

Neuromuscular risk factors for non-contact knee injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Bonar McGuire^{1,2}, Ben King²

¹ GKT School of Medical Education, King's College London
Guys Campus
Great Maze Pond
London
SE1 1UL
United Kingdom

² Queen Mary University London
Centre for Sports and Exercise Medicine
Mile End Hospital
Bancroft Road
London
E1 4DG
United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Bonar McGuire

E-mail address: bonar.mcguire@kcl.ac.uk

Full postal address: 5 Styles Way, Beckenham, BR3 3AJ

Contact number: 07908704727

ABSTRACT

Objectives

Identify neuromuscular risk factors for non-contact knee injury, using a systematic review and meta-analysis, to inform the development of preventive strategies.

Methods

Medline, Web of Science and SCOPUS were searched from inception until November 2020. Prospective and nested case-control studies that analysed baseline neuromuscular characteristics as potential risk factors for subsequent non-contact knee injuries were included. Two reviewers independently appraised methodological quality using a modified Newcastle–Ottawa Scale. Meta-

analysis was performed where appropriate, with standardised mean differences calculated for continuous scaled data.

Results

Seventeen studies were included, comprising baseline data from 5,584 participants and 415 non-contact knee injuries (heterogeneous incidence = 7.4%). Protocols and outcome measures differed across studies, limiting data pooling. Twenty-one neuromuscular variables were included in the meta-analysis. Three were identified as risk factors. For patellofemoral pain, among military recruits: reduced non-normalised quadriceps strength at 60°/s (SMD -0.66; 95% CI -0.99, -0.32); reduced quadriceps strength at 240°/s (normalised by body mass) (SMD -0.53; CI -0.87, -0.20). For PFP/ACL injury among female military recruits: reduced quadriceps strength at 60°/s (normalised by body mass) (SMD -0.50; CI -0.92, -0.08).

Conclusions

Quadriceps weakness is a risk factor for PFP among military recruits, and for PFP/ACL injury among female military recruits. However, the effect sizes are small, and the generalisability of these findings is limited. The effectiveness of quadriceps strengthening interventions for preventing PFP and ACL injury merits evaluation in prospective randomised trials.

Key terms

Strength, flexibility, balance, activation, knee

INTRODUCTION

High rates of knee injury have been reported among physically active populations, including team sports athletes, runners, and military personnel.^{1, 2} Acute knee injuries often require surgical intervention,³ and chronic knee injuries frequently persist, despite evidence-based management.^{4, 5} Consequently, knee injuries result in more time loss than injuries to other lower limb regions.⁶ In the longer term, both acute and chronic knee injuries increase the risk of knee osteoarthritis and other knee-related symptoms, reducing quality of life.^{7, 8, 9} Prevention of knee injuries is critical to the physical and psychological health of physically active people, and success in competitive sport.




Figure 1: The sequence of prevention of sports injuries¹⁰

The ‘sequence of prevention’ model (Figure 1) provides a guide to developing injury prevention strategies.¹⁰ Knee injuries have both a high incidence and severity (Stage 1).¹⁻⁹ Among potential risk factors, neuromuscular variables are particularly relevant to prevention, as they can be quantified using valid and reliable tests and modified through clinical intervention. For example, strength can be assessed by handheld dynamometry,¹¹ and can be enhanced by resistance training.¹² In contrast, other potential risk factors may require specialist expertise or technology to assess (e.g. bone

anatomy), or may be unmodifiable (e.g. age, sex, previous injury).¹² Identifying neuromuscular risk factors for knee injury facilitates understanding of the mechanisms of injury (Stage 2), and provides targets for modification by preventive interventions (Stage 3), the effectiveness of which can then be evaluated in clinical trials (Stage 4).

Prospective study designs are best placed to identify possible risk factors for subsequent injury, when compared with case-control or cross-sectional study designs that are unable to eliminate or control for factors that associated with existing injury or pain. Previous systematic reviews of risk factors for knee injuries have identified quadriceps weakness as a risk factor for PFP among military recruits, and increased hip abduction strength as a risk factor for PFP among adolescents.¹⁸ However, rather than studying knee injuries in general, these reviews focused on specific diagnoses,^{18, 19} populations,²⁰ or activities,²¹ reducing the number of eligible studies, and the number of variables for which data could be pooled for meta-analysis. Data syntheses have also been limited by the small number of high-quality prospective studies. For instance, Chester *et al*¹⁶ identified only one study of VMO activation timing as a risk factor for PFP that was of sufficient quality for inclusion. Thus, the extent to which neuromuscular variables can predict future knee injury remains unclear.

The aim of the present review was to synthesise evidence on neuromuscular risk factors for non-contact knee injuries, to inform the development of preventive interventions. To maximise the number of neuromuscular variables available for meta-analysis, we included prospective studies of risk factors for any type of non-contact knee injury, in any population, with exposure to any type of activity.

METHODS

Protocol and registration

The PRISMA checklist²² was consulted prior to the review and all items were completed.

Eligibility criteria

Table 1: Eligibility criteria

Population	To increase the number of eligible studies, no selection criteria were applied to the population from which participants were sampled.
Exposure	To further increase the number of eligible studies, no limits were placed on the physical activity to which participants were exposed.
Comparison	The subjects that developed non-contact knee injuries were compared with those that did not.
Outcomes	Study inclusion required the assessment of at least one neuromuscular variable at baseline, and the monitoring of non-contact knee injuries during follow-up.
Study design	Only prospective studies and nested case-control studies were eligible because the tracking of new (incident) injuries among a healthy cohort enables baseline neuromuscular variables to be considered as causal factors.

Information sources

Medline, Scopus and Web of Science online databases were searched on 25th November 2020, using the search strategy described in Table 2.

Search

Table 2: Search Strategy

Neuromuscular risk factors	neuromuscular OR motor OR activ* OR strength OR torque OR power OR timing OR contraction OR delay OR emg OR electromyography AND
Musculoskeletal injuries	msk OR musc* OR tend* OR bone OR menisc* OR ligament* OR cartilage OR injur* OR strain OR sprain OR tear OR rupture OR fracture OR joint AND
Lower limb	leg OR lower OR thigh OR shank OR foot OR hip OR knee OR ankle OR pelvis AND
Study design	prospective

Study selection

Table 3: Selection Criteria

Inclusion criteria	1. Prospective or nested case-control study design. 2. Participants were healthy (uninjured) at baseline. 3. Participants were exposed to physical activity of any type during the follow-up period. 4. At least one neuromuscular characteristic (potential risk factor) was assessed at baseline. 5. Recorded incident non-contact injuries to the lower limb (knee) during the follow-up period.
Exclusion criteria	1. Mean age of participants was <16 years or >50 years at baseline, or, if no mean age was provided, participants were described as ‘child’, ‘youth’ or ‘older adults’. 2. Did not distinguish between contact injuries and non-contact injuries during data collection or statistical analysis. (3. The specific location of incident injuries did not include the knee or a structure of the knee)

Children and older individuals are susceptible to growth- and frailty-related injuries, respectively.

