

Can a knee sleeve influence ground reaction forces and knee joint power during a step-down hop in participants following ACL reconstruction?

An explanatory analysis

Gisela Sole^{1*}, Todd Pataky², Niels Hammer,^{3,4,5} Peter Lamb⁶

¹ Centre for Health, Activity and Rehabilitation Research, School of Physiotherapy, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

² Graduate School of Medicine, Department of Human Health Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

³ Division of Macroscopic and Clinical Anatomy, Gottfried Schatz Research Center, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria; ⁴ Department of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany; ⁵ Fraunhofer IWU, Dresden, Germany

⁶ School of Physical Education, Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

* Corresponding author

E-mail: Gisela.sole@otago.ac.nz (GS)

Word count: 5,418

Trial Registration

The trial was prospectively registered with the Australia New Zealand Clinical Trials

Registry No: ACTRN12618001083280, 28/06/2018

<https://anzctr.org.au/Trial/Registration/TrialReview.aspx?id=375347&isClinicalTrial=False>

Abstract

Purpose

Elastic knee sleeves are often worn following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction but mechanisms underlying observed changes in movement patterns are still unclear. The aim of this study was to determine the immediate and 6-week effects of wearing a knee sleeve on ground reaction forces (GRF) and knee joint power during a step-down hop task.

Methods

Using a cross-over design, we estimated GRF and knee kinematics and kinetics during a step-down hop for 30 participants (age 26.1 [SD 6.7] years, 14 women) following ACL reconstruction (median 16 months post-surgery) with and without wearing a knee sleeve. In a subsequent randomised clinical trial, participants in the ‘Sleeve Group’ (n=9) then wore the sleeve for 6 weeks at least 1 hour daily, while a ‘Control Group’ (n=9) did not wear the sleeve. Statistical parametric mapping (SPM) was used to compare (1) GRF trajectories in the three planes as well as knee joint power between three conditions at baseline (uninjured side, unsleeved injured and sleeved injured side); (2) within-participant changes for GRF and knee joint power trajectories from baseline to follow-up between groups. We also compared discrete peak GRFs and power, rate of (vertical) force development, and mean knee joint power in the first 5% of stance phase.

Results

GRF did not differ for the (unsleeved) injured compared to the uninjured sides based on SPM analysis. Discrete variables showed lower peak anterior (propulsive) GRF for the

injured side, and lower peak eccentric and concentric power, and mean power in the first 5% of stance. When wearing the sleeve on the injured side, mean power in the first 5% of stance increased significantly [mean difference (95% CIs) 1.3 (0.6, 2.0) N/BW*ht] from a concentric to an eccentric power when wearing the knee sleeve. After six weeks, the direction of change for vertical GRF differed between the groups: while the Control Group had slightly decreased forces, the Sleeve Group presented increased forces.

Conclusions

Increased knee power in the first 5% of landing when wearing the knee sleeve, combined with greater knee flexion, may indicate a protective response for ACL ruptures, most commonly occurring during that early phase of landing. The directional change of increased vertical GRF for the Sleeve group, combined with shorter stance duration at follow-up, may indicate enhanced performance when being prescribed such sleeve.

Key words

Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, hopping, kinematics, kinetics, knee sleeve

Abbreviations

ACL	anterior cruciate ligament
Fx	medio-lateral ground reaction force
Fy	anterior-posterior ground reaction force
Fz	vertical ground reaction force

78	GRF	ground reaction forces
79	IKDC-SKF	International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form
80	RCT	randomised controlled trial
81	RFD	rate of force development
82	SPM	Statistical parametric mapping

Background

Rupture of the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) is a debilitating knee injury with potentially devastating short-term and long-term consequences. Rehabilitation following ACL reconstruction includes individualised progressive exercise prescription to improve range of motion, muscle strength, sensori-motor control and sports- and work-specific skills, as well as physical fitness [1]. Strategies are also included to address potential psychosocial factors, such as fear of re-injury, and to improve knee-related confidence and self-efficacy for return to physical activity [2-4]. Such strategies may include prescription of wearing a knee sleeve, or people with ACL reconstruction may intuitively use them [2, 5]. We have shown that individuals with ACL reconstruction may have immediate improved jump-related performance when wearing a knee sleeve [6]. Besides focussing on the distance or height of jumping, considering movement patterns during landing are also important [7, 8]. In our initial analysis of movement patterns during a step-down hop, we found that participants with ACL reconstruction landed with greater knee flexion when wearing a knee sleeve [9]. Wearing a sleeve for at least one hour over a 6-week period resulted in no differences in knee flexion and moments compared to participants who did not wear the sleeve, but those with the sleeve jumped faster, evidenced with shorter stance duration [9]. Wearing a knee sleeve may influence sensorimotor control [10-12], however, the mechanisms whereby a knee sleeve might improve jump distance or enhance knee flexion during jump landing are unclear.

Jump-landing strategies have received substantial attention as a risk factor for ACL rupture and as outcomes following such injury [13, 14]. Current understanding is that

increased impact, reflected by higher vertical ground reaction forces (GRF), increased posterior GRF [15, 16], and higher rate of force development (RFD) may increase risk for incurring an ACL injury [17]. In uninjured athletes, higher vertical GRF during jump landing appear to be associated with decreased hip, knee and ankle flexion angles, thus a ‘stiffer’ leg during landing [18]. Such stiffer landing patterns are associated with increased risk of subsequent injuries in current uninjured participants [19]. Jump landing training can increase knee flexion on landing [14] and reduce vertical and posterior GRF and RFD [17]. Following ACL injury and ACL reconstruction, the response of GRF is less clear. Vertical GRFs are likely to be lower for the injured than the contralateral uninjured side post-reconstruction [20, 21], however such change may be time- and task-dependent. For maximum single-leg hop, a systematic review found moderate evidence for no difference between ACL-injured and contralateral sides for vertical GRF [7]. Pietrosimone et al. [22] showed that within the first 12 months following ACL reconstruction, peak vertical GRF are likely to be lower compared to the contralateral uninjured sides while walking but at mid-stance, the GRF may be higher. In contrast, in the phase from 12 to 24 months post-ACL, the peak vertical GRF are likely to be higher compared to the contralateral sides [22]. The GRF of the injured side relative to the contralateral uninjured sides may thus change over the recovery period. The desired direction for GRF change is thus uncertain post-ACL reconstruction.

During jump landing, power is absorbed by the lower extremity, and during take-off, power is generated. Lower knee range of motion decreases the range over which force can be generated, potentially leading to lower peak knee moments and knee power [7,

23]. Following ACL reconstruction, it is likely that knee power is reduced, both during absorption and during take-off [7, 23].

