

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2 **Title of article:** A novel biomechanical injury risk score demonstrates
3 correlation with lower limb posterior chain injury in fifty elite level rugby union
4 athletes.

5 **Corresponding (Lead) Author**

6 Name: Mr. Rhys Hughes

7 Senior Physiotherapist, Gloucester Rugby Performance Medical Department,
8 Gloucester, United Kingdom.

9 Postal Address: Performance Medical Department, Gloucester Rugby,
10 Kingsholm Stadium, Kingsholm Road, Gloucester, GL1 3AX.

11 Email: RHphysio@gmail.com

12 **Co-author 1**

13 Name: Dr. Matt Cross

14 Research and Rugby Development Manager, Premiership Rugby, London,
15 United Kingdom.

16 Email: MCross@premiershiprugby.com

17 **Co-author 2**

18 Name: Prof. Keith Stokes

19 Medical Research Lead, Rugby Football Union, London, United Kingdom and
20 Professor in Sports Injury Prevention Group and Department of Health,
21 University of Bath, United Kingdom.

22 Email: KeithStokes@rfu.com

23 **Abstract Word Count:** 244

24 **Manuscript Word Count:** 2,988

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 **Objectives:** Lower limb posterior chain injury (PCI) is common amongst
27 athletic populations, with multi-factorial risk factors including age, previous
28 injury, strength measurements, range of motion and training load.
29 Biomechanics are commonly considered in the prevention and rehabilitation
30 of PCI by performance staff. However, there is no documented testing
31 method to assess for associations between biomechanics and PCI. The aim
32 of this study was to investigate whether there is an association between an
33 easily applicable, novel biomechanical assessment tool and PCI. **Methods:**
34 Fifty male elite-level rugby union athletes (age 22.83 ± 5.08) participating in
35 the highest tier of England were tested at the start of the 2019 pre-season
36 period and PCIs (N=48) were recorded over the 2019/20 playing season.
37 Participants' biomechanics were analysed using two-dimensional video
38 analysis against an Injury Risk Score (IRS) system in the performance of the
39 combined movement – prone hip extension and knee flexion. Participants'
40 biomechanics in carrying out this movement were scored against the 10-point
41 IRS, where the more compensatory movement recorded sees an increase in
42 an individual's IRS. Participants' IRS were then compared against the
43 number of PCI sustained and Spearman's correlation coefficient was utilised
44 for analysis. **Results:** There is a good significant association between IRS
45 and PCI ($R=0.573$, $p<0.001$). Linear Regression demonstrated that an
46 increase of 1 in IRS was associated with a 35% increase in PCI incidence
47 ($R^2=0.346$). **Conclusion:** A good significance between the IRS and PCI
48 provides preliminary support for its use as an injury risk assessment tool.

49 INTRODUCTION

50 The term posterior chain injury (PCI) is commonly used in relation to injuries
51 to the posterior musculoskeletal system of the lower limb.[1-2] PCI is
52 commonly observed within athletic populations, with a reported time loss of
53 10 hours for every 1000 playing hours within elite level sport.[3] The most
54 prevalent PCIs involve structures within the posterior musculoskeletal system
55 such as the trunk, pelvis, hamstring, and calf complexes.[4-8] This has
56 subsequently led to a large amount of research being conducted that focuses
57 on these areas of PCI, particularly during high velocity activities such as
58 sprinting. Sprinting requires multiple structures of the posterior
59 musculoskeletal system to work concurrently.[8-9] Occurrence of PCI is
60 attributed to a failure and a loss of concurrence somewhere within this
61 system.[9-10] Therefore, it is no surprise that PCI prevalence is high in many
62 sports that require sprinting, including rugby union,[3] soccer,[11] American
63 football [12] and athletics [13]. Of the structures within the posterior
64 musculoskeletal system, the hamstring complex is most frequently
65 affected.[14]

66

67 Research in athletic populations has found the non-modifiable risk factors of:
68 1) greater age and 2) previous injury to be predictors of PCI.[15-16]

69 Modifiable risk factors suggested to influence PCI include deficits in strength,
70 particularly eccentric strength in hamstring injury;[17] overload in training
71 volume;[18-19] sprint performance;[20] and reduced ranges of motion.[21]

