

1 **Title page**

2 **Which assessments are used to analyze active knee stability after an anterior**
3 **cruciate ligament injury to determine readiness to return to sports?**

4 Running title: Assessments for active knee stability

5

6 Registration number in PROSPERO: CRD42019122188

7

8 Blasimann Angela^{1,2,*}, Koenig Irene¹, Baert Isabel², Baur Heiner¹, Vissers Dirk²

9 ¹Bern University of Applied Sciences, Department of Health Professions, Division of
10 Physiotherapy, Bern, Switzerland

11 ²University of Antwerp, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of Rehabilitation
12 Sciences and Physiotherapy, Wilrijk, Belgium

13

14 *Corresponding author:

15

16 Angela Blasimann

17 Bern University of Applied Sciences

18 Department of Health Professions

19 Murtenstrasse 10

20 CH-3008 Bern

21 Switzerland

22 Phone: +41 31 848 45 27

23 E-Mail: angela.blasimann@bfh.ch

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background**

26 Adequate neuromuscular control of the knee for active joint stability could be one element to
27 prevent secondary injuries after an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury, either treated
28 conservatively or surgically. However, it is unclear which measurements should be used to
29 assess neuromuscular control of the knee for a safe return to sports (RTS).

30 **Purpose**

31 To summarize assessments for neuromuscular control of the knee in athletes after an ACL
32 injury to decide upon readiness towards a successful return to sports (RTS).

33 **Study design**

34 Systematic review, level of evidence 4

35 **Methods**

36 This systematic review followed the guidelines of Preferred Reporting of Items for Systematic
37 Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) and has been listed in PROSPERO
38 (CRD42019122188). The databases MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE, CINAHL, Cochrane
39 Library, Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro), SPORTDiscus and the Web of Science
40 were searched from inception until March 2019. The search was updated with e-mail alerts
41 from the searched databases until December 2019 and yielded to studies identifying
42 assessments using electromyography (EMG) for neuromuscular control during dynamic
43 activities in patients with an ACL rupture or repair. All included articles were assessed for risk
44 of bias with a modified Downs and Black checklist.

45 **Results**

46 A total of 1178 records were identified through database search. After screening for title,
47 abstract and content regarding in- and exclusion criteria, 31 articles could be included for

48 analysis. Another six articles could be included from hand search of reference lists of the
49 included articles, resulting in a total of 37 articles. Surface EMG was used in all studies as
50 method to assess neuromuscular control. However, there was a wide range of tasks,
51 interventions, muscles measured, and outcomes used. Risk of bias was medium to high due
52 to an unclear description of participants and prior interventions, confounding factors and
53 incompletely reported results.

54 **Conclusions**

55 Despite a wide range of EMG outcome measures for neuromuscular control, none was used
56 to decide upon a safe RTS in adult patients after an ACL injury.

57 **Clinical relevance**

58 Future studies should aim at finding valid and reliable assessments for neuromuscular control
59 to judge upon readiness towards RTS.

60 **Key words:** anterior cruciate ligament, assessment, active knee stability, neuromuscular
61 control, return to sports

62 **What is known about the subject:**

63 The recurrence rates even after successful surgery and subsequent rehabilitation in ACL
64 patients are high (up to 30%), with a re-injury of the ipsilateral knee, an injury of the opposite
65 leg, muscle injuries on the ipsilateral side or even bilateral consequences and an increased
66 risk for knee osteoarthritis. Furthermore, the diagnostic outcomes used to determine RTS after
67 an ACL tear are numerous. However, they are not always functional and do not sufficiently
68 reflect neuromuscular control abilities of ACL patients. Currently, decisions regarding joint
69 stability for RTS are based on subjective clinical assessments (passive joint stability) and
70 physical test batteries (e.g. hop tests as surrogates for active joint stability). Additional
71 knowledge regarding objective neuromuscular measures closes the gap between the two
72 mentioned currently available evaluations. Up to date, it is unclear which measurements
73 should be used to assess neuromuscular control of the knee for a safe RTS.

74 **What this study adds to existing knowledge:**

75 Surface electromyography is the choice of method to assess neuromuscular control of the
76 knee during active tasks in adult ACL patients. However, it remains unclear which outcome
77 variables would be best to judge upon readiness towards RTS or which dynamic tasks should
78 be used for RTS.

79 Introduction

80 ACL injuries happen quite frequently and concern athletes (0.15 injuries per 1000 athletic
81 exposures AEs) but also the active part of the general population.^{34,37} Most ACL injuries are
82 due to a non-contact, multiplane mechanism³² and may lead to instability, secondary meniscal
83 injury or even knee osteoarthritis in the long run.²¹ Consequently, this injury means several
84 weeks or even months of physical impairment with wide consequences for the patients
85 concerning return to work, return to activity or RTS. Furthermore, the overall incidence rate of
86 a second ACL injury within 24 months after successful ACL reconstruction and RTS is reported
87 to be 1.39 per 1000 AEs, leading to an almost six-fold increased risk compared to a healthy
88 young control group (0.24/1000 AEs).⁶⁴ Overall, the recurrence rates even after successful
89 surgery and subsequent rehabilitation are high (29.5% or 1.82/1000 AEs), with a tear of the
90 ACL graft (9.0%), an ACL injury of the opposite leg (20.5%), muscle injuries following ACL
91 repair/rehabilitation on the ipsilateral side or even bilateral consequences and an increased
92 risk for knee osteoarthritis.^{21,63,64} Therefore, not only primary but also secondary prevention
93 strategies are warranted.

94 Approximately 90% of patients with an ACL reconstruction achieve successful surgical
95 outcomes (impairment-based measures of knee function) and 85% show successful outcome
96 in terms of activity-based measures.⁵ Of these patients, more than 80% return to some form
97 of sports participation, however, only 44% return to competition.⁵ More recently published
98 systematic reviews found a range of RTS values between 63 and 97% for elite athletes with
99 an ACL reconstruction.^{41,50} Of these athletes, more than 5% sustained a re-rupture of the
100 graft^{41,96} in the ipsilateral knee. The risk for an ACL tear in the contralateral knee was as double
101 as high (11.8%) five years or longer after an ACL reconstruction.⁹⁶ It is known that returning to
102 high-demanding sports, including jumping, pivoting and hard cutting, after ACL reconstruction
103 leads to a more than 4-fold increase in reinjury rates over two years.²⁴ Considering simple
104 decision rules such as RTS not before nine months after reconstruction and achievement of
105 symmetrical quadriceps strength was reported to substantially decrease reinjury rates.²⁴

106 However, a recently published review did not find an association between current objective
107 criteria based RTS decisions and risk of a second ACL injury⁴⁴, but these findings were based
108 on only four studies with low quality of evidence.

109 Most elite athletes RTS on average within one year⁴¹ – this population seems to return earlier
110 than non-elite athletes.⁵ However, it remains unclear, whether this approach is safe.⁴¹ In a
111 systematic review⁷, time from surgery was the only criterion used to determine RTS after ACL
112 reconstruction in a third of the studies, sometimes combined with subjective, non-measurable
113 criteria. Objective criteria such as muscle strength, general knee examination or hop tests were
114 applied in 13% of the reviewed studies.⁷ To measure functional performance after ACL
115 reconstruction, mainly the single leg hop test for distance or a combination of several hop tests
116 are used, and functional performance is expressed with the Lower Limb Symmetry Index
117 (LSI).^{3,91} However, the LSI may overestimate the time point of RTS six months after ACL
118 surgery, and therefore leads to an increased risk for secondary injury.⁹⁵ Furthermore, often
119 used clinical impairment assessments for disability⁵³ do not appear to be related to measured
120 physical performance⁴⁷ and do not necessarily reflect readiness for RTS.⁴⁸ This could be
121 shown for isokinetic strength measures which “have not been validated as useful predictors of
122 successful RTS”.⁸⁹ In addition, no standardized isokinetic protocol assessing strength for
123 patients after ACL reconstruction could be found.⁸⁹ Moreover, no measure for assessing quality
124 of functional performance after ACL reconstruction has been reported so far.^{19,91,92}

125 Regarding the determination of RTS after ACL reconstruction, there is some evidence for the
126 use of functional performance tests: Multiple functional performance measures – a battery
127 including strength and hop tests, quality of movement and psychological tests⁹² - might be
128 more useful for the determination of RTS than a single performance measure.⁴ However, it is
129 still unclear, which measures should be used to bring athletes safely back to RTS with a low
130 risk of a second ACL injury.⁹² Currently used RTS criteria may be suboptimal at reducing the
131 risk of a second ACL injury.⁴⁴

132 It is known that patients with ACL reconstruction show altered kinematics and kinetics²⁷ - these
133 changes are referred to neuromuscular adaptations due to altered sensorimotor control.²⁵
134 These changes in sensorimotor control are caused by altered afferent inputs to the central
135 nervous system due to the loss of the mechanoreceptors of the native (original) ACL.^{79,99}
136 Furthermore, patients with a deficient ACL show different neuromuscular strategies during
137 walking⁸¹, depending on the functional activity level and being copers (sufficient knee stability)
138 or non-copers (suffering from giving-way episodes).

139 Neuromuscular control is defined and used in different ways: Biomechanical measures such
140 as three-dimensional kinetics and kinematics are used to predict ACL injury risk³¹ or physical
141 performance test batteries (including strength tests, hop tests and measurement of quality of
142 movement) are used to clear an athlete for RTS.⁹² So far, nonspecific vertical jump squats,
143 single leg distance hops, side hops, the assessment of limb symmetry and muscle strength
144 tests⁹⁵ are often used in daily clinical practice to assess active knee stability. However, there
145 is only limited evidence that passing RTS test batteries reduces the risk for a second ACL
146 injury.⁹⁴

147 Three-dimensional kinetics and kinematics provide some data to judge upon quality of active
148 knee stability ("dynamic valgus"), however, give only little insight in neuromuscular control. In
149 addition, the currently suggested RTS criteria do not seem to be adequate to assess
150 neuromuscular control of the knee joint to judge upon a safe RTS or even competition.
151 Consequently, meaningful, reliable, valid and accurate diagnostic tools for patients with an
152 ACL injury (either treated surgically or conservatively) are needed and may aid clinical
153 decision-making to optimize sports participation following ACL reconstruction.⁷⁸ Objective
154 measurements of neuromuscular control should include EMG of involved muscles to judge
155 upon quantity, quality and timing of voluntary activation and reflex activity.^{15,88} So far, it is
156 unclear which measurements for neuromuscular control are used in patients with an ACL injury
157 to clear for RTS.

158 Therefore, the first aim of this systematic review was to summarize the scientific literature
159 regarding assessments for neuromuscular control in patients with an ACL injury (either treated
160 surgically or conservatively). The second aim is to analyze whether these assessments for
161 neuromuscular control were used to decide upon readiness for RTS in these patients.

162 **Methods**

163 **Design, protocol and registration**

164 This systematic review was planned, conducted and analyzed according to the guidelines of
165 Preferred Reporting of Items for Systematic Reviews and Metaanalyses (PRISMA)⁴⁹ and
166 followed the recommendations of Cochrane group.³³

167 The protocol for this systematic review was registered beforehand in the International
168 prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO) from the National Institute for Health
169 Research NHI (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/index.php#index.php>) and got the
170 registration number CRD42019122188. The search protocol can be accessed via
171 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=122188.

172 **Eligibility criteria**

173 To define the relevant key words for the literature search, the PICOS⁸³ strategy was used as
174 follows (Table1):

175 Table 1: Overview of PICOS criteria for key word definitions

176 *Insert table 1 about here.*

177 In addition, the following inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied: As inclusion criteria
178 were used: Study participants have to be athletes or physically active people who participate
179 in sports activities on a regular basis (as defined by each study, e.g. Tegner Activity Score⁸⁷
180 (TAS) ≥ 3) to get data to decide upon RTS (synonyms: back to sports, back to competition,
181 return to competition, sports participation, sports activities, or in German: "Sportfähigkeit"),

182 assessments for neuromuscular control of lower limb muscles using EMG as method, original
183 articles published in peer-reviewed, scientific journals, available as full texts, written in English,
184 German, French, Italian or Dutch without any restriction regarding publication date or year
185 could be included. Exclusion criteria were studies with model-driven approaches, animals,
186 cadavers, comparisons of surgical techniques, passive or non-functional tasks (such as
187 isokinetic measurements for strength and isometric muscle activity), editorials, conference
188 abstracts, book chapters, theses, systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

189 **Information sources**

190 The search was effectuated in the electronic databases MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE,
191 CINAHL, Cochrane Library, Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro), SPORTDiscus and
192 in the Web of Science. Furthermore, a hand search was done using the reference lists of
193 included articles to identify additional and potentially eligible articles that had been missed in
194 the electronic database search. To ensure new articles matching the search terms, e-mail
195 alerts were established from each of the databases if possible.⁷³ The hits from these two
196 additional sources were also screened for eligibility applying the same criteria as for the articles
197 from the database search.

198 **Search**

199 The search was executed based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria in all of the seven
200 electronic sources mentioned above from inception until March 15th, 2019. In all sources, the
201 advanced search mode was used if available. Where applicable, the same search matrix
202 combining relevant search (if possible, MeSH-) terms with the Boolean operators AND and
203 OR. The following search strategy was applied for PubMed and customized for searches in
204 the six other databases: ((anterior cruciate ligament [Mesh] OR anterior cranial cruciate
205 ligament OR ACL) AND (anterior cruciate ligament injuries[Mesh] OR strains and
206 sprains[Mesh] OR rupture OR tear OR injury OR deficiency) AND (anterior ligament
207 reconstruction[Mesh] OR anterior cruciate ligament/surgery[Mesh] OR reconstructive surgical

208 procedures[Mesh] OR orthopedic procedure OR orthopaedic procedure OR tendon graft or
209 tendon transfer OR conservative treatment OR non-surgical OR rehabilitation[Mesh] OR
210 physical therapy modalities[Mesh] OR physiotherapy OR kinesiotherapy OR exercise[Mesh]
211 OR instruction OR resistance training[Mesh] OR neuromuscular training OR postoperative
212 care[Mesh]) AND (neuromuscular control OR neuromuscular activity OR sensorimotor control
213 OR muscle activity OR active stability) AND (electromyography[Mesh] OR EMG OR
214 electromyogram OR amplitude OR timing OR mean activity OR peak activity R duration of
215 activity OR onset OR offset OR on-off-pattern OR pre-activity OR latency OR reflex response)).