Thus, studies were excluded if participants had a mean age of <16 or >50 years. Studies were excluded if they did not distinguish between contact and non-contact injuries. However, studies of overuse injuries were not required to explicitly state that these had occurred via non-contact mechanisms.

Two authors (BM and BK) exported all articles identified by the search strategy to Mendeley Desktop (Version 1.19.4, Elsevier, New York, New York, USA). Articles were uploaded into Rayyan²³ (Version 0.1.0, QCRI, Doha, Qatar) and blind screened (BM and BK) for relevance to non-contact knee injury. Once both authors had applied the selection criteria to all articles, blinding was removed. The full texts of the remaining articles were then screened to confirm their eligibility. In addition, the reference lists of articles included in the review, and of previous systematic reviews of risk factors for knee injuries, were hand-searched. Any conflicting selection decisions were discussed and resolved by the two authors. Reasons for excluding articles after full-text screening were recorded.

Data collection process

Data related to study characteristics were extracted and entered on spreadsheets using Microsoft Excel (Version 16.35, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington, USA). When studies did not report all potentially relevant data, the corresponding author was emailed, and missing data requested.

Means and standard deviations for measures of strength, flexibility, balance and muscle activation were extracted. When numerical values were not available, these were obtained using graph digitiser software (WebPlotDigitizer, Version: 4.2, San Francisco, California, USA).

Data items

Data were extracted on participants (population, number, baseline injury history); exposure (duration of follow-up period, type of physical activity, training requirements); baseline neuromuscular variables (summary measures, assessment protocols); knee injuries recorded during follow-up; and key findings.

Risk of bias in individual studies

Because the review comprised prospective and nested case-control studies, methodological quality was independently assessed by two reviewers (BM and BK) using a modified Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS).²⁴ NOS Criterion 5 relates to the comparability of a study's cohorts. In the present review, this was modified to apply to the sexes of the participants, and the male-to-female ratio in the injured and uninjured groups, to account for sex differences in neuromuscular measures at baseline. A study was awarded one point for each criterion that it satisfied. In total, the modified NOS contained 8 categories relating to methodological quality. Each study was given a score, with a maximum of 8 points. Low-, moderate- and high-quality studies were defined as having scores of ≤ 4 , 5-6, and 7-8 points respectively. Initial decisions were recorded and used to calculate inter-rater reliability. Conflicting decisions were discussed, and the authors made consensus decisions.

Summary measures

The principal summary measures were the means and standard deviations (SDs) for baseline neuromuscular variables in the injured and uninjured groups. These were used to calculate standardised mean differences (SMDs) and 95% confidence intervals. Alternative summary measures included medians, risk ratios and odds ratios.

Synthesis of results

Statistical analysis was performed using Review Manager (RevMan, [Computer program]. Version 5.3.5. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014).²⁵ Means and SDs were extracted for continuous scaled variables and used to calculate standardised mean differences (SMDs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Alternative summary measures (e.g. medians) were extracted and described in the text but not included in the meta-analysis.

Table 4: Levels of Evidence

Strong evidence	Statistically homogeneous findings across three or more studies, including a minimum of two high-quality studies.
Moderate evidence	Statistically homogeneous findings across two or more low- or moderate-quality studies. OR Statistically heterogeneous findings across two or more studies, at least one of which is high-quality.
Limited evidence	Statistically heterogeneous findings from one high-quality study. OR Statistically heterogeneous findings from two or more moderate- or low-quality studies.
Very limited evidence	Findings from one moderate- or low-quality study.

Following the guidelines outlined by van Tulder *et al.*,²⁶ the level of evidence depended on the number and quality of studies that investigated each variable, and the homogeneity (consistency) of the direction and magnitude of its effect across different studies (Table 4).

Neuromuscular variables were categorised into domains of strength, flexibility, balance and muscle activation. Within each domain are specific characteristics, such as 'quadriceps strength', or 'quadriceps flexibility'. If studies assessed a variable using different protocols or outcome measures, data were only pooled for meta-analysis if the respective methods were deemed sufficiently similar. For example, 'concentric strength' was not deemed similar enough to 'isometric strength' for data from these measures to be pooled.

A random effects model was used to account for between-study variation in participant characteristics and methods, and for the small number of studies. This reduced the probability of a type 1 error.²⁷ Calculated individual and pooled SMDs were categorised as small (0.5-0.79), medium (0.80–1.19) or large (≥ 1.2). We used higher SMD thresholds than those proposed by Cohen,²⁸ to reduce the probability that variables would be falsely labelled as risk factors (type 1 errors).²⁹ Thus, in the present

review, to be labelled as a risk factor, a variable had to have been investigated in two or more studies, have a pooled SMD ≤ -0.5 , and an upper confidence interval limit ≤ 0 .

Additional analyses

Because knee injury rates can differ between males and females,^{30, 31, 32} wherever possible, sex-specific data were extracted and analysed in male and female subgroups.

Similarly, wherever possible, data were pooled by specific population (e.g. military recruits) and analysed as subgroups.

RESULTS

Study selection

The initial ‘lower limb’ search identified 12,694 titles and abstracts. Of these, 12,588 articles were excluded as not relevant to the research question. After the aim of the review was updated (see Methods), articles unrelated to knee injury were excluded. Of the 54 articles that remained, 17 met inclusion criteria for the review, of which 10 were included in the meta-analysis (Figure 2).

Study characteristics

Thirteen studies^{33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48} assessed strength, four^{41, 46, 47, 49} assessed muscle activation, three^{44, 47, 48} assessed flexibility and two^{42, 47} assessed balance.

Nine studies^{33, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43, 45, 46, 47} investigated risk factors for patellofemoral pain (PFP). Six^{35, 38, 40, 41, 43, 49} investigated non-contact ACL injuries. One⁴⁸ investigated patellar tendinopathy, and one³⁴ investigated overuse knee injuries.




