. The majority of the injuries (41%) were minor (1 to 3 days of absence), however, moderate injuries (8 to 28 days of absence) were also common (25%) (Figure 3). The ankle was the most commonly injured body part (32% of all injuries), followed by the knee (20%) (Figure 4). The dominant leg was injured in 51% and non-dominant leg in 48% of the cases. In three slight injuries, the player was unable to report which leg was injured and these players were removed from the risk factor analysis. Number of injured legs by sex and age group are presented in Figure 5. A total of 40 players were unable to perform enough valid trials on either leg and 92 players only performed enough valid trials on one leg. When comparing the injured athletes to the uninjured, there were no differences in the mean values of age, height, weight, BMI, number of years playing football or the proportion of boys and girls.

**Risk factors for acute lower extremity injuries**

In the univariate analysis for the risk of a new acute lower extremity injury, the categorical weight and BMI and continuous height, weight and BMI achieved \( P < 0.20 \) (Table 2). Continuous height and weight and categorical BMI were entered into the multivariate model based on the smaller \( P \)-value. In the multivariate analysis there were no associations between the variables and the risk of lower extremity injuries (Table 3).

In the subgroup analysis of boys, categorical height and weight and continuous height, weight and age achieved \( P < 0.20 \). Categorical height and weight and continuous age were entered in to the multivariate analysis but were not associated with acute lower extremity injury (Table 3). Among girls, none of the variables achieved \( P < 0.20 \) in the univariate analysis, therefore no multivariate
analysis was performed. The univariate analyses for lower extremity injury for boys and girls are presented in supplementary material (Appendix tables 1–2).

**Risk factors for acute non-contact lower extremity injuries**

In the univariate analysis of new acute non-contact lower extremity injury risk in the entire cohort, low BMI and high FPKPA asymmetry achieved $P<0.20$ in the univariate analysis (Table 4). In the multivariate analysis, the analysed factors were not associated with non-contact injuries (Table 5).

For boys, low BMI and high FPKPA asymmetry were entered into the multivariate model but were not associated with non-contact injury (Table 5). For girls, categorised weight and ability to perform valid SLS test were entered into the multivariate model but were not associated with non-contact lower extremity injury (Table 5). Univariate analyses for a new non-contact lower extremity injury by sex are presented in supplementary material (Appendix tables 3–4).

**Effects of age, sex and leg dominance on FPKPA**

There was no difference in the mean FPKPA between boys and girls. There were significant differences in FPKPA between age groups among boys ($F=3.09$, $P=0.03$) and girls ($F=4.22$, $P=0.006$). Among boys, the FPKPA decreased as age increased. Among girls, the largest mean FPKPA was detected in the U12 age group. The oldest girls demonstrated best frontal plane knee control (mean FPKPA 12.2° ± 8.3°). The mean values for FPKPA by sex and age group for right, left, dominant and non-dominant leg are presented in Table 6.

There were significant differences in the mean FPKPA between the right and the left leg and the dominant and the non-dominant leg (Table 6). Among both sexes, the FPKPA was greater on the right leg compared to the left ($P<0.001$ for boys and for girls) and greater on the dominant compared to the non-dominant leg ($P<0.001$ for boys and $P=0.001$ for girls). When further analysed
by age group, the differences were statistically significant in all age groups among boys and U11 girls.

**DISCUSSION**

Our study on a cohort of youth football players investigated the relationship between FPKPA and sustaining an acute lower extremity injury and non-contact lower extremity injury. We found no association between the FPKPA and future injuries.