Our project for exploring the effects of wearing a knee sleeve during the step-down hop provides opportunity to explore the influence of wearing a knee sleeve on the ground reaction forces and on knee power. The aim of this study was to determine the (1) immediate effects and (2) 6-week effects of wearing a knee sleeve on GRF and on knee power in participants who had undergone an ACL reconstruction in the previous five years.

Our primary hypothesis is that peak vertical GRF and the rate of force development will be lower in the injured side compared to the uninjured side during the unsleeved conditions. The secondary hypothesis is that wearing the sleeve will increase the peak vertical GRF and rate of force development during the absorption phase of the injured side. Similarly, we hypothesise that, for the 6-week effects, the Sleeve Group will have larger changes in the vertical GRF and for rate of force development than the Control Group.

Methods

This is the third paper in a sequence of papers stemming from a single, multi-year study exploring the influence of wearing a knee sleeve for people with ACLR. This paper differs from the previous papers [6, 9] in that it considers GRF and knee power. We recruited participants from August 2018 to September 2020 and the follow-up data

collection was completed in October 2020. While this paper reports an additional analysis, there are no on-going or related trials for the intervention. The data had been collected during two sessions (baseline and six-week follow-up) in the School of Physiotherapy Human Movement laboratory of the University of Otago, and via REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture). The Health and Disability Ethics Committee (of New Zealand) granted ethical approval for the study. We follow CONSORT reporting guidelines [24]. We repeat the data collection methods here for completeness of this report.

Trial design and blinding

The study had two linked parts and all participants were involved in both parts. Part 1 consisted of a cross-over laboratory-based study, to examine immediate effects of the wearing of the knee sleeve on single-leg hop distance [6] and knee mechanics during a single-leg step-down hop task [9]. Part 2 entailed a parallel two-armed, assessor-blinded randomised controlled trial (RCT) to determine the effects of wearing the knee sleeve over a 6-week period on self-reported knee function and physical performance measures.

Participants

Recruitment

We recruited participants via community advertising and the research participant recruitment agency TrialFacts (<https://trialfacts.com/>). Volunteers completed a questionnaire (also serving as screening for eligibility) via REDCap prior to attending the first laboratory session. The questionnaire included demographics, injury and surgery

history, the International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form (IKDC-SKF) [25] and the Tegner activity scale [26]. The Tegner scale categorises sports and physical activity in terms of the level of knee-related loading where ‘0’ indicates ‘sick leave or disability due to a knee injury’ and ‘10’ indicates ‘competitive soccer or rugby at national or international elite level’.

Inclusion criteria

We recruited men and women, aged 18-40 years, who underwent ACL reconstruction within 6 months to 5 years previously. We specifically sought individuals who had not yet reached full functional level, defined for the purpose of this study by a score between 40 to 80/100 on the IKDC-SKF [25, 27, 28].

Exclusion criteria

Participants were excluded if they had undergone a revision ACL reconstruction of the same knee (due to re-injury), or a previous ACL reconstruction of the opposite knee; self-reported any other lower limb, pelvic or low back musculoskeletal injuries or disorders that required medical care over the past 6 months; had known systemic, neurological or cardiovascular disorders; or had a body mass index (BMI) greater than 30 kg/m².

Participants found to have an IKDC-SKF score less than 40 (due to potential safety risk during the laboratory-based tasks) or greater than 80/100 (as use of a sleeve would clinically be less likely to add benefit) were excluded.

196

197 **Procedures**

198 **Randomisation**

199 Participants were individually randomised twice (once for the cross-over trial, and once
200 for the RCT) with equal numbers in each group for both allocations. Block randomisation
201 (in groups of 8 participants) was undertaken sequentially by a research officer using an
202 electronic random number generator prior to participants being entered into the study.
203 Each group was stratified by sex. The research officer informed the researcher
204 responsible for the laboratory data collection of the order for the conditions for the cross-
205 over trial, and the group allocation (for the RCT) via email prior to the start of the
206 individual participant's first laboratory session.

207

208 Eligibility to be included was confirmed and participants provided written informed
209 consent at the start of the first session. Participants were asked to be dressed in a singlet, a
210 pair of shorts and their own sport shoes. Body mass and height were measured during the
211 baseline session.

212

213 **Part 1: Laboratory cross-over trial – immediate effects**

214 Participants undertook two hopping tasks; a maximum horizontal single leg hop and a
215 stub-maximum step-down hop. Participants practised the hopping tasks at sub-maximal
216 distance with the uninjured and injured sides until they were confident with performing
217 them as part of familiarisation and warm-up. They performed the maximum horizontal
218 hop prior to undertaking the step-down-hop.

219

220 **Part 2: Randomised clinical trial**

221 Participants were informed of their group allocation for the RCT on completion of the
222 first laboratory session. Following the 6-week period, all participants were asked to return
223 to the laboratory to repeat the above assessments, repeating the hopping tasks (without
224 wearing the knee sleeve).

225

226 **Intervention**

227 The intervention entailed use of the commercially available GenuTrain (Bauerfeind® AG,
228 Zeulenroda-Triebes, Germany), a CE-certified medical device. For Part 1 (cross-over
229 trial), all participants performed the step-down hop with and without the sleeve. For Part
230 2 (RCT), participants of the ‘Sleeve Group’ (intervention) were instructed to wear the
231 knee sleeve while performing their rehabilitative exercises, physical activity and sports,
232 with a minimum of 1 hour per day for the 6-week period; the control group were not
233 provided with a sleeve during this period.

234

235 **Outcomes**

236 Step-down hop: Three-dimensional motion analysis was performed for the step-down hop
237 with 11 infra-red Eagle-500RT cameras (Motion Analysis Corporation, Santa Rosa, CA,
238 USA), sampling at 120 Hz, and Cortex 4.4 software (Motion Analysis Corporation, Santa
239 Rosa, CA, USA). This was synchronized with a floor-mounted tri-axial force plate (OR6-
240 5 AMTI Inc., Newton, MA, USA), sampling at 2,400 Hz. Cortex 5.5 was used to track
241 and label the markers, and the biomechanical model, kinematic (joint angles) and kinetic

(moments) variables were calculated using Visual3D Professional v6 (C-Motion, Inc., Germantown, MD, USA). Here we report the procedures only for the force plate data.

The participants were asked to stand on a 30-cm box, placed 15 cm from the force plate, and performed a step-down hop (adapted from E Kristianslund and T Krosshaug [29]) onto the force plate: the participants were asked to step off the box with either the injured or the uninjured leg onto the force plate, then hop forward off the plate as fast as possible. The distance of that hop was defined as 60-70% of the maximum horizontal jump length. They performed the step-down hop with the uninjured side first, then the injured side under the (1) the ‘sleeved’ condition (experimental, wearing the sleeve) and (2) the ‘unsleeved’ condition (control, no sleeve), ordered by randomisation. A 5-minute walk between the conditions provided a standardised run-in to the second condition to minimise carryover effects.

