It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The time course of injury-risk after return-to-play

in professional football

Running head: Injury risk after return-to-play in football

Guangze Zhang^{1,2}, Michel Brink², Karen aus der Fünten¹, Tobias Tro □ β^{1,3}, Peter Willeit^{4,5}, Tim Meyer¹, Koen Lemmink², Anne Hecksteden^{1,6,7}

- ¹ Institute of Sports and Preventive Medicine, Saarland University, Saarbrücken, Germany
- ² Center for Human Movement sciences, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen (UMCG), Groningen, The Netherlands
- ³ University Sports, Stuttgart University, Stuttgart, Germany
- ⁴ Institute of Health Economics, Medical University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria
- ⁵ Department of Public Health & Primary Care, University of Cambridge, UK
- ⁶ Institute of Sport Science, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria
- ⁷ Institute of Physiology, Medical University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

Corresponding author:

Anne Hecksteden

Universität Innsbruck, Department of Sport Science, Chair of Sports Medicine

Fürstenweg 176, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria

eMail: anne.hecksteden@uibk.ac.at; ORCID: 0000-0003-3390-9619

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Abstract

2 Background

Injury risk in professional football is increased in the weeks following return-to-play
(RTP). However, the time course of injury risk after RTP (the hazard curve) as well
as its influencing factors are largely unknown. This knowledge gap, which is arguably
due to the volatility of instantaneous risk when calculated for short time intervals,
impedes on informed RTP decision-making and post-RTP player management. **Objectives**

9 To characterize the hazard curve for non-contact, time-loss injuries after RTP in 10 male professional football and investigate the influence of the severity of the index 11 injury and playing position.

12 Methods

Media-based injury records from the first German football league were collected over four seasons as previously published. Time-to-event analysis was employed for noncontact, time-loss injury after RTP. The Kaplan-Meier survival function was used to calculate the cumulative hazard function, from which the continuous hazard function was retrieved by derivation.

18 Results

19 1623 observed and 1520 censored events from 646 players were analyzed. The 20 overall shape of the hazard curve was compatible with an exponential decline of 21 injury risk, from an approximately two-fold level shortly after RTP towards baseline, 22 with a half-time of about four weeks. Interestingly, the peak of the hazard curve was 23 slightly delayed for moderate and more clearly for severe index injuries.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

24 Conclusions

The time course of injury risk after RTP (the hazard curve) can be characterized based on the Kaplan-Meier model. The shape of the hazard curve and its influencing factors are of practical as well as methodological relevance and warrant further investigation.

29

30 Keywords: Subsequent injury; risk trajectory; professional football; survival analysis;
31 continuous hazards.

32

33 Summary box

What is already known on this topic - As football players return to play after an injury, the risk of incurring a subsequent injury is high. With (event-free) time, this elevated risk returns to baseline. However, the shape of the risk-trajectory over time as well as its influencing factors are unknown.

What this study adds - This study characterizes the time course of injury risk after
RTP by providing a continuous hazard curve. Moreover, differences in risk
trajectories across severities of index injury and playing positions were investigated.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy - An evidence-informed estimate of the excess injury risk still remaining at a certain time-point after RTP is of obvious use for RTP decision making and post-RTP player management. Moreover, the continuous hazard curves enable informed specification of follow-up period in epidemiological studies and verification of the proportional hazard assumption in data analysis.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

47 Introduction

48 Injuries are common in professional football players and seemingly unavoidable in their career.¹ As players return to play (RTP) from a previous injury, the risk of 49 subsequent injury is high² and the time point at which the risk returns to baseline is 50 51 largely unknown. Given the economic and competitive implications of injury burden, 52 decisions on the timing of return to play and post-RTP player management are of 53 particular importance for stakeholders (e.g., coaches, players and managers).³ 54 Although there are attempts to determine the time frame within which injury risk is 55 elevated⁴⁻⁷, the time course of the excess injury risk after RTP has yet to be 56 uncovered.