72 The most influential finding regarding modifiable risk factors relating to PCI
73 management has arguably been the introduction of the Nordic hamstring

74 extension (NHE) in 2001.[4, 17, 22-24] Many exercise programmes focusing
75 on the prevention or rehabilitation of PCI aim to influence these modifiable
76 factors and include some form of coached lower limb biomechanical
77 positioning during exercise prescription.[25] However, there is a lack of
78 evidence of the effect biomechanics may have on PCI specifically. Whilst
79 pelvic and lower limb positioning is assessed in many ways by practitioners
80 in sport performance-medical settings, until recently [20, 26-27] there has
81 been no evidence of a relationship between biomechanics and PCI. It is also
82 worth noting, there is currently no uniform clinical assessment method of
83 pelvic or lower limb mechanics that relates to PCI.

84

85 A multi-modal intervention of bed-based treatment, mobility and exercise
86 therapy has demonstrated positive influence on pelvic biomechanics when
87 assessed using an inertial sensor.[26] The authors suggest a neutral pelvis
88 position and relative limb alignment could reduce hamstring strain injury risk,
89 however there is a lack of uniform assessment and comparison to injury
90 incidences to conclude this. Further research,[20] also supports a link
91 between these factors highlighting athletes who have sustained a PCI
92 present with an increased amount of anterior pelvic tilt through the gait cycle
93 of running when compared against those who do not. Yet, no conclusion was
94 drawn as to whether this was the cause or effect of the injuries and no
95 evidential comparison can be made. The role of muscle co-contraction in
96 biomechanics when analysing electromyography (EMG) patterns within
97 soccer players has also been investigated.[27] Athletes who demonstrated
98 an inefficient co-contraction pattern when recruiting specific stabilising

99 muscles within the posterior musculoskeletal system (lumbar spine erectors,
100 gluteus maximus and hamstrings) were up to 8 times more susceptible to
101 PCI.[27] It is evident association between an individuals' biomechanics and
102 PCI risk may be present but need further evidential support with direction on
103 a uniform assessment method.

104

105 This study assesses the association between an easily applicable, novel,
106 clinician-assessed biomechanical injury risk score (IRS) and the number of
107 PCI amongst a group of elite-level rugby union athletes.

108 **METHODS**

109 **Study Participants**

110 Fifty adult male professional rugby union athletes aged between 18 and 35
111 years (22.8 ± 5.1) were recruited at the start of a full playing season (1st July
112 2019) and were considered relatively well rested after a minimum of 5 weeks
113 break between playing seasons. The participants were injury free and
114 considered available for full training at the time of testing. Informed consent
115 was gained from all participants and ethics were appropriately obtained from
116 the Research Ethics Approval Committee for Health at the University of Bath,
117 reference number EP18/19029.

118

119 **Study Design**

120 This study investigates the association between a clinician assessed injury
121 risk score (IRS) system and PCI sustained during one full playing season.
122 PCI was defined as any non-contact injury to the foot (palmar aspect), calf

123 complex (including the achilles tendon), hamstring muscle group, gluteal
124 muscle group, lumbar spine, and thoracic spine regions that led to time loss
125 in training and/or matches. PCI included soft tissue disruption categorised
126 using the British Athletics Muscle Injury Classification, [28] which details
127 tissue disruption of all types between grades 0-4; discopathy, neuropathy,
128 tendonopathy and overload injuries were also included. Contact injuries from
129 direct impact were excluded from the study as direct impact injuries are not
130 deemed to be affected by biomechanics.

131

132 **The Injury Risk Score (IRS)**

133 A visual representation of the testing procedure is presented in figure 1 and
134 an example of the IRS system criteria in figure 2. This novel testing protocol
135 is clinician assessed and it is not documented in empirical literature.

136 However, the assessment method uses a modified approach that utilised
137 EMG in assessing prone hip extension (PHE), which demonstrated good
138 levels of reliability and validity.[27] The modification translated into this study
139 sees the replacement of EMG with palpable assessment of gluteal muscle
140 tone, the addition of prone knee flexion (PKF) and observation of
141 biomechanics retrospectively analysed using two-dimensional video analysis.
142 Biomechanics are assessed against the IRS system in the performance of
143 combined PHE and PKF (figure 1), subsequently providing greater
144 comparison to the gait cycle than PHE alone, where PHE and PKF are
145 performed concurrently.[20] Participants can score a maximum of 10 points
146 following the IRS system criteria – the more biomechanical change observed
147 from the participants anatomical prone starting position, the higher the score.