Data processing

GRF data from the stance phase of the hop is of interest; the start and end of the stance phase were defined by the vertical component of the GRF exceeding and returning below 20 N, respectively. Based on the SPM analysis the following discrete variables were extracted: rate of force development, mean joint power during the first 5% of stance, peak eccentric joint power and peak concentric joint power. The averages of five trials for each limb (injured versus uninjured) and condition (sleeved and unsleeved) for each participant along with descriptive variables were calculated.

The x , y , and z components of the ground reaction force data during stance were analysed for immediate effects (Part 1) and 6-week effects (Part 2). Force data were time-normalised to 1001 data points for each participant and condition (baseline) or session (follow-up). The mean time of all first and second vertical GRF peaks (F_z peaks), relative to the mean length of all trials, were used to time-align the respective F_z peaks for each trial. Therefore, data were time-normalised in three phases to ensure comparison of equivalent events in the movement. For trials with only one F_z peak, standard time-normalisation to 1001 frames was performed.

Joint power was analysed as a follow-up to the GRF presented in this report and the kinetic, kinematic and temporal variables in previous reports. We investigated joint power in the sagittal plane as $JP(t) = M_x(t) \cdot \omega_x(t)$, where JP is joint power at each time t , M_x is the knee flexion-extension moment (normalised by body weight and height) and ω_x is knee flexion-extension angular velocity. By convention a knee (external) flexion moment is positive, and a flexing knee has a positive angular velocity, thus positive joint power indicates a net eccentric muscle contraction at the joint and negative joint power indicates a concentric contraction.

Statistical analysis

For our primary analysis, we analysed GRF and knee joint power using Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM, <http://spm1d.org/>; Pataky, 2012) [30]. Mean trajectories of five trials for each participant, limb and condition (Part 1) and each session (Part 2) were computed using MATLAB R2022a (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA, USA). A

secondary analysis of discrete variables followed. The data set can be found on Zenedo [31].

Ground reaction forces

We determined immediate effects by two-way comparisons across the three combinations of sleeved injured leg, unsleeved injured leg, uninjured leg. The SPM time-continuous Hotellings T^2 test was performed on the GRF components within each baseline condition [32, 33]. SPM allows comparison of the entire GRF trajectory, rather than a pre-selected discrete variable, which helps to control both Type 1 and Type 2 error rates [32].

Six-week effects were determined by calculating the mean, time-normalised GRF curves for each component, as with the immediate effects, and subtracting the baseline from the follow-up session, leaving ‘difference’ trajectories. We performed a time-continuous Hotellings T^2 test on the three-dimensional force difference trajectories comparing Sleeve and Control groups [32, 33]. For both immediate and 6-week analyses, significant effects were analysed with *post-hoc* time-continuous *t*-tests to determine which conditions differed.

A conservative Bonferroni threshold of 0.017 was adopted to correct for multiple comparisons across the three GRF components.

Knee joint power

Sagittal plane joint power is a one-dimensional, time-continuous variable so immediate effects were determined with multiple time-continuous paired *t*-tests. A Bonferroni threshold of 0.017 was adopted to correct for multiple comparisons across the three conditions. Six-week effects were determined by time-continuous independent *t*-tests on the joint power difference trajectories. SPM calculations were performed using the `spm1d` package version M.0.4.8 (`spm1dmatlab`: One-Dimensional Statistical Parametric Mapping in MATLAB. <https://github.com/Otodd0000/spm1dmatlab>, T Pataky, 2019).

Secondary analysis: Discrete variables

Post hoc analyses were performed for the pre-defined GRF and knee joint power discrete variables, and those that were deemed to be of interest from the SPM analysis. Time-based variables included the Rate of Force Development (RFD). The RFD reflects the speed at which F_z increases from initial contact to the first F_z peak. We defined the RFD as the first F_z peak divided by the time duration from landing force to the first F_z peak [34]. For trials with a single F_z peak a time duration of 100 ms was used.

To investigate the immediate effects of wearing a knee sleeve, we used one-way repeated measures ANOVAs to compare three conditions at the baseline: (a) uninjured side, unsleeved to (b) injured side, unsleeved, and (c) injured side, sleeved. Sex (male/women) and time since ACL reconstruction (in months) were entered as co-variates. If Mauchley's test for sphericity was significant ($p \leq 0.05$), the Greenhouse-Geisser

correction was used. Post-hoc pairwise analyses using paired *t*-tests and a Bonferroni correction across the three pairwise tests assessed between-condition effects.

Individual change scores from baseline to follow-up were calculated for the dependent variables of the GRF and knee joint power. Due to low sample size (n=9 per group) the change scores were compared between the intervention and the control groups using Mann-Whitney U tests for each outcome. The alpha level were set at $p \leq 0.05$. These analyses and those of demographic data were performed with SPSS Version 28.0.1.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY).

Results

We assessed 34 participants at baseline, but data for four participants were excluded from this analysis due to technical issues. Two participants of the Sleeve Group withdrew from the study following baseline assessment due to knee re-injuries, unrelated to use of the knee sleeve (Fig 1). Eight participants were lost to follow-up due to the COVID-19 lockdown in New Zealand, March/April 2020. Twenty-four participants completed the follow-up laboratory session. Data from six participants were excluded due to technical difficulties, resulting in data being analysed for nine participants in each group for Part 2 (RCT). Demographic data of the participants are provided in Table 1.

Fig 1. CONSORT flowchart of participant recruitment, allocation and follow-up.

354 **Table 1. Demographic data (n = 30)**

	All	Men	Women
Men/Women n (%)	30	16 (53)	14 (47)
Age (years)	26.1 (6.7)	25.5 (5.7)	27.3 (7.6)
Mass (kg)	75.9 (11.3)	78.5 (12.2)	76.1 (11.8)
Height (m)	1.72 (0.1)	1.76 (0.07)	1.67 (0.08)
Body mass index (kg.m ⁻²)	25.7 (3.1)	25.1 (2.7)	27.1 (3.3)
Reconstruction: Hamstring/patella tendon grafts n (%)	14 (47)/16 (53)	9 (56)/7 (44)	5 (36)/9 (64)
Meniscal repair: no/yes n (%)	22 (73)/8 (27)	13 (81)/3 (19)	9 (64)/5 (36)
Time since ACL injury (months)	21 (9 – 108)	21 (9 – 55)	25 (12 – 108)
Time since surgery (months)	16 (6 – 53)	17 (6 – 44)	16 (7 – 53)
Time from ACL injury to surgery (months)	6 (1 – 89)	6 (1 – 11)	8 (1 – 89)
Tegner activity scale: Preinjury (median, range)	8 (3 – 10)	9 (3 – 10)	7 (6 – 10)
Tegner activity scale: Baseline (median, range)	5 (2 – 9)	5 (2 – 9)	4 (2 – 9)
IKDC-SKF Baseline	66.8 (9.8)	67.2 (10.3)	67.8 (8.7)
IKDC-SKF Follow-up	73.7 (11.5)	71.3 (13.2)	76.5 (8.9)

Figures are numbers (Frequency), Mean (SD) or Medians (minimum – maximum)

IKDC-SKF: International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form

Part 1: Immediate effects

Ground reaction forces

The SPM analysis found no statistical differences between any GRF components for any of the baseline conditions (Fig 2 to 4).