**FPKPA and the risk of lower extremity injury**

In the current study, we found no association between the FPKPA during the SLS and future lower extremity injuries. In our previous study among older team sport athletes (mean age 15.7 ± 1.8 years), we detected a significant association between FPKPA and acute lower extremity injury and acute ankle injury: displaying high FPKPA was associated with a higher odds of injury. The association between frontal plane knee control and the risk of injuries has not been previously studied in young, under 14-year-old athletes. Padua et al. utilised another field-assessment test, the Landing Error Scoring System, to study the association between high-risk movement patterns and the risk of anterior cruciate ligament injury. Out of the cohort of 11 to 17-year-old football players, 25% were U13 players. The athletes who were injured during the follow-up demonstrated more high-risk movement patterns during the test than the uninjured players. However, none of the injured players were under 13-years-old. Generally in sports, the under 13-year-olds have a lower risk of injury than older adolescents and in youth football, overall injury incidence increases along with age. The lower risk of injury among the under 13-year-olds could be a possible explanation why no significant associations were detected between the analysed intrinsic factors and future injuries.
**Leg dominance**

Leg dominance is an imbalance in the strength and joint kinematics in the lower extremities and it has been associated with an increased risk of lower extremity injuries. We detected significantly greater FPKPA in the dominant leg, which suggests an imbalance in knee control between legs. However, displaying great FPKPA asymmetry was not associated with future injuries. Findings on the side-to-side differences must be interpreted with caution since the starting leg was not randomised. The SLS test was always performed on the right leg first, which was the dominant leg for most of the players. The learning effect could have influenced the results; it is possible that the SLS test was harder on the first attempts, which were done on the right leg. Therefore, the side-to-side asymmetry as a potential injury risk factor should be investigated further using randomisation of the starting leg.

**Differences in FPKPA and injury risk between boys and girls**

There was no difference in the mean FPKPA angle between boys and girls. This is in agreement with a prior study on adolescent SLS performance. Agresta et al. (2016) evaluated frontal plane knee control during the SLS by visual assessment and detected no differences between sexes. In the current study, we detected differences in the FPKPA between age groups. Among boys, the frontal plane knee control improved along with age. Among girls, the relationship between age and FPKPA was not as clear. The oldest girls (U14) had the lowest mean FPKPA (12.0° ± 8.1°) in the study. The highest FPKPA among girls was measured in the U12 group (19.4° ± 11.2°). However, these findings on FPKPA may be somewhat limited by the small number of female subjects in this study; the girls’ age groups consisted of 24 to 32 subjects.

Previous studies on youth football have reported no differences in injury risk between boys and girls. We analysed sex as a potential risk factor in the entire cohort but detected no significant associations. In addition, separate risk factor analyses were performed for boys and girls. However,
none of the analysed intrinsic factors were associated with injuries. Among the young football players, sex does not seem to affect lower extremity injury risk.

**The single-leg squat test**

The SLS test is used in clinical practice to assess frontal plane knee control. The visual assessment of frontal plane knee control correlates well with the FPKPA, when assessment if performed by experienced observer. Previous studies on young athletes have shown that reduced frontal plane knee control is associated with higher risk of future injuries, although all the studies are not in agreement. Since reduced knee control has been identified as an injury risk factor, using movement control tests to identify athletes who could reduce their injury risk by improving knee control seems sensible. In a previous study, different athletes were identified as having reduced knee control by the vertical drop jump and the SLS. Therefore, it seems rational to use both, a jump-landing task and the SLS, to identify athletes with reduced knee control. When interpreting the results it must be kept in mind that sports injuries are multifactorial and movement control test results do not predict injuries but they do provide valuable information individual movement control and injury risk.

However, one factor to consider is the SLS test procedure. In the current study, the subjects were required to squat to 90° knee flexion. In some prior studies on SLS, the knee flexion angle has been determined at 60°, 90° or the subjects to squat as far as possible while maintaining balance. The procedure used here has been previously used among adults and older adolescents and it has been able to differentiate between the athletes. In the present study, 40 players were not able to perform valid SLS trials on either leg and additional 92 players only performed enough valid trials on one leg. It is possible that among these young athletes, this test procedure could be too demanding for part of the population. The double-legged squat might be a more suitable tool to
assess knee control among young athletes and should be investigated further as potential, low level movement control test.

**Strength and limitations**

The weekly injury registration via text message was well received by the parents and the players and can be viewed as a strength of the study. The text messaging system made it possible for the players (or the parent) to report all musculoskeletal complaints. This can be considered more accurate than collecting injury data from coaches. The size of the cohort can be viewed as a strength of the current study. To our knowledge, this is the largest study describing SLS performance among adolescents and the first one to measure the FPKPA in the SLS in young subjects. However, the lack of exposure data can be viewed as a limitation since we are not able to analyse whether the players getting injured were exposed more or less than those not getting injured.

