

Title: Sensorimotor deficits in distance runners with medial plantar pain

Authors:

Colton Funk, MEd, ATC

1. Department of Kinesiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
2. Athletics Department, St. Olaf College, 1520 St. Olaf Ave, Northfield, MN 55057; 715-490-1835; funk1@stolaf.edu

John J. Fraser, PT, DPT, PhD

1. Department of Kinesiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
2. Warfighter Performance Department, Directorate for Operational Readiness & Health, Naval Health Research Center, 140 Sylvester Road, San Diego, CA 92106, USA. email: john.j.fraser8.mil@mail.mil, ORCID: 0000-0001-9697-3795, Twitter: @NavyPT

Jacob Resch, PhD, ATC

Department of Kinesiology, University of Virginia, 210 Emmet St S, Charlottesville, VA 22903, USA. email: jer6x@virginia.edu; Twitter: @jeresch

Jay Hertel, PhD, ATC

Department of Kinesiology, University of Virginia, 210 Emmet St S, Charlottesville, VA 22903, USA. email: jhertel@virginia.edu; Twitter: @Jay_Hertel

*Address correspondence to Colton Funk; 1520 St. Olaf Ave, Northfield, MN 55057, USA. Phone: 715-490-1835; email: funk1@stolaf.edu

Conflicts of Interest: We affirm that we have no financial affiliation or involvement with any commercial organization that has a direct financial interest in any matter included in this manuscript.

The preprint of this manuscript is archived on MedRxiv at doi: 10.1101/XXXXXXXXXX
Presented at the 2018 NATA Clinical Symposia & AT Expo, June 2018, New Orleans, LA.

Disclosures: This study was funded in part by the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education Foundation and the Navy Medicine Professional Development Center, US Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. The views expressed in this manuscript reflect the results of research conducted by the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, nor the U.S. Government. Commander John J. Fraser is a military service member and this work was prepared as part of his official duties. Title 17, USC, §105 provides that 'Copyright protection under this title is not available for any work of the U.S. Government.' Title 17, USC, §101 defines a U.S. Government work as a work prepared by a military service member or employee of the U.S. Government as part of that person's official duties. All participants provided informed consent and this study was approved by the Institutional Review Board for Health Sciences Research at the University of Virginia in compliance with all applicable Federal regulations governing the protection of human subjects.

Title: Sensorimotor deficits in distance runners with medial plantar pain

ABSTRACT

1 **Context:** Medial plantar pain is a complex and multifactorial condition experienced by some
2 distance runners, which makes etiological differentiation and diagnosis challenging.

3 **Objective:** To assess plantar sensation, pain perception and sensitivity, intrinsic foot strength,
4 and foot morphology before and after a 9.7 km run in long-distance runners with and without
5 medial plantar pain.

6 **Design:** Descriptive laboratory study

7 **Setting:** Laboratory.

8 **Patients:** Seven distance runners with medial plantar pain (four males, three females; aged
9 22.3±3.7 years; BMI 22.3±3.5 kg/m²) and seven matched healthy controls (four males, three
10 females; aged 20.3±1.0 years; BMI 22.0±1.7 kg/m²) were recruited from a public university.

11 **Intervention(s):** Participants ran a six-mile course in their own footwear at a self-selected pace.

12 **Main Outcome Measures:** Pain visual analogue scale (VAS), pressure pain thresholds (PPT),
13 plantar sensation, foot morphology, weight-bearing dorsiflexion (WBDF), forefoot joint
14 mobility, toe flexion, intrinsic foot muscle strength, and a seated neural provocation test were
15 analyzed pre-and post-run utilizing mixed model group by time ANOVAs, *post hoc* effect size
16 point estimates, and 95% confidence intervals.

17 **Results:** A significant group by time interaction was observed for PPT at the mid-arch (Control:
18 pre: 83.0±27.4N, post: 79.5±22.6N; Symptomatic: pre: 90.5±31.9N, post: 70.1±32.7 N; p=.03)
19 and posterior tibialis (PT) (Control: pre: 75.7±19.5 N, post: 65.7±14.2N; Symptomatic: pre:
20 75.8±20.4 N, post: 51.1±11.9 N; p=.05) sites. PPT in the posterior tibialis significantly decreased
21 in the symptomatic group following the run (ES=1.5, 95% CI: 0.3, 2.7). Both groups

22 demonstrated significantly decreased plantar sensation thresholds at the base of the 5th metatarsal
23 (p=.04), PPT at the calcaneal tuberosity (p=.001), and increased TMT extension (p=.01) and
24 WBDF (p=.01) following the run.