57 Regarding the interval between RTP and subsequent injury, 50-80% of 58 subsequent injuries are reported to occur within the first four weeks^{4,7}. However, 59 those figures are based on injury frequency and do not consider the fact that the 60 number of players still at risk (i.e., the cohort that have not sustained a subsequent 61 injury) also drops as time goes by because each injured player reduces this group. A 62 decreasing number of players at risk would lead to a decline of injury occurrence even with constant injury risk. Time-to-event analysis⁸ (survival analysis) has been 63 widely employed to investigate the occurrence and timing of events in epidemiology⁹ 64 65 and beyond¹⁰. When applied to injury occurrence, time-to-event analysis (e.g., using 66 the Kaplan-Meier method) enables incorporating the decreasing number of players 67 at risk. Previous studies have generally quantified injury risk after RTP in coarse time intervals of 2 to 8 weeks^{4,7,11}. In such a discrete time framework¹², injury risk for a 68 69 specific time interval can be conveniently estimated by dividing the number of 70 injuries by the number of players still at risk¹². However, discrete hazard estimation 71 with a coarse time metric (e.g., months) may be inadequate to capture the fast

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

changes in injury risk after RTP. The key challenge for a fine-grained time scale (e.g., days) is the volatility of hazard estimates due to the low number of injuries per time interval (including intervals without injury at all). As a consequence, the hazard function cannot be directly estimated in a continuous time framework¹². The present work explores the application of an established statistical solution¹² within the field of injury risk after RTP.

78 In the analysis of injury occurrences and RTPs over a football career, two 79 classes of time-intervals must be distinguished. The interval between an (index) 80 injury and RTP (i.e., RTP time) and the interval between RTP and the subsequent 81 injury. While the present work will be focusing on the latter, RTP time is also of 82 interest for the following two reasons. Firstly, according to the time-loss concept, time to RTP is used as an indicator of injury severity¹³ with implications for post-RTP 83 iniury risk¹⁴. The respective consensus has been widely applied^{7,15}. Secondly, RTP 84 85 time relative to the initial diagnosis of the injury could allow an estimation on rehabilitation (in)adequacy which also influences injury risk after RTP^{6,16}. In addition, 86 87 the playing position is also an established influencing factor of injury risk within and 88 beyond the context of RTP.¹

In existing time-to-injury analysis in football, Cox regression models have been widely used to estimate discrete hazard ratios for supposed risk factors¹⁶, including in the RTP context⁷. However, a fundamental assumption of the Cox model (proportional hazard) has not been verified so far. That is, that hazard functions for these risk factors are proportional (parallel hazard curves over time¹⁷) and their association can therefore be summarized as one common hazard ratio.

95 Contact injuries are relatively unpredictable in football.¹⁸ Therefore, the present 96 work aims to characterize the continuous-time hazard curve of non-contact injuries

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

97 after RTP in professional football. Moreover, variations of the continuous hazard

- 98 curve among severities of index injury and playing positions will be investigated. The
- 99 hazard curves may also verify whether the proportional assumptions are met.

100 Methods

101 Dataset

102 The analyzed data included four seasons (2014/15 to 2017/18) of media-based 103 injury records in the 1st male German football league, a subset of the dataset used by aus der Fühten et al¹⁹. Neither research ethics board approval nor a trial 104 105 registration was required as all data were collected from publicly available sources. 106 The primary data source was the online version of the sport-specific journal "kicker 107 Sportmagazin^{TM₁₁₂₀₋₂₂} complemented by further publicly available resources. Injury 108 data collection followed the Fuller consensus statement on football injury studies¹³. 109 All injury records were subsequently examined by an independent orthopedic doctor for medical plausibility.¹⁹ 110

111 Equity, diversity and inclusion statement

The focus of this work is on male professional football. While the specific results are presumably dependent on discipline, performance level and sex, the method presented may be applied in other settings and populations.

115 Data processing

116 The severity of index injuries was categorized according to the time loss concept:

- 117 minimal (1-3 days), mild (4-7 days), moderate (8-28 days), and severe (>28 days).¹³
- 118 The playing position was considered as players' main position when the subsequent

injury occurred, including goalkeeper, defender, midfielder, and forward.