216 **Study selection**

217 All hits obtained by the database searches were downloaded to the Rayyan reference
218 management platform (rayyan.qcri.org). Prior to screening, duplicates were removed. Parallel
219 to these steps, the obtained hits were also inserted into EndNote (Clarivate Analytics,
220 Philadelphia, USA) and duplicates removed. Two authors (AB and IK) screened title and
221 abstract of the records, one by using the software EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia,
222 USA) and the other one with the help of the free software “rayyan”.⁶¹ If in- or exclusion of the
223 record was unclear, the full text was read, and in-/exclusion criteria were applied. Two authors
224 (IK, AB) independently decided upon in- or exclusion of all studies; if their decisions did not
225 match, discussion took place until consensus was achieved. If consensus would not have been
226 achieved, a third author (IB or HB) would have finally decided upon in- or exclusion of the
227 record in question; however, this was not necessary.

228 **Risk of bias across studies**

229 The risk of bias of all the included articles was independently assessed by two raters (AB, IK)
230 by using the Downs and Black checklist²⁰ in a former used, modified form.^{62,73} For this
231 systematic review, studies with a total score of 17 or above out of 25 (more than 2/3 of the
232 maximum total score) were considered as being of high methodological quality, low risk of bias
233 respectively.⁷³ Studies which reached 13 to 16 points (more than 50% of the maximum total

234 score) were rated as being of medium quality, and total scores below 13 were rated as being
235 of low methodological quality, high risk of bias respectively. As the aim of this systematic
236 review was to summarize the applied measures for neuromuscular control, the methodological
237 quality of the included studies was of secondary interest. Therefore, no study was excluded
238 due to a low total score in the risk of bias assessment.

239 **Data collection process**

240 After final decision of all studies, data extraction for each eligible study was performed by the
241 first author (AB) with predefined Microsoft® Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond WA, USA)
242 spreadsheet. As all included studies were available as full texts and the provided data were
243 enough for the systematic review, no authors had to be contacted in order to obtain or confirm
244 data. The first author (AB) extracted necessary information from each article describing the
245 study design, groups measured and their characteristics, the tasks to be fulfilled by all
246 participants, and all assessments or methods used to evaluate neuromuscular control.
247 Furthermore, the use of the chosen assessment for neuromuscular control was judged whether
248 it was used as tool to clear the participants for RTS. The second author (IK) controlled the
249 extracted data at random.

250

251 **Results**

252 Initially, a total of 1178 records were identified through database search. After deduplication,
253 946 remaining articles were screened for title and abstract. Fifty-eight articles were fully read
254 and assessed for eligibility. From the database search, a total of 31 articles, mainly cross-
255 sectional, case-controlled studies, were included for qualitative analysis. Furthermore, a hand
256 search in the reference lists of included articles yielded to another six hits which could be
257 included. E-mail alerts provided five articles, however, none of them met the inclusion criteria.
258 Reasons for exclusion were participants younger than 18 years, not able to achieve RTS, time
259 since injury or surgery less than 6 months, static or non-functional task, study design (e.g.

260 systematic review, study protocol), unclear or inadequate outcome, healthy participants or
261 without ACL injury. Details about every step of the search are illustrated in the following
262 flowchart (Fig.1).

263 *Insert Figure 1 about here.*

264 Figure 1: Flowchart of literature search according to PRISMA guidelines⁴⁹

265

266 **Risk of bias assessment**

267 Risk of bias of approximately half (18 studies, 48.6%) of the included studies was
268 medium^{1,2,6,12,15,17,18,36,43,57,58,65,67,68,75,76,77,84}, six (16.2%) showed high methodological
269 quality^{10,42,45,54,55,56} and 13 studies (35.1%) were of low quality^{9,13,23,28,38,39,40,46,59,60,66,85,98}
270 (Table 2). The main reasons for a medium to low methodological quality were due to an unclear
271 description of participants and prior interventions, confounding factors, and incompletely
272 reported results.

273

274 Table 2: Risk of Bias assessment with the adapted Downs & Black checklist²⁰

275 *Insert Table 2 about here.*

276

277 **Characteristics of included studies**

278 All included studies were case-control studies, except two which were case series⁵⁵ or a
279 single-case study.⁹⁸ Two reported a retrospective or secondary data analysis^{42,56} or provided
280 a subgroup analysis from a larger trial.^{59,60,65,66,75,76,77} Thirty-four studies compared the ACL
281 participants with at least one control group (other ACL treatment, e.g. surgical versus
282 conservative, or healthy controls), the remaining three studies made a comparison between
283 the injured and the non-injured leg of the participants^{57,67} or compared the pre-injury status with
284 follow-up data from pre- and post-surgery.⁹⁸

285 The number of included, adult participants with ACL injury varied from N = 1⁹⁸ to a maximum
286 of N = 70³⁹ with a wide range of described physical activity from “normal”¹³, “regular”⁴⁶, “active
287 in at least one sport”³⁸, TAS of minimal 3⁸⁴, minimal 2h/week^{1,2} to athletes at level I sports
288 including jumping, pivoting and hard cutting^{9,23,57}, elite soccer players^{6,17,66,98} or elite skiers.³⁶

289 Some authors restricted study participation to either males^{1,2,12,13,17,18,28,65,66,67,68} or
290 females^{10,46,59,60,84,85,98}, others measured females and males.^{6,9,15,23,36,38,39,42,43,54,55,56,75,76,77}

291 Three studies did not provide any data about the gender of their participants.^{40,45,57}

292 More patient characteristics of included studies can be found in table 3.

293 *Insert Table 3 about here.*

294 Table 3: Participants' characteristics of included studies

295 Abbreviations: ACLD = anterior cruciate ligament deficiency (conservative/non-surgical treatment); ACLR = anterior cruciate
296 ligament reconstruction/repair (surgery); BPTB = bone-patella-tendon-bone technique for ACLR; Level I: sports are described as
297 jumping, pivoting and hard cutting sports; Level II sports: also involve lateral motion, but with less jumping or hard cutting than
298 level I; n.a. = not applicable; n.s. = not stated; RTA = return to activity (return to participation); RTS = return to sports; RTP = return
299 to performance; TAS = Tegner Activity Score; TLS = Tegner & Lysholm Score; TSK = Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia; wk = week;
300 vs. = versus

301 All included studies used surface EMG as method to assess neuromuscular control and
302 provided EMG-related variables such as peak and mean amplitudes, timing and peak of
303 muscle activity, preparatory and reactive muscle activity, on- and offset of muscular activation,
304 co-activation/co-contraction ratios, asymmetry index. The outcome variables were expressed
305 as percentage of maximum voluntary (isometric) contraction (%MVIC or %MVC) or reported
306 in microvolts or milliseconds according to the variable chosen in amplitude or time domain.

307 The outcome variables were expressed as percentage of maximum voluntary (isometric)
308 contraction (%MVIC or %MVC) or reported in microvolts, milliseconds according to the variable
309 chosen.

310 The number of muscles assessed ranged from one^{38,65} to ten.²³ Mainly muscle activity of four
311 muscles of the thigh, vastus lateralis, vastus medialis, biceps femoris and semitendinosus, had

312 been assessed. However, there were also studies measuring the adductor longus^{18,39}, gluteus
313 medius^{18,59,60}, gluteus maximus^{23,42,43,5,55,56,59,60}, and calf muscles such as soleus, medial and
314 lateral gastrocnemius.^{23,28,40,54,55,56,75,76,77} The tasks used were very broad: there were activities
315 of daily life such as walking on even ground and downhill^{2,9,13,39,40,45,76,85}, and stair climbing.^{15,75}
316 Other activities went more towards sports such as running^{28,65,66,67,85} and jumping^{10,12,18,23,}
317 ^{36,38,42,43,54,55,56,57,59,60,75,84,85} where mainly the single-leg jump for distance, drop jumps and
318 countermovement jumps were used. Some authors chose typical rehabilitation exercises such
319 as forward lunges¹, Nordic hamstrings or hamstrings curls⁶ and squats.⁴⁶ At the other end of
320 the scale, more complex, highly demanding, sport-specific tasks such as an instep soccer
321 kick¹⁷ or a side cutting maneuver⁹⁸ were reported. Only few research groups used perturbation
322 platforms to simulate injury mechanisms during walking⁴⁵ or squatting^{46,68}, or applied devices
323 to stress the ACL in the posterior-anterior direction.⁸⁴ In addition, two studies even investigated
324 the influence of fatigue on neuromuscular control.^{42,43}

325 Details regarding methodological aspects of all included studies can be found in table 4 below.

326 *Insert table 4 about here.*

327 Table 4: Characteristics of methods of included studies

328 Abbreviations: AL = adductor longus muscle; BF = biceps femoris muscle; sEMG = surface electromyography; GC =
329 gastrocnemius muscles; GM = gluteus medius muscle; GMax = gluteus maximus muscle; GRF = ground reaction force; Hz =
330 Hertz; LG = gastrocnemius lateral head; LH = lateral hamstring muscle; MG = gastrocnemius medial head; MH = medial hamstring
331 muscle; ms = milliseconds; n.a. = not applicable; n.s. = not stated; RF = rectus femoris muscle; RTA = return to activity (return to
332 participation); RTS = return to sports; RTP = return to performance; SI = symmetry index; SM = soleus medialis muscle; SL =
333 soleus lateralis muscle; SO = soleus muscle; SPM = Statistical Parametric Mapping; ST = semitendinosus muscle; VL = vastus
334 lateralis muscle; VM = vastus medialis muscle; vs. = versus; WA = weight acceptance

335

336 **Decision for Return to Sports RTS**

337 None of the included studies used the surface EMG measurements to decide upon readiness
338 for RTS (Table 4). However, the results from about a third of the studies (32.4%, 12 studies)

339 could provide useful information by the choice of the assessed groups such as copers versus
340 non-copers^{1,2,9,75,76,77}, intervention and control group from the same team or level/league^{6,17,36},
341 data from pre-injury/pre-surgery including post-surgical follow up^{39,98} or participants with full
342 RTS versus limited RTS.⁴⁵ In addition, two studies even investigated the influence of fatigue
343 on neuromuscular control.^{42,43}

344 Discussion

345 The aim of this systematic review was to summarize the scientific literature regarding
346 assessments for neuromuscular control in patients with an ACL injury (either treated surgically
347 or conservatively). The second aim was to analyze whether these assessments for
348 neuromuscular control were used to decide upon readiness for RTS in these patients.

349 There were a lot of factors in the study population which could have an influence on
350 neuromuscular control:

351 *Influence by type of comparison (intra- versus inter-subject)*

352 The use of the contralateral, non-injured leg in intra-subject comparison, without a “real” control
353 group^{57,67} may lead to an overestimation of the neuromuscular performance in the ACL-
354 reconstructed or -injured leg. After ACL reconstruction, functional performance is often
355 expressed with the Lower Limb Symmetry Index (LSI).^{3,91} However, the LSI may overestimate
356 the time point of RTS ACL surgery, and therefore lead to an increased risk for secondary
357 injury.⁹⁵ In acutely injured ACL patients, intra-individual comparison showed bilateral
358 consequences during stair ascent and indicates an alteration in the motor program (“pre-
359 programmed activity”).¹⁶ In addition, in case of a case-controlled study design, the subjects in
360 the control group should be matched to the ACL participants regarding age, body mass, height,
361 activity level and leg dominance.

362 *Influence by level of activity and fatigue*

363 Some of the included studies used very challenging, sports-specific task to assess
364 neuromuscular control, some even assessed neuromuscular control after fatiguing tasks. It is
365 known that most of ACL tears are non-contact injuries happening at the end of a training
366 session or a play.^{11,72} Therefore, the closer the task to the sports and injury-risky situation, the
367 safer the decision towards full RTS or even return to competition will be. However, assessing
368 performance-based tests or movement quality may be more difficult to standardize, require
369 more complex equipment and large amounts of space.²⁹ But if only impairments will be tested,
370 there will be a lack of information regarding an “athlete’s capacity to cope with the physical and

371 mental demands of playing sport".¹⁴ Furthermore, impairment measures are also poorly related
372 to participation.⁷⁴ It is therefore recommended to search for a standardized assessment close
373 to the injury mechanism.

374 *Influence by sex*

375 Not all included studies reported findings of mixed groups separately by gender. Some did not
376 even state the sex of the participants. This could partly be explained by the date of publication
377 as gender difference in ACL patients has not been in the focus of research 20 years before.
378 But nowadays, a lot of facts concerning females are known: Female athletes are more likely
379 to suffer from an ACL injury⁹³ than men: their increased risk is probably multifactorial. However,
380 several studies indicate that hormonal factors play a role^{8,32,71,80,97} contributing to an increased
381 laxity of ligaments in the first half of the menstrual cycle. The higher risk for females to suffer
382 from an ACL injury can be explained by motion and loading of the knee joint during
383 performance.³¹ The ligament dominance theory says that female athletes typically perform
384 movements in sports with a greater knee valgus angle than men. Therefore, the amount of
385 stress on the ACL in these situations is higher because there is a high activation of the
386 quadriceps despite limited knee and hip flexion, greater hip adduction and a large knee
387 adduction moment.^{69,70} Moreover, females typically land with an internally or externally rotated
388 tibia⁵², leading to an increased knee valgus stress due to greater and more laterally orientated
389 ground reaction forces.⁸² A systematic review and meta-analysis⁸⁶ reported equal results in
390 women and men for outcomes such as anterior drawer, Pivot-Shift and Lachman test, hop
391 tests, quadriceps or hamstring testing, International Knee Documentation Committee (IKDC)
392 knee examination score and loss of range of motion. However, female patients showed inferior,
393 statistically significant subjective and functional outcomes such as laxity, revision rate, Lysholm
394 score, TAS and incidence of not returning to sports.