25 **Conclusions:** The etiology of medial plantar pain observed in our sample was likely attributed to
26 central sensitization and running-induced sensory changes. Clinicians should include
27 sensorimotor testing when managing patients with medial plantar pain.

28

29 **Key Words:** Foot; Sensation; Central Nervous System Sensitization; Physical Examination;
30 Diagnosis

31

32 **Abstract Word Count:** 297

33

34 **Body of Manuscript Word Count:** 2736

35

36 **Key Points:** Medial plantar pain is a unique pathologic entity that has not been previously well
37 described and likely caused by central sensitization. Clinicians should include sensorimotor
38 testing and interventions when managing patients with medial plantar pain.

39 INTRODUCTION

40 Running-related lower extremity injuries are ubiquitous and affect about 20% of all
41 runners, especially in individuals who run longer distances.¹ With the increased popularity of
42 long distance races such as half and full marathons, it is not uncommon for both recreational and
43 elite runners to surpass 40 miles per week during training. The majority of running injuries occur
44 at the foot and ankle, with plantar foot pain being a common complaint.²

45 There are several potential pain generators that may contribute to plantar foot pain in long
46 distance runners. Factors such as foot posture and osseous malalignment of the tarsals that lead
47 to intrinsic foot muscular demand may contribute to the onset and recovery of ankle-foot injury.³
48 Muscular fatigue during prolonged running may lead to altered running kinematics and kinetics⁴
49 and aberrant mechanical loading of osseous, ligamentous, muscular, and neurologic structures in
50 the foot and ankle. As dynamic stabilizers of the medial longitudinal arch fatigue during cyclical
51 loading, microtrauma to both dynamic and static stabilizers result in inflammation, abnormal
52 collagen synthesis, and the onset of plantar pain.⁵ Repetitive mechanical stress may result in
53 tissue failure when tension, compression, and shear exceeds the rate of physiological repair and
54 remodeling.⁶

55 Due to the variability of injury mechanism and the multiple potential tissues affected, the
56 clinical presentation of medial plantar pain in runners is complex. Plantar pain is the cardinal
57 symptom in many conditions of the foot such as plantar fasciitis,⁷ tarsal tunnel syndrome,⁸
58 posterior tibialis tendinopathy,^{9,10} and stress fracture.¹¹ These diagnoses share common
59 mechanisms of injury as well as signs and symptoms that frequently present concurrently.
60 However, plantar pain in the central portion of the medial longitudinal arch is a symptom distinct
61 from the other running-related injuries and may have its own unique etiology.

62 The purpose of this descriptive study was to determine if there were differences in pain
63 perception, pressure pain thresholds, plantar sensation, toe flexor and intrinsic foot strength, and
64 foot morphology in long distance runners with and without medial plantar pain before and after a
65 9.7 km (6-mile) run.

66 METHODS

67 *Design*

68 The current study was a laboratory-based descriptive cross-sectional study. The
69 independent variables were group (runners with medial plantar pain, asymptomatic controls) and
70 time (pre-run, post-run) and the primary outcome measures were participant-reported pain and
71 function, plantar sensation, hallux and lesser toe flexion strength, foot morphology across
72 loading, and algometric pressure pain thresholds.

73 *Participants*

74 Seven runners reporting primary plantar pain in the medial longitudinal arch (4 males, 3
75 females; aged 22.3 ± 3.7 years; BMI 22.3 ± 3.5 kg/m²) and 7 matched runners without medial
76 plantar pain (4 males, 3 females; aged 20.3 ± 1.0 years; BMI 22.0 ± 1.7 kg/m²) participated in the
77 current study (**Table 1**).