As contact and non-contact injuries can equally impact on players' physical condition and subsequently influence the injury risk after RTP, both categories are

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

122 considered for the index injury. However, given the unpredictability of physical 123 contact in football, only non-contact, time-loss injuries were considered as 124 subsequent injuries. For each player, the first injury in record was considered as the 125 index injury of the following one, the second injury as the index injury of the third one, 126 and so on. RTP in this study was defined as a full return to training and competition⁷.

127

128 INSERT FIG. 1 HERE

129

130 Censoring

131 Censoring refers to abbreviated length of follow-up due to the end of the follow-up 132 period or reasons other than the target event. Four football seasons were segmented 133 by the date of the last official match for corresponding season, 23rd May for 2014/15 134 season, 14th May for 2015/16 season, 20th May for 2016/17 season, and 12nd May 135 for 2017/18 season. Given that training and match exposure as well as the recording 136 of minor injuries during the summer break might differ from in-season, cases that did 137 not incur a subsequent injury in the same season as RTP were censored at the end 138 of season (date of last match, cp. above and Fig. 1). As this study mainly focused on 139 the occurrence of non-contact injury after RTP, contact-related subsequent injuries 140 equally led to censoring (Fig. 1). Altogether, a subsequent injury was confirmed as 141 an observed event only when it was observed in both categories (i.e., non-contact 142 subsequent injury occurring in the same season as RTP).

143

144 INSERT FIG. 2 HERE

145

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

146 Hazard function

147 Fig. 2 illustrates the steps to derive the continuous hazard function. First, the dataset 148 with censoring information was used to fit a Kaplan-Meier (KM) model⁸. Due to the 149 fine-grained time metric (day), the number of observed events might be trivial for 150 individual time units, which makes the discrete-time KM hazards too volatile to be 151 meaningful. By contrast, at each time t_i , the cumulative hazard function $\hat{H}(t_i)$ can be 152 derived through an established mathematical relationship (see equation 1) from the KM survival function $\hat{S}_{KM}(t_j)$.¹² The instantaneous risk is the change in cumulative 153 154 hazard from one time unit (day) to the next, that is, the local slope of the cumulative 155 hazard function. The cumulative hazard function provides a pivot to retrieve continuous hazards as its first derivative.¹² To simplify calculation, cumulative 156 157 hazards and time, as response and explanatory variables respectively, were used to 158 fit a polynomial (10th degree) regression model. Subsequently, predictions were 159 made for successive days. The rate of change in predicted cumulative hazards was 160 then calculated as the continuous hazard function (i.e., the risk of subsequent injury).¹² Note that only cumulative hazards from the first 100 days after RTP were 161 162 used to fit the polynomial.

163
$$\widehat{H}(t_j) = -\ln \widehat{S}_{KM}(t_j)$$
(1)

164 A linear interpolation approach ⁸ was applied to estimate the median survival 165 time *T*, as shown in equation 2 where *m* represents the time interval when the 166 sample survival function is just above 0.5.

167
$$T = m + \left[\frac{\hat{s}_{KM}(t_m) - 0.5}{\hat{s}_{KM}(t_m) - \hat{s}_{KM}(t_{m+1})}\right] ((m+1) - m)$$
(2)

168 Note that the analysed dataset features a hierarchical data structure. As players 169 with more frequent injuries (and therefore RTPs) contribute more data points, these medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.25.23295972; this version posted September 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

individuals have a disproportionately high impact on the hazard function, leading to potential bias. Aiming to expose the general analytical pipeline for deriving the continuous hazard function as transparently as possible, the nesting of RTP episodes within players is not considered in the above analysis. However, in supplement, we illustrate and discuss two potential options for mitigating this issue while still avoiding advanced modelling techniques.

176 **Results**

177 Epidemiology of subsequent injuries

Within the four seasons, 822 players incurred 4065 injuries, with a total of 3143 subsequent injuries from 646 players. 674 (21.4%) subsequent injuries occurred across the end of season, which in conjunction with contact-related injuries (*n*=1102, 35.1%) resulted in 1520 censored cases and 1623 observed subsequent injuries.