148 The 5 compensatory criteria include: 1) loss of palpable co-activation in either
149 gluteal muscle, 2) lumbar spine extension, 3) lift of the anterior superior iliac
150 spine from the plinth, 4) An increase in hip external rotation 5) An increase in
151 hip abduction. If the athlete displays a compensatory movement pattern for
152 one of the 5 criterion, 1 point would be scored per limb, left (maximum 5
153 points) and right (maximum 5 points) with a maximum of 10 points
154 achievable.

155

156 As the IRS system is novel, a repeatability pilot was performed prior to the
157 data collection and results analysed using Fleiss Kappa to assess inter-rater
158 reliability (IRR). The lead researcher educated and familiarised four
159 assessors in the IRS system. Each clinician had a minimum of five years'
160 experience in musculoskeletal medicine. The clinicians were blinded and
161 asked to analyse a small pilot group (four participants), against the IRS
162 system. Results from this pilot study were interpreted as suggested by
163 McHugh,[29] whereby ($R \geq 0.90$ – excellent, $R = 0.80-0.89$ – very good,
164 $R = 0.60-0.79$ – good, $R = 0.40-0.59$ – moderate and $R = 0.21-0.39$ – minimal).
165 Completing this pre-trial pilot demonstrated good levels of IRR ($R = 0.651$, p
166 < 0.001) and allowed for some minor adjustments in the logistics around
167 participant testing, reflected in the testing procedure section.

168

169 **Testing Procedure**

170 Each participant started in a prone position on a treatment plinth with arms
171 placed by their side or above their head (as in figure 1) to negate the use of
172 upper limb stabilisation during testing. The testing clinician then placed their

173 index finger and thumb of one hand on the horizontal plateau of the gluteus
174 maximus to assess palpable gluteal activation.[30] Prior to testing, each
175 participant was read the same script by the testing clinician, *“Tense both*
176 *buttock muscles and maintain this contraction for the duration of the*
177 *movement, until told the test is over. Now bend your left knee to 90 degrees*
178 *and lift that knee off the bed”*. The testing practitioner would then say, *“The*
179 *test is over”*. The participant then relaxes, resuming the prone starting
180 position. The opposite side would then be tested with the same instructions
181 where *“left knee”* was replaced with *“right knee”*. Each participant was given
182 a 2-minute testing window and participants were tested consecutively. The
183 testing clinician retrospectively assessed each participant through the
184 combined PHE and PKF movement against the IRS criteria (table 1), using
185 video analysis. The only live score recorded during the testing protocol was
186 palpable gluteal activation as muscle tone was deemed unrecordable by
187 video analysis. All scores were recorded on a laptop using spreadsheet
188 software.

189

190 **Setting and Equipment**

191 Equipment included: a password protected external hard drive; computer
192 compatible with spreadsheet software and the Statistical Package for the
193 Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 [31] for analysis; height adjustable
194 treatment plinth (plinth height was maintained throughout); three high
195 resolution video recording cameras (Panasonic HC-V770 50x Zoom 4k Full
196 HD) with tripods, capable of recording in two dimensions at perpendicular
197 angles in line with the horizontal surface of the treatment plinth. Video

198 cameras were synchronised to record simultaneously from two angles at the
199 start of testing. Recording angles included a lateral view of both left and right
200 sides of the participants and a caudal to cephalad view. Footage was
201 cropped to allow for time efficiency when assessing IRS by deleting plinth
202 transfer footage between participants using video analysis software.[32] This
203 method of video augmentation in movement analysis is well validated [33-34]
204 and has proven reliable when qualitatively assessing human biomechanics
205 against quantitative criteria.[35-37]

206

207 **Data Collection**

208 Data collection took place within the physiotherapy room of an English
209 premiership rugby union club. Participants were required to spend a
210 maximum of 2 minutes each (including transfer time) in a prone position on
211 the treatment plinth. Testing for all participants took approximately 2 hours
212 including equipment set up. Data was collected from all participants on day
213 one of pre-season testing. The number and location of PCIs for each
214 participant were then recorded for the duration of one full English premiership
215 rugby playing season using digital spreadsheet software as part of
216 departmental injury surveillance. This was standardised using the definition
217 of PCI as outlined in the study design and the same individual was
218 responsible for data recording to ensure continuity and avoid potential for
219 bias.