395 *Influence* *by* *treatment*

396 The included studies reported different treatment options (surgical reconstruction with different
397 graft types, conservative treatment). Depending on the classification of the participants in
398 copers and non-copers, the results in neuromuscular control may differ from a population of

399 ACL-reconstructed (ACL-R) participants. Therefore, all researchers who worked with copers
400 and non-copers made intra- and inter-group comparisons without an ACL-R group. A
401 Cochrane review revealed low evidence for no difference in young, active adults after two and
402 five years after the injury, assessed with patient-reported outcomes. However, many
403 participants with conservative treatments remain symptomatic (non-copers with unstable knee)
404 and therefore, later opt for ACL surgery.⁵¹ Furthermore, the choice of graft would influence the
405 neuromuscular control of measured muscles due to the morbidity of the harvesting site of the
406 graft (hamstrings e.g.).

407 *EMG variables*

408 The provided EMG-related variables were in accordance to the ones mentioned in a systematic
409 review searching for knee muscle activity in ACL-deficient (ACLD) patients and healthy
410 controls during gait.⁸¹ Another study summarized and quantitatively analyzed muscle onset
411 activity prior to landing in patients after ACL injury⁸⁸ and provided values in milliseconds and
412 in percentage of gait cycle as some of the included studies did. However, some of the
413 researchers only provided integrated EMG values which would make it difficult to be compared
414 to other studies using the respective units (milliseconds, millivolts) or widely used percentage
415 values (%MVIC, %MVC).

416 If the researchers mentioned the procedures for collecting EMG data, they referred to
417 standardized applications and guidelines such as SENIAM.³⁰

418 *Return to sports (RTS)*

419 Regarding the determination of RTS after ACL reconstruction, there is some evidence for the
420 use of functional performance tests, which had also been widely used in the included studies.
421 Multiple functional performance measures – a battery including strength and hop tests, quality
422 of movement and psychological tests⁹² - might be more useful for the determination of RTS
423 than a single performance measure.⁴ However, it is still unclear, which measures should be
424 used to bring athletes safely back to RTS with a low risk of a second ACL injury.⁹² Currently
425 used RTS criteria may be suboptimal at reducing the risk of a second ACL injury.⁴⁴ A recently
426 published scoping review¹⁴ reported the following RTS criteria: time, strength tests, hop tests,

427 patient-reports, clinical examination, thigh circumference, ligamentous stability, range of
428 motion, effusion and performance-based criteria. Recovery of neuromuscular function was
429 mentioned to be important because of the existing connection between the variables time since
430 surgery and the risk for re-injury of the knee joint but adequate assessment procedures to
431 assess neuromuscular function are still a matter of debate.²⁴

432 *Limitations*

433 The sample size of all the studies was quite low, however providing reasonable sample size
434 calculations and depending on the variable investigated, the results were acceptable.
435 Furthermore, the more restrictive the inclusion criteria for the participants, the more
436 homogeneous the intervention and the control groups were, but the more challenging the
437 recruitment process was, leading to smaller groups to be investigated.

438 The used assessment for the risk of bias, the Downs and Black checklist²⁰ (in a former used,
439 modified form^{62,73} is designed for randomized and non-randomized controlled studies,
440 however, the latter score lower in some items, get lower total scores and therefore a worse
441 overall rating of the methodological quality. Despite this disadvantage, we decided to use the
442 modified checklist as we could assess all the study designs included in the presented
443 systematic review.

444

445 **Conclusions**

446 Despite a wide range of assessments for neuromuscular control, none was used to decide
447 upon a safe RTS. Additional studies are needed to define readiness towards RTS by assessing
448 neuromuscular control in adult ACL patients. Clinicians should be aware of LSI problems (non-
449 injured side is affected, probably not a good reference, pre-surgery/-injury scores would be
450 perfect but not realistic in recreational athletes, probably in professional sports) and that
451 physical performance batteries do not reflect neuromuscular control needed for a safe RTS.

452 More research is needed to find a reliable and valid, EMG-related variable to assess
453 neuromuscular control in a standardized situation, close to the injury mechanism and as sport-
454 specific as possible.

455

456 **Conflict of interest**

457 All authors declare to have no conflict of interest.

458

459 **Acknowledgements**

460 We would like to thank the librarians of the Bern University, Department for Health Professions,
461 and of the University of Bern (Institute for Sports Science), Mariyam Akter for her help to find
462 relevant key words and Aglaja Busch for her help in refining the search strategy. For this
463 systematic review, the Bern University of Applied Science provided working hours for AB.

464

465 **References**

- 466 1. Alkjaer T, Simonsen EB, Peter Magnusson SP, Aagaard H, Dyhre-Poulsen P. Differences in the
467 movement pattern of a forward lunge in two types of anterior cruciate ligament deficient patients:
468 copers and non-copers. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*. 2002 Oct;17(8):586-93.
- 469 2. Alkjaer T, Simonsen EB, Jørgensen U, Dyhre-Poulsen P. Evaluation of the walking pattern in two
470 types of patients with anterior cruciate ligament deficiency: copers and non-copers [published online
471 ahead of print Mar 14, 2003]. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2003 May;89(3-4):301-8.
- 472 3. Almangoush A, Herrington L. Functional performance testing and patient-reported outcomes
473 following ACL reconstruction: A systematic scoping review. *Int Sch Res Notices*. 2014. article ID
474 613034. doi:10.1155/2014/613034.
- 475 4. Ardern CL, Glasgow P, Schneiders A, Witvrouw E, Clarsen B, Cools A, Gojanovic B, Griffin S, Khan
476 KM, Moksnes H, Much SA, Phillips N, Reurink G, Sadler R, Grävare Silbernagel K, Thorborg K,
477 Wangenstein A, Wilk KE, Bizzini M. 2016 Consensus statement on return to sport from the First
478 World Congress in Sports Physical Therapy, Bern. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50:853-864.
- 479 5. Ardern CL, Webster KE, Taylor NF, Feller JA. Return to sport following anterior cruciate ligament
480 reconstruction surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the state of play. *Br J Sports Med*.
481 2011;45:596-606.
- 482 6. Arnason SM, Birnir B, Guðmundsson TE, Guðnason G, Briem K. Medial hamstring muscle activation
483 patterns are affected 1-6 years after ACL reconstruction using hamstring autograft [published online
484 ahead of print Sep 26, 2013]. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2014 May;22(5):1024-9. doi:
485 10.1007/s00167-013-2696-4.
- 486 7. Barber-Westin SD, Noyes FR. Factors used to determine return to unrestricted sports activities after
487 anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Arthroscopy*. 2011;27:1697-1705.
- 488 8. Belanger L, Burt D, Callaghan J, Clifton S, Gleberzon BJ. Anterior cruciate ligament laxity related to
489 the menstrual cycle: an updated systematic review of the literature: *J Can Chiropr Assoc*.
490 2013;57:76-86.
- 491 9. Boerboom AL, Hof AL, Halbertsma JP, van Raaij JJ, Schenk W, Diercks RL, van Horn JR. Atypical
492 hamstrings electromyographic activity as a compensatory mechanism in anterior cruciate ligament
493 deficiency. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2001 Jul;9(4):211-6.

- 494 10. Briem K, Ragnarsdóttir AM, Árnason SI, Sveinsson T. Altered medial versus lateral hamstring
495 muscle activity during hop testing in female athletes 1-6 years after anterior cruciate ligament
496 reconstruction [published online ahead of print Sep 24, 2014]. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol*
497 *Arthrosc.* 2016 Jan;24(1):12-7. doi: 10.1007/s00167-014-3333-6.
- 498 11. Brown T.N., McLean S.G. & Palmier-Smith R.M. Associations between lower limb muscle activation
499 strategies and resultant multi-plantar knee kinematics during single leg landings. *J Sci Med Sport.*
500 2014;17:408-413.
- 501 12. Bryant AL, Newton RU, Steele J. Successful feed-forward strategies following ACL injury and
502 reconstruction [published online ahead of print Jul 24, 2008]. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2009
503 Oct;19(5):988-97. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2008.06.001.
- 504 13. Bulgheroni P, Bulgheroni MV, Andriani L, Guffanti P, Giughello A. Gait patterns after anterior cruciate
505 ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 1997;5(1):14-21.
- 506 14. Burgi CR, Peters S, Ardern CL, Magill JR, Gomez CD, Sylvain J, Reiman MP. Which criteria are
507 used to clear patients to return to sport after primary ACL reconstruction? A scoping review
508 [published online ahead of print Feb 2, 2019]. 2019: *Br J Sports Med.* 2019 Feb 2. pii: bjsports-
509 2018-099982. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2018-099982.
- 510 15. Busch A, Blasimann A, Henle P, Baur H. Neuromuscular activity during stair descent in ACL
511 reconstructed patients: A pilot study. *Knee.* 2019a;26:310-316.
- 512 16. Busch A, Henle P, Boesch L, Blasimann A, Baur H. Neuromuscular control in patients with acute
513 ACL injury during stair ascent—A pilot study. *Sports Traumatol Sports Injury.* June 2019b;35(2):158-
514 165. doi.org/10.1016/j.orthtr.2019.04.002
- 515 17. Cordeiro N, Cortes N, Fernandes O, Diniz A, Pezzarat-Correia P. Dynamic knee stability and ballistic
516 knee movement after ACL reconstruction: an application on instep soccer kick [published online
517 ahead of print Feb 12, 2014]. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2015 Apr;23(4):1100-6. doi:
518 10.1007/s00167-014-2894-8.
- 519 18. Dashti Rostami K, Naderi K, Thomas A. Hip abductor and adductor muscles activity patterns during
520 landing after anterior cruciate ligament injury. *J Sport Rehab.* 2019;28(8):871-876.
- 521 19. Davies GJ, McCarty E, Provencher M, Manske RC. ACL return to sport guidelines and criteria. *Curr*
522 *Rev Musculoskelet Med.* 2017;10:307–314. doi: 10.1007/s12178-017-9420-9.

- 523 20. Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological
524 quality both of randomized and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. *J Epidemiol*
525 *Community Health*. 1998;52:377-384.
- 526 21. Friel NA, Chu CR. The role of ACL injury in the development of posttraumatic knee osteoarthritis.
527 *Clin Sports Med*. 2013;32(1):1–12. doi: 10.1016/j.csm.2012.08.017.
- 528 22. Frost G, Dowling J, Dyson K, Bar-Or O. Cocontraction in three age groups of children during
529 treadmill locomotion. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 1997;7:179-86. doi:10.1016/S1050-6411(97)84626-
530 3.
- 531 23. Gokeler A, Hof AL, Arnold MP, Dijkstra PU, Postema K, Otten E. Abnormal landing strategies after
532 ACL reconstruction [published online ahead of print Feb 2, 2009]. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*.
533 2010;20(1):e12-9. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2008.00873.x.
- 534 24. Grindem H, Snyder-Mackler L, Moksnes H, et al. Simple decision rules can reduce reinjury risk by
535 84% after ACL reconstruction: the Delaware-Oslo ACL cohort study. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50:804–
536 8.
- 537 25. Grooms DR, Page SJ, Nichols-Larsen DS, Chaudhari AMW, White SE, Onate JA. Neuroplasticity
538 associated with anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2017;
539 47(3):180-189.
- 540 26. Gustavsson A, Neeter C, Thomeé P, Grävare Silbernagel K, Augustsson J, Thomeé R, Karlsson J.
541 A test battery for evaluating hop performance in patients with an ACL injury and patients who have
542 undergone ACL reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2006;14:778-788.
- 543 27. Hall M, Stevermer CA, Gillette JA. Gait analysis post anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Knee
544 osteoarthritis perspective. *Gait Posture*. 2012;36(1):56-60. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2012.01.003.
- 545 28. Hansen C, Einarson E, Thomson A, Whiteley R, Witvrouw E. Hamstring and calf muscle activation
546 as a function of bodyweight support during treadmill running in ACL reconstructed athletes
547 [published online ahead of print Jul 29, 2017]. *Gait Posture*. 2017;58:154-158. doi:
548 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2017.07.120.
- 549 29. Hegedus EJ, McDonough S, Bleakley C, Cook, CE, Baxter GD. Clinician-friendly lower extremity
550 physical performance measures in athletes: a systematic review of measurement properties and
551 correlation with injury, part 1. The tests for knee function including the hop tests. *Br J Sports Med*.
552 2015;49:642-648.

- 553 30. Hermens H, Freriks B, Disselhorst-Klug C, Rau G. Development of recommendations for SEMG
554 sensor and sensor placement procedures. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2000;10:361–74.
- 555 31. Hewett TE, Myer GD, Ford KR, Heidt RS, Colosimo AJ, McLean SG, den Bogert AJ, Paterno MV,
556 Succop P. Biomechanical measures of neuromuscular control and valgus loading of the knee predict
557 anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in female athletes: a prospective study. *Am J Sports Med.*
558 2005;33(4):492–501. doi:10.1177/0363546504269591
- 559 32. Hewett TE, Zazulak BT, Myer GD. Effects of the menstrual cycle on anterior cruciate ligament injury
560 risk: a systematic review. *Am J Sports Med.* 2007;35:659-668.
- 561 33. Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.* Chichester
562 UK: Wiley-Blackwell; 2008.
- 563 34. Hootman JM, Dick R, Agel J. Epidemiology of collegiate injuries for 15 sports: summary and
564 recommendations for injury prevention initiatives. *J Athl Train.* 2007;42(2):311–319.
- 565 35. Itoh H, Kurosaka M, Yoshiya S, Ichihashi N, Mizuno K. Evaluation of functional deficits determined
566 by four different hop tests in patients with anterior cruciate ligament deficiency. *Knee Surg Sports*
567 *Traumatol Arthrosc.* 1998;6(4):241-45. doi: 10.1007/s001670050106.
- 568 36. Jordan MJ, Aagaard P, Herzog W. Asymmetry and thigh muscle coactivity in fatigued anterior
569 cruciate ligament-reconstructed elite skiers. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2017;49(1):11-20.
- 570 37. Kaeding CC, Léger-St-Jean B, Magnussen RA. Epidemiology and diagnosis of anterior cruciate
571 ligament injuries. *Clin Sports Med.* 2017;36(1):1-8. doi:10.1016/j.csm.2016.08.001
- 572 38. Klyne DM, Keays SL, Bullock-Saxton JE, Newcombe PA. The effect of anterior cruciate ligament
573 rupture on the timing and amplitude of gastrocnemius muscle activation: a study of alterations in
574 EMG measures and their relationship to knee joint stability [published online ahead of print Feb 21,
575 2012]. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2012 Jun;22(3):446-55. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2012.01.013.
- 576 39. Knoll Z, Kocsis L, Kiss RM. Gait patterns before and after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction
577 [published online ahead of print Oct 29, 2003]. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2004;12(1):7-
578 14.
- 579 40. Kuster M, Sakurai S, Wood GA. The anterior cruciate ligament-deficient knee: compensatory
580 mechanisms during downhill walking. *Knee.* 1995;2(2):105-111. doi: 10.1016/0968-0160(95)00021-
581 G.