In the SLS protocol, the test was always performed on the right leg first. This can contribute to the significant differences detected between the right and left leg and dominant and non-dominant leg. This is considered a source of bias. We recommend randomising the starting leg in the SLS test procedure in future studies. In addition, the difficulty of the SLS test, as discussed previously, is a limitation to the study.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Frontal plane knee control is not associated with the risk of lower extremity injuries among young football players. There were significant side-to-side differences in frontal plane knee control between the dominant and non-dominant leg but displaying side-to-side asymmetry in FPKPA was not associated with future injuries.
PERSPECTIVES
Football is the most popular sport in the world. Young football players lose valuable training time due to injuries. There is a need to identify modifiable risk factors which are associated with a higher risk of lower extremity injuries. The results of this study indicate that among young football players, the single-leg squat test is not a suitable tool to assess the risk of future injuries.
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Figure 1. Number of players in each stage of the study
Figure 2. The frontal plane knee projection angle (A) measured during the single-leg squat.
Figure 3. Number of acute lower extremity and acute non-contact lower extremity injuries by severity
Figure 4. Number of acute lower extremity and acute non-contact lower extremity injuries according to anatomical locations
Figure 5. Proportion of injured legs for boys and girls and in each age group
Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the players (mean presented with standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Weight (kg)</th>
<th>BMI</th>
<th>Playing football (years)</th>
<th>FPKPA (°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>151.6 (9.9)</td>
<td>41.1 (8.7)</td>
<td>17.7 (1.9)</td>
<td>6.5 (1.7)</td>
<td>16.5 (12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>143.3 (6.5)</td>
<td>34.9 (5.3)</td>
<td>16.9 (1.6)</td>
<td>5.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>17.6 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>148.5 (6.5)</td>
<td>38.0 (5.1)</td>
<td>17.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>6.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>17.5 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>154.0 (7.8)</td>
<td>43.3 (6.6)</td>
<td>17.8 (1.8)</td>
<td>6.8 (1.5)</td>
<td>17.0 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>161.7 (8.3)</td>
<td>49.9 (9.2)</td>
<td>18.9 (2.2)</td>
<td>8.0 (1.3)</td>
<td>14.2 (11.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>151.7 (9.2)</td>
<td>41.6 (7.7)</td>
<td>17.9 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.3 (1.6)</td>
<td>15.4 (10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>140.5 (4.1)</td>
<td>33.1 (3.9)</td>
<td>16.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>4.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>15.0 (9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>149.1 (6.4)</td>
<td>39.9 (5.8)</td>
<td>17.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>5.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>19.2 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>157.3 (5.9)</td>
<td>45.6 (5.9)</td>
<td>18.3 (1.6)</td>
<td>5.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>14.2 (11.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>159.6 (5.9)</td>
<td>47.8 (5.3)</td>
<td>18.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>6.2 (1.8)</td>
<td>12.2 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index, FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle
**Table 2.** Univariate analyses of the potential risk factor for acute lower extremity injuries. Odds ratios (OR) presented with 95% confidence interval (CI). N refers to number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>884 (183)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>226 (47)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.63 to 1.40</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>650 (133)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;10.8 years)</td>
<td>236 (46)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.64 to 1.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;13.2 years)</td>
<td>224 (51)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.78 to 1.63</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>726 (152)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;142.3 cm)</td>
<td>186 (33)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.53 to 1.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;161.1 cm)</td>
<td>172 (40)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.76 to 1.68</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>702 (148)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;33.9 kg)</td>
<td>204 (34)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.49 to 1.13</td>
<td>0.16 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.3 kg)</td>
<td>178 (43)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.79 to 1.73</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>984 (211)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>58 (7)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.24 to 1.19</td>
<td>0.12 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>40 (7)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.36 to 1.92</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>622 (126)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;4.0°)</td>
<td>154 (36)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.78 to 1.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;28.4°)</td>
<td>163 (34)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.67 to 1.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>938 (196)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>162 (31)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.59 to 1.38</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>574 (124)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.6°)</td>