Fig 2. Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-down hop for the injured (unsleeved) sides to the uninjured contralateral sides (n=30). A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively.

Fig 3. Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-down hop for the sleeved and unsleeved conditions for the ACL injured sides (n=30). A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively.

Fig 4. Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-down hop for the ACL-injured sleeved sides to the uninjured unsleeved sides (n=30). A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively

378 For the discrete variables, significant effects were found for RFD, and peak anterior and
 379 posterior GRFs (Table 2). Although RFD for the sleeved, injured side was higher ($34.3 \pm$
 380 14.1 N/BW/s) than the unsleeved, injured side (31.9 ± 12.2 N/BW/s), this difference was
 381 not statistically significant in *post-hoc* testing. Similarly, although the actual peak
 382 $F_{yPosterior}$ was higher for the sleeved (0.140 ± 0.080 N/BW) than the unsleeved
 383 conditions (0.127 ± 0.071 N/BW) for the injured sides, the difference was not statistically
 384 significant in *post-hoc* testing. The (unsleeved) injured side had lower peak $F_{yAnterior}$
 385 (0.237 ± 0.097 N/BW) compared to the uninjured side (0.270 ± 0.087 N/BW), and
 386 wearing the sleeve showed no statistically significant effect for the injured side.

387

388 **Table 2. Immediate effects of wearing the sleeve: cross-over trial (n=30)**

	Unsleeved Condition		Sleeved Condition	Repeated measures ANOVA	Between side comparison (unsleeved)		Between condition comparison, injured side		Between side/condition comparison (unsleeved, uninjured side; sleeved, injured side)	
	Uninjured side	Injured Side	Injured side		Mean Difference (95%CI)	p-value	Mean Difference (95%CI)	p-value	Mean Difference (95%CI)	p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)							
Rate of Force Development	34.1 (12.0)	31.8 (12.1)	34.3 (14.1)	0.133*	--		--		--	
Knee joint power										
Mean, first 5% of stance	0.4 (3.3)	-1.5 (2.9)	-0.2 (3.5)	<0.001	1.9 (0.7, 3.0)	<0.001	1.3 (0.5, 2.1)	<0.001	0.6 (-0.5, 1.6)	0.574
						1		1		

Peak	28.8	20.7 (10.3)	21.3 (11.5)	<0.001	8.1 (5.0, 11.3)	<0.00	0.5 (-2.1, 3.2)	1.000	7.6 (4.0, 11.1)	<0.001
eccentric	(11.9)					1				
Peak	-14.2	-9.7 (3.8)	-10.4 (5.2)	<0.001	4.5 (3.0, 6.0)	<0.00	0.7 (-8.4, 2.2)	0.762	3.8 (2.1, 5.6)	<0.001
concentric	(4.0)					1				

*Greenhouse-Geisser correction

Knee joint power

The absorption phase (first phase) of stance entails eccentric quadriceps contraction, followed by a force generation (second) phase entailing concentric quadriceps contraction. Based on the SPM analysis, with one exception, there were no significant differences between the (unsleeved) injured and uninjured sides (Fig 5A and D), between the sleeved and unsleeved conditions for the injured side (Fig 5B and E), or between the sleeved injured and (unsleeved) uninjured sides (Fig 5C and F). The exception was at a timepoint at around 5% of the stance phase where the SPM trajectory for the comparison between the (unsleeved) injured and uninjured sides met the $p=0.017$ threshold (Fig 5A). At that timepoint, the injured side had a greater magnitude and slightly longer lasting negative power (concentric contraction) than the uninjured side. During this initial part of the landing phase there was brief a knee (external) extension moment which shifted to a flexion moment earlier for the uninjured sides. Knee angular velocity was positive for both sides during this period, indicating the knee was flexing, with the uninjured side showing a greater magnitude knee flexion velocity.

Fig 5. Knee joint power time-continuous comparisons for the uninjured (unsleeved) sides, and ACL injured sides for sleeved and unsleeved conditions. Top panels: SPM paired t-tests for comparisons between injured (sleeved versus unsleeved) and uninjured sides. Joint power curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) for each respective test are shown in the bottom panels.

The difference for the knee power in the first 5% of the stance phase when comparing injured to uninjured side is also evident with the discrete variable analysis (Table 2).

When wearing the knee sleeve, the power increased significantly for the injured side during that phase, resulting in no statistical difference when comparing the (sleeved) injured side with the (unsleeved) uninjured side. Wearing the sleeve, however, did not change the peak eccentric and concentric power, respectively (Table 2), corroborating the results of the SPM analysis.

Part 2: Six-week effects

Ground reaction forces and knee joint power

There were no significant differences between the change in ground reaction force from baseline to follow-up comparing the Sleeve group to the Control group (Fig 6). Similarly, there were no significant differences in 6-week changes in joint power between groups (Fig 7).

Fig 6. SPM analysis of ground reaction force trajectory differences between baseline and follow-up for the Sleeve group (n=9) and Control group (n=9). A. Hotellings T^2 test trajectory. The dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion. B – D. The x, y, and z component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) comparing groups. Positive values indicate increases in values from baseline to follow-up.

Fig 7. SPM comparing changes in knee joint power trajectories. A. Independent t-test trajectory (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands). Dashed red line indicates significance criterion. B. Baseline to follow-up differences for the Sleeved and the Control Groups.

Discrete variable analyses of the baseline to follow-up changes suggest that there was no significant difference for the Sleeve group, based on the 95% confidence intervals for GRF and knee joint power variables (Table 3). There was, however, a difference in the response between the two groups for the peak vertical GRF (Peak FzVertical): while there was a slight *decrease* in Peak FzVertical for the Control Group, an *increase* was evident for the Sleeve Group. However, based on the 95% confidence intervals for each of the groups, the changes per group were not significant. The Control Group exhibited an increase in the anterior GRF (Peak FyAnterior) from baseline to follow-up. In contrast, no change was evident for the Sleeve group. For knee joint power in the first 5% of stance an increase was evident only for the Control group.