182 77% (*n*=2406) of all subsequent injuries and 83% (*n*=1343) of observed 183 subsequent injuries were sustained during the first 100 days after RTP. The median 184 survival time was 84 days after RTP (Fig. 3). Fig. 4 showed that the number of 185 players still at risk steadily fell over the post-RTP period. Observed subsequent 186 injuries presented a similar overall pattern, however, with fluctuation.

187

188 INSERT FIG. 3 HERE

189

190 INSERT FIG. 4 HERE

191

Among all observed subsequent injuries, minimal, mild, moderate, and severe index injuries contributed 38.9%, 20.2%, 24.5%, and 16.3%, respectively. The

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

respective proportions of severity categories were similar across playing positions
(Fig. 5). With respect to playing positions, 551 (including 278 observed) subsequent
injuries were suffered by 141 forwards, 1406 (696 observed) subsequent injuries by
272 midfielders, 1051 (582 observed) subsequent injuries by 236 defenders, 135 (67
observed) subsequent injuries by 41 goalkeepers.

199

200 INSERT FIG. 5 HERE

201

202 Risk of subsequent injury (hazard curve)

Overall, as players returned to play, the risk of non-contact subsequent injury was about two times higher than the baseline. Across all analyzed events, the shape of the hazard curve is compatible with an exponential decay of excess risk, which diminished by half after approximately 25 days and levels off afterwards (Fig. 6a). There is a larger relative change over time when analyzing injury frequencies (the red bars in Fig. 4) vs. hazards (Fig. 6a) which take the number of players at risk into account.

As shown in Fig. 6b, the shape of the hazard curve differs across severities of the index injury. For minimal and mild index injuries, the "exponential" pattern holds. A minor risk increment over the first five days was observed for moderate index injuries and RTP from severe injuries was followed by a significantly increasing injury risk within the first 10 days, which thereafter remained relatively high.

Goalkeepers, midfielders, and defenders faced a decreasing risk of non-contact injuries in the first four weeks as returning to full football activity (Fig. 6c). The greatest plunge of injury risk was seen in goalkeepers, with an approximate decline by 75% in the two weeks after RTP. In contrast, forwards experienced a slightly

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 219 increasing risk of getting injured again after RTP which fluctuated over the post-RTP
- 220 period.
- 221
- 222 INSERT FIG. 6 HERE
- 223

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

224 Discussion

225 The primary aim of this study was to derive and investigate the hazard curves for 226 subsequent non-contact injuries after RTP in professional football. The overall shape 227 of the hazard curve followed the expected pattern of an exponential "decay" of excess risk towards baseline. Importantly, in contrast to previous studies^{4,7} looking 228 229 into the timing of subsequent injuries after RTP, the current study determined a 230 continuous hazard function, thereby avoiding overestimation of changes in injury risk. 231 With respect to the risk across severities of index injury and playing positions, as 232 opposed to other groups in each category, a delayed maximum of hazard was found 233 for those returning from moderate and severe index injuries and for forwards. This is 234 indicative of a period and a group of players which need particular attention. Hazards 235 appeared not to be proportional for these groups.

Bengtsson et al.² reported an increased injury rate in the first match appearance 236 237 after RTP compared to the average seasonal match injury rate for all injuries (46.9 238 vs 25.0/1000 hours) and for muscle injuries (24.6 vs 9.5/1000 hours) when injury 239 risk was simply calculated by dividing the number of injured players by the total number of players. In a 3-year follow-up study²³, 6 (6.7%) players after ACL 240 reconstruction suffered complications (five re-ruptures and four other knee injuries) 241 242 between return-to-training and the first match. While, similarly, Orchard et al.⁵ found 243 that players in Australian Football League faced the highest injury risk during the first 244 week after RTP, they also reported that risk was still increased during the following 245 weeks. This could be explained by still ongoing muscle regeneration after a 246 rehabilitation of weeks²⁴. Nevertheless, these findings were obtained from incidence 247 rates averaged over a certain period and critically depended on the follow-up 248 duration, thereby ignoring the potentially time-varying distribution of injury over

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

time^{17,25}. The current time-to-event analysis presented the continuous hazard of non-

250 contact injuries after RTP and takes into account its time-varying characteristics.