<td>132 (25)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.53 to 1.39</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;18.8°)</td>
<td>148 (28)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.53 to 1.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>1110 (230)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>1084 (225)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.15 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1082 (225)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.08 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>1082 (225)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.14</td>
<td>0.19 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (°)</td>
<td>938 (196)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99 to 1.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry (°)</td>
<td>898 (164)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index, FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle, SLS=single-leg squat
Table 3. Multivariate analyses of the potential risk factors for all acute lower extremity injuries for all subjects and boys. Adjusted odds ratios (OR) presented with 95% confidence interval (CI). The variables achieving P<0.20 in univariate analyses were analysed. N refers to number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>1084 (225)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1082 (225)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.06</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>984 (211)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>58 (7)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.25 to 1.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>40 (7)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.245 to 1.74</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>614 (128)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;141.7 cm)</td>
<td>128 (19)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.44 to 1.68</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;161.5 cm)</td>
<td>126 (31)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.59 to 2.14</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>636 (133)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;32.4 kg)</td>
<td>104 (14)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.31 to 1.34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.8 kg)</td>
<td>128 (31)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.58 to 2.07</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>884 (183)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.85 to 1.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index
Table 4. Univariate analyses of the potential risk factor for acute non-contact lower extremity injuries. Odds ratios (OR) presented with 95% confidence interval (CI). N refers to number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>884 (95)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>226 (28)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.72 to 1.83</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>650 (69)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;10.8 years)</td>
<td>236 (27)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.67 to 1.73</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;13.2 years)</td>
<td>224 (27)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.71 to 1.83</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>726 (78)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;142.3 cm)</td>
<td>186 (20)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.59 to 1.68</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;161.1 cm)</td>
<td>172 (22)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.72 to 1.98</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>702 (75)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;33.9 kg)</td>
<td>204 (22)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.60 to 1.66</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.3 kg)</td>
<td>178 (23)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.74 to 2.01</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>984 (116)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>58 (2)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07 to 1.13</td>
<td>0.07 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.10 to 1.71</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>6272(66)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;4.0°)</td>
<td>154 (17)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.60 to 1.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;28.4°)</td>
<td>163 (19)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.63 to 1.87</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>938 (102)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>162 (18)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.61 to 1.76</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>574 (69)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.6°)</td>
<td>132 (17)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.62 to 1.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;18.8°)</td>
<td>148 (12)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.34 to 1.23</td>
<td>0.18 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>1110 (123)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.87 to 1.19</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>1084 (120)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.02</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>1082 (120)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>1082 (120)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.91 to 1.12</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (°)</td>
<td>938 (102)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.02</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry (°)</td>
<td>798 (89)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.02</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index, FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle, SLS=single-leg squat
Table 5. Multivariate analyses of potential risk factors for non-contact lower extremity injuries for all subjects, boys and girls. Adjusted odds ratios (OR) presented with 95% confidence interval (CI).