447 **Table 3. Randomised Clinical Trial:** Parameters of injured sides at baseline and follow-up, and between-group differences of changes
448 from baseline to follow-up.

	Control Group (n=9)		Sleeve Group (n=9)		Change score group Mean difference (95% CI)		Between- group difference <i>p</i> -value*
	Mean (SD)		Mean (SD)				
	BL	FU	BL	FU	Control	Sleeve	
Ground reaction forces							
Rate of Force	31.63	35.87	35.82	32.76	-2.74 (-7.09, 1.61)	-2.11 (-7.90, 3.69)	0.935
Development	(11.82)	(11.96)	(16.24)	(10.89)			
Peak FzVertical	2.28 (0.68)	2.32 (0.81)	2.37 (0.56)	2.44 (0.59)	0.08 (-0.17, 0.33)	-0.25 (-0.79, 0.29)	0.142
Peak FxMedial	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.10 (0.05)	-0.08 (-0.04)	-0.08 (0.5)	0.008 (-0.004, 0.020)	-0.003 (-0.022, 0.029)	0.369
Peak FxLateral	0.07 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	0.08 (0.05)	0.08 (0.05)	-0.014 (-0.002, 0.031)	-0.003 (-0.015, 0.010)	0.086
Peak FyAnterior	0.23 (0.10)	0.30 (0.10)	0.27 (0.02)	0.28 (0.14)	-0.064 (-0.109, -0.019)	0.021 (-0.023, 0.065)	0.004

Peak FyPosterior	-0.12 (0.08)	-0.09 (0.05)	-0.14 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.935
Knee joint power							
Mean, first 5% of stance	-1.1 (3.5)	-1.2 (4.1)	0.22 (4.3)	-0.38 (3.4)	-0.6 (-1.7, 0.5)	0.2 (-2.3, 2.7)	0.514
Peak eccentric	22.6 (12.6)	24.7 (16.8)	24.6 (16.3)	26.3 (16.2)	-5.2 (-12.0, 1.5)	1.6 (-7.3, 10.5)	0.683
Peak concentric	-12.1 (5.9)	-11.8 (6.3)	-10.7 (5.8)	-12.0 (6.1)	1.3 (-2.2, 4.7)	-0.3 (-3.8, 3.2)	0.221

BL: Baseline; FU: Follow-up; * Mann-Whitney Test

Discussion

In our initial report of immediate effects of wearing a knee sleeve on knee kinematics and kinetics showed increased knee flexion at initial contact and peak flexion during stance during the step-down hop [9]. In the current analysis we found, firstly, increased knee joint power during the first 5% of landing (stance) of the ACL-reconstructed knee during that task when wearing the sleeve, compared to the unsleeved condition. Wearing the knee sleeve appeared to limit an initial (external) extension moment and more quickly transition to a flexion moment, similar to the uninjured sides. Secondly, at 6-week follow-up, we found a significant difference in the *direction* of the change of the vertical GRF: while the Sleeve Group showed increased vertical GRF at follow-up, those of the Control group decreased. Per se, the differences within each group were not significant, based on the 95% confidence intervals. No other significant differences in changes between the Sleeve Group and the Control Group for kinematics and kinetics during the task were found (when not wearing the sleeve).

Our SPM results do not support our hypotheses of lower vertical GRFs, and the discrete variable analysis does not support lower RFD for the (unsleeved) injured versus the uninjured sides for the group of 30 participants. The SPM results also do not support the hypothesis that when wearing the sleeve, the peak vertical GRFs and RFD of the injured side increase significantly. However, a potential effect on RFD when wearing the sleeve may exist, although the post-hoc analyses did not reach significance.

Ground reaction forces

Our finding of lack of immediate differences for GRF in the three planes between the injured and uninjured sides with the SPM analysis, as well as between the sleeved and unsleeved conditions contrast with previous studies that found lower vertical GRF for the ACL-reconstructed sides [20, 21]. The discrete variable analysis found significantly lower peak $F_{yAnterior}$ (Table 2) for the injured versus contralateral side. Peak $F_{yAnterior}$ occur during the early propulsion as the centre of mass is moved forwards over the weight-bearing foot. Less trunk flexion observed participants with ACL reconstruction may explain lower $F_{yAnterior}$ [35], but remains speculative as we did not analyse trunk movements. The knee sleeve did not influence that variable for the injured side. We used a sub-maximal hop for safety reasons as we had recruited participants who had not achieved a high level of function post-reconstruction, as defined by an IKDC less than 80/100. Dai, et al. [20] used a stop-jump task and a side-cutting task, whereas Baumgart, et al. [21] used a bilateral and a single-leg countermovement jumping task. Those tasks may have generated higher GRF than during our step-down task, thus those tasks may be able to identify residual asymmetries to a greater extent. Pietrosimone et al. [22] found that the time since ACL reconstruction influenced GRF during walking, with vertical GRF during walking gait being lower in the injured side compared to the uninjured side during the first year post-surgery, but higher than the uninjured side in the longer term.

Lower vertical GRF following ACL reconstruction may indicate a more cautious, hesitant landing pattern. Thus, the directional differences for the two groups for vertical GRF over

the 6-week period may be of interest. The Sleeve Group had reported higher physical activity levels and duration during the 6-week period than the Control Group [6]. Thus, the slight *increase* in vertical GRF from baseline to follow-up for the Sleeve Group (compared to *decrease* for the Control Group), combined with the shorter stance duration [9] may reflect increased confidence as well as performance for the Sleeve Group. Such increased performance is most likely due to higher levels of physical activity during the intervention period, potentially motivated by having a sleeve available.

Knee joint power

The stance phase of landing includes the eccentric (absorption) phase and a concentric (propulsion) phase [8, 21]. During the eccentric absorption phase, the body decelerates and the centre of mass lowers. During the concentric phase, the body is propelled upwards and forwards. Both phases have a peak FzVertical (first and second peak during the stance phase). The (unsleeved) injured side had significantly lower peak eccentric and concentric power compared to the uninjured side. Particularly during the initial 5% of stance, the unsleeved injured side had a mean concentric (negative) joint power, suggesting a greater and slightly longer lasting (external) extension moment paired with a lower magnitude (positive; flexing) angular velocity. In contrast, the uninjured sides had a mean eccentric (positive) power during that early stance phase as the flexion moment was initiated earlier. When wearing the sleeve, joint power increased during the first 5% stance for the injured side, becoming ‘more positive’, leading to similar values for the sleeved injured side and the unsleeved uninjured side. However, peak powers remained lower for the sleeved injured side compared to the uninjured side.