251 While in the current study, the risks of subsequent injury steadily declined after 252 returning from minimal and mild index injuries, rehabilitation adequacy for these cases should not be overlooked in practice²⁶. Ekstrand and Gillquist¹¹ reported that a 253 254 minimal or mild injury could be followed by a more severe subsequent injury. Severe 255 injuries are usually less common in football but cause longer absence times.¹⁵ The 256 delayed peak of injury risk after returning from severe index injuries may be due to 257 larger tissue damage, for example, damage of nerves and impaired proprioception. 258 This might require longer time for regeneration. De-training effects after long 259 absence and immobilization due to severe injuries could also undermine players' muscle mass²⁷, proprioception¹⁵, and cardiovascular capacity²⁸. Players returning 260 261 from severe injuries may play with greater care in the first days. After several regular 262 training sessions, their confidence may be restored sooner than actual athletic 263 capacity, which in conjunction with the expectation of proving themselves may lead 264 to the delayed peak of injury risk. Thus, players returning from severe injuries 265 warrant further attention and monitoring over the following weeks.

266 The trajectory of non-contact injury risk after RTP differed across playing 267 positions. This could correspond with the fact that different roles were exposed to various intensities of physical contact in training and match^{29,30}. Forwards faced a 268 delayed peak shortly after RTP with some fluctuations over the post-RTP period. 269 Carling et al¹ similarly found that center-forwards sustained a higher incidence of 270 271 recurrent muscle strains than other positions. Comparable results were reported for 272 groin injuries.³¹ Nevertheless, findings are inconsistent across studies for an association between playing positions and injury risk.³² Some circulation of playing 273

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

positions in modern football may explain the inconsistency. Classification of playing
positions in this type of study may need further discussion.

276 In this study, the characterization of hazard curves enables a direct, visual 277 assessment of the proportional hazard assumption. Importantly, hazard curves 278 differed in overall shape and scale across severities of index injury and playing 279 positions. This result points to the necessity of explicitly verifying the proportional 280 hazard assumption for any given setting. The direct visual assessment of the 281 quantity of interest could be a pragmatic approach especially when working with 282 limited sample sizes³³. Previously, more indirect visualizations have been used to 283 examine this assumption, such as survival function against time, cumulative hazard 284 versus time, log (cumulative hazard) versus log (time), or Schoenfeld residuals versus log (-survival function) 9,34. For example, Della Villa et al³⁵ examined the 285 286 proportional hazards assumption with Schoenfeld residuals when investigating 287 potential factors associated with second ACL injuries, where the assumption was 288 globally met for all candidate risk factors. Again, sample size and statistical power 289 should be considered for the specific case.

290 Strengths, limitations, and future directions

291 For the first time this study used time-to-event analysis to characterize the 292 continuous hazard curves for subsequent non-contact injuries in football. However, it 293 should be noted that the retrospective, media-based data set is associated with 294 some limitations. In prospective follow-up studies, exposure hours (or exposure load) 295 after RTP could provide more accurate insights into the time course of injury risk 296 after RTP compared to days after RTP as it has been utilized here. Moreover, future 297 research could include other influencing factors such as injury history (e.g., frequency of previous injuries)³⁶, rehabilitation adequacy¹⁴, location (e.g., the body 298

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

region^{36,37} and affected tissue^{6,15}) and type^{1,16} of index injury. Of note, the findings from male professional football may not be applicable to other playing levels or female football, nor to other sports.

302 Finally, as aforementioned in the methods section, the main analysis did not 303 consider the nesting of events within individuals. It has to be kept in mind that this 304 might lead to bias because frequent injury occurrence leads to overrepresentation of 305 episodes from the concerned player in the dataset and is, at the same time, plausibly 306 associated with shorter time intervals (injury severity and time between RTP and 307 subsequent injuries). Respecting the proof-of-concept character of this work, we 308 consciously opted to focus on exposing the main analytical strategy. However, in the 309 supplementary document we illustrate two potential solutions which still avoid 310 advanced modeling technique (a) randomly up-sampling on the individual level within 311 each season to the maximum number of RTPs per player in the corresponding 312 season; (b) including only the first RTP of each player within each season (as a form 313 of down-sampling). Both methods operate on the level of data processing without 314 requiring alterations of the main analytical proceedings presented in the methods 315 section. Importantly, all three analytical options result in a similar overall shape of the 316 hazard curve.