The variables achieving \( P<0.20 \) in univariate analyses were analysed. \( N \) refers to number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>( P ) value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>984 (116)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>58 (2)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.09 to 1.70</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00 to 0.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>574 (69)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.6°)</td>
<td>132 (17)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.64 to 2.02</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;18.8°)</td>
<td>148 (12)</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.35 to 1.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>450 (53)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.5°)</td>
<td>98 (13)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.60 to 2.23</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;19.5°)</td>
<td>102 (7)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.26 to 1.35</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>784 (88)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>48 (2)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.14 to 2.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>34 (2)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00 to 0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>134 (13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;34.0 kg)</td>
<td>40 (8)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.93 to 6.71</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.2 kg)</td>
<td>42 (7)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.48 to 4.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>212 (23)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>11 (3)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.67 to 12.78</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{BMI}= \text{body mass index, FPKPA}= \text{frontal plane knee projection angle, SLS}= \text{single-leg squat} \)
Table 6. Mean frontal plane knee projection angles (FPKPA) by sex and age group. P values are presented for the comparisons of right and left leg and dominant and non-dominant leg FPKPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and age group</th>
<th>Mean FPKPA right leg (SD)</th>
<th>Mean FPKPA left leg (SD)</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Mean FPKPA dominant leg (SD)</th>
<th>Mean FPKPA non-dominant leg (SD)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>19.6 (12.2)</td>
<td>13.4 (12.3)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>19.2 (12.1)</td>
<td>13.8 (12.6)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11</td>
<td>20.1 (13.2)</td>
<td>14.9 (13.5)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>19.4 (13.2)</td>
<td>15.6 (13.8)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12</td>
<td>18.8 (13.3)</td>
<td>16.2 (13.6)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>19.1 (13.1)</td>
<td>15.8 (13.8)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13</td>
<td>21.1 (11.7)</td>
<td>12.7 (10.7)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>20.8 (11.4)</td>
<td>13.2 (11.3)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>18.2 (10.7)</td>
<td>10.0 (10.7)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>17.3 (10.9)</td>
<td>10.8 (11.1)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>17.2 (9.5)</td>
<td>13.5 (11.5)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>17.1 (10.2)</td>
<td>13.6 (10.9)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11</td>
<td>19.0 (7.4)</td>
<td>10.8 (10.3)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>19.0 (7.4)</td>
<td>10.8 (10.3)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12</td>
<td>19.9 (10.0)</td>
<td>18.5 (12.6)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>20.6 (11.3)</td>
<td>17.8 (11.3)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13</td>
<td>15.9 (10.2)</td>
<td>12.6 (12.5)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>15.1 (11.1)</td>
<td>13.4 (11.9)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>13.3 (9.1)</td>
<td>11.1 (7.5)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>13.0 (8.5)</td>
<td>11.5 (8.3)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle, SD=standard deviation
**SUPPLEMENTARY FILES**