220

221 **Outcome Measures**

222 The two main outcome measures for this study were PCI (dependent
223 variable) and the IRS (independent variable). The IRS was measured
224 quantitatively from analysis of the qualitative data collected against the IRS
225 and cross referenced against the recorded video by the lead researcher. The
226 number of PCI sustained by each player across a 10-month playing season
227 was captured at the end of the season.

228

229 **Statistical Analysis**

230 Data analysis using SPSS version 25 [31] was utilised for data comparisons
231 and assessment of correlation. Prior to statistical analysis both IRS and PCI
232 variables were assessed for homogeneity of variance and normal distribution
233 using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests. As assumptions of
234 homogeneity and normal distribution were not met, a Spearman's correlation
235 co-efficient (SCC) was conducted where R was interpreted as (R=>0.90 –
236 very strong, R=0.70-0.89 – strong, R=0.40-0.69 – good, R=0.10-0.39 – weak
237 and R=0-0.09 – negligible). [38]

238

239 To reduce the likelihood of any type 1 errors within the group (N=50) a
240 critical alpha (p) of <0.05 was utilised. Finally, a non-parametric linear
241 regression was conducted to demonstrate whether there was a linear
242 relationship between PCI and IRS, and if so to what degree the variables
243 were related. To ensure methodological rigour throughout the study adheres
244 to STROBE [39] reporting guidelines.

245

246 **Patient and Public Involvement**

247 Participants were first involved in research during the first day of data
248 collection when informed consent was obtained, and their IRS was recorded.
249 The research question and outcome measures were developed by the
250 authors, and participants were informed of these using a patient information
251 sheet prior to data collection. Participants were not involved in study design,
252 recruitment or conduction and they were not asked to assess the burden or
253 time required to participate in the study. In the dissemination of the results
254 the participants will receive their individual IRS followed by a discussion
255 around their PCI risk with advice around reducing this risk.

256 **RESULTS**

257 Fifty subjects participated in the study (age 22.83 ± 5.08). The mean IRS
258 score across the population was 5.80 ± 1.74 and participants IRS ranged from
259 3 to 10 with a median of 7. A total of 48 PCIs were observed in 20 of the
260 participants across the playing season, as displayed in figure 3. Twenty
261 participants did not suffer a PCI, eighteen suffered 1 PCI, seven suffered 2
262 PCIs, four suffered 3 PCIs and one suffered 4 PCIs. The average number of
263 PCIs across the population was 0.90 ± 1.03 per participant. The most
264 frequently observed PCIs were lumbar spine – (muscle cramp/ stiffness/
265 myofascial trigger points) and hamstring – biceps femoris (grade 2) both
266 recording 7 incidences across the season (figure 3). The number of
267 biomechanical compensations observed across the group was 320, with
268 some common themes in compensation, as displayed in table 2.
269

270 Table 2: IRS system points scored for each biomechanical compensation.

	Loss of Palpable Glute Co-activation	Lumbar Spine Extension	Lift off of the Anterior Superior Iliac Spine from plinth	Increase in Hip External Rotation from starting position	Increase in Hip Abduction from starting position	TOTAL
Total points for each biomechanical characteristic	62	95	71	54	38	320
Percentage (%)	19%	30%	22%	17%	12%	

271

272 Spearman's correlation demonstrated a good positive association between
 273 participant IRS and number of PCIs ($R=0.573$ ($p < 0.001$)) (figure 4). Linear
 274 regression identified that for every 1-point increase in IRS there was a 35%
 275 increase for a further PCI ($R^2=0.346$) (figure 4).