78 All participants met inclusion criteria as “long distance runners” if they ran at least 65 km
79 (40 miles) per week. Runners were included in the symptomatic group if they experienced a
80 primary complaint of medial plantar foot pain that was exacerbated from running. Participants
81 with comorbid plantar fasciosis,⁷ or posterior tibialis tendinitis^{9,10} were included only if these
82 symptoms were secondary to the primary focal medial plantar pain. Participants in the
83 asymptomatic control group were matched by sex and test limb and were included if they had no
84 complaint of plantar foot symptoms while running. Individuals were excluded if they had signs

85 of tarsal tunnel syndrome,⁸ osseous,¹²⁻¹⁴ or ligamentous injury,¹² or reported a history ankle or
86 foot sprain in the past year, fracture or surgery in the leg or foot, self-reported disability resulting
87 from lower extremity pathology, neurological or vestibular disorders that affected balance,
88 diabetes mellitus, lumbosacral radiculopathy, a soft tissue disorder such as Marfan or Ehlers-
89 Danlos syndrome. Participants provided informed consent and the study was approved by the
90 university's Institutional Review Board for Health Science Research.

91 *Screening Procedures*

92 Following consent, participants provided medical history and completed the PROMIS
93 General Health Questionnaire version 1.1,¹⁵ Foot and Ankle Ability Measure-Sport Scale,¹⁶ the
94 Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia-11 item scale,¹⁷ and the Grit Scale of Resilience.¹⁸ Participants
95 were asked to rate the severity of their foot pain at the present and at the worst in the past week
96 using a 10-centimeter visual analogue scale (VAS). If participants experienced symptoms in both
97 feet, the foot that was more problematic was evaluated. A board certified orthopedic physical
98 therapist with 15-years of clinical experience completed a screening consisting of observation for
99 the posterior tibial edema sign,¹⁰ plantar arch ecchymosis,¹² or the gap sign;¹² a palpatory
100 examination of the proximal plantar fascia,⁷ tarsal tunnel,⁸ posterior tibial tendon,¹⁰ the Ottawa
101 Ankle Rule screening;¹⁴ the single limb heel raise test;⁹ and performance of provocative tests that
102 include the windlass test,⁷ Tinel's test of the tarsal tunnel,⁸ and the single leg hop test.¹³
103 Following screening, an athletic trainer with one year clinical experience, who was blinded to
104 clinical history conducted pre-and post-run assessments.

105 *Neurosensory Assessment Procedures*

106 Sensory testing was performed at the plantar aspect of the heel, the base of the 5th
107 metatarsal, and the head of the 1st metatarsal using Semmes-Weinstein Monofilaments (Smith &

108 Nephew, Inc, Germantown, WI) in the 4-2-1 stepping protocol.¹⁹ Pressure pain thresholds were
109 tested with a push-pull force gauge (FDN 100, Wagner Instruments, Greenwich, CT) at the apex
110 of medial longitudinal arch, plantar fascia origin, and posterior superior medial malleolus.²⁰
111 Participants were instructed to verbalize when the applied pressure reached an intolerable level.
112 Each location was tested three times with at least 30 seconds between trials with the average of
113 the three trials recorded. Passive seated knee extension was tested with the foot dorsiflexed to
114 assess neural provocation and plantarflexed to assess hamstring length²¹ using a digital
115 inclinometer (Fabrication Enterprises, White Plains, NY). The participant was seated at the foot
116 of the examination table, while sitting erect and holding a dowel behind their back with the
117 occiput, thoracic spine, and the sacrum in contact. The average of three trials was recorded.

118 *Ankle-Foot Morphology, Mobility, and Neuromotor Assessment Procedures*

119 Foot posture was assessed using the Foot Posture Index-6 (FPI-6).²² Total foot length,
120 truncated foot length, foot width, and dorsal arch height were measured seated, double limb
121 standing, and single limb standing using the Arch Height Index Tool (JAKTOOL, Inc,
122 Cranberry, NJ).²² Arch flexibility and foot mobility magnitude were calculated from the
123 morphologic foot measurements across loading. Ankle dorsiflexion was assessed using the
124 weight bearing dorsiflexion test.²² The intrinsic foot muscle (IFM) test was performed as
125 described by Jam.²³ Forefoot inversion and eversion motion was measured using a digital
126 inclinometer (Fabrication Enterprises, White Plains, NY) as described by Fraser and
127 colleagues.²² First metatarsal dorsiflexion and plantar flexion were measured using a custom
128 device consisting of two bent rulers.²² Forefoot and 1st tarsometatarsal measures were performed
129 three times, with the average of each motion recorded. Three trials of hallux and lesser toe flexor

130 strength were assessed using a microFET2 digital handheld dynamometer (Hoggan Health
131 Industries, West Jordan, UT),²² with the highest force recorded.