Figure 2: PRISMA search flowchart

Five distinct populations were studied: military recruits,^{33, 35, 38, 44, 45, 46} adolescents,^{34, 37, 39, 47, 48} elite female athletes,^{41, 42, 49} recreational runners,^{40, 43} and club-level athletes.²⁶

Seven studies^{33, 36, 37, 40, 44, 47, 48} recruited participants of both sexes, seven^{34, 35, 39, 41, 42, 43, 49} recruited only females, and three^{38, 45, 46} recruited only males.

Follow-up periods ranged in duration from 6 weeks to 8 years (median 12 months).

Risk of bias within studies

Six studies^{35, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48} were deemed high quality (HQ), ten^{33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44} were deemed moderate quality (MQ), and one⁴⁹ was deemed low quality (LQ) (Table 6). The mean percentage agreement between the two authors for quality ratings was 90.25% (range 76-100%), indicating a high inter-rater reliability. The lowest rates of agreement (76%) were for Criteria 3 and 5. No study satisfied Criterion 2 (inclusion of a non-exposed control group).

Table 5: Study Characteristics

Study	NOS	Population	Activity	Neuromuscular variables	Injury	Injured n	Sample size	Duration (months)
Boling <i>et al</i> ³³	MQ	Military (USA)	Training	STR (Hip, Qd, Ha)	PFP	40 (M=16, F=24)	1319	30
Devan <i>et al</i> ³⁴	MQ	Adolescents (USA)	Team sports	STR (Qd, Ha)	Overuse	9 (F=9)	53	12*
Duvigneaud <i>et al</i> ³⁵	HQ	Military (Belgium)	Training	STR (Qd, Ha, Fun)	PFP	26 (F=26)	62	1.5
Khayambashi <i>et al</i> ³⁶	MQ	Club level athletes (Iran)	Team sports	STR (Hip)	ACL	15 (M=6, F=9)	468	12
Luedke <i>et al</i> ³⁷	MQ	Adolescents (USA)	Running	STR (Hip, Qd, Ha)	PFP	3 (M=1, F=2)	68	12*
Milgrom <i>et al</i> ³⁸	MQ	Military (Israel)	Training	STR (Qd, Ha, Fun)	PFP	60 (M=60)	390	3.5
Myer <i>et al</i> ³⁹	MQ	Adolescents (USA)	Team sports	STR (Qd, Ha, Fun)	ACL	22 (F=22)	132	24
Ramsgov <i>et al</i> ⁴⁰	MQ	Recreational runners (Denmark)	Running	STR (Hip)	PFP	24 (M=10, F=14)	629	12
Smeets <i>et al</i> ⁴¹	MQ	Elite female athletes (Belgium)	Team sports	EMG	ACL	4 (F=4)	39	12
Steffen <i>et al</i> ⁴²	MQ	Elite female athletes (Norway)	Team sports	BAL	ACL	67 (F=67)	838	96
Thijs <i>et al</i> ⁴³	HQ	Recreational runners (Belgium)	Running	STR (Hip)	PFP	16 (F=16)	77	2.5
Uhorchak <i>et al</i> ⁴⁴	MQ	Military (USA)	Training	STR (Qd, Ha); FLX (Ha)	ACL	24 (M=16, F=8)	859	48
Van Tiggelen <i>et al</i> ⁴⁵	HQ	Military (Belgium)	Training	STR (Qd, Ha)	PFP	31 (M=31)	96	1.5
Van Tiggelen <i>et al</i> ⁴⁶	HQ	Military (Belgium)	Training	EMG	PFP	26 (M=26)	79	1.5
Witvrouw <i>et al</i> ⁴⁷	HQ	Adolescents (Belgium)	PE classes	STR (Qd, Ha, Fun); FLX (Qd, Ha, Ga); EMG; BAL	PFP	24 (M=11, F=13)	282	24
Witvrouw <i>et al</i> ⁴⁸	HQ	Adolescents (Belgium)	PE classes	STR (Qd, Ha); FLX (Qd, Ha)	PT	19 (M=11, F=8)	138	24
Zebis <i>et al</i> ⁴⁹	LQ	Elite female athletes (Denmark)	Team sports	EMG	ACL	5 (F=5)	55	24*

NOS = Newcastle-Ottawa Scale; HQ = high quality; MQ = moderate quality; LQ = low quality; PE = physical education; STR = strength; EMG = electromyography; BAL = balance; FLX = flexibility; Qd = quadriceps; Ga = gastrocnemius; Ha = hamstrings; Fun = functional; PFP = patellofemoral pain; ACL = anterior cruciate ligament; PT = patellar tendinopathy; M = male; F = female.

* where duration was reported as n 'seasons', one season was assumed to last twelve months.

Strength

All studies that investigated concentric and eccentric strength used isokinetic dynamometry (IKD). Studies that investigated isometric strength used handheld dynamometry (HHD). Studies either reported absolute (non-normalised) strength, relative strength (normalised by body mass), or both. Absolute strength data were pooled separately from relative strength data in the meta-analysis.

Knee extension (quadriceps) strength

Moderate evidence (two HQ studies^{35, 45}) of small effect indicates absolute concentric knee extension weakness at 60°/s is a risk factor (SMD -0.66; CI -0.99, -0.32; $I^2 = 0\%$) for patellofemoral pain (PFP) in military recruits, but not at 240°/s (SMD -0.49; CI -0.85, -0.12; $I^2 = 17\%$) (Figures 3.1.1 and 3.1.2). Moderate evidence (three HQ studies,^{35, 45, 48} one MQ study⁴⁴) indicates that concentric knee extension weakness at 60°/s, normalised to body mass, is not a risk factor (SMD -0.33; CI -0.64, -0.02; $I^2 = 45\%$) for non-contact knee injury at 60°/s (Figure 3.1.3). This finding remained true (SMD -0.44; CI -0.75, -0.13; $I^2 = 30\%$) when data were pooled for military recruits only^{35, 44, 45} (Figure 3.1.4).

Moderate evidence (three HQ studies^{35, 45, 48}) indicates that concentric knee extension weakness at 240°/s, normalised to body mass, is not a risk factor (SMD -0.35; CI -0.74, 0.03; $I^2 = 48\%$) for non-contact knee injury (Figure 3.1.5), but moderate evidence (two HQ studies^{35, 45}) of small effect indicates that it is a risk factor (SMD -0.53; CI -0.87, -0.20; $I^2 = 0\%$) for PFP when data were pooled for military recruits only (Figure 3.1.6).