276 **DISCUSSION**

277 With significance demonstrating association between the IRS and PCI an
 278 increase in the identified biomechanical compensations are suggestive of
 279 increasing an individual's risk of PCI. These results also provide confidence
 280 in the IRS as a biomechanical assessment tool for injury risk of PCI and
 281 provide guidance on biomechanical areas for intervention. Hence,
 282 practitioners may use the IRS alongside other pre-existing methods of
 283 identifying PCI risk, whilst guiding injury prevention. The IRS also has

284 capacity to provide practitioners with areas for biomechanical improvement in
285 the prevention of PCI when considering table 2. These suggest target areas
286 for reducing an individual's IRS when considering reduction of PCI risk. For
287 example, lumbar spine extension is highlighted as the most common
288 compensatory movement in the IRS across the population. With good levels
289 of significance in the association between PCI and the IRS assessment tool it
290 could be suggested that reducing lumbar spine extension which in turn
291 lowers an individual's IRS could reduce the PCI risk, although further
292 investigation would be required to prove this.

293

294 It is also worth highlighting the observational differences in IRS as highlighted
295 with the yellow markers in figure 5. The transverse views of the IRS clearly
296 demonstrate an example of the possible biomechanical asymmetry present
297 when performing combined prone PHE and PKF (figure 5). Figure 5 further
298 demonstrates how observational differences may translate from the prone
299 IRS testing position to upright running using the ALTIS kinogram
300 analysis.[40] It is evident in the transverse views of the IRS that lower limb
301 abduction and external rotation are increased from the midline starting
302 position in the participants right lower limb compared to left, this is also
303 evident at toe off in the kinogram analysis – see corresponding points A and
304 B on figure 5. This may provide some practical explanation of how the
305 correlation between IRS and PCI occurs during function, further promoting
306 the use of the IRS in the management of PCI.

307

308 **Limitations**

309 Despite the injury surveillance data originally being planned across a full
310 season, it is worth noting data collection was reduced to 9 months due to the
311 COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 with approximately twenty five percent of
312 the season's games remaining. Injury surveillance data is missing the last 3
313 months of the season when injuries may be most prevalent, possibly limiting
314 true findings.[3] As is also common in literature of this type, further limitation
315 is present on the information quality of biomechanics as a single point in time
316 (preseason IRS testing) is compared to PCI occurring at multiple points
317 through the season, some months apart.

318

319 Additionally, the IRS quantifies an individual score for each participant based
320 on a subjective analysis of movement which will always be open to
321 interpretation as with any descriptive method of movement analysis.[40] This
322 enforces the need for careful undertaking of the methodology in any
323 replication of this study. A new test should demonstrate appropriate levels of
324 reliability and validity and whilst the methodology gives clear direction in
325 performing the IRS system with good pilot levels of IRR, this is a novel test
326 and there is arguably room for development. Further studies could improve
327 the reliability and strength of the IRS in completing a larger IRR analysis. In
328 addition, whilst the inclusion criteria required individuals to be injury free and
329 well rested at the time of IRS testing, no adjustment was made for previous
330 injury history. Amongst athletic populations it is difficult to find athletes
331 without previous injury history, particularly at elite level but as one of the
332 largest risk factors to injury this could be considered a further limitation.

333

334 **Future Studies**

335 It may be of interest to first compare the IRS against an established injury
336 predictor such as strength assessment.[23] Any correlation between an
337 established injury risk predictor and IRS system would further strengthen its
338 use as an assessment tool. Performing PHE and PKF is a key component of
339 human movement, particularly in running [16, 27, 41-42] and although the
340 correlation in prone testing to upright running positions has been discussed,
341 formal comparison is required. An upright testing position may provide
342 greater functional comparison although may present difficulties when
343 standardising test position.

344 **CONCLUSION**

345 The results demonstrate good significant correlation between the novel IRS
346 system compared to PCI within in an athletic population. This study adds
347 evidence that demonstrates that an increased IRS has influence on an
348 individual's PCI risk and provides guidance for a uniformed assessment tool
349 in assessing this risk. Establishing individual injury risk scores for athletes in
350 this way may aid in preventing and managing PCI that lead to time loss in
351 training and matches. The IRS system can be utilised easily within
352 musculoskeletal settings requiring minimal equipment, making it easily
353 applicable around the constraints of performance-medical environments.