317 **Conclusions**

Through time-to-event analysis, this study determined the continuous hazard curve of non-contact injuries after RTP, which was two times higher at the day of RTP than the baseline level. One month follow-up after RTP is reasonable to capture most "surplus" risk of subsequent non-contact injury while avoiding excessive effort as well as "dilution" with injuries unrelated to RTP. The severity of index injury and

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 323 playing position impact on the time course of the non-contact injury after RTP,
- 324 resulting in a severity-dependent delay of the peak hazard.

325 **Practical implication**

- 326 Post-RTP player management benefits from a valid estimate of the remaining excess
- 327 injury risk as time elapses. This study demonstrates how to derive a continuous time
- 328 hazard curve to support such decision making. However, replication and further
- 329 investigation are warranted before applying our specific results in practice.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

330 **Declarations**

331 Conflict of interest

- 332 TM is the chairman of the medical committees of the German FA (DFB) and the
- 333 European Football Confederation (UEFA).
- 334 Funding
- 335 Guangze Zhang is supported by a PhD scholarship from the German Football
- 336 Federation (DFB). No further external funding was used in this work.

337 Author contributions

- 338 All authors contributed to the drafting, writing, and editing of this article. All authors
- have read and approved the final manuscript.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

340 **References**

- Carling C, Le Gall F, Orhant E. A four-season prospective study of muscle strain
 reoccurrences in a professional football club. *Res Sports Med.* 2011;19(2):92 102.
- Bengtsson H, Ekstrand J, Waldén M, Hägglund M. Few training sessions
 between return to play and first match appearance are associated with an
 increased propensity for injury: a prospective cohort study of male professional
 football players during 16 consecutive seasons. *British journal of sports medicine*.
 2020;54(7):427-432.
- Yung KK, Ardern CL, Serpiello FR, Robertson S. A Framework for Clinicians to
 Improve the Decision-Making Process in Return to Sport. *Sports Med Open.* 2022;8(1):52.
- Wangensteen A, Tol JL, Witvrouw E, et al. Hamstring Reinjuries Occur at the
 Same Location and Early After Return to Sport: A Descriptive Study of MRI Confirmed Reinjuries. *Am J Sports Med.* 2016;44(8):2112-2121.
- 355 5. Orchard J, Best TM. The management of muscle strain injuries: an early return
 356 versus the risk of recurrence. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine*. 2002;12(1):3-5.
- Gajhede-Knudsen M, Ekstrand J, Magnusson H, Maffulli N. Recurrence of
 Achilles tendon injuries in elite male football players is more common after early
 return to play: an 11-year follow-up of the UEFA Champions League injury study.
 Br J Sports Med. 2013;47(12):763-768.
- 361 7. Hagglund M, Walden M, Ekstrand J. Lower reinjury rate with a coach-controlled
 362 rehabilitation program in amateur male soccer: a randomized controlled trial. *Am*
- 363 *J Sports Med.* 2007;35(9):1433-1442.
- 364 8. Miller R. Survival analysis. New York: Wiley; 1981.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 365 9. Kuitunen I, Ponkilainen VT, Uimonen MM, Eskelinen A, Reito A. Testing the
 366 proportional hazards assumption in cox regression and dealing with possible
- 367 non-proportionality in total joint arthroplasty research: methodological
 368 perspectives and review. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2021;22(1):489.
- 369 10. Morrison J. Introduction to survival analysis in business. *Journal of Business* 370 *Forecasting Methods and Systems*. 2004:23(1):18-22.
- 371 11. Ekstrand J, Gillquist J. Soccer injuries and their mechanisms: a prospective
 372 study. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*. 1983;15(3):267-270.
- 373 12. Singer JD, Willett JB. Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and
- 374 *event occurrence.* Oxford university press; 2003.
- 13. Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, et al. Consensus statement on injury definitions
- and data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. *Br J Sports Med.* 2006;40(3):193-201.
- 14. Murphy DF, Connolly DA, Beynnon BD. Risk factors for lower extremity injury: a
 review of the literature. *Br J Sports Med.* 2003;37(1):13-29.
- 380 15. Ekstrand J, Krutsch W, Spreco A, et al. Time before return to play for the most
- common injuries in professional football: a 16-year follow-up of the UEFA Elite
 Club Injury Study. *Br J Sports Med.* 2020;54(7):421-426.
- 16. Hägglund M, Waldén M, Ekstrand J. Previous injury as a risk factor for injury in
 elite football: a prospective study over two consecutive seasons. *British Journal*
- 385 of Sports Medicine. 2006;40(9):767.
- 17. Hernan MA. The hazards of hazard ratios. *Epidemiology.* 2010;21(1):13-15.
- 387 18. Hecksteden A, Schmartz GP, Egyptien Y, Aus der Funten K, Keller A, Meyer T.
- 388 Forecasting football injuries by combining screening, monitoring and machine
- 389 learning. *Sci Med Footb.* 2022:1-15.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