- 582 41. Lai CCH, Feller JA, Webster KE. Fifteen-year audit of anterior cruciate ligament reconstructions in
583 the Australian football league from 1999 to 2013: return to play and subsequent ACL injury. *Am J*
584 *Sports Med.* 2018;46(14). doi: 10.1177/0363546518803932.
- 585 42. Lessi GC, Silva RS, Serrão FV. Comparison of the effects of fatigue on kinematics and muscle
586 activation between men and women after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction [published online
587 ahead of print Feb 5, 2018]. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2018;31:29-34. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2018.01.009.
- 588 43. Lessi GC, Dos Santos AF, Batista LF, de Oliveira GC, Serrão FV. Effects of fatigue on lower limb,
589 pelvis and trunk kinematics and muscle activation: Gender differences [published online ahead of
590 print Nov 9, 2016]. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2017;32:9-14. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2016.11.001.
- 591 44. Losciale JM, Zdeb RM, Ledbetter L, Reiman MP, Sell TC. The association between passing return-
592 to-sport criteria and second anterior cruciate ligament injury risk: a systematic review with meta-
593 analysis. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2018;49(2):43-54. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2019.8190.
- 594 45. Lustosa LP, Ocarino JM, de Andrade MA, Pertence AE, Bittencourt NF, Fonseca ST. Muscle co-
595 ntraction after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Influence of functional level [published
596 online ahead of print Oct 5, 2011]. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2011;21(6):1050-5. doi:
597 10.1016/j.jelekin.2011.09.001.
- 598 46. Madhavan S, Shields RK. Neuromuscular responses in individuals with anterior cruciate ligament
599 repair. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2011;122:997-1004.
- 600 47. Mayer SW, Queen RM, Taylor D, Moorman CT, Toth AP, Garrett WE Jr, Butler RJ. Functional
601 testing differences in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction patients released versus not released
602 to return to sport. *Am J Sports Med.* 2015;43(7):1648-55. doi: 10.1177/0363546515578249.
- 603 48. McGrath T, Waddington G, Scarvell JM, Ball N, Creer R, Woods K, Smith D, Adams R. An ecological
604 study of anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, part 1. Clinical tests do not correlate with return-
605 to-sports outcomes. *Orthop J Sports Med.* 2016;4(11) doi:10.1177/2325967116672208.
- 606 49. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D., & PRISMA-Group. Preferred reporting items for
607 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6(7): e1000097.
608 doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.
- 609 50. Mohtadi NG, Chan DS. Return to sport-specific performance after primary anterior cruciate ligament
610 reconstruction: a systematic review. *Am J Sports Med.* 2018;46(13):3307-3316.

- 611 51. Monk AP, Davies LJ, Hopewell S, Harris K, Beard DJ, Price AJ. Surgical versus conservative
612 interventions for treating anterior cruciate ligament injuries. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2016;4.
613 Art. No.: CD011166. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD011166.pub2.
- 614 52. Nagano Y, Ida H, Akai M, Fukubayashi T. Gender differences in knee kinematics and muscle activity
615 during single limb drop landing. *Knee.* 2007;14(3):218–223. doi: 10.1016/j.knee.2006.11.008.
- 616 53. Narducci E, Waltz A, Gorski K, Leppla L, Donaldson M. The clinical utility of functional performance
617 tests within one-year post-ACL reconstruction: a systematic review. *Int J Sports Phys Ther.*
618 2011;6:333-342.
- 619 54. Nyland J, Klein S, Caborn DN. Lower extremity compensatory neuromuscular and biomechanical
620 adaptations 2 to 11 years after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction [published online ahead of
621 print Jun 16, 2010]. *Arthroscopy.* 2010;26(9):1212-25. doi: 10.1016/j.arthro.2010.01.003.
- 622 55. Nyland J, Wera J, Klein S, Caborn DN. Lower extremity neuromuscular compensations during
623 instrumented single leg hop testing 2-10 years following ACL reconstruction [published online ahead
624 of print Jul 31, 2014]. *Knee.* 2014;21(6):1191-7. doi: 10.1016/j.knee.2014.07.017.
- 625 56. Nyland J, Mauser N, Caborn DN. Sports involvement following ACL reconstruction is related to lower
626 extremity neuromuscular adaptations, subjective knee function and health locus of control
627 [published online ahead of print Jan 16, 2013]. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.*
628 2013;21(9):2019-28. doi: 10.1007/s00167-013-2366-6.
- 629 57. Oliver G, Portabella F, Hernandez JA. A comparative study of the neuromuscular response during
630 a dynamic activity after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction [published online ahead of print
631 Oct 26, 2018]. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol.* 2019;29(3):633-638. doi: 10.1007/s00590-018-2334-
632 4.
- 633 58. Ortiz A, Capo-Lugo CE, Venegas-Rios HL. Biomechanical deficiencies in women with
634 semitendinosus-gracilis anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction during drop jumps [published
635 online ahead of print Jul 17, 2014]. *PM&R.* 2014;6(12):1097-106. doi: 10.1016/j.pmrj.2014.07.003.
- 636 59. Ortiz A, Olson S, Libby CL, Trudelle-Jackson E, Kwon YH, Etnyre B, Bartlett W. Landing mechanics
637 between noninjured women and women with anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction during 2 jump
638 tasks [published online ahead of print Oct 16, 2007]. *Am J Sports Med.* 2008;36(1):149-57.
- 639 60. Ortiz A, Olson S, Trudelle-Jackson E, Rosario M, Venegas HL. Landing mechanics during side
640 hopping and crossover hopping maneuvers in noninjured women and women with anterior cruciate
641 ligament reconstruction. *PM&R.* 2011;3:13-20. doi: 10.1016/j.pmrj.2010.10.018.

- 642 61. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan — a web and mobile app for
643 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5:210. doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
- 644 62. Pairot-de-Fontenay B, Willy RW, Elias ARC, Mizner RL, Dube M-O. Running biomechanics in
645 individuals with anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a systematic review. *Sports Med*.
646 2019;49:1411-1424. doi:10.1007/s40279-019-01120-x.
- 647 63. Paterno MV, Rauh MJ, Schmitt LC, Ford KR, Hewett TE. Incidence of Contralateral and Ipsilateral
648 Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) Injury After Primary ACL Reconstruction and Return to Sport. *Clin*
649 *J Sport Med*. 2012;22(2):116–121. doi: 10.1097/JSM.0b013e318246ef9e.
- 650 64. Paterno MV, Rauh MJ, Schmitt LC, Ford KR, Hewett TE. Incidence of Second ACL Injuries 2 Years
651 After Primary ACL Reconstruction and Return to Sport [published online ahead of print April 21,
652 2014]. *Am J Sports Med*. 2014;42(7):1567-1573. doi:10.1177/0363546514530088
- 653 65. Patras K, Ziogas G, Ristanis S, Tsepis E, Stergiou N, Georgoulis AD. ACL reconstructed patients
654 with a BPTB graft present an impaired vastus lateralis neuromuscular response during high intensity
655 running [published online ahead of print Mar 12, 2010]. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2010;13(6):573-7.
656 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2009.12.001.
- 657 66. Patras K, Zampeli F, Ristanis S, Tsepis E, Ziogas G, Stergiou N, Georgoulis AD. Hamstring-
658 Dominant Strategy of the Bone–Patellar Tendon–Bone Graft Anterior Cruciate Ligament–
659 Reconstructed Leg Versus Quadriceps-Dominant Strategy of the Contralateral Intact Leg During
660 High-Intensity Exercise in Male Athletes. *Arthroscopy*. 2012;28(9):1262-1270.
- 661 67. Patras K, Ziogas G, Ristanis S, Tsepis E, Stergiou N, Georgoulis AD. High intensity running results
662 in an impaired neuromuscular response in ACL reconstructed individuals [published online ahead
663 of print Jun 4, 2009]. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2009;17(8):977-84. doi:
664 10.1007/s00167-009-0822-0.
- 665 68. Pincheira PA, Silvestre R, Armijo-Olivo, Guzman-Venegas R. Ankle perturbation generates bilateral
666 alteration of knee muscle onset times after unilateral anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction.
667 *PeerJ*. 2018. doi:10.7717/peerj.5310.
- 668 69. Pappas E, Carpes FP. Lower extremity kinematic asymmetry in male and female athletes
669 performing jump-landing tasks. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2012;15(1):87–92.
670 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2011.07.008.

- 671 70. Pollard CD, Sigward SM, Powers CM. Limited hip and knee flexion during landing is associated with
672 increased frontal plane knee motion and moments. *Clin Biomech.* 2010;25(2):142–146.
673 doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2009.10.005.
- 674 71. Posthumus M, Collins M, September AV, Schwellnus MP. The intrinsic risk factors for ACL ruptures:
675 an evidence-based review. *Phys Sportsmed.* 2011;39:62-73.
- 676 72. Price RJ, Hawkins RD, Hulse MA, Hodson A. The Football Association medical research
677 programme: an audit of injuries in academy youth football. *Br J Sports Med.* 2004 Aug;38(4):466-
678 71.
- 679 73. Ramsey CA, Lamb P, Kaur M, Baxter GD, Ribeiro DC. How are running shoes assessed? A
680 systematic review of characteristics and measurement tools used to describe running footwear. *J*
681 *Sports Sci.* 2019;37:14:1617-1629. doi:10.1080/02640414.2019.1578449.
- 682 74. Ross MD, Irrgang JJ, Denegar CR, et al. The relationship between participation restrictions and
683 selected clinical measures following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports*
684 *Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2002;10:10–19.
- 685 75. Rudolph KS, Axe MJ, Snyder-Mackler L. Dynamic stability after ACL injury: who can hop? *Knee*
686 *Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2000;8(5):262-9. doi:10.1007/s001670000130.
- 687 76. Rudolph KS, Axe MJ, Buchanan TS, Scholz JP, Snyder-Mackler L. Dynamic stability in the anterior
688 cruciate ligament deficient knee. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2001;9(2):62-71.
- 689 77. Rudolph KS, Snyder-Mackler L. Effect of dynamic stability on a step task in ACL deficient individuals.
690 *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2004;14(5):565-75.
- 691 78. Schmitt LC, Paterno MV, Ford KR, Myer GD, Hewett TE. Strength Asymmetry and Landing
692 Mechanics at Return to Sport after Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Med Sci Sports*
693 *Exerc.* 2015;47(7):1426–1434. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000560.
- 694 79. Schutte MJ, Dabezies EJ, Zimny ML, Happelt LT. Neural anatomy of the human anterior cruciate
695 ligament. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1987;69:243–247.
- 696 80. Serpell BG, Scarvell JM, Ball NB, Smith PN. Mechanisms and risk factors for noncontact ACL injury
697 in age mature athletes who engage in field or court sports: a summary of the literature since 1980.
698 *J Strength Cond Res.* 2012;26:3160-3176.
- 699 81. Shanbehzadeh S, Bandpei MAM, Ehsani F. Knee muscle activity during gait in patients with anterior
700 cruciate ligament injury: a systematic review of electromyographic studies. *Knee Surg Sports*
701 *Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2017;25:1432–1442. doi:10.1007/s00167-015-3925-9.

- 702 82. Sigward SM, Powers CM. Loading characteristics of females exhibiting excessive valgus moments
703 during cutting. *Clin Biomech.* 2007;22(7): 827–833. doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2007.04.003.
- 704 83. Straus SE, Glasziou P, Richardson WS, Haynes RB. *Evidence-based medicine: how to practice and*
705 *teach EBM.* 4th ed (reprint). Edinburgh: Elsevier Churchill Livingstone; 2011.
- 706 84. Swanik CB, Lephart SM, Swanik KA, Stone DA, Fu FH. Neuromuscular dynamic restraint in women
707 with anterior cruciate ligament injuries. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2004;425:189-99.
- 708 85. Swanik CB, Lephart SM, Giraldo JL, Demont RG, Fu FH. Reactive muscle firing of anterior cruciate
709 ligament-injured females during functional activities. *J Athl Train.* 1999;34(2):121-9.
- 710 86. Tan SH, Lau BP, Khin LW, Lingaraj K. The importance of patient sex in the outcomes of anterior
711 cruciate ligament reconstructions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med.*
712 2016;44(1):242-54. doi:10.1177/0363546515573008.
- 713 87. Tegner Y, Lysholm J. Rating systems in the evaluation of knee ligament injuries. *Clin Orthop Relat*
714 *Res.* 1985;198:43-49.
- 715 88. Theisen D, Rada I, Brau A, Gette P, Seil R. Muscle Activity Onset Prior to Landing in Patients after
716 Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One.* Published
717 online May 11, 2016. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0155277
- 718 89. Undheim MB, Cosgrave C, King E, Strike S, Marshall B, Falvey E, Franklyn-Miller A. Isokinetic
719 muscle strength and readiness to return to sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction:
720 is there an association? A systematic review and a protocol recommendation. *Br J Sports Med*
721 2015;49:1305-1310.
- 722 90. Unnithan VB, Dowling JJ, Frost G, Volpe Ayub B, Bar-Or O. Cocontraction and phasic activity during
723 GAIT in children with cerebral palsy. *Electromyogr Clin Neurophysiol.* 1996 Dec;36(8):487-494.
- 724 91. van Melick N, van Cingel REH, Tijssen MPW, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MWG. Assessment of
725 functional performance after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a systematic review of
726 measurement procedures. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2013;21:869-879.
- 727 92. van Melick N, van Cingel REH, Brooijmans F, Neeter C, van Tienen T, Hullegie W, Nijhuis-van der
728 Sanden MWG. Evidence-based clinical practice update: practice guidelines for anterior cruciate
729 ligament rehabilitation based on a systematic review and multidisciplinary consensus. *Br J Sports*
730 *Med.* 2016;50:1506-1515.