517

518 Our initial report suggested enhanced knee flexion angle at initial contact (mean
519 difference 3°) when wearing the knee sleeve [9], alternatively a relatively more extended
520 injured knee at initial contact when unsleeved. Exploring the mean and individual time
521 series for the (external) knee flexion moments for the injured (sleeved and unsleeved) and
522 uninjured sides (unsleeved) reveals the slightly longer (external) extension moment for
523 the injured unsleeved sides compared to the uninjured sides in the first 5% of stance. The
524 SPM analysis suggested that the difference at that timepoint was statistically significant
525 [9].

526

527 **Improved sensori-motor control as a potential mechanism**

528 Combining that result with those of the current report with reference to the slight
529 concentric power in the early stance phase, it is possible that the unsleeved ACL-injured
530 knee lacks knee control during landing and decreased ability to absorb initial impact.
531 That lack of control might be evident in a short-lived extension moment and reduced
532 angular velocity at initial contact, resulting in prolonged concentric knee power. The
533 observed delayed flexion moment, more extended knee and reduced angular velocity at
534 initial contact may also be explained by previously reported subtle increased quadriceps
535 pre-activation prior to landing in a group ACL-reconstructed participants with similar
536 duration post-surgery as our group [36]. As outlined in our earlier report [9] and by other
537 researchers [10-12, 37, 38], wearing a knee sleeve may enhance sensori-motor control or
538 awareness of the knee position. We speculate that wearing the sleeve might also decrease
539 subtle fear of movement, potentially decreasing quadriceps pre-activation or guarding.

Improved awareness may spontaneously lead to increased landing absorption and control, evident with slightly increased power during the first 5% of stance when sleeved. ACL ruptures are likely to occur in the first 50 ms following landing [39]. Based on our findings, we cautiously speculate that the sleeve might enhance sensori-motor mechanisms during the early eccentric (absorption) phase of landing, potentially decreasing risk for ACL injury or re-injury.

Based on our findings, changes in knee power may explain possible immediate responses of enhanced landing knee flexion when wearing the knee sleeve, rather than adaptation or responses related to ground reaction forces. To confirm such hypothesis, knee angular velocity could also be explored. In contrast, over a longer period, wearing the sleeve regularly may lead to enhanced overall performance, evident in potential small increases for vertical GRF and shorter stance duration. Whether an increased vertical GRF explains the improved stance duration for the Sleeve group at follow-up, and implications of increased anterior GRF remain speculative considering the very low sample size. Increased anterior GRF at follow-up for the Control group poses the question whether they needed greater effort to hop at the same pre-defined, individualised distance as during the baseline assessment. Furthermore, compensatory responses of the hip, ankle and trunk and centre of mass positioning during landing need to be explored further.

As a summary for the research pipeline, several directional changes are supportive of the sleeve's role in improving function for individuals with ACL reconstruction. Immediate effects of wearing a knee sleeve included approximately 5% increased maximal single leg hop distance [6]; increased knee flexion at initial contact and peak flexion (approximately

3□) [9] and, from the current analysis, increased knee power in the first 5% of stance. While changes for RFD and peak anterior and posterior GRF when wearing the sleeve did not reach significance, directional changes were evident towards the values of the uninjured side. Particularly, the combination of increased knee flexion at initial contact and increased knee power during the early landing (stance) phase may indicate enhanced sensorimotor control during the phase in which the knee is most vulnerable for ACL rupture and re-rupture. Wearing a knee sleeve at least one hour daily for 6 weeks may lead to increased performance evident in faster stance phase during the step-down hop, and there is evidence of a directional change towards increased vertical GRF. However, there is no statistical evidence that the magnitude of GRF, peak knee power or moments changed over that period. We found no effects for wearing the sleeve in terms of self-reported outcomes (IKDC-SKF) and thigh muscle strength, indicating that wearing the sleeve did not improve nor limit self-reported knee function and muscle strength to a greater extent than not wearing the sleeve. From a clinical perspective, prescription of knee sleeves for people with ACL reconstruction should be based on assessment of the individual's impairments, context, and their response to the knee sleeve on re-assessment.

Methodological considerations

Our findings need to be interpreted with caution. Most variables that we explored had relatively large standard deviations compared to their means, suggesting large between-individual variability. We did not explore responses at the ankle, hip and trunk, which would add to the complexity of the analysis. Anticipation of a task (such as a drop jump) can lead to change in neuromechanical and functional differences in performance [19,

40], in turn, potentially enhancing confidence. Thus, psychological responses, such as levels of confidence, also need to be considered.

A strength of our analysis is that we included SPM as well as discrete variable analysis. SPM allows identification of differences across time series without *a priori* defined variables. However, time-aligning the respective peaks for each trial may mask potential differences between conditions and between participants. The discrete variable analysis of specified time points thus complemented the SPM analysis. As an explanatory study of findings, we performed multiple analyses, increasing the risk of Type 1 errors. On the other hand, as the COVID pandemic interfered with the follow-up sessions, only a small number of participants completed the RCT. The of Type II errors exists, thus those results, in particular, remain speculative.

Various confounders influencing the outcomes need to be considered. Wearing the knee sleeve may lead to improved knee-related confidence, or being prescribed a knee sleeve might lead to greater motivation to exercise or undertake physical activity, thereby potentially improving sensori-motor control and skill. The level of activity may influence outcomes such that those with higher performance levels may respond to a lesser degree to those with low performance (or greater impairment). We did not control for level of activity in the analysis, such as by the Tegner Activity scale. That remains a direction for future research with a larger sample. Lastly, time since surgery and sex influences biomechanical outcomes. We included participants with a large range of duration since surgery (6 months to 5 years), which may have confounded our results. We controlled for those two confounders by entering them as co-variates in the repeated measures

ANOVAs of the discrete variable analyses. Thus, time since surgery and sex are unlikely to influence our findings of no statistically significant differences observed between sides for vertical GRF.

Conclusion

Knee power increased during the first 5% of stance during a step-down hop when wearing the knee sleeve on the injured side compared to not wearing the sleeve while peak powers did not change. Wearing a knee sleeve did not change GRFs during that task for the ACL-reconstructed side, as evident in the SPM analysis. Wearing the knee sleeve at least one hour daily for 6-weeks lead to a directional change of increased vertical GRF for the Sleeve Group at follow-up. There were no significantly different changes (in magnitude) of GRFs compared to not wearing the sleeve, except for peak anterior ground reaction forces. Our previous report indicated increased knee flexion at initial contact. Combining that finding with increased knee power in the first 5% of landing when wearing the knee sleeve may indicate a protective response during the phase when the knee is most vulnerable for ACL ruptures.