390	19. Aus der Funten K, Tross T, Hadji A, Beaudouin F, Steendahl IB, Meyer T.
391	Epidemiology of Football Injuries of the German Bundesliga: A Media-Based,
392	Prospective Analysis over 7 Consecutive Seasons. Sports Med Open.
393	2023;9(1):20.
394	20. Werner K, Clemens M, Volker K, et al. High return to competition rate following
395	ACL injury – A 10-year media-based epidemiological injury study in men`s

396 professional football. *European Journal of Sport Science*. 2019;20:1-15.

397 21. Krutsch W, Memmel C, Alt V, et al. Timing return-to-competition: a prospective
398 registration of 45 different types of severe injuries in Germany's highest football
399 league. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2022;142(3):455-463.

400 22. Florian B, Karen aus der F, Tobias T, Claus R, Tim M. Head injuries in
401 professional male football (soccer) over 13 years: 29% lower incidence rates
402 after a rule change (red card). *British Journal of Sports Medicine.*403 2019;53(15):948.

Waldén M, Hägglund M, Magnusson H, Ekstrand J. ACL injuries in men's
professional football: a 15-year prospective study on time trends and return-toplay rates reveals only 65% of players still play at the top level 3 years after ACL
rupture. *British journal of sports medicine.* 2016;50(12):744-750.

408 24.Huard J, Li Y, Fu FH. Muscle injuries and repair: current trends in research. *JBJS*.
409 2002;84(5):822-832.

410 25. Dunn OJ, Clark VA. *Basic statistics: a primer for the biomedical sciences.* John
411 Wiley & Sons; 2009.

412 26. Woods C, Hawkins R, Hulse M, Hodson A. The Football Association Medical
413 Research Programme: an audit of injuries in professional football—analysis of
414 preseason injuries. *British journal of sports medicine.* 2002;36(6):436-441.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 415 27. Morgan N, Weston M, Nevill A. Seasonal variation in body composition of
 416 professional male soccer players. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 2005.
- 417 28. Bangsbo J, Mizuno M. Morphological and metabolic alterations in soccer players
 418 with detraining and retraining and their relation to performance. *Science and*419 *Football: London, UK.* 1988.
- 420 29.Carling C, Orhant E. Variation in body composition in professional soccer players:
- 421 interseasonal and intraseasonal changes and the effects of exposure time and
- 422 player position. The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research.
- 423 2010;24(5):1332-1339.
- 30. Dauty M, Collon S. Incidence of injuries in French professional soccer players. *International journal of sports medicine*. 2011;32(12):965-969.
- 426 31. Leventer L, Eek F, Hofstetter S, Lames M. Injury patterns among elite football
 427 players: a media-based analysis over 6 seasons with emphasis on playing
 428 position. *International journal of sports medicine.* 2016;37(11):898-908.
- 429 32. Della Villa F, Mandelbaum BR, Lemak LJ. The Effect of Playing Position on
- 430 Injury Risk in Male Soccer Players: Systematic Review of the Literature and Risk
- 431 Considerations for Each Playing Position. *American journal of orthopedics (Belle*432 *Mead, NJ).* 2018;47(10).
- 33. Hecksteden A, Kellner R, Donath L. Dealing with small samples in football
 research. *Science and Medicine in Football.* 2021;epub ahead of print; DOI:
- 435 10.1080/24733938.2021.1978106.
- 436 34. Batson S, Greenall G, Hudson P. Review of the Reporting of Survival Analyses
 437 within Randomised Controlled Trials and the Implications for Meta-Analysis.
 438 *PLoS One.* 2016;11(5):e0154870.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