- 731 93. Waldén M, Hägglund M, Werner J, Ekstrand J. The epidemiology of anterior cruciate ligament injury
732 in football (soccer): a review of the literature from a gender-related perspective. *Knee Surg Sports*
733 *Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2011;19:3-10.
- 734 94. Webster KE, Feller JA. A research update on the state of play for return to sport after anterior
735 cruciate ligament reconstruction. *J Orthop Traumatol.* 2019 Jan 28;20(1):10. doi: 10.1186/s10195-
736 018-0516-9.
- 737 95. Wellsandt E, Failla MJ, Snyder-Mackler L. Limb Symmetry Indexes can overestimate knee function
738 after ACL injury. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2017;Mar 29:1-18. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2017.7285.
- 739 96. Wright RW, Magnussen RA, Dunn WR, Spindler KP. Ipsilateral Graft and Contralateral ACL Rupture
740 at Five Years or More Following ACL Reconstruction. A Systematic Review. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.*
741 2011;93(12):1159–1165.
- 742 97. Zazulak BT, Paterno M, Myer GD, Romani WA, Hewett TE. The effects of the menstrual cycle on
743 anterior knee laxity: a systematic review. *Sports Med.* 2006;36:847-862.
- 744 98. Zebis MK, Andersen CH, Bencke J, Ørntoft C, Linnebjerg C, Hölmich P, Thorborg K, Aagaard P,
745 Andersen LL. Neuromuscular coordination deficit persists 12 Months after ACL reconstruction but
746 can be modulated by 6 Weeks of Kettlebell training: A case study in Women's Elite Soccer
747 [published online ahead of print Jan 18, 2017]. *Case Rep Orthop.* 2017;2017:4269575. doi:
748 10.1155/2017/4269575.
- 749 99. Zimny ML, Schutte M, Dabezies E. Mechanoreceptors in the human anterior cruciate ligament. *Anat*
750 *Rec.* 1986;214:204–209.




Figure 1: Flowchart of literature search according to PRISMA guidelines⁴⁹

Table 1: Overview of PICOS⁸³ criteria for key word definitions

Parameter	Criteria
Participants (P)	Adult people (age of 18 – 65 years) who sustained an ACL injury, either treated conservatively or surgically (repaired with an autograft)
Intervention (I)	Assessment of neuromuscular control, active knee stability, sensorimotor control, active stability of the lower limb or similar during dynamic activities
Control (C)	Uninjured limb / contralateral side or contralateral lower limb of the ACL-injured participant, or a healthy control group
Outcomes (O)	Any EMG-related outcome describing neuromuscular activity/control in domains of time, amplitude etc.; parameters describing EMG activity of lower limb muscles; related to EMG variables, such as amplitude, timing, mean or peak activity, duration of activity, onset and offset / on-off-pattern respectively, pre-activity, latency, reflex response (Shanbehzadeh et al., 2017; Theisen et al., 2016)
Study design (S)	Any laboratory or interventional study, cross-sectional or longitudinal, randomized controlled trials, clinically controlled trials without randomization, laboratory/experimental controlled trials etc.

Table 2: Risk of Bias assessment with the adapted Downs & Black checklist^{20,62,73}

Authors & year	Design	Reporting								External validity			Internal validity										Power	Score	Rating				
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	20	21	22	23	24				25	26	27	Total
Alkjaer et al.	2003	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	14	medium	
Alkjaer et al.	2002	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	1	0	15	medium	
Arnason et al.	2014	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	1	X	0	15	medium	
Boerboom et al.	2001	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	X	X	1	X	X	1	0	1	0	0	X	X	X	1	X	0	11	high	
Briem et al.	2016	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	1	18	low	
Bryant et al.	2009	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	X	1	X	0	16	medium	
Bulgheroni et al.	1997	CCS	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	X	X	1	X	X	1	0	1	1	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	9	high	
Busch et al.	2019	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	14	medium
Cordeiro et al.	2015	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	14	medium	
Dashti Rostami et al.	2019	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	15	medium	
Gokeler et al.	2010	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high	
Hansen et al.	2017	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high	
Jordan et al.	2016	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	14	medium	
Klyne et al.	2012	CCS	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high	
Knoll et al.	2004	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	X	X	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	10	high	
Kuster et al.	1995	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	X	X	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high
Lessi & Serrao	2017	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	1	14	medium	
Lessi et al.	2018	R ₂ CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	0	X	X	1	X	1	17	low	
Lustosa et al.	2011	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	0	17	low	
Madhavan & Shields	2011	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	9	high	
Nyland et al.	2010	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	0	X	0	17	low	
Nyland et al.	2013	R ₂ CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	0	18	low	
Nyland et al.	2014	CS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	X	1	X	X	1	X	0	17	low	
Oliver et al.	2018	P ₂ CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	IC	1	X	X	IC	X	0	14	medium	
Ortiz et al.	2008	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	11	high	
Ortiz et al.	2011	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	10	high	
Ortiz et al.	2014	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	0	1	0	15	medium
Patras et al.	2012	CCS	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	X	0	0	X	X	0	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	8	high	
Patras et al.	2010	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	13	medium	
Patras et al.	2009	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	0	1	1	IC	X	X	X	IC	X	0	12	medium	
Pincheira	2018	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	13	medium	
Rudolph et al.	2000	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	0	15	medium	
Rudolph et al.	2001	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	0	15	medium	
Rudolph & Snyder-Mackler	2000	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	0	13	medium	
Swanik et al.	2004	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	1	13	medium	
Swanik et al.	1999	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	10	high	
Zebis et al.	2017	CS	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	11	high	

Legend: CCS = case-control study, CS = case study, R = retrospective (secondary analysis), P = prospective, RoB = risk of bias, X = not applicable or unclear, IC = intrasubject comparison (injured leg versus healthy leg); green = from database search

Colours: green = database searches; blue = handsearch out of reference lists of included studies

Table 3: Participants' characteristics of included studies

Author & Year	Number of participants (age, sex, group-specific inclusion criteria)	Diagnosis & treatment (only ACL)	Level of activity or sports (RTA, RTS, RTP)	Intervention Group	Control Group 1 (ACL patients)	Control Group 2 (healthy people)	significant difference between groups?
Alkjaer et al. 2002	N = 23 all male; N = 17 males with complete ACLD, N = 6 healthy controls	complete ACLD, min. 6months of rehab program after injury; Lysholm and Tegner scores applied to separate ACLD-participants in copers and non-copers	min. 2h/wk	N=8; male copers; weight: 76.6 kg (SD, 14.8); height: 1.81 m (SD, 0.06), age: 26.0 years (SD, 4.0); mean Lysholm & Tegner scores: 85.5 (SD, 5.3) and 6.25 (SD, 0.5), respectively, mean time after injury: 34.0 months (SD, 39.2) (range 6.0–120.0)	N=9; male non-copers; weight: 80.6 kg (SD, 7.1); height: 1.79 m (SD, 0.06), age: 31.2 years (SD, 6.0); mean Lysholm & Tegner scores: 74.0 (SD, 7.1) and 3.8 (SD, 0.6), respectively; mean time after injury: 51.8 months (SD, 44.0) (range 6.0–144.0)	N=6; male healthy; weight: 73.8 kg (SD, 7.9), height: 1.81 m (SD, 0.05), age: 31.0 years (SD, 1)	no
Alkjaer et al. 2003	N = 29; N = 19, all male, complete chronic (post-injury time 6 months or more) ACLD and N = 10 healthy males as controls for EMG	complete chronic ACLD, min. 6months of rehab program after injury, ACL injury clinically diagnosed by experienced orthopaedic surgeons with Lachman, Anterior Drawer and Pivot-Shift Tests; Lysholm and Tegner scores applied to separate ACLD-participants in copers and non-copers	min. 2h/wk of physical activity	N=9; male copers; (mass: 76.7 (14.3)kg, height: 1.81 (0.06)m, age: 28.3 (6.1) years); mean Lysholm & Tegner scores: 87.1 (5.8) and 6.1 (0.6) respectively; mean time after injury: 39.1 (42.3) (range 6.0–120.0) months	N=10; male non-copers; mass: 80.4 kg (SD, 6.7); height: 1.79 m (SD, 0.05), age: 31.7 years (SD, 5.9); mean Lysholm & Tegner scores: 74.0 (SD, 7.1) and 3.8 (SD, 0.6), respectively; mean time after injury: 55.0 months (SD, 42.7) (range 6.0–144.0)	N=10; male healthy; mass: 77.5 kg (SD, 7.9), height: 1.82 m (SD, 0.05), age: 31.0 years (SD, 2.8)	no
Arnason et al. 2014	N = 36; N = 18, female and male soccer players with ACLR (post-injury time 1 - 6 years) and N = 18 healthy female and male soccer players from the same team (men's and women's top league in Iceland), matched for gender, height, body mass and "involved" side designation, as controls	ACLR: successful return to full participation in soccer; no muscle strain injury in knee flexors in past 3 months, no orthopaedic condition excluding from soccer	full participation in soccer (Icelandic top leagues)	N = 8 males, N = 10 females → N=18 ACLR participants in total; all participants mean mass: 69.2 (11.8)kg, height: 1.73 (0.09)m, age: 23.7 (3.6) years; mean BMI 23.0 (2.4)kg/m ² ; left/right dominance 2/16; involved/uninvolved is the dominant leg 8/10; time since injury 1 - 6 years	n.a.	N = 8 males, N = 10 females → N=18 healthy participants in total; all participants mean mass: 68.6 (11.2)kg, height: 1.73 (0.08)m, age: 20.5 (3.7) years; mean BMI 22.7 (2.0)kg/m ²	no

Boerboom et al. 2001	N = 20; N = 10 ACLD (5 copers, 5 noncopers), N = 10 controls	ACLD: ACL rupture confirmed by physical examination and arthroscopy, conservative treatment	before injury: all ACLD participants at level I (of the International Knee Documentation Committee, IKDC, score), after injury: level I (all copers), level II and III (noncopers)	N = 5 copers (all males) with ACLD, median age 32 years, range 21–46, median time between primary injury and gait analysis: 39 months (13–67), acting at same level of sports and daily activities (level I) as before the injury	N = 5 noncopers (3 males, 2 females) with ACLD, with functional instability, median age 27 years, range 23–35, median time between injury and gait analysis: 22 months (16–87), acting at lower level (4 at level III, 1 at level II)	N = 10 healthy males, without a history of knee injury, median age was 22 years (range 18–24)	no in patient groups (age, time between injury and gait analysis), in comparison with healthy controls: n.s.
Briem et al. 2016	N = 36; N = 18, female players with ACLR (post-injury time 1 - 6 years) and N = 18 healthy female players from the same team (from Icelandic women's top league in handball, football, basketball), matched for gender, height, body mass and "involved" side designation, as controls	no information about diagnosis or treatment; exclusion criteria: current musculoskeletal injury, lower lomb muscle strain within 3 previous months, not being able to do single-limb hops	ACLR: successful return to competition with their teams; healthy: full participation in soccer (Icelandic top leagues)	N = 18 females, ACLR, recruited via advertisement from teams competing in the top leagues in three sports team handball (n = 5), basketball (n = 4), and football (n = 9)]. In 12 instances, the surgical limb was the individual's dominant one. Characteristics: mean mass: 67.2 (7.8)kg, height: 1.714 (0.05)m, age: 22.7 (3.5) years; mean BMI 22.8 (2.4)kg/m ² ; involved/uninvolved is the dominant leg 12/18; time since injury 1 - 6 years	n.a.	N = 18 healthy females recruited from the same teams, matched for age, height, weight. Characteristics mean mass: 66.3 (7.1)kg, height: 1.708 (0.05)m, age: 21.5 (2.7) years; mean BMI 22.7 (2.2)kg/m ² ;	no
Bryant et al. 2009	N = 59; N = 10 male with ACLD (18–35 years); N = 27 matched males with ACLR (14 with patella tendon graft, 13 with combined semitendinosus and gracilis graft); N = 22 matched-controls	Cincinnati Knee Rating System (0 - 100 points); ACLD: full ROM, neg. Lachman, neg. Pivot-Shift; confirmed isolated ACL rupture (arthroscopic) min. 1yr before testing; same orthopaedic surgeon for all ACLR	n.s., but hopping required	N = 10 male with ACLD (18–	N = 27 matched males with ACLR (14 wi	N = 22 matched (age, activity level, anthropometrics), healthy controls no history of trauma or disease in either knee and no evidence of abnormality on clinical examination	no
Bulgheroni et al. 1997	N = 30 all males; N = 15 with ACLR, N = 10 with ACLD, N = 5 healthy controls	ACLR: BPTB graft	normal activity	N = 15 males with ACLR, age 25 ± 3 yearst, time after reconstruction: 17 ± 5 months, normal activity	N = 10 males with ACLD, age 27 ± 6 years, mean time after injury: 20.4 months after injury (range 8–48 months), knee instability	N = 5 males, healthy controls, age 28 ± 3 years, no history of musculoskeletal pathology	n.s.