354 **STATEMENTS**

355 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank the players of Gloucester
356 Rugby and the performance medical staff who assisted with this study
357 particularly Eoin Power, Steph McNally and Steve Whyte who assisted with
358 injury surveillance data, additionally to Aaron Walters and Luke Croughton
359 who assisted with the inter-rater reliability pilot, and Tom Reynolds who
360 facilitated the video analysis. I (RH) would also like to acknowledge Tony
361 Denton a previous colleague and physiotherapist who originally introduced
362 me to pelvic mechanics and provoked the initial thoughts surrounding this
363 novel screening method, some years ago.

364

365 **Contributors:** Conception and design: all authors. Acquisition of data: RH.
366 Analysis and interpretation: all authors. Drafting, critical revision and final
367 approval: all authors. Statistical analysis, collection and assembly of the data:
368 RH. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that
369 questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are
370 appropriately investigated and resolved: all authors.

371

372 **Patient Consent:** Informed consent was gained from all participants.

373

374 **Competing Interests:** The authors identified no competing interests for this
375 research.

376

377 **Funding:** The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research
378 from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

379 **REFERENCES**

380

381 1. Mendiguchia J, Alentorn-Geli E, Brughelli, M. Hamstring strain injuries:
382 are we heading in the right direction? *British Journal of Sports*
383 *Medicine* 2012;46:81-5.

384

385 2. Schuermans J, Danneels L, Van Tiggelen DE, et al. Proximal
386 neuromuscular control protects against hamstring injury in male
387 football players: a prospective study with EMG time-series analysis
388 during maximal sprinting. *British Journal of Sports*
389 *Medicine* 2017;51:383-4.

390

391 3. Brooks JHM, Kemp SPT. Injury-prevention priorities according to
392 playing position in professional rugby union players. *British Journal of*
393 *Sports Medicine* 2011;45:765-75.

394

395 4. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Thorstensson A. Acute hamstring injuries in
396 Swedish elite football: a prospective randomised controlled clinical trial
397 comparing two rehabilitation protocols. *British Journal of Sports*
398 *Medicine* 2013;47:953-59.

399

400 5. Bramah C, Preece SJ, Gill N, et al. Is There a Pathological Gait
401 Associated With Common Soft Tissue Running Injuries? *The*
402 *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2018;46:3023-31.

403

- 404 6. Brooks JHM, Fuller CW, Reddin DB. Incidence, risk, and prevention of
405 hamstring muscle injuries in professional rugby union. *American*
406 *Journal of Sports Medicine* 2006;34:1297-306.
- 407
- 408 7. Folland JP, Allen SJ, Black MI, et al. Running technique is an
409 important component of running economy and performance. *Medicine*
410 *and science in sports and exercise* 2017;49:1411-2.
- 411
- 412 8. Mendiguchia J, Edouard P, Samozino P, Brughelli M, et al. Field
413 monitoring of sprinting power-force-velocity profile before, during and
414 after hamstring injury: two case reports. *Journal of Sports Sciences*,
415 2016;34:535-41.
- 416
- 417 9. Gre KG, Millet GP. Conceptual Framework for Strengthening
418 Exercises to Prevent Hamstring Strains. *Sports Medicine*,
419 2013;43:1207-15.
- 420
- 421 10. Opar DA, Williams MD, Timmins, RG, et al. Rate of Torque and
422 Electromyographic Development During Anticipated Eccentric
423 Contraction Is Lower in Previously Strained Hamstrings. *American*
424 *Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2013;41:116-25.
- 425
- 426 11. Ekstrand J, Hagglund M., Walden, M. Injury incidence and injury
427 patterns in professional football: the UEFA injury study. *British Journal*
428 *of Sports Medicine*, 2011;45:553-8.

429

430 12. Elliott M, Zarins B, Powell JW, et al. Hamstring Muscle Strains in
431 Professional Football Players A 10-Year Review. *American Journal of*
432 *Sports Medicine*, 2011;39:843-50.

433

434 13. Malliaropoulos N, Papacostas E, Kiritsi O, et al. Posterior Thigh
435 Muscle Injuries in Elite Track and Field Athletes. *American Journal of*
436 *Sports Medicine*, 2010;38:1813-9.

437

438 14. Lategan L, Gouveia CP. Prevention Of Hamstring Injuries In Sport: A
439 Systematic Review. *South African Journal for Research in Sport*
440 *Physical Education and Recreation*, 2018;40:55-69.