Acknowledgements

We thank David Jackson, Drs Anupa Patak, Sarah Ward and Mandeep Kaur for their assistance for data collection and processing.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethics approval was granted by the Health & Disability Ethics Committee, New Zealand, Reference 18/CEN/93, dated 5th June 2018, amended on 27th August 2019 and 4th October 2019. All participants provided written informed consent to participate. All methods were undertaken in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization: Gisela Sole, Niels Hammer
Data curation: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb
Formal analysis: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb, Todd Pataky
Funding acquisition: Gisela Sole, Niels Hammer
Investigation: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb
Methodology: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb, Todd Pataky
Project administration: Gisela Sole
Verification: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb
Visualisation: Peter Lamb
Writing – original draft: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb
Writing – review & editing: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb, Todd Pataky, Niels Hammer

Data availability

All relevant data are available through Zenodo at DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6859069>

653

654 **Funding**

655 Funding and material (knee sleeves) were provided by Bauerfeind AG (Triebeser Straße,
656 07937 Zeulenroda-Triebes, Germany. The Funder was not involved in participant
657 recruitment, data collection, processing and analysis, and interpretation of results, and in
658 no way influenced experimental procedures or report preparation. The funding covered
659 the overheads for the Biomechanics laboratory, laboratory technician, administrative
660 support, research assistant, contribution towards participant transport costs, and staff-
661 related overheads.

662

663 **Conflict of interest**

664 The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

665

666

667 **References**

- 668 1. van Melick N, van Cingel REH, Brooijmans F, Neeter C, van Tienen T, Hullegie
669 W, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MWG: Evidence-based clinical practice update:
670 practice guidelines for anterior cruciate ligament rehabilitation based on a
671 systematic review and multidisciplinary consensus. Br J Sports Med 2016,
672 50(24):1506.
- 673 2. Mahood C, Perry M, Gallagher P, Sole G: Chaos and confusion with confidence:
674 Managing fear of Re-Injury after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Phys
675 Ther Sport 2020, 45:145-154.

- 676 3. Martinez-Calderon J, Flores-Cortes M, Morales-Asencio JM, Fernandez-Sanchez
677 M, Luque-Suarez A: Which interventions enhance pain self-efficacy in people
678 with chronic musculoskeletal pain? A systematic review with meta-analysis of
679 randomized controlled trials, including over 12 000 participants. J Orthop Sports
680 Phys Ther 2020, 50(8):418-430.
- 681 4. Liew BXW, Feller JA, Webster KE: Understanding the psychological
682 mechanisms of return to sports readiness after anterior cruciate ligament
683 reconstruction. PLoS One 2022, 17(3):e0266029.
- 684 5. Ardern CL, Taylor NF, Feller JA, Webster KE: Fear of re-injury in people who
685 have returned to sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery.
686 J Sci Med Sport 2012, 15(6):488-495.
- 687 6. Sole G, Lamb P, Pataky T, Klima S, Navarre P, Hammer N: Immediate and 6-
688 week effects of wearing a knee sleeve following anterior cruciate ligament
689 reconstruction: a cross-over laboratory and randomised clinical trial. BMC
690 Musculoskelet Disord 2021, 22:655.
- 691 7. Kotsifaki A, Korakakis V, Whiteley R, Van Rossom S, Jonkers I: Measuring only
692 hop distance during single leg hop testing is insufficient to detect deficits in knee
693 function after ACL reconstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J
694 Sports Med 2020, 54(3):139.
- 695 8. Kotsifaki A, Van Rossom S, Whiteley R, Korakakis V, Bahr R, Sideris V, Smith
696 PG, Jonkers I: Symmetry in triple hop distance hides asymmetries in knee
697 function after ACL reconstruction in athletes at return to sports. Am J Sports Med
698 2021:036354652110631.

- 699 9. Sole G, Lamb P, Pataky T, Pathak A, Klima S, Navarre P, Hammer N: Immediate
700 and six-week effects of wearing a knee sleeve following anterior cruciate ligament
701 reconstruction on knee kinematics and kinetics: a cross-over laboratory and
702 randomised clinical trial. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2022, 23(1):560.
- 703 10. Collins A, Blackburn T, Olcott C, Jordan JM, Yu B, Weinhold P: A kinetic and
704 kinematic analysis of the effect of stochastic resonance electrical stimulation and
705 knee sleeve during gait in osteoarthritis of the knee. J Appl Biomech 2014,
706 30(1):104–112.
- 707 11. Schween R, Gehring D, Gollhofer A: Immediate effects of an elastic knee sleeve
708 on frontal plane gait biomechanics in knee osteoarthritis. PLoS One 2015,
709 10(1):e0115782.
- 710 12. Van Tiggelen D, Coorevits P, Witvrouw E: The use of a neoprene knee sleeve to
711 compensate the deficit in knee joint position sense caused by muscle fatigue. Scan
712 J Med Sci Sports 2008, 18:62-66.
- 713 13. Nagelli C, Di Stasi S, Tatarski R, Chen A, Wordeman S, Hoffman J, Hewett TE:
714 Neuromuscular training improves self-reported function and single-leg landing
715 hip biomechanics in athletes after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction.
716 Orthop J Sports Med 2020, 8(10):2325967120959347.
- 717 14. Neilson V, Ward S, Hume P, Lewis G, McDaid A: Effects of augmented feedback
718 on training jump landing tasks for ACL injury prevention: A systematic review
719 and meta-analysis. Phys Ther Sport 2019, 39:126-135.
- 720 15. Padua DA, Distefano LJ: Sagittal plane knee biomechanics and vertical ground
721 reaction forces are modified following ACL Injury prevention programs: A
722 systematic review. Sports Health 2009, 1(2):165-173.