Busch et al. 2019	N = 20; N = 10 ACL-R (age: 26 ± 10 years; height: 175 ± 6 cm; mass: 75 ± 14 kg) and N = 10 healthy matched controls (age: 31 ± 7 years; height: 175 ± 7 cm; mass: 68 ± 10 kg)	N = 10 ACLR (13.2 ± 2 months since repair), quadriceps tendon graft by same surgeon, some with additional injuries which needed surgery;	Tegner Score mind. 4	N = 10 ACLR participants; age 26 ± 10 years, height 175 ± 7 cm, weight 75 ± 14 kg, 3 females & 7 males, Tegner 7 ± 2	n.a.	N = 10 healthy participants (ACL-I) without prior injury of the knee, age 31 ± 7 years, height 175 ± 8 cm, weight 68 ± 10 kg, 3 females & 7 males, Tegner 6 ± 1; matched according to age, height, weight, gender, (sports) activity level and leg dominance	no
Cordeiro et al. 2015	N = 17 male players from Portuguese Soccer League; N = 8 with ACLR and N = 9 healthy controls	ACL-R: mind. 6 months post-surgery on dominant leg, bone-tendon-bone arthroscopy, no problems at end of physiotherapy phase	soccer, professional level	N = 8 N = 8 professional male soccer players (age = 24.6 ± 3.5 years, height = 1.83 ± 0.06 m, mass = 77.3 ± 7 kg) with ACLR mind. 6 months since surgery	n.a.	N = 9 healthy controls; professional male soccer players (age = 24.0 ± 3.5 years, height = 1.76 ± 0.05 m, mass = 72.9 ± 3.5 kg), no knee or leg injuries or previous ACL surgeries	no
Dashti Rostami et al. 2019	N = 36; N = 12 ACL-D, N = 12 ACL-R; N = 12 healthy controls; all male athletes	for patients: primary unilateral ACL injury	athletes, regular sports participation, ACLD = copers	N = 12 males, 18 to 36 months post-ACLR	N = 12 males, 18 to 36 months after ACL rupture (= ACLD, copers); grade 2 or 3 rupture including the following definition of copers: athletes with ACLD for at least 18 months, no symptoms of knee instability during regular sports participation	N = 12 healthy males, matched controls; no knee injury, no knee pain	no
Gokeler et al. 2010	N = 29; N = 9 ACLR patients, N = 11 healthy controls	ACLR: six months after surgery, isolated ACL lesion, no major meniscal or cartilage lesion, normal limb alignment, no relevant previous surgery at any other joint of the limbs, same rehab program at same institution, unrestricted RTS allowed after 9 months post-surgery	level I-II athletes	N = 9 ACLR patients (6 males, 3 females), mean age 28.4 ± 9.7 years, 27 ± 1.5 weeks postoperatively (BPTB technique, same surgeon),	n.a.	N = 11 healthy subjects (8 males, 3 females), level I-II athletes,	n.s.

Hansen et al. 2017	N = 37; N = 18 male patients, N = 19 healthy participants	ACL: discharged from rehabilitation facility,	ready to return to on-fields sports specific activity	N = 19 male ACL at the end of their rehabilitation and allowed to running, 7 ± 2 months post-surgery; N = 8 with a BPTB graft, age 27 ± 7.69 years, weight 80.40 ± 9.44 kg, height: 178.49 ± 7.29 cm; N = 10 with a hamstring graft, age 26 ± 3.84 years, weight 74.16 ± 7.19 kg, height 176.89 ± 5.6 cm,	n.a.	N = 19 injury-free male controls, age 35.4 ± 7.8 years, weight 77.6 ± 8.4 kg, height 179.1 ± 5.6 cm	n.s.
Jordan et al. 2016	N = 22; N = 11 ACL, N = 11 control; elite skiing athletes from Canada's national alpine skiing and skier cross team,	ACL: primary ACL injury, at least 12 months post-surgery, actively competing athletes at the Federation International de Ski World Cup level with full medical clearance to compete	elite ski racers, Tegner activity score 10, competing at international level	N = 11 actively competing ACL skiers (females, n = 5: age = 23.6 ± 1.8 yr, mass = 61.0 ± 5.3 kg; males, n = 6: age = 26.5 ± 5.8 yr, mass = 84.4 ± 9.0 kg; 7 subjects with ST autograft, 1 with BPTB autograft, 3 with cadaver allograft	n.a.	N = 11 matched controls with no history of ACL injury (females, n = 5: age = 21.8 ± 3.2 yr, mass = 63.7 ± 4.6 kg; males, n = 6: age = 23.3 ± 3.3 yr, mass = 84.7 ± 5.1 kg; active competitors at the international level defined as participation in the Federation International de Ski World Cup circuit	n.s.
Klyne et al. 2012	N = 26; N = 15 ACLD, N = 11 healthy controls	ACLD: chronic, unilateral ACL rupture demonstrated with a positive pivot shift and confirmed by orthopaedic surgeon, plus a history of subjective stability and a right skill preference in the lower limb, without previous ACL surgery	active in at least one sport	N = 15 ACLD, 10 males and 5 females, 28 ± 7 years, average time since injury of 34 months (±17 months), sustained injury while playing sport	n.a.	N = 11 healthy controls, 9 males, 2 females (29 ± 8 years), active in at least one sport, no other musculoskeletal problems, right skill preferred in their lower limb, matched for age and activity level	n.s.

Knoll et al. 2004	N = 76; N = 25 ACLR (pre- and postsurgery), N = 51 healthy controls	no previous injury, no meniscal damage, BPTB graft, rehabilitation program	non-professional athletes pursuing some sports two to three times a week.	N = 25 with ACLD (before surgery, later ACLR), 18 males, 7 females; first subgroup: 9 male with acute ACLD (mean age: 29.86±6.52 years, mean height 1.77±0.8 metres, mean mass 81.40 kg±9.06 kg); second subgroup: 9 males with chronic ACLD (mean age: 39.70±2.1 years, mean height: 1.70±0.21 metres, mean mass: 88.1±20.2 kg) and 7 females with chronic ACLD (mean age: 30.31±9.48 years, mean height: 1.64±0.32 metres, mean mass: 62.0±8.4 kg). The chronic ACL-deficient group was examined an average of 28.2 months after injury (ranging from 24 to 52 months), but before surgery	same population of ACLD, but after surgery → ACLR, measured at 6 weeks, 4, 8 and 12 months post-surgery	N = 51 healthy controls, 31 males, 20 females, mean age: 31.70±4.1 years, mean height: 1.71±0.12 metres, mean mass 72.1±25.2 kg, no pathology that would affect gait, unfamiliar with treadmill walking	n.s.
Kuster et al. 1995	N = 33; N = 21 with ACLD, N = 12 healthy controls	ACLD: arthroscopically confirmed complete ACL ruptures at least 1 year previously	ACLD: Tegner activity scores 6-10 (mean 8.2) before injury and 3-9 (mean 5.3) after injury; controls: Tegner activity scores range 4-8 (mean 6.1)	N = 19 with 21 ACLD, mean age: 28.2 years (range 19-42), mean height: 174.1cm (156-187.6), mean weight: 77.9kg (50-112), mean time since injury: 45 months (range of 12-108), mean Lysholm score 82 (range 55-100),	n.a.	N = 12 healthy controls, similar in height and weight, mean height: 171.2 cm and weight 70.8 kg, no lower limb injury	unclear (similar for height and weight)
Lessi & Serrao 2017	N = 40; N = 20 with ACLR, N = 20 healthy controls	ACLR: non-contact ACL injury, unilateral reconstruction of the ACL with no prior history of a contralateral ACL injury, no recent history of an ankle, hip, spine, or contralateral knee injury in the past 12 months; rehabilitation completed, cleared to RTS by both their physician and physical therapist	recreational sports, meaning aerobic or athletic activity at least three times per week	N = 20 with ACLR, 13 male, 7 female, at least 12 months post-surgery, 13 with hamstring ipsilateral autografts, 7 with BPTB ipsilateral autograft),	n.a.	N = 20 healthy controls, 13 male, 7 female, no history of any dysfunction or previous joint trauma, no prior history of ACL injury or injury of lower extremity in last 12 months; were matched by age, sex, weight, and current sporting activity type	no

Lessi et al. 2018	N = 14 ACLR (7 males, 7 females) from study of Lessi & Serrao, 2017	non-contact ACL injury; unilateral ACLR with autologous ipsilateral graft at least 12 months before recruitment; undergone a rehabilitation program; returned to sports participation; no contralateral ACL injury	recreational sports	N = 7 males ACLR, age 23.90 ± 2.80 years, height 1.80 ± 0.1m, body mass 83.3 ± 7.8 kg, 3 with BPTB graft, 4 with flexor tendons grafts	N = 7 females ACLR, age 24.7 ± 5.3 years, height 1.63 ± 0.1m, body mass 65.9 ± 9.0 kg, 2 with BPTB graft, 5 with flexor tendons grafts	n.a.	no, except men were taller than women (P < 0.001) and performed a higher number of sets of the protocol before becoming fatigued their reconstructed limb (P = 0.006).
Lustosa et al. 2011	N = 25 ACLR; N = 15 with Cincinnati Knee Rating System (CKRS) > 90 points (full RTS), N = 10 with CKRS < 85 points (limited RTS)	at least 2 years post-surgery, same rehabilitation program which allowed full RTS activities 7 months post-surgery	full RTS allowed, not further specified	N = 10 ACLR with CKRS 77.30 ± 6.14 points, age 33.4 ± 7.53 years, time between injury and surgery 52.20 ± 31.33 months, 3 with associated meniscal injuries, 7 without	N = 15 ACLR with CKRS 96.87 ± 2.75 points, age 34.5 ± 8.85 years, time between injury and surgery 67.3 ± 28.5 months, 3 with associated meniscal injuries, 12 without	n.a.	no
Madhavan & Shields 2011	N = 24 all female; N = 12 with ACLR, N = 12 healthy controls	complete reconstruction of the ACL with BPTB or HS autograft, ability to climb stairs without difficulty, full joint ROM, SR-36, KOOS, IKDC	regular physical activity, TAS	N = 12 females ACLR, age 22.4 ± 2.4 yrs, mean time from surgery 3.7 ± 1.8 yrs, weight 144.1 ± 19kg, height 164.5 ± 5.28cm, Tegner (current) 7.1 ± 2.4	n.a.	N = 12 healthy females, no previous history of knee pathology, age 24.1 ± 3.2 yrs, weight 136.5 ± 20.3kg, height 163.8 ± 7.3cm, Tegner (current) 6.9 ± 2.1; matched to age,	no
Nyland et al. 2010	N = 70 ACLR; N = 35 males; N = 35 females, 5.3 ± 3 years after surgery	minimum of 2 years since unilateral primary ACL reconstruction with allografts performed by same surgeon, standard rehabilitation program with sufficient adherence	met or exceeded standard accepted return-to-sports activity goals of a minimum 85% bilateral equivalence with single-leg hop-for-distance testing and 60°/s isokinetic peak knee extensor and flexor torque testing	N = 35 males with ACLR, age ?, height 180.3 ± 6.9cm, weight 88.9 ± 13.3kg, time after surgery 5.6 ± 3.2 yrs	N = 35 females with ACLR, age ?, height 166.6 ± 7.1cm, weight 68.2 ± 18.9kg, time after surgery 5.1 ± 2.6 yrs	n.a.	n.s.

Nyland et al. 2013	N = 70 ACLR; 35 male and 35 females, 5.3 ± 3 years after surgery; secondary analysis of Nyland et al., 2010	minimum of 2 years since unilateral primary ACL reconstruction with allografts performed by same surgeon, standard rehabilitation program with sufficient adherence	met or exceeded standard accepted return-to-sports activity goals of a minimum 85% bilateral equivalence with single-leg hop-for-distance testing and 60°/s isokinetic peak knee extensor and flexor torque testing;	N = 24 ACLR well-trained/frequently sporting, 50% males, age at surgery 29.8 ± 11.4 yrs, height 172.5 ± 8.6 cm, weight 77.1 ± 18.2 kg, time post-surgery 5.7 ± 2.8 yrs, IKDC 87.3 ± 11.5	N = 26 ACLR only sporting sometimes, 50% males, age at surgery 33.1 ± 13.5 yrs, height 171.7 ± 9.7 cm, weight 79.4 ± 23.2 kg, time post-surgery 5.4 ± 3.1 yrs, IKDC 87.3 ± 11.5	no healthy control group, but N = 20 ACLR highly competitive subjects, 50% males, age at surgery 26.5 ± 9.4 yrs, height 176.5 ± 9.4 cm, weight 76.8 ± 13.9 kg, time post-surgery 4.6 ± 3.0 yrs, IKDC 91.0 ± 9.4	no
Nyland et al. 2014	N = 65 ACLR; 32 male and 33 females, 5.2 ± 2.9 years after surgery; Subject group assignments were made based on how they responded to the following question: "Compared to prior to your knee injury how capable are you now in performing sports activities", very capable (group 1 → see field for healthy controls), capable (group 2), or not capable (group 3)?	minimum of 2 years since unilateral primary ACL reconstruction with allografts performed by same surgeon, standard rehabilitation program with sufficient adherence	met or exceeded standard accepted return-to-sports activity goals of a minimum 85% bilateral equivalence with single-leg hop-for-distance testing and 60°/s isokinetic peak knee extensor and flexor torque testing	N = 23 "capable = group 2", 52.2% males, age at surgery 29.3 [24.1, 34.4] yrs, height 172.8 [168.4, 177.3]cm, weight 76.8 [68.3, 85.2] kg, time post-surgery 5.4 [4.2, 6.6] yrs, IKDC 87.2 [82.1, 92.4]	N = 22 "not capable = group 3", 45.5% males, age at surgery 33.6 (26.4, 39.1) yrs, height 172.1 [167.1, 177.1]cm, weight 79.7 [68.0, 91.3] kg, time post-surgery 5.2 [3.8, 6.5] yrs, IKDC 78.6 [71.7, 85.5]	no healthy control group, but N = 20 "very capable = group 1", 50% males, age at surgery 26.5 [21.9, 31.8] yrs, height 176.5 [170.4, 180.1]cm, weight 76.8 [67.4, 80.3]kg, time post-surgery 4.6 [2.8, 6.2] yrs, IKDC 91.0 [84.1, 94.6]	no
Oliver et al. 2018	N = 25 ACLD, mean age 22 ± 4.61 years, mean mass 71.18 ± 10.57 kg, mean height was 177.55 ± 9.69 cm; N = 18 males (72%); N = 2 lost to follow-up due to personal issues, all remaining 23 patients concluded the study (pre-surgery, 4 and 6 months post-surgery for questionnaires, at 6 months for jumps)	complete ACL tear was based on clinical symptoms, on positive Lachman's and pivot shift tests, and was confirmed by magnetic resonance imaging; reconstruction 2–3 months after the injury by same surgeon using BTB-technique,	more than 200 h of sports activity per year, including jumping, pivoting and twisting actions	injured knee	non-injured knee	n.a.	n.a.