35. Della Villa F, Hagglund M, Della Villa S, Ekstrand J, Walden M. High rate of

440	second ACL injury following ACL reconstruction in male professional footballers:
441	an updated longitudinal analysis from 118 players in the UEFA Elite Club Injury
442	Study. Br J Sports Med. 2021;55(23):1350-1356.
443	36. Arnason A, Sigurdsson SB, Gudmundsson A, Holme I, Engebretsen L, Bahr R.
444	Risk factors for injuries in football. The American journal of sports medicine.
445	2004;32(1_suppl):5-16.
446	37. Hägglund M, Waldén M, Ekstrand J. Injury recurrence is lower at the highest
447	professional football level than at national and amateur levels: Does sports
448	medicine and sports physiotherapy deliver? British Journal of Sports Medicine.
449	2016;50:bjsports-2015.
450	
451	Figure legends
452	Fig. 1: Two strategies of censoring observations. The example at the bottom is not
453	subsequently injured until the end of follow-up.
453 454	subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time.
453 454 455	subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95%
453 454 455 456	subsequently injured until the end of follow-up.Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time.Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time.
453 454 455 456 457	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries
453 454 455 456 457 458	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries (red bar) at time course after RTP.
453 454 455 456 457 458 459	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries (red bar) at time course after RTP. Fig. 5: Distribution of observed subsequent injuries after different severities of index
453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries (red bar) at time course after RTP. Fig. 5: Distribution of observed subsequent injuries after different severities of index injury across playing positions.
453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries (red bar) at time course after RTP. Fig. 5: Distribution of observed subsequent injuries after different severities of index injury across playing positions. Fig. 6: The time course of a) non-contact injury risk after RTP; non-contact
453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries (red bar) at time course after RTP. Fig. 5: Distribution of observed subsequent injuries after different severities of index injury across playing positions. Fig. 6: The time course of a) non-contact injury risk after RTP; non-contact subsequent injury across b) severities of index injury, and c) playing
453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries (red bar) at time course after RTP. Fig. 5: Distribution of observed subsequent injuries after different severities of index injury across playing positions. Fig. 6: The time course of a) non-contact injury risk after RTP; non-contact subsequent injury risk across b) severities of index injury, and c) playing positions.
453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463	 subsequently injured until the end of follow-up. Fig. 2: Retrieving the hazard function on continuous time. Fig. 3: Kaplan-Meier estimates of continuous-time survivor function with 95% confidence interval and median survival time. Fig. 4: The count of players still at risk (green bar) and observed subsequent injuries (red bar) at time course after RTP. Fig. 5: Distribution of observed subsequent injuries after different severities of index injury across playing positions. Fig. 6: The time course of a) non-contact injury risk after RTP; non-contact subsequent injury risk across b) severities of index injury, and c) playing positions.

Observed Censored by "contact-related subsequent injury" Censored by "RTP & subsequent injury located across seasons"









medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.25.23295972; this version posted September 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.





Time-to-event data _____ Kaplan-Meier (KM) (with censoring) life table

Intersection of the section of th

Rate of change Hazards ------ Predicted Cumulative hazards ------ Cumulative hazards





Probability remaining free of subsequent injury

Median time (83.6 days) 100 Time afte

200 Time after RTP (days)





Proportion of observed subsequent injuries