- 723 16. Yu B, Lin C-F, Garrett WE: Lower extremity biomechanics during the landing of
724 a stop-jump task. Clin Biomech 2006, 21(3):297-305.
- 725 17. Irmischer BS, Harris C, Pfeiffer RP, DeBeliso MA, Adams KJ, Shea KG: Effects
726 of a knee ligament injury prevention exercise program on impact forces in
727 women. J Strength Condit Res 2004, 18(4):703-707.
- 728 18. Myers CA, Torry MR, Peterson DS, Shelburne KB, Giphart JE, Krong JP, Woo
729 SLY, Steadman JR: Measurements of tibiofemoral kinematics during soft and stiff
730 drop landings using biplane fluoroscopy. Am J Sports Med 2011, 39(8):1714-
731 1723.
- 732 19. Bates NA, Ford KR, Myer GD, Hewett TE: Impact differences in ground reaction
733 force and center of mass between the first and second landing phases of a drop
734 vertical jump and their implications for injury risk assessment. J Biomech 2013,
735 46(7):1237-1241.
- 736 20. Dai B, Butler RJ, Garrett WE, Queen RM: Using ground reaction force to predict
737 knee kinetic asymmetry following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction.
738 Scand J Med Sci Sports 2014, 24:974-981.
- 739 21. Baumgart C, Hoppe MW, Freiwald J: Phase-specific ground reaction force
740 analyses of bilateral and unilateral jumps in patients with ACL reconstruction.
741 Orthop J Sports Med 2017, 5(6):232596711771091.
- 742 22. Pietrosimone B, Seeley MK, Johnston C, Pfeiffer SJ, Spang JT, Blackburn JT:
743 Walking ground reaction force post-acl reconstruction: Analysis of time and
744 symptoms. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2019, 51(2):246-254.

- 745 23. Orishimo KF, Kremenec IJ, Mullaney MJ, McHugh MP, Nicholas SJ: Adaptations
746 in single-leg hop biomechanics following anterior cruciate ligament
747 reconstruction. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc 2010, 18(11):1587-1593.
- 748 24. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, the CG: CONSORT 2010 Statement: updated
749 guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. Trials 2010, 11(1):32.
- 750 25. Irrgang JJ, Anderson AF, Boland AL, Harner CD, Kurosaka M, Neyret P,
751 Richmond JC, Shelborne KD: Development and validation of the international
752 knee documentation committee subjective knee form. Am J Sports Med 2001,
753 29(5):600-613.
- 754 26. Tegner Y, Lysholm J: Rating systems in the evaluation of knee ligament injuries.
755 Clin Orthop Relat Res 1985, 198:43-49.
- 756 27. van Meer BL, Meuffels DE, Vissers MM, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA, Verhaar JAN,
757 Terwee CB, Reijman M: Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score or
758 International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form: Which
759 questionnaire is most useful to monitor patients with an anterior cruciate ligament
760 rupture in the short term? Arthrosc 2013, 29(4):701-715.
- 761 28. Lefevre N, Klouche S, Mirouse G, Herman S, Gerometta A, Bohu Y: Return to
762 sport after primary and revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: A
763 prospective comparative study of 552 patients from the FAST Cohort. Am J
764 Sports Med 2017, 45:34-41.
- 765 29. Kristianslund E, Krosshaug T: Comparison of drop jumps and sport-specific
766 sidestep cutting: implications for anterior cruciate ligament injury risk screening.
767 Am J Sports Med 2013, 41(3):684-688.

- 768 30. Friston KJ, Holmes AP, Poline JB, Grasby PJ, Williams SC, Frackowiak RS,
769 Turner R: Analysis of fMRI time-series revisited. *Neuroimage* 1995, 2(1):45-53.
- 770 31. Sole G, Pataky T, Hammer N, Lamb P: Can a knee sleeve influence ground
771 reaction forces and knee joint power during a step-down hop in participants
772 following ACL reconstruction? Discrete and time-continuous datasets. Zenodo
773 2022, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6859069>
- 774 32. Pataky TC, Robinson MA, Vanrenterghem J: Vector field statistical analysis of
775 kinematic and force trajectories. *J Biomech* 2013, 46(14):2394-2401.
- 776 33. Pataky TC, Robinson MA, Vanrenterghem J, Savage R, Bates KT, Crompton RH:
777 Vector field statistics for objective center-of-pressure trajectory analysis during
778 gait, with evidence of scalar sensitivity to small coordinate system rotations. *Gait*
779 *Posture* 2014, 40(1):255-258.
- 780 34. Jensen RL, Ebben WP: Quantifying plyometric intensity via rate of force
781 development, knee joint and ground reaction forces. *J Strength Cond Res* 2007,
782 21(3):763-767.
- 783 35. Trigsted SM, Post EG, Bell DR: Landing mechanics during single hop for
784 distance in females following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction compared
785 to healthy controls. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2017, 25(5):1395-1402.
- 786 36. Trigsted SM, Cook DB, Pickett KA, Cadmus-Bertram L, Dunn WR, Bell DR:
787 Greater fear of reinjury is related to stiffened jump-landing biomechanics and
788 muscle activation in women after ACL reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports*
789 *Traumatol Arthrosc* 2018, 26(12):3682-3689.
- 790 37. Birmingham TB, Bryant DM, Giffin JR, Litchfield RB, Kramer JF, Donner A,
791 Fowler PJ: A randomized controlled trial comparing the effectiveness of

792 functional knee brace and neoprene sleeve use after anterior cruciate ligament
793 reconstruction. Am J Sports Med 2008, 36(4):648-655.

794 38. Mohd Sharif NA, Goh S-L, Usman J, Wan Safwani WKZ: Biomechanical and
795 functional efficacy of knee sleeves: A literature review. Phys Ther Sport 2017,
796 28:44-52.

797 39. Carlson VR, Sheehan FT, Boden BP: Video analysis of anterior cruciate ligament
798 (ACL) injuries. JBJS Reviews 2016, 4(11):1.

799 40. Ambegaonkar JP, Shultz SJ, Perrin DH: A subsequent movement alters lower
800 extremity muscle activity and kinetics in drop jumps vs. drop landings. J Strength
801 Cond Res 2011, 25(10).

802

803




Figure 1. CONSORT flowchart of participant recruitment, allocation and follow-up.




Figure 2: Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-down hop for the injured (unsleeved) sides to the uninjured contralateral sides (n=30). A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively.




Figure 3: Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-down hop for the sleeved and unsleeved conditions for the ACL injured sides (n=30).

A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively.




Figure 4: Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-down hop for the ACL-injured sleeved sides to the uninjured unsleeved sides (n=30).

A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively




Figure 5: Knee joint power time-continuous comparisons for the uninjured (unsleeved) sides, and ACL injured sides for sleeved and unsleeved conditions. Top panels: SPM paired t-tests for comparisons between injured (sleeved versus unsleeved) and uninjured sides. Joint power curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) for each respective test are shown in the bottom panels.




Fig 6. SPM analysis of ground reaction force trajectory differences between baseline and follow-up for the Sleeve group (n=9) and Control group (n=9). A. Hotellings T^2 test trajectory. The dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion. B – D. The x, y, and z component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) comparing groups. Positive values indicate increases in values from baseline to follow-up.




Fig 7. SPM comparing changes in knee joint power trajectories. A. Independent t-test trajectory (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands). Dashed red line indicates significance criterion. B. Baseline to follow-up differences for the Sleeved and the Control groups.