Ortiz et al. 2008	N = 28 females; N = 13 ACLR, N = 15 non-injured controls	not controlled for graft/surgery or rehabilitation protocol (only similarities); at least 1 year postsurgery, no multiple surgeries on the same knee	recreational fitness activities such as jogging, running, and weight lifting, none of the participants formed part of any intercollegiate, varsity, or competitive sport team	N = 14 physically active young women with ACLR (age, 25.4 ± 3.1 years; height, 167.5 ± 5.9 cm; body mass, 63.2 ± 6.7 kg; mean time after surgery 7.2 ± 4.2 years (1–16 years after reconstruction); N = 9 with BPTB graft, N = 3 with gracilis-ST-graft, N = 2 with Achilles tendon graft; N = 1 excluded due to inability to perform tasks	n.a.	N = 15 healthy, noninjured young women from physiotherapy school (age, 24.6 ± 2.6 years; height, 164.7 ± 6.5 cm; body mass, 58.4 ± 8.9 kg)	n.s.
Ortiz et al. 2011	N = 28 females; N = 13 ACLR, N = 15 non-injured controls (same group as for Ortiz et al., 2008)	not controlled for graft/surgery or rehabilitation protocol (only similarities); at least 1 year postsurgery, no multiple surgeries on the same knee	recreational fitness activities such as jogging, running, and weight lifting, none of the participants formed part of any intercollegiate, varsity, or competitive sport team	N = 14 physically active young women with ACLR (age, 25.4 ± 3.1 years; height, 167.5 ± 5.9 cm; body mass, 63.2 ± 6.7 kg; mean time after surgery 7.2 ± 4.2 years (1–16 years after reconstruction); N = 9 with BPTB graft, N = 3 with gracilis-ST-graft, N = 2 with Achilles tendon graft; N = 1 excluded due to inability to perform tasks	n.a.	N = 15 healthy, noninjured young women from physiotherapy school (age, 24.6 ± 2.6 years; height, 164.7 ± 6.5 cm; body mass, 58.4 ± 8.9 kg)	n.s.
Ortiz et al. 2014	N = 31 females; N = 15 ACLR, N = 16 healthy females	ACLR: same orthopaedic surgeon, same rehabilitation protocol, N = 13 were injured while participating in competitive volleyball at the collegiate or professional level; at least 12 months post-surgery, full RTS allowed (without restrictions) to pre-injury level	sports-specific physical activities as described by the Activity Rating Scale, scores from 12 to 16, consistent with activities such as running, cutting, decelerating, and pivoting more than 2 times per week, = high level of participation	N = 15 ACLR with SG graft, age range 21 - 35 years (height: 167.71 ± 9.0 cm, body mass: 67.68 ± 11.66 kg), time since surgery was between 12 months and 5 years, full RTS allowed (pre-injury level); N = 1 drop-out due to inability to perform tasks	n.a.	N = 16 healthy females, participating in volleyball, basketball, and soccer at the collegiate or intramural sports level, age range 21 - 35 years, height: 160.50 ± 5.17 cm, body mass: 59.35 ± 10.37 kg	no for age and activity, no for height and weight

Patras et al. 2012	N = 28 males; N = 14 ACLR and N = 14 healthy controls	ACLR: performed sub-acute within 6 months after the injury from the same surgeon (range 1 to 4 months), unilateral ACL tear confirmed by MRI and arthroscopy; full RTS allowed 6 months post-surgery	competitive soccer players	N = 14 ACLR with BPTB autograft, age 24.8 ± 5.3 years, weight 77.3 ± 7.5 kg and height 177 ± 5.3 cm, mean time since surgery 18.5 ± 4.3 months; Tegner 8 (range 7-9), Lysholm score 95 (range 94 - 100).	n.a.	N = 14 healthy male controls, age 21.7 ± 4.4 years, weight 72.2 ± 8.3 kg and height 180 ± 9.0 cm	
Patras et al. 2010	N = 28 males; N = 14 ACLR, N = 14 healthy controls	ACLR: unilateral ACL tear confirmed by MRI and arthroscopy, BPTB graft, performed within 6 months after injury, same surgeon, same rehabilitation, RTS permitted after 6 months post-surgery	amateur soccer players	N = 14 males with ACLR, mean age: 24.8 ± 5.3 years; mean height: 177 ± 5.3 cm, mean weight 77.3 ± 7.5 kg, time since surgery: mean 18.5 ± 4.3 months, pre-injury level of sports participation, median Lysholm score 95 (range 94–100) and Tegner score 8 (range 7–9)	n.a.	N = 14 healthy males, mean age: 21.7 ± 4.4 years; mean height: 180 ± 9.0 cm, mean weight 72.2 ± 8.3 kg, never suffered of any kind of orthopaedic or neurological condition; left leg = control leg	n.s.
Patras et al. 2009	N = 9 males with ACLR	ACLR: unilateral ACL tear confirmed by MRI and arthroscopy, BPTB graft within 6 months after injury, same rehabilitation protocol, RTS permitted 6 months post-surgery	athletes, amateur soccer players, at least Tegner 7	N = 9 males with ACLR, mean age: 27.7 ± 3.5 years, mean weight: 79.5 ± 7.3 kg, mean height: 178 ± 5.9 cm, mean time since surgery: 19.2 ± 5.7 months, median Lysholm score: 95 (range 94–96), Tegner score: 8 (range 7–9), resumed their sports activities	n.a.	n.a., non-injured side respectively	n.a.
Pincheira et al. 2018	N = 50 male soccer players; N = 25 with unilateral ACLR, N = 25 uninjured controls	ACLR: unilateral ACLR with ST-gracilis graft, same surgical team, at least 6 months post-surgery; non-contact mechanism during soccer match on the dominant limb	amateur soccer players, playing at least 2x/week	N = 25 males with ACLR, age 28.36 ± 7.87 years; weight 77.56 ± 6.35 kg, height 169 ± 7 cm, time after surgery 9 ± 3 months, time between ACL injury and surgery 3.4 ± 1 months; at time of measurements cleared for full RTS	n.a.	N = 25 healthy males, age 24.16 ± 2.67 years; weight 78.16 ± 5.46 kg, height 172 ± 5 cm; without injury or surgery on lower limb	no

Rudolph et al. 2000	one component of a larger study; N = 31; N = 10 healthy controls, N = 11 ACLD copers, N = 10 ACLD non-copers	ACLD: full range of motion in both knees, no visible or palpable knee effusion, no symptoms of locking, an uninjured, healthy knee	athletes, regular activity in level I sports (involving jumping, pivoting, and hard cutting) and level II sports (involving lateral motions) before injury	N = 11 ACLD copers (2 females, 9 males), ages 22–43 years, mean 30.7, high-level athletes with ACLD for at least 1 year (confirmed by MRI, any knee instability during regular participation in level I and II sports, no more than one episode of giving way, even during sports, since injury	N = 10 noncopers ACLD (4 females, 6 males), ages 16–43 years, mean 28.1; more than one episode of giving way since injury, instability during ADL, not returned to sports	N = 10 uninjured individuals, matched by age and activity level to the copers subjects (2 females, 8 men), ages 23–41 years, means 32.2)	n.s.
Rudolph et al. 2001	one component of a larger study; N = 31; N = 10 healthy controls, N = 11 ACLD copers, N = 10 ACLD non-copers	ACLD: full range of motion in both knees, no visible or palpable knee effusion, no symptoms of locking, an uninjured, healthy knee	athletes, regular activity in level I sports (involving jumping, pivoting, and hard cutting) and level II sports (involving lateral motions) before injury	N = 11 ACLD copers (2 females, 9 males), ages 22–43 years, mean 30.7, high-level athletes with ACLD for at least 1 year (confirmed by MRI, any knee instability during regular participation in level I and II sports, no more than one episode of giving way, even during sports, since injury	N = 10 noncopers ACLD (4 females, 6 males), ages 16–43 years, mean 28.1; more than one episode of giving way since injury, instability during ADL, not returned to sports	N = 10 uninjured individuals, matched by age and activity level to the copers subjects (2 females, 8 men), ages 23–41 years, means 32.2)	no (age and joint laxity)
Rudolph & Snyder-Mackler 2000	one component of a larger study; N = 31; N = 10 healthy controls, N = 11 ACLD copers, N = 10 ACLD non-copers	ACLD: full range of motion in both knees, no visible or palpable knee effusion, no symptoms of locking, an uninjured, healthy knee	athletes, regular activity in level I sports (involving jumping, pivoting, and hard cutting) and level II sports (involving lateral motions) before injury	N = 11 ACLD copers (2 females, 9 males), ages 22–43 years, mean 30.7, high-level athletes with ACLD for at least 1 year (confirmed by MRI, any knee instability during regular participation in level I and II sports, no more than one episode of giving way, even during sports, since injury	N = 10 noncopers ACLD (4 females, 6 males), ages 16–43 years, mean 28.1; more than one episode of giving way since injury, instability during ADL, not returned to sports	N = 10 uninjured individuals, matched by sex, age and activity level to the copers subjects (2 females, 8 men), ages 23–41 years, means 32.2)	no (age and leg length)
Swanik et al. 2004	N = 29; N = 12 female ACLD, N = 17 female controls	complete unilateral ACL tear, at least 1 year after injury, mechanical instability (positive Lachman & Pivot-Shift tests), rehabilitation program completed, no ACL surgery	minimum Tegner score of 3	N = 12 females with ACLD, age 25.2 ± 7.3 years, mean time since injury 33.6 ± 5.2 months, Tegner score 5.4 ± 1.83 points	n.a.	N = 17 healthy females, age 22.7 ± 4.0 years, Tegner score 5.41 ± 1.5 points	n.s.

Swanik et al. 1999	N = 24 females, mean age = 29.4 ± 10.4 years; mean height = 168 + 10.7 cm; mean weight = 61.2 ± 6 kg; N = 6 ACLD, N = 12 ACLR, N = 6 controls	complete unilateral ACL tear, ACLR: BPTB grafts, testing 6 - 30 months after surgery, rehabilitation program completed, attempt to previous level of activity	recreational activity at least for healthy controls, TAS of experimental groups 6.8 ± 1.5 points, Lysholm Knee Scoring Scale of experimental groups 92.9 ± 5.4	N = 6 females with ACLD	N = 12 females with ACLR	N = 6 females, healthy controls, recreational activity, no previous history of knee pathology, dominant limb (leg to kick a ball with)	n.s.
Zebis et al. 2017	N = 1 female	non-contact ACL injury (video-recorded) in the right knee during match play, ST-gracilis graft, standardized rehabilitation	elite soccer players	N = 1 female elite soccer player at high level (age 21 years) with no previous history of ACL injury	n.a.	screening of elite soccer players pre-season → see Zebis et al., Am J Sports Med 2009;37(10):1967-73; Zebis et al., Clin J Sports Med 2008;18(4):329-37	n.a.

Abbreviations: ACLD = anterior cruciate ligament deficiency (conservative/non-surgical treatment); ACLR = anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction/repair (surgery); BPTB = bone-patella-tendon-bone technique for ACLR; Level I: sports are described as jumping, pivoting and hard cutting sports; Level II sports: also involve lateral motion, but with less jumping or hard cutting than level I; n.a. = not applicable; n.s. = not stated; RTA = return to activity (return to participation); RTS = return to sports; RTP = return to performance; TAS = Tegner Activity Score; TLS = Tegner & Lysholm Score; TSK = Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia; wk = week; vs. = versus

Table 4: Characteristics of methods of included studies

Author & Year	tasks: number of repetitions, duration, frequency	muscles/legs measured	Outcome measure, variables	direct link to RTS?
Alkjaer et al. 2002¹	15 consecutive forward lunges with recordings from hitting a force plate (rest between trials as long as wanted)	VL, VM, ST, BF of injured leg of patients and right leg of healthy controls	peak and mean values of EMG amplitudes (microvolts)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Alkjaer et al. 2003²	six trails of walking across two force plates at a speed of 4.5km/h	VL, VM, ST, BF of injured leg of patients and right leg of healthy controls	mean amplitudes during weight acceptance (%maxEMG); coactivation between VL & BF (method by Rudolph et al. 2001) (%maxEMG)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Arnason et al. 2014⁶	3 trials of Nordic hamstring exercise, 3 trials of TRX hamstring curl exercise; order of exercises was randomized, time	MH, LH of both legs	peak normalized muscle activation (%MVIC)	(no) --> soccer
Boerboom et al. 2001⁹	walking at normal, slower, and faster than normal speed	VM, VL, BF, ST, GC medialis, GC lateralis; of injured leg (patients)	deviations of the normative EMG profiles (individual averaged EMG pattern during gait)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Briem et al. 2016¹⁰	3 consecutive maximal hops (triple jump, single-limb crossover hop for distance) --> two practice trials, a single maximal test trial; same procedure for each limb. ACLR participants startet with non-surigcal limb, each matched control participant with matched limb.	MH, LH	Peak activation of the normalized signal (%MVIC)	no