Sex-specific data could only be pooled for concentric knee extension strength at 60°/s, normalised by body mass. Moderate evidence (one HQ study,⁴⁵ one MQ study⁴⁴) indicates that it is not a risk factor (SMD -0.19; CI -0.98, 0.59; $I^2 = 82\%$) for non-contact knee injury in male military recruits (Figure 3.1.7). Moderate evidence (one HQ study,³⁵ one MQ study⁴⁴) of small effect indicates that it is a risk

factor (SMD -0.50; CI -0.92, -0.08; $I^2 = 0\%$) for non-contact knee injury in female military recruits (Figure 3.1.8).

Limited evidence (two MQ studies^{33, 38}) indicates that isometric knee extension weakness, normalised to body mass, is not a risk factor (SMD -0.25; CI -0.74, 0.25; $I^2 = 82\%$) for PFP in military recruits (Figure 3.1.9). Very limited evidence (one MQ study³⁸) indicates that absolute isometric knee extension weakness is not a risk factor (SMD 0.28; CI 0.01, 0.56) for PFP in military recruits. Luedke *et al*³⁷ (MQ) found that adolescent runners in the weakest third for knee extension strength had a higher incidence of PFP than those in the strongest third (chi-square = 6.562; $P = 0.046$).

Limited evidence (one HQ study³⁵) indicates that absolute eccentric quadriceps strength at 30°/s is not a risk factor (SMD -0.15; CI -0.66, 0.35) for PFP in military recruits. Very limited evidence (one MQ study³⁴) indicates that eccentric quadriceps strength at 60°/s, normalised by body mass, is not a risk factor (SMD -0.13; CI -0.55, 0.28) for ACL injury in military recruits.

Knee flexion (hamstrings) strength

Moderate evidence (two HQ studies^{35, 45}) indicates that absolute concentric knee flexion weakness is not a risk factor for PFP in military recruits at 60°/s (SMD -0.09; CI -0.42, 0.24; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Figure 3.2.1) or at 240°/s (SMD -0.10; CI -0.43, 0.22; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Figure 3.2.2).

Moderate evidence (one HQ study,⁴⁸ one MQ study⁴⁴) indicates that concentric knee flexion weakness at 60°/s, normalised by body mass, is not a risk factor (SMD -0.16; CI -0.48, 0.15; $I^2 = 0\%$) for non-contact knee injury (Figure 3.2.3).

Eccentric knee flexion strength data could not be pooled for meta-analysis. Limited evidence (one HQ study³⁵) indicates that absolute eccentric hamstrings strength at 30°/s is not a risk factor for PFP in military recruits (SMD -0.49; CI -1.00, 0.02). Very limited evidence (one MQ study⁴⁴) indicates that eccentric hamstrings strength at 60°/s, normalised by body mass, is not a risk factor (SMD 0.01; CI -0.40, 0.43) for ACL injury in military recruits.

Isometric knee flexion strength data could not be pooled for meta-analysis because only one study reported means and standard deviations. Very limited evidence (one MQ study³³) indicates that isometric knee flexion strength is not a risk factor (SMD -0.40; CI -0.72, -0.08) for PFP in military recruits. Luedke *et al*³⁷ (MQ) found that adolescent runners in the weakest third for knee flexor strength had a higher incidence of PFP than those in the strongest third (chi-square = 6.140; P = 0.046).

Hamstrings-to-quadriceps ratio

Limited evidence (one HQ study³⁵) of small effect indicates that a high hamstrings-to-quadriceps ratio is a risk factor for PFP in military recruits at both 60°/s (SMD 0.6; CI 0.08, 1.12) and 240°/s (SMD 0.59; CI 0.08, 1.11). One MQ study³⁴ found that prevalence of overuse knee injuries was greater in athletes with H:Q ratios below the normal range at both 60°/s and 300°/s ($p = 0.004$). One MQ study³⁹ found that the median hamstrings to quadriceps ratio at 300°/s was lower in adolescents that developed ACL injuries compared with those that remained uninjured.

Hip strength

Moderate evidence (one HQ study,⁴³ two MQ studies^{33, 36}) indicates that isometric hip abduction weakness, normalised by body mass (SMD -0.46; CI -0.86, -0.06; $I^2 = 57\%$), and isometric hip

external rotation weakness, normalised by body mass (SMD -0.38; CI -0.79, 0.04; $I^2 = 61\%$) are not risk factors for non-contact knee injury (Figures 3.3.1 and 3.3.2).

Moderate evidence (one HQ study,⁴³ one MQ study³³) indicates that isometric hip internal rotation weakness, normalised by body mass (SMD -0.11; CI -0.49, 0.26; $I^2 = 36\%$), and isometric hip extension weakness (SMD -0.23; CI -0.50, 0.05; $I^2 = 0\%$), normalised by body mass, are not risk factors for non-contact knee injury (Figures 3.3.3 and 3.3.4).

Hip flexion and hip adduction strength were each assessed only in one study. Limited evidence (one HQ study⁴³) indicates that isometric hip flexion (SMD 0.28; CI -0.27, 0.83) and isometric hip adduction (SMD -0.32; CI -0.87, 0.23) strength are not risk factors for PFP in runners.

Functional strength

Moderate evidence (one HQ study,⁴⁷ one MQ study³⁸) indicates that trunk flexion weakness, assessed by sit-ups, is not a risk factor (SMD -0.06; CI -0.29, 0.17; $I^2 = 0\%$) for PFP (Figure 3.4).

Limited evidence (one HQ study³⁷) of small effect indicates that lower vertical jump height is a risk factor (SMD -0.56; CI -0.98, -0.13) for PFP in adolescents. Myer *et al*³⁹ (MQ) reported a median vertical jump height of 15.8cm in adolescents that sustained an ACL injury compared with 15.5cm in those that remained uninjured.

Flexibility

Moderate evidence (two HQ studies^{47, 48}) indicates that reduced quadriceps flexibility is not a risk factor (SMD -1.81; CI -4.46, 0.84; $I^2 = 98\%$) for non-contact knee injury in adolescents (Figure 4.1).

Moderate evidence (two HQ studies,^{47, 48} one MQ study⁴⁴) indicates that reduced hamstrings flexibility is not a risk factor (SMD -0.23; CI -1.02, 0.56; $I^2 = 90\%$) for non-contact knee injury (Figure 4.2.1). This remained true when data were pooled for adolescents only (small SMD -0.57; CI -1.38, 0.24; $I^2 = 84\%$) (Figure 4.2.2).

Limited evidence (one HQ study⁴⁷) indicates gastrocnemius flexibility is not a risk factor (SMD -0.48; CI -0.90, -0.06) for PFP in adolescents.