441

442 15. Duhig S, Shield AJ, Opar D, et al. Effect of high-speed running on
443 hamstring strain injury risk. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*,
444 2016;50:1536-40.

445

446 16. Bramah C, Preece SJ, Gill N., et al. Is There a Pathological Gait
447 Associated With Common Soft Tissue Running Injuries? *The*
448 *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2018;46:3023-31.

449

450 17. Van der Horst N, Smits DW, Petersen J, et al. The Preventive Effect
451 of the Nordic Hamstring Exercise on Hamstring Injuries in Amateur
452 Soccer Players: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *American Journal of*
453 *Sports Medicine*, 2015;43:1316-23.

454

455 18. Malone S, Roe M, Doran DA, et al. High chronic training loads and
456 exposure to bouts of maximal velocity running reduce injury risk in
457 elite Gaelic football. *Journal of science and medicine in*
458 *sport*, 2017;20:250-4.

459

460 19. Huijing PA. Muscular force transmission necessitates a multilevel
461 integrative approach to the analysis of function of skeletal muscle.
462 *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 2003;31:167-75.

463

464 20. Schuermans J, Van Tiggelen D, Palmans T, et al. Deviating running
465 kinematics and hamstring injury susceptibility in male soccer players:
466 Cause or consequence?. *Gait & posture*, 2017;57:270-7.

467

468 21. Schuermans J, Van Tiggelen D, Danneels L, et al. Biceps femoris and
469 semitendinosus—teammates or competitors? New insights into
470 hamstring injury mechanisms in male football players: a muscle
471 functional MRI study. *Br J Sports Med*, 2014;48:1599-606.

472

473 22. Bourne MN, Opar DA, Williams MD, et al. Eccentric Knee Flexor
474 Strength and Risk of Hamstring Injuries in Rugby Union: A Prospective
475 Study. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2015;43:2663-70.

476

- 477 23. Brockett CL, Morgan DL, Proske U. Human hamstring muscles adapt
478 to eccentric exercise by changing optimum length. *Medicine and*
479 *Science in Sports and Exercise*, 2001;33:783-90.
- 480
- 481 24. Petersen J, Thorborg K, Nielsen MB, Budtz-Jorgensen E, et al.
482 Preventive Effect of Eccentric Training on Acute Hamstring Injuries in
483 Men's Soccer A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial. *American*
484 *Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2011;39:2296-303.
- 485
- 486 25. Brukner P. Hamstring injuries: prevention and treatment-an update.
487 *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2015;49:21-6.
- 488
- 489 26. Mendiguchia J, Gonzalez De la Flor A, Mendez-Villanueva A, et al.
490 Training-induced changes in anterior pelvic tilt: potential implications
491 for hamstring strain injuries management. *Journal of Sports Sciences*,
492 2020;38:1-8.
- 493
- 494 27. Schuermans J, Van Tiggelen D, Witvrouw E. Prone Hip Extension
495 Muscle Recruitment is Associated with Hamstring Injury Risk in
496 Amateur Soccer. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*,
497 2017;38:696-706.
- 498
- 499 28. Pollock N, James SLJ, Lee JC, et al. British athletics muscle injury
500 classification: a new grading system. *British Journal of Sports*
501 *Medicine*, 2014;48:1347-9.

- 502
- 503 29. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia*
504 *medica: Biochemia medica*, 2012;22:276-82.
- 505
- 506 30. Tortora G, Derrickson B. Principles of anatomy and physiology. 15th
507 ed. United States of America: John Wiley & Sons 2016.
- 508
- 509 31. IBM. IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Version
510 25. [For Windows 64]. Portsmouth: IBM 2020.
- 511
- 512 32. Nacsport. New Assistant for Coach Sport, S.L. [For Windows 64].
513 United Kingdom: Nacsport 2020.
- 514
- 515 33. Munro A, Herrington L. The effect of videotape augmented feedback
516 on drop jump landing strategy: implications for anterior cruciate
517 ligament and patellofemoral joint injury prevention. *The*
518 *Knee*, 2014;21:891-5.
- 519
- 520 34. Sado N, Yoshioka S, Fukashiro S. The three-dimensional kinetic
521 behaviour of the pelvic rotation in maximal sprint running. *Sports*
522 *biomechanics*, 2017;16:258-71.
- 523
- 524 35. Pipkin A, Kotecki K, Hetzel S, et al. Reliability of a qualitative video
525 analysis for running. *journal of orthopaedic & sports physical*
526 *therapy*, 2016;46:556-61.