Bryant et al. 2009¹²	ACLD and ACLR: involved limb; healthy controls: both limbs; maximal single limb hop for distance on their involved limb from a standing position. 5 trials with 1min rest in between trials, landing in a fixed position on the takeoff foot.	VL, VM, ST, BF	timing of the onset of muscle activity relative to IC (onset-IC; ms) and timing of the peak of muscle activity relative to IC (ms)	no
Bulgheroni et al. 1997¹³	at least 5 trials of walking at natural cadence (112 ± 5.1 steps/min), 20-m distance used to reach steady state of walking	VL, RF, BF, ST	amplitude of EMG activity, EMG normalized to the maximum recorded signal amplitude during a single walking cycle	no
Busch et al. 2019¹⁵	10x stair descent, Warm-up on treadmill with 5km/h for 10min -> individual, submaximal normalisation of EMG data (KOOS, Tegner Activity Score, VAS for pain & general well-being)	VM, VL, BF, ST of both legs	Normalized root mean squares for each muscle, limb and movement phase (preactivation, weight acceptance, push-off) were calculated (%subMVC)	no
Cordeiro et al. 2015¹⁷	3x instep soccer kick with dominant leg, (KOOS, TSK)	RF, VL, VM, BF, ST	muscle activation during knee extension phase (% MVC)	(no) --> soccer, instep kick
Dashti Rostami et al. 2019¹⁸	single-leg vertical drop landing; 3 proper trials	GM, AL; only the injured limb of ACLR and ACLD individuals and the dominant limb of controls were tested	Preparatory and reactive muscle activity and coactivation from 100 milliseconds prior to initial contact to 250 milliseconds postcontact; mean and peak activity (%MVIC); coactivation of GM:AL (method by Rudolph et al. 2001)	no

Gokeler et al. 2010²³	single-leg hop test for distance (arms behind back, maintained balance for at least 1s after landing ²⁶ , 3 maximal trials for each limb; (IKDC, Rolimeter device for laxity testing)	Gmax, BF, ST, SM, VM, VL, RF, MG, LG, SO	mean onset times (=preparatory activity before landing) of the EMG signals of each muscle	no
Hansen et al. 2017²⁸	running on weight-supporting ("anti-gravity", Alter G, respectively) treadmill at 16km/h with 6 different body weight conditions from 50% (half weight) to 100% (full weight-bearing) in random order	SM, SL, MG, LG, MH, LH	soleus, gastrocnemius and hamstring cluster formed, SPM used to analyze entire time-dependent EMG signal, comparison of injured vs. non-injured leg and left vs. right leg; EMG signal normalized to ist MVC value during 100% BW running trials for each participant	no
Jordan et al. 2016³⁶	80-s repeated squat jump test (jump test) on a dual force plate system	VL, VM, BF, ST	normalized EMG amplitudes at takeoff, at the 25-ms interval prelanding, and at postlanding for the ACLR limb (affected limb), contralateral limb, and limbs of the control subjects (control limb), (Asymmetry index, jump height of body center of mass)	(no) --> fatigue, downhill skiing

Klyne et al. 2012 ³⁸	controlled single leg hop on each limb (arms behind back, landing position hold for at least 1-2s) ²⁶ , length of the horizontal distance hopped was equal to the measured length of the lower leg; 3 successful trials	MG	onset and offset of MG activation relative to take-off, during flight and landing, muscle activity (RMS), 7 temporal variables (ms, %activity)	no
Knoll et al. 2004 ³⁹	walking on treadmill at least 10 minutes at a constant speed of 2 km/h	VL, VM, BF, AL	linear envelope EMG curve determined by root mean square method and normalized to average of peak EMG signal values of six gait cycles --> EMG patterns during % of gait cycle	(no) --> pre-operatively & follow-up (6 weeks, 4, 8, 12 months post-surgery)
Kuster et al. 1995 ⁴⁰	at least 5 trials of each task in order to obtain at least ten cycles of EMG data for ensemble average processing; level walking and downhill walking on dismountable slope (6m length, -19° gradient)	RF, BF, GC	peak muscular activity at heel strike, just before heel strike; values normalized to subject's individual peak levels	no
Lessi & Serrao 2017 ⁴³	single-leg landing before and after fatigue (fatigue protocol: 10 squats, 2 vertical jumps, 20 steps)	VL, BF, Gmax	EMG average amplitude of activation, expressed as a %peak EMG during landing	no
Lessi et al. 2018 ⁴²	single-leg drop vertical jump landing before and after fatigue protocol (fatigue protocol: 10 squats, 2 vertical jumps, 20 steps)	VL, GM, Gmax	mean amplitude of activation during landing (% of the peak RMS obtained during the landing task)	no

<p>Lustosa et al. 2011⁴⁵</p>	<p>walking with self-selected speed on a 3m-walkway with two stable platforms and one electromechanical balance board that could apply a sudden perturbation (20° tilt in the frontal plane (medial/lateral) -> varus stress in the slightly flexed knee, leading to external rotation of the femur (=common etiology of ACL injury)</p>	<p>VL, BF</p>	<p>co-contraction pre- and postperturbation between groups and limbs (co-contraction levels in the 250 ms before perturbation and in the 250 ms after perturbation periods), %MVIC; muscular co-contraction calculated^{22,90}</p>	<p>(no) --> stratification of included patients (full RTS or limited RTS)</p>
<p>Madhavan & Shields 2011⁴⁶</p>	<p>single leg squat maneuver with random/unexpected perturbations at the start of the flexion phase (triggered compensatory reflex activity)</p>	<p>VM obliquus, RF, VL, lh, MH of exercised limb (reconstructed leg of ACLR subjects, pseudorandomly selected limb of healthy controls to counterbalance ACLR limbs)</p>	<p>normalized long latency responses (= difference between the mean EMG of perturbation trials and the mean EMG of unperturbed trials, divided by the mean EMG of the unperturbed trials) between 50 and 200 ms after the onset of perturbation of quadriceps and hamstrings; peak velocity (cm/s); latency of peak LLR (= time to peak EMG activity between 50–200 ms following the perturbation); mean muscle EMG activity (% MVIC) in the 200 ms prior to perturbation, 50–200 ms after the perturbation, and 200–400 ms post perturbation</p>	<p>no</p>

Nyland et al. 2010⁵⁴	single-leg countermovement jump (CMJ) performance	Gmax, VM, MH, GC	mean EMG signal amplitudes (%MVIC); EMG activation duration during propulsion and landing phase (ms)	no
Nyland et al. 2013⁵⁶	single-leg countermovement jump (CMJ) performance	Gmax, VM, MH, GC	EMG amplitude comparison during single-leg countermovement jumping propulsion (Difference = involved - uninvolved lower extremity) (%MVIC)	no
Nyland et al. 2014⁵⁵	single-leg hop test for distance	Gmax, VM, MH, GM	Standardized EMG amplitudes during single leg hop for distance propulsion [%MVIC involved lower extremity – %MVIC uninvolved lower extremity]; standardized EMG amplitudes during single leg hop for distance landing [%MVIC involved lower extremity – %MVIC uninvolved lower extremity].	no

<p>Oliver et al. 2018⁵⁷</p>	<p>single leg jump from a 25-cm tall box, with hands on hips and without gaining momentum; five times with each leg (injured/non-injured); .</p>	<p>VM, VL, RF, ST, BF</p>	<p>mean values per each patient, leg, and muscle were considered in the analysis; muscle latency time over time of each muscle was defined as the time from touchdown to peak amplitude of EMG activity (RMS) in each muscle. RMS was normalized at the maximum activity of the muscles (%MVC)</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Ortiz et al. 2008⁵⁹</p>	<p>5 trials of a single-legged 40-cm drop jump: standing initially on both feet on the 40-cm platform and then standing on the jumping leg, and then to drop when ready to do so, maximal-effort vertical jump on landing single-legged on the center of the force plate, use of arms allowed for balance; 2 trials of a 20-cm up-down hop task³⁵, participant stood facing a 20-cm step and performed 10 consecutive jumps up to and down when ready. The 10 consecutive up and down hops composed 1 trial.</p>	<p>GM, GMax, RF, LH, MH; dominant leg in noninjured women and reconstructed leg in ACLR women</p>	<p>quadriceps/hamstring cocontraction ratios (values between 0 and 1; closer to 1 = excellent co-contraction, closer to 0 = poor co-contraction) and normalized EMG activity of lower extremity muscles (values between 0 and 1; effect sizes respectively)</p>	<p>no</p>

<p>Ortiz et al. 2011⁶⁰</p>	<p>side-to-side hopping task that consisted of hopping single-legged 10 times consecutively from side to side across 2 lines marked 30 cm apart on 2 individual force plates. The task was designated as a side hopping when the hop was to the opposite side of the stance leg and as crossover hopping when the hop was toward the side of the stance leg</p>	<p>GM, GMax, RF, LH, MH; dominant leg in noninjured women and reconstructed leg in ACLR women</p>	<p>quadriceps/hamstring cocontraction ratios (values between 0 and 1; closer to 1 = excellent co-contraction, closer to 0 = poor co-contraction) and normalized EMG activity of lower extremity (values between 0 and 1; effect sizes respectively)</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Ortiz et al. 2014⁵⁸</p>	<p>60-cm double-legged and a 40-cm single-legged drop jumps to assess bilateral and unilateral landing strategies, respectively</p>	<p>VM, VL, RF, MH, LH measured in the involved leg of women with ACLr and the dominant leg of the control subjects</p>	<p>rectified normalized electromyographic activity of the quadriceps and hamstrings (amplitude and latency) in %maximum contraction; quadriceps/hamstrings electromyographic co-contraction ratio (values between 0 and 1); time to maximum neuromuscular activation (time-to-peak muscle activation) in seconds for hamstring and quadriceps muscle groups</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Patras et al. 2012⁶⁶</p>	<p>two 10-min treadmill runs on 2 occasions in the lab, one at a moderate (80%VO₂max) and one at a high intensity (85-88% VO₂max), EMG recordings at the 3rd, 5th, 7th, and 10th minute of the runs</p>	<p>VL, BF bilaterally: left leg of controls selected for analysis</p>	<p>peak EMG amplitude during the stance phase</p>	<p>no</p>

Patras et al. 2010 ⁶⁵	10 min running at moderate intensity and 10 min running at high intensity on separate occasions separated by a time span of 48 h; moderate intensity = at 80% of the lactate threshold; high intensity = at 40% of the difference between VO ₂ max and lactate threshold	VL bilaterally	EMG amplitude during stance, over time respectively in microvolts	no
Patras et al. 2009 ⁶⁷	10 min running at moderate intensity (20% below the lactate threshold) and 10 min running at high intensity (40% above the lactate threshold) on separate occasions separated by a time span of 48 h and completed within 10–12 days; moderate intensity = at 20% below the lactate threshold; high intensity = at 40% above the lactate threshold	VL, BF bilaterally	values from 15 strides averaged to calculate the mean peak amplitude during stance for each recording period	no
Pincheira et al. 2018 ⁶⁸	Two destabilizing platforms (one for each limb) generated a controlled perturbation at the ankle of each participant (30° of inversion, 10° plantarflexion simultaneously) in a weight bearing condition; time between the release and the stop (impact) of the mechanism was 200 ± 10 ms	VM, ST	muscle activation onset times (ms)	no

Rudolph et al. 2000 ⁷⁵	single-leg hops	LH, VL, SO, medial head of the gastrocnemius muscles of both limbs	peak EMG activity over 30-ms from either the dynamic or maximum isometric trials was used to normalize the EMG data (%MVIC); muscle timing variables, muscle intensity: integrating the linear envelope of the EMG curves over a weight acceptance interval (defined as the range from 100 ms prior to initial contact to the point of peak knee flexion. Muscle cocontraction: using normalized EMG data, between the VL and LH, and VL and medial gastrocnemius	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Rudolph et al. 2001 ⁷⁶	5 trials of walking and jogging with 1 - 3min rest intervalls between trials	LH, VL, SO, medial head of the gastrocnemius muscles of both limbs	peak EMG activity; onset and termination of muscular activation; duration of muscular activity; co-contraction (integrals calculated)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Rudolph & Snyder-Mackler 2004 ⁷⁷	step up and over a 26 cm high step; ten trials, five each with the right and left leg ascending a 26 cm step (higher than a typical step, provide a more challenging condition), EMG collected from landing limb	LH, VL, SO, medial head of the gastrocnemius muscles of both limbs	peak EMG activity (%max); onset and termination of muscular activation; duration of muscular activity; co-contraction	(no) --> copers and non-copers

<p>Swanik et al. 2004⁸⁴</p>	<p>landing from a hop: The subject stood on a 20-cm step, balanced momentarily on test limb, and hopped to target placed 30 cm horizontally: knee perturbation (special knee perturbation device, 100-N force on the posterior aspect of the tibia --> anterior displacement of the tibia)</p>	<p>VL, VM, MH, LH</p>	<p>muscle activity before and after landing from a hop (area of integrated EMG recordings), hamstring latency after joint perturbation (reflexive muscle activity in the hamstrings assessed by measuring the onset time after anterior translation of the tibia)</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Swanik et al. 1999⁸⁵</p>	<p>4 functional activities: downhill walking (15°, 0.92 m/s), level running (2.08 m/s), and hopping (self-paced) and landing from a jump (20.3 cm)</p>	<p>VL, VM, MH, LH</p>	<p>integrated EMG (IEMG, microvolts x milliseconds) normalized to mean amplitude of 3 - 6 consecutive test repetitions --> mean area & peak IEMG of a 250ms-period after ground contact = reactive muscle activity; testing order and leg assessed by random</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Zebis et al. 2017⁹⁸</p>	<p>standardized side cutting maneuver, countermovement jumping with the hands placed at the hip (akimbo), and maximal jump height was calculated</p>	<p>VL, BF, ST</p>	<p>EMG preactivity</p>	<p>(no) --> single case, risk profile retrospective, pre-post surgery and post-intervention</p>

Abbreviations: AL = adductor longus muscle; BF = biceps femoris muscle; sEMG = surface electromyography; GC = gastrocnemius muscles; GM = gluteus medius muscle; GMax = gluteus maximus muscle; GRF = ground reaction force; Hz = Hertz; LG = gastrocnemius lateral head; LH = lateral hamstring muscle; MG = gastrocnemius medial head; MH = medial hamstring muscle; ms = milliseconds; n.a. = not applicable; n.s. = not stated; RF = rectus femoris muscle; RTA = return to activity (return to participation); RTS = return to sports; RTP = return to performance; SI = symmetry index; SM = soleus medialis muscle; SL = soleus lateralis muscle; SO = soleus muscle; SPM = Statistical Parametric Mapping; ST = semitendinosus muscle; VL = vastus lateralis muscle; VM = vastus medialis muscle; vs. = versus; WA = weight acceptance