**Appendix table 1.** Univariate odds ratios (OR) for new acute lower extremity injury for boys presented with 95% confidence interval (CI). N refers to the number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>502 (100)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;10.8 years)</td>
<td>200 (40)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.65 to 1.49</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;13.2 years)</td>
<td>182 (43)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.82 to 1.85</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>614 (128)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;141.7 cm)</td>
<td>128 (19)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.39 to 1.14</td>
<td>0.14 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;161.5 cm)</td>
<td>126 (31)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.78 to 1.93</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>636 (133)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;32.4 kg)</td>
<td>104 (14)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.32 to 1.05</td>
<td>0.07 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.8 kg)</td>
<td>128 (31)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.78 to 1.91</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>784 (165)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>48 (7)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.32 to 1.64</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>34 (6)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.38 to 2.33</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>470 (97)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;3.9°)</td>
<td>121 (29)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.74 to 1.93</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;29.1°)</td>
<td>136 (28)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.61 to 1.58</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>726 (154)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>151 (28)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.54 to 1.34</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>450 (98)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.5°)</td>
<td>98 (19)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.49 to 1.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;19.5°)</td>
<td>102 (18)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43 to 1.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>884 (183)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.28</td>
<td>0.12 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>868 (178)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.16 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>866 (178)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.09 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>866 (178)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (*)</td>
<td>726 (154)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99 to 1.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry (*)</td>
<td>610 (126)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index, FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle, SLS=single-leg squat
Appendix table 2. Univariate odds ratios (OR) for new acute lower extremity injury for girls presented with 95% confidence interval (CI). N refers to the number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>132 (29)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;10.9 years)</td>
<td>48 (9)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.35 to 1.89</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;13.1 years)</td>
<td>46 (9)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.39 to 2.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>136 (30)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;142.5 cm)</td>
<td>44 (10)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.45 to 2.31</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;160.9 cm)</td>
<td>36 (7)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.33 to 2.11</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>134 (26)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;34.0 kg)</td>
<td>40 (10)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.59 to 3.15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.2 kg)</td>
<td>42 (11)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.64 to 3.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>200 (46)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>10 (0)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00 to 4.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.07 to 5.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>145 (29)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;4.7°)</td>
<td>35 (7)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.39 to 2.49</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;26.1°)</td>
<td>32 (6)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.34 to 2.42</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>212 (42)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>11 (3)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.38 to 5.95</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>132 (28)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.6°)</td>
<td>34 (6)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.32 to 2.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;18.8°)</td>
<td>38 (8)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.41 to 2.42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>226 (47)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.71 to 1.28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>216 (47)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.04</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>216 (47)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.06</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>216 (47)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.89 to 1.33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (*)</td>
<td>212 (42)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry (*)</td>
<td>188 (38)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95 to 1.05</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index, FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle, SLS=single-leg squat
Appendix table 3. Univariate odds ratios (OR) for new acute non-contact lower extremity injury for boys presented with 95% confidence interval (CI). N refers to the number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>502 (49)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;10.8 years)</td>
<td>200 (23)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.71 to 2.03</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high (&gt;13.2 years)</td>
<td>182 (23)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.78 to 2.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>614 (64)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;141.7 cm)</td>
<td>128 (11)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.42 to 1.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;161.5 cm)</td>
<td>126 (17)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.75 to 2.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>636 (67)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;32.4 kg)</td>
<td>104 (9)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.39 to 1.66</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.8 kg)</td>
<td>128 (16)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.68 to 2.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>784 (88)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>48 (2)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08 to 1.48</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>34 (2)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.12 to 2.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>470 (52)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;3.9°)</td>
<td>121 (13)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.50 to 1.82</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;29.1°)</td>
<td>136 (14)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.49 to 1.71</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>726 (79)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>151 (15)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.51 to 1.63</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>450 (53)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.5°)</td>
<td>98 (13)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.59 to 2.17</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;19.5°)</td>
<td>102 (7)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.24 to 1.27</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>884 (95)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.90 to 1.29</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>868 (92)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.99 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>866 (92)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>866 (92)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.92 to 1.15</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (*)</td>
<td>726 (79)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98 to 1.02</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry (*)</td>
<td>610 (66)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index, FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle, SLS=single-leg squat
**Appendix table 4.** Univariate odds ratios (OR) for new acute non-contact lower extremity injury for girls presented with 95% confidence interval (CI). N refers to the number of legs in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic factors</th>
<th>n (injured)</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, intermediate</td>
<td>132 (17)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, low (&lt;10.9 years)</td>
<td>48 (7)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.44 to 2.99</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, high ( &gt;13.1 years)</td>
<td>46 (4)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.21 to 2.15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, intermediate</td>
<td>136 (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, low (&lt;142.5 cm)</td>
<td>44 (8)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.65 to 4.17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, high (&gt;160.9 cm)</td>
<td>36 (4)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.29 to 2.97</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, intermediate</td>
<td>134 (13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, low (&lt;34.0 kg)</td>
<td>40 (8)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.87 to 6.04</td>
<td>0.09 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, high (&gt;49.2 kg)</td>
<td>42 (7)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.67 to 4.98</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, healthy</td>
<td>200 (28)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, low</td>
<td>10 (0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00 to 0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, overweight</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00 to 0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, intermediate</td>
<td>145 (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, low (&lt;4.7°)</td>
<td>35 (3)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.21 to 2.76</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA, high (&gt;26.1°)</td>
<td>32 (4)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.35 to 3.64</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>212 (23)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to perform valid SLS</td>
<td>11 (3)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.76 to 12.6</td>
<td>0.12 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, intermediate</td>
<td>132 (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, low (&lt;2.6°)</td>
<td>34 (4)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.32 to 3.36</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry, high (&gt;18.8°)</td>
<td>38 (5)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.37 to 3.24</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>226 (28)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.55 to 1.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>216 (28)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.94 to 1.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>216 (28)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.93 to 1.03</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>216 (28)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.74 to 1.20</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA (*)</td>
<td>212 (23)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97 to 1.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPKPA asymmetry (*)</td>
<td>188 (23)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.96 to 1.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI=body mass index, FPKPA=frontal plane knee projection angle, SLS=single-leg squat