Balance

The ‘balance platform test (static), 95% confidence ellipse’ in Steffen *et al*⁴² (MQ) was considered to be similar enough to the Flamingo balance test in Witvrouw *et al*⁴⁷ (HQ) for data pooling. Moderate evidence (one HQ study,⁴⁷ one MQ study⁴²) indicates that reduced single leg balance is not a risk factor (SMD 0.17; CI -0.07, 0.41; $I^2 = 0\%$) for non-contact knee injury (Figure 5).

Muscle activation

Four studies assessed baseline muscle activation by electromyography. However, their methods were not similar enough for data to be pooled for meta-analysis.

Limited evidence (one HQ study⁴⁶) of large effect indicates that delayed vastus medialis obliquus (VMO) activation in relation to vastus lateralis (VL) is a risk factor (SMD -1.58; CI -2.11, -1.05) for PFP in military recruits.

Limited evidence (one HQ study⁴⁷) of small effect indicates that shortened VMO (SMD -0.50; CI -0.92, -0.08) and VL (SMD -0.64; CI -1.06, -0.22) reflex response times are risk factors for PFP in military recruits.

Very limited evidence (one LQ study⁴⁹) of large effect indicates that reduced semitendinosus activity (SMD -1.16; CI -2.1, -0.21) and increased vastus lateralis activity (SMD 2.30; CI 1.28, 3.31), prior to a cutting manoeuvre, are risk factors for ACL injury in elite female athletes.

Very limited evidence (one MQ study⁴¹) indicates that (hamstrings medialis, hamstrings lateralis), (vastus lateralis, hamstrings lateralis) and (hamstrings lateralis, vastus medialis) vector activations around peak loading and just before take-off are greater ($P < 0.001$) among female athletes that subsequently suffered ACL injuries compared with those that remained uninjured.

Risk of bias across studies

Some authors were involved in multiple studies included in the present review. In particular, *Witvrouw, E.* was the first author of two articles,^{47, 48} and a co-author in four others.^{35, 43, 45, 46} Nevertheless, all of these studies were rated as either high (n=4) or moderate (n=2) quality.




Figure 3.1: Quadriceps strength

M = military; A = adolescents; PFP = patellofemoral pain; ACL = anterior cruciate ligament; PT = patellar tendinopathy; HQ = high quality; MQ = moderate quality.




Figure 3.2: Hamstrings strength

M = military; A = adolescents; PFP = patellofemoral pain; PT = patellar tendinopathy; ACL = anterior cruciate ligament; HQ = high quality; MQ = moderate quality.




Figure 3.3: Hip strength

M = military; A = adolescents; PFP = patellofemoral pain; ACL = anterior cruciate ligament; PT = patellar tendinopathy; HQ = high quality; MQ = moderate quality.




Figure 3.4: Trunk flexion strength

M = military; A = adolescents; PFP = patellofemoral pain; HQ = high quality; MQ = moderate quality.




Figure 4.1: Quadriceps flexibility

A = adolescents; PT = patellar tendinopathy; PFP = patellofemoral pain; HQ = high quality.




Figure 4.2: Hamstrings flexibility

A = adolescents; M = military recruits; PT = patellar tendinopathy; PFP = patellofemoral pain; ACL = anterior cruciate ligament; HQ = high quality; MQ = moderate quality.




Figure 5: Single leg static balance

F = female athletes; A = adolescents; ACL = anterior cruciate ligament; PFP = patellofemoral pain; HQ = high quality; MQ = moderate quality.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this systematic review was to identify neuromuscular risk factors for non-contact knee injuries. The key findings were that lower absolute concentric quadriceps strength at 60°/s, and lower quadriceps strength at 240°/s (normalised by body mass) were risk factors for patellofemoral pain (PFP) among military recruits; reduced concentric knee extension strength at 60°/s, normalised by body mass, was a risk factor for PFP and non-contact ACL injury, specifically among female military recruits. For each risk factor, the effect size (according to our thresholds) was small (-0.66, -0.53, and -0.50, respectively).

Strength

Our findings are consistent with those from a previous systematic review,¹⁸ which identified the same two quadriceps weakness risk factors for PFP, after pooling data from the same two prospective studies of Belgian military recruits.^{35, 45} Although each study lasted only six weeks, there was a remarkably high incidence of PFP (41.9% and 32.3%, respectively). Studies of PFP among military recruits in other settings have reported much lower rates (3.0%³³ and 15.4%³⁸), despite longer follow-up periods (130 weeks and 15 weeks, respectively). This suggests that in the two studies in which we and Neal *et al*¹⁸ identified quadriceps weakness as a risk factor for PFP, the extrinsic training load was particularly high. In line with this, we found no evidence that quadriceps strength was a risk factor for PFP from studies in non-military cohorts.⁴⁸ Thus, the generalisability of the findings is limited. Although only three strength variables in the meta-analysis met our risk factor criteria, subjects who developed injuries were weaker on every strength variable (Figures 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4), with pooled SMDs ranging from -0.06 to -0.66.

No measure of hip strength was found to be a risk factor. This is surprising, given that proximal (hip) strengthening exercises are effective in the treatment of PFP⁵⁷ and improve pain and function more than quadriceps rehabilitation.^{57, 58} However, the clinical benefits of proximal rehabilitation may result from other mechanisms than increased hip muscle strength.⁵⁷ It is also possible that we were

unable to detect an effect of hip strength because statistical power was limited, and subgrouping by population or sex was not possible. Although Neal *et al*¹⁸ identified *increased* hip abduction strength as a risk factor for PFP in adolescents, they suggested that this reflected an adaptation to increased physical activity, and that this accounted for the association.

Flexibility

Quadriceps flexibility had the largest pooled effect size (large SMD -1.81) of any variable. This was driven by data from a single high quality study⁴⁸ which reported a very large difference (SMD -3.18, CI -3.81, -2.58) in passive knee flexion range of motion (ROM) between adolescent physical education students that developed patellar tendinopathy (PT) (ROM $86.0^{\circ} \pm 12.4^{\circ}$) and controls (ROM $132.6^{\circ} \pm 14.9^{\circ}$). However, when these data were pooled with data from a study investigating PFP,⁴⁷ quadriceps flexibility could no longer be considered a risk factor, as the pooled upper CI limit was positive (0.86). Nevertheless, reduced quadriceps flexibility may still be a risk factor for PT specifically, and given the large effect size, this relationship merits further investigation.