527

528 36. Van den Tillaar R, Solheim JAB, Bencke J. Comparison of hamstring
529 muscle activation during high-speed running and various hamstring
530 strengthening exercises. *International journal of sports physical*
531 *therapy*, 2017;12:717-8.

532

533 37. Dingenen B, Barton C, Janssen T, et al. Test-retest reliability of two-
534 dimensional video analysis during running. *Physical Therapy in*
535 *Sport*, 2018;33:40-7.

536

537 38. Schober P, Boer C, Schwarte. Correlation coefficients: appropriate
538 use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 2018;126:1763-8.

539

540 39. Bahr R, Clarsen, B, Derman, W, et al. International Olympic
541 Committee consensus statement: methods for recording and reporting
542 of epidemiological data on injury and illness in sport 2020 (including
543 STROBE Extension for Sport Injury and Illness Surveillance
544 (STROBE-SIIS)). *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2020;54:372-389.

545

546 40. McMillan S, Pfaff D. The ALTIS Kinogram Method [Online]. United
547 States of America: ALTIS. Available
548 from <https://simplifaster.com/articles/altis-kinogram-method> [Accessed
549 05 December 2020].

550

- 551 41. Herrington L, Munro A. A preliminary investigation to establish the
552 criterion validity of a qualitative scoring system of limb alignment
553 during single-leg squat and landing. *Journal of Exercise and Sports*
554 *Orthopaedics*, 2014;1:1-6.
- 555
- 556 42. Welling W, Benjaminse A, Lemmink K, et al. Passing return to sports
557 tests after ACL reconstruction is associated with greater likelihood for
558 return to sport but fail to identify second injury risk. *The knee*,
559 2020;27:949-57.

560 **LEGEND**

561

562 Figure 1: Still image views of longitudinal (left) and transverse (right) views of
563 biomechanical deficit and limb asymmetry when using the IRS system.

564 Starting Position (1a), Testing Left Limb (1b) and Testing Right Limb (1c).

565

566 Figure 2: IRS System Criteria.

567

568 Figure 3: Number of Posterior Chain Injuries (PCI) for the study population.

569

570 Figure 4: A graph demonstrating the Number of Posterior Chain Injuries (PCI
571 Number) vs Injury Risk Score (IRS) with Linear Regression.

572

573 Figure 5: Example of translation in biomechanics from IRS to upright running
574 in Kinogram analysis. Note – Analysis of increased external rotation
575 observed in right limb in IRS and Kinogram (on toe off) at points B compared
576 to left limb at points A.

Images Available upon reasonable request from author. Blanked to maintain anonymity.

Figure 1: Still image views of longitudinal (left) and transverse (right) views of biomechanical deficit and limb asymmetry when using the IRS system. Starting Position (1a), Testing Left Limb (1b) and Testing Right Limb (1c).

Injury Risk Score System Criteria		
	Lower Limb	
	Left	Right
Loss of Palpable Glute Co-activation		
Lumbar Spine Extension		
Lift off of the Anterior Superior Iliac Spine from plinth		
Increase in Hip External Rotation from starting position		
Increase in Hip Abduction from starting position		
Unilateral Risk Score	/ 5	/ 5
Total Risk Score	/ 10	

Key: 1 = Yes, this occurs / 0 = No, this does not occur.

Figure 2: IRS System Criteria




Figure 3: Number of Posterior Chain Injuries (PCI) for the study population.




Figure 4: A graph demonstrating the Number of Posterior Chain Injuries (PCI Number) vs Participant's Injury Risk Score (IRS) with Linear Regression.

Images Available upon reasonable request from author. Blanked to maintain anonymity.

Figure 5: Example of translation in biomechanics from IRS to upright running in Kinogram analysis. Note – Analysis of increased external rotation observed in right limb in IRS and Kinogram (on toe off) at points B compared to left limb at points A.