Muscle activation

An alteration in the relative timing of the onset of vastus medialis obliquus (VMO) and vastus lateralis (VL) activation, which disrupts mediolateral patellar tracking, may underlie PFP.^{59, 60, 61} A previous systematic review⁶² found a trend towards delayed VMO activation in PFP subjects, but data synthesis was limited by between-study heterogeneity. Similarly, in this review, data from the two studies^{46, 47} that investigated VMO and VL activation could not be pooled for meta-analysis because of methodological differences. Nevertheless, both studies were of high quality and found that VMO activation was delayed in subjects that later developed PFP. Moreover, Van Tiggelen *et al*⁴⁶ found that the larger the delay in VMO activation at baseline, the higher the risk of later PFP. It was reported that after completing military training, onset of VMO activation occurred after VL in all subjects that

had developed PFP, but only a third of those who had not developed PFP. The latter finding raises the possibility that delayed VMO contraction may result from PFP, as well as being a causal factor.

Balance

A previous systematic review⁶³ concluded that balance training should be included in ACL injury prevention programmes. However, we identified only two studies^{42, 48} that assessed balance, and neither found associations between balance measures and subsequent knee injury (ACL and PFP, respectively).

Clinical Implications




Figure 6: Illustration of the substantial (68.9%) overlap (black) between the values of injured (red) and uninjured (blue) subjects for a putative neuromuscular variable, even when the effect size (according to Cohen's thresholds)²⁸ is large (Cohen's $d = 0.8$). Injured and control groups were assigned means of 100 and 112, respectively, with normal distributions, and SDs of 15. In this example, there is a 71.4% chance that a person picked at random from the injured group will have a lower score than a person picked at random from the control group.²⁹

It has been argued that “screening tests to predict injury do not work” because they measure continuous variables which tend to be normally distributed (Figure 6).⁵⁰ Hence, on the basis of a single test, even if a variable is significantly associated with increased injury risk, it is rarely possible

to identify a cut-off point that is both sensitive and specific enough to justify risk stratification. Our findings support this view, as the variables that we found to be associated with non-contact knee injury had small effect sizes, and would not, in isolation, be strong predictors. However, prediction of knee injury may still be possible if different risk factors are integrated in multi-factorial models.^{18,}

⁵¹ This approach has proven successful in other fields of medicine: for example, the Fracture Risk Assessment Tool (FRAX)^{52, 53} and the QRISK3-2018 calculator⁵⁴ are used to predict the risk of osteoporotic fractures and cardiovascular events, respectively.

Testing protocols and outcome measures differed across studies, which reduced the number of variables with data that could be pooled for meta-analysis. This issue could be addressed by standardising protocols and measures across research groups within this field, as has proven successful in other research areas.^{63, 64}

All studies in the present review involved subjects who were asymptomatic at baseline. However, the criteria used to exclude participants on the basis of their injury history differed greatly between studies, which may have affected the results. For instance, Uhorchak *et al*⁴⁴ excluded volunteers with previous ACL injuries but Steffen *et al*⁴² did not, and found that a previous ACL injury tripled the odds for sustaining a new ACL injury. Previous musculoskeletal injuries are common in physically active individuals, so the exclusion of previously injured volunteers may result in an unrepresentative sample and an underpowered study. On the other hand, if subjects with previous injuries are to be included, it is unclear how long they should have been injury-free, and which types of previous injury are acceptable. The development of standardised participant selection criteria that take these considerations into account would facilitate future research in this area.

Some of the testing protocols used in the studies we examined have limited clinical applicability. For example, in team sports, the assessment of quadriceps strength using isokinetic dynamometry (IKD) may be too time-consuming to test multiple players, and teams may not have access to an IKD machine. Future research should employ more practical means of assessing neuromuscular characteristics. For example, handheld dynamometry represents a valid and reliable alternative to IKD.^{11, 55, 56}

Limitations

Not restricting our review to studies of a particular athletic population, physical exposure, or type of knee injury, allowed us to increase the number of neuromuscular variables available for meta-analysis, addressing a limitation of previous reviews. For example, pooling data from military recruits, club-level athletes and recreational runners permitted meta-analysis of hip abduction strength (Figure 3.3.1). However, this approach limits the clinical applicability of the findings to specific populations, and this could only be partially mitigated by population- and sex-specific subgrouping, due to the small number of studies (maximum four) from which data were pooled for each variable.

Applying conventional effect size thresholds would have resulted in more risk factors being identified. Many of these would have been very weak predictors of injury (Figure 6), but could represent areas for further research.

<u>CONCLUSIONS</u>
Key findings • Three measures of quadriceps strength were identified as risk factors for knee injury, but only from studies of military recruits. • Large effect sizes were detected for reduced quadriceps flexibility and altered muscle activation, but only in single studies. • No other neuromuscular variables were identified as risk factors for non-contact knee injury.
Clinical implications • Standardisation of participant selection criteria, testing protocols and outcome measures across studies would enable future meta-analyses to examine more potential neuromuscular risk factors. • A single measure of quadriceps strength is unlikely to be a strong predictor of knee injury, but might be useful when combined with other risk factors in a multifactorial model. • The effectiveness of quadriceps strengthening interventions for prevention of PFP and ACL injury merits evaluation in randomised controlled trials.

REFERENCES

1. DeHaven KE, Lintner DM. Athletic injuries: comparison by age, sport, and gender. *Am J Sports Med*. 1986;14(3):218–224. doi:10.1177/036354658601400307
2. Francis P, Whatman C, Sheerin K, Hume P, Johnson MI. The Proportion of Lower Limb Running Injuries by Gender, Anatomical Location and Specific Pathology: A Systematic Review. *J Sports Sci Med*. 2019;18(1):21–31. Published 2019 Feb 11.
3. Barry P. Boden, Letha Y. Griffin & William E. Garrett Jr (2000) Etiology and Prevention of Noncontact ACL Injury, *The Physician and Sports medicine*, 28:4, 53-60, DOI: 10.3810/psm.2000.04.841
4. Lankhorst NE, van Middelkoop M, Crossley KM, et al. Factors that predict a poor outcome 5–8 years after the diagnosis of patellofemoral pain: a multicentre observational analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50:881-886.
5. Rathleff MS, Rasmussen S, Olesen JL. [Unsatisfactory long-term prognosis of conservative treatment of patellofemoral pain syndrome]. *Ugeskr Laeger*. 2012;174:1008-1013.
6. Stubbe JH, van Beijsterveldt A-MMC, van der Knaap S, Stege J, Verhagen EA, van Mechelen W, et al. Injuries in Professional Male Soccer Players in the Netherlands: A Prospective Cohort Study. *J Athl Train* [Internet]. 2014 Dec 22;50(2):211–6. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-49.3.64>
7. Lohmander LS, Osterberg A, Englund M, Roos H. High prevalence of knee osteoarthritis, pain, and functional limitations in female soccer players twelve years after anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2004;50(10):3145–3152. doi:10.1002/art.20589
8. von Porat A, Roos EM, Roos H. High prevalence of osteoarthritis 14 years after an anterior cruciate ligament tear in male soccer players: a study of radiographic and patient relevant outcomes. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2004;63(3):269–273. doi:10.1136/ard.2003.008136
9. Poulsen E, Goncalves GH, Bricca A, Roos EM, Thorlund JB, Juhl CB. Knee osteoarthritis risk is increased 4-6 fold after knee injury-a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2019;53(23):1454–63.
10. Van Mechelen, W., Hlobil, H., & Kemper, H. C. G. (1992). Incidence, Severity, Aetiology and Prevention of Sports Injuries. *Sports Medicine*, 14(2), 82–99. doi:10.2165/00007256-199214020-00002
11. Paul DJ, Nassis GP. Testing strength and power in soccer players: the application of conventional and traditional methods of assessment. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2015;29(6):1748–1758. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000000807
12. Fulton J, Wright K, Kelly M, et al. Injury risk is altered by previous injury: a systematic review of the literature and presentation of causative neuromuscular factors. *Int J Sports Phys Ther*. 2014;9(5):583–595.
13. Boling MC, Bolgia LA, Mattacola CG, et al.: Outcomes of a weight-bearing rehabilitation program for patients diagnosed with patellofemoral pain syndrome. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 2006, 87: 1428–1435. [Medline][CrossRef]

It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](#).

14. Cowan SM, Hodges PW, Bennell KL, et al.: Altered vastii recruitment when people with patellofemoral pain syndrome complete a postural task. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, 2002, 83: 989–995. [Medline][CrossRef]
15. Kim, H., & Song, C. H. (2012). Comparison of the VMO/VL EMG Ratio and Onset Timing of VMO Relative to VL in Subjects with and without Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science*, 24(12), 1315–1317. doi:10.1589/jpts.24.1315
16. Chester, R., Smith, T. O., Sweeting, D., Dixon, J., Wood, S., & Song, F. (2008). The relative timing of VMO and VL in the aetiology of anterior knee pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*, 9(1). doi:10.1186/1471-2474-9-64 4
17. Zhang ZJ, Ng GYF, Lee WC, Fu SN. Increase in passive muscle tension of the quadriceps muscle heads in jumping athletes with patellar tendinopathy. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2017;27(10):1099–1104. doi:10.1111/sms.12749
18. Neal BS, Lack SD, Lankhorst NE, Raye A, Morrissey D, van Middelkoop M. Risk factors for patellofemoral pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* [Internet]. 2018/09/21. 2019 Mar;53(5):270–81. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30242107>
19. Sprague, A. L., Smith, A. H., Knox, P., Pohlig, R. T., & Grävare Silbernagel, K. (2018). Modifiable risk factors for patellar tendinopathy in athletes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, bjsports–2017–099000. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-099000
20. Mucha, M. D., Caldwell, W., Schlueter, E. L., Walters, C., & Hassen, A. (2017). Hip abductor strength and lower extremity running related injury in distance runners: A systematic review. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 20(4), 349–355. doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2016.09.002
21. Dallinga, J. M., Benjaminse, A., & Lemmink, K. A. P. M. (2012). Which Screening Tools Can Predict Injury to the Lower Extremities in Team Sports? *Sports Medicine*, 42(9), 791–815. doi:10.1007/bf03262295
22. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Med* 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097.
23. Mourad Ouzzani, Hossam Hammady, Zbys Fedorowicz, and Ahmed Elmagarmid. Rayyan — a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews* (2016) 5:210, DOI: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
24. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al., 2008. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp (accessed March 2020)
25. Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.
26. Van Tulder, M., Furlan, A., Bombardier, C., & Bouter, L. (2003). Updated Method Guidelines for Systematic Reviews in the Cochrane Collaboration Back Review Group. *Spine*, 28(12), 1290–1299. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000065484.95996.af

It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](#).

27. Brockwell SE, Gordon IR. A comparison of statistical methods for meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2001;20:825–40
28. Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155
29. Magnusson, K.: Interpreting Cohen's *d* Effect Size; An Interactive Visualization. Version 2.0.0 (beta))
30. Francis P, Whatman C, Sheerin K, Hume P, Johnson MI. The Proportion of Lower Limb Running Injuries by Gender, Anatomical Location and Specific Pathology: A Systematic Review. *J Sports Sci Med*. 2019;18(1):21–31. Published 2019 Feb 11
31. Lankhorst NE, Bierma-Zeinstra SM, van Middelkoop M. Risk factors for patellofemoral pain syndrome: a systematic review. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2012;42:81–A12.
32. Peduzzi P, Concato J, Kemper E, Holford TR, Feinstein AR. A simulation study of the number of events per variable in logistic regression analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1996;49(12):1373–1379. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(96)00236-3
33. Boling MC, Padua DA, Marshall SW, Guskiewicz K, Pyne S, Beutler A. A prospective investigation of biomechanical risk factors for Patellofemoral pain syndrome: The joint undertaking to monitor and prevent acl injury (JUMP-ACL) Cohort. *Am J Sports Med*. 2009;37(11):2108–16.
34. Devan MR, Pescatello LS, Faghri P, Anderson J. A prospective study of overuse knee injuries among female athletes with muscle imbalances and structural abnormalities. *J Athl Train*. 2004;39(3):263–7.
35. Duvigneaud N, Bernard E, Stevens V, Witvrouw E, Van Tiggelen D. Isokinetic assessment of patellofemoral pain syndrome: A prospective study in female recruits. *Isokinet Exerc Sci*. 2008;16(4):213–9.
36. Khayambashi K, Ghoddosi N, Straub RK, Powers CM. Hip Muscle Strength Predicts Noncontact Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury in Male and Female Athletes: A Prospective Study. *Am J Sports Med* [Internet]. 2015/12/08. 2016 Feb;44(2):355–61. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26646514>
37. Luedke LE, Heiderscheit BC, Williams DSB, Rauh MJ. Association of Isometric Strength of Hip and Knee Muscles With Injury Risk in High School Cross Country Runners. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* [Internet]. 2015;10(6):868–76. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26618066> <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC4637921>
38. Milgrom C, Finestone A, Eldad A, et al. Patellofemoral pain caused by overactivity. A prospective study of risk factors in infantry recruits. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1991;73:1041–3.
39. Myer GD, Ford KR, Barber Foss KD, Liu C, Nick TG, Hewett TE. The relationship of hamstrings and quadriceps strength to anterior cruciate ligament injury in female athletes. *Clin J Sport Med*. 2009;19(1):3–8.
40. Ramskov D, Barton C, Nielsen RO, Rasmussen S. High eccentric hip abduction strength reduces the risk of developing patellofemoral pain among novice runners initiating a self-structured running program: a 1-year observational study. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2015 Mar;45(3):153–61.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](#).

41. Smeets A, Malfait B, Dingenen B, Robinson MA, Vanrenterghem J, Peers K, et al. Is knee neuromuscular activity related to anterior cruciate ligament injury risk? A pilot study. *Knee* [Internet]. 2018/11/08. 2019 Jan;26(1):40–51. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30415973>
42. Steffen K, Nilstad A, Krosshaug T, Pasanen K, Killingmo A, Bahr R. No association between static and dynamic postural control and ACL injury risk among female elite handball and football players: a prospective study of 838 players. *Br J Sports Med*. 2017 Feb;51(4):253+.
43. Thijs Y, Pattyn E, Van Tiggelen D, Rombaut L, Witvrouw E. Is hip muscle weakness a predisposing factor for patellofemoral pain in female novice runners? A prospective study. *Am J Sports Med*. 2011;39(9):1877–82.
44. Uhorchak JM, Scoville CR, Williams GN, Arciero RA, St Pierre P, Taylor DC. Risk factors associated with noncontact injury of the anterior cruciate ligament - A prospective four-year evaluation of 859 West Point cadets. *Am J Sports Med*. 2003;31(6):831–42.
45. Van Tiggelen D, Witvrouw E, Coorevits P, Croisier JL, Roget P. Analysis of isokinetic parameters in the development of anterior knee pain syndrome: A prospective study in a military setting. *Isokinet Exerc Sci*. 2004;12(4):223–8.
46. Van Tiggelen D, Cowan S, Coorevits P, Duvigneaud N, Witvrouw E. Delayed vastus medialis obliquus to vastus lateralis onset timing contributes to the development of patellofemoral pain in previously healthy men: A prospective study. *Am J Sports Med*. 2009;37(6):1099–105.
47. Witvrouw E, Bellemans J, Lysens R, Danneels L, Cambier D. Intrinsic risk factors for the development of patellar tendinitis in an athletic population. A two-year prospective study. *Am J Sports Med* [Internet]. 2001;29(2):190–5. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11292044>
48. Witvrouw E, Lysens R, Bellemans J, Cambier D, Vanderstraeten G. Intrinsic risk factors for the development of anterior knee pain in an athletic population. A two-year prospective study. *Am J Sports Med* [Internet]. 2000;28(4):480–9.
49. Zebis MK, Andersen LL, Bencke J, Kjaer M, Aagaard P. Identification of athletes at future risk of anterior cruciate ligament ruptures by neuromuscular screening. *Am J Sports Med* [Internet]. 2009/07/02. 2009 Oct;37(10):1967–73.
50. Bahr R. Why screening tests to predict injury do not work—and probably never will...: a critical review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2016;50:776-780.
51. Bittencourt NFN, Meeuwisse WH, Mendonça LD, et al. Complex systems approach for sports injuries: moving from risk factor identification to injury pattern recognition— narrative review and new concept. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50:1309–14.
52. Kanis JA on behalf of the World Health Organization Scientific Group. Technical Report World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for Metabolic Bone Diseases. University of Sheffield; 2007.
53. Dagan Noa, Cohen-Stavi Chandra, Leventer-Roberts Maya, Balicer Ran D. External validation and comparison of three prediction tools for risk of osteoporotic fractures using data from population based electronic health records: retrospective cohort study *BMJ* 2017; 356 :i6755

It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](#).

54. Hippisley-Cox Julia, Coupland Carol, Brindle Peter. Development and validation of QRISK3 risk prediction algorithms to estimate future risk of cardiovascular disease: prospective cohort study BMJ 2017; 357 :j2099
55. Thorborg, K, Petersen, J, Magnusson, SP, and Holmich, P. Clinical assessment of hip strength using a hand held dynamometer is reliable.Scand J Med Sci Sports20: 493–501, 2010.
56. Malliaras, P, Hogan, A, Nawrocki, A, Crossley, K, and Schache, A.Hip flexibility and strength measures: Reliability and association with athletic groin pain.Br J Sports Med43: 739–744, 2009.
57. Lack S, Barton C, Sohan O, Crossley K, Morrissey D. Proximal muscle rehabilitation is effective for patellofemoral pain: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med. 2015;49(21):1365–1376. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-094723
58. Khayambashi K, Fallah A, Movahedi A, Bagwell J, Powers C. Posterolateral hip muscle strengthening versus quadriceps strengthening for patellofemoral pain: a comparative control trial Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2014;95(5):900–907. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2013.12.022
59. Boling MC, Bolgla LA, Mattacola CG, et al.: Outcomes of a weight-bearing rehabilitation program for patients diagnosed with patellofemoral pain syndrome. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2006, 87: 1428–1435. [Medline][CrossRef]
60. Cowan SM, Hodges PW, Bennell KL, et al.: Altered vastii recruitment when people with patellofemoral pain syndrome complete a postural task. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2002, 83: 989–995. [Medline][CrossRef]
61. Kim, H., & Song, C. H. (2012). Comparison of the VMO/VL EMG Ratio and Onset Timing of VMO Relative to VL in Subjects with and without Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome. Journal of Physical Therapy Science, 24(12), 1315–1317. doi:10.1589/jpts.24.1315
62. Chester, R., Smith, T. O., Sweeting, D., Dixon, J., Wood, S., & Song, F. (2008). The relative timing of VMO and VL in the aetiology of anterior knee pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders, 9(1). doi:10.1186/1471-2474-9-64 4
63. Michaelidis, M., & Koumantakis, G. A. (2014). Effects of knee injury primary prevention programs on anterior cruciate ligament injury rates in female athletes in different sports: A systematic review. Physical Therapy in Sport, 15(3), 200–210. doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2013.12.002
64. Tugwell, P., Boers, M., Brooks, P., Simon, L., Strand, V., & Idzerda, L. (2007). OMERACT: An international initiative to improve outcome measurement in rheumatology. Trials, 8(1). doi:10.1186/1745-6215-8-38
65. Clarke, M. Standardising outcomes for clinical trials and systematic reviews. Trials 8, 39 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-8-39>