132 *Intervention*

133 Following the baseline assessment, participants ran an outdoor 9.7 km running course in
134 their own footwear. Participants were instructed to run at a pace that was habitual and based on
135 their current level of training. Immediately following the run, each participant was asked to rate
136 their current foot pain using the VAS. A post-run assessment consisting of sensory testing, foot
137 morphology, intrinsic foot muscle test, toe flexion strength, pressure pain threshold, seated knee
138 extension, forefoot inversion and eversion, 1st metatarsal dorsiflexion and plantar flexion, and
139 weight-bearing dorsiflexion range of motion tests was performed. Participants were dismissed
140 from the study following their post-run assessment.

141 *Statistical Analysis*

142 Descriptive statistics were calculated for group demographic and self-reported measures,
143 with independent t-tests used to assess group differences. Proportion estimates and 95% CI were
144 calculated for all dichotomous variables. The Wilcoxon's signed rank test was used to assess
145 group differences for the IFM test at pre-and post-run time points. Ordinal measures that had
146 greater than five items (plantar sensation) were treated as continuous data during analysis.²⁴
147 Mixed model group by time ANOVAs and *post hoc* Cohen's *d* effect size (ES) point estimates
148 and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated. ES were interpreted using the scheme
149 proposed by Cohen:²⁵ as trivial (<0.2), small (0.2-0.49), moderate (0.5-0.79), or large (>0.8). Pre-
150 to-post treatment ES point estimates and 95% CI were statistically significant when the CI did not
151 cross the '0' threshold. Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)
152 Version 23.0 (IBM, Inc., Armonk, New York). Proportion point estimates, Cohen's *d* effect sizes,

153 and 95% confidence intervals were calculated using Microsoft Excel for Mac 2016 (Microsoft
154 Corp., Redmond, WA). The level of significance was $p \leq 0.05$ for all analyses.

155

156

RESULTS

157 No statistical differences were observed for demographics, injury history, or foot posture
158 between groups. The symptomatic group had significantly decreased PROMIS Physical
159 composite and FAAM Sport scores compared to controls (**Table 1**). Both groups primarily
160 utilized training shoes during long distance running. Running style was equally distributed
161 among the control group (rearfoot: 33.3%, midfoot: 33.3%, forefoot: 33.3%). The majority
162 (85.7%) of the symptomatic group was observed to have a midfoot strike pattern.

163 A significant group by time interaction for pressure pain threshold at the mid-arch
164 (Control: pre: 83.0 ± 27.4 N, post: 79.5 ± 22.6 N; Symptomatic: pre: 90.5 ± 31.9 N, post: 70.1 ± 32.7
165 N; $p=.03$) and posterior tibialis (Control: pre: 75.7 ± 19.5 N, post: 65.7 ± 14.2 N; Symptomatic:
166 pre: 75.8 ± 20.4 N, post: 51.1 ± 11.9 N; $p=.05$) sites was present (**Table 2**). Only the posterior
167 tibialis in the symptomatic group demonstrated a significantly large decrease (ES=1.5, 95% CI:
168 0.3, 2.7) in pressure pain threshold following the run (**Figure 4**). Both groups demonstrated
169 decreased thresholds for plantar sensation at the base of the 5th metatarsal ($p=.04$) and pressure
170 pain at the calcaneal tuberosity ($p=.001$) following the run (**Table 2**) and a significant increase in
171 TMT extension ($p=.01$) and WBDF ($p=.01$) (**Table 3**). There were no significant differences in
172 IFM test performance pre-to-post run in either group (Control: pre: 2.4 ± 0.8 , post: 2.7 ± 0.5 , $p=.16$;
173 Symptomatic: pre: 2.4 ± 0.8 , post: 2.4 ± 0.8 , $p=1.00$). There were no additional significant group or
174 time effects or group by time interactions.

175

DISCUSSION

176 To the author's knowledge, the current study is the first to describe neurophysiologic
177 changes in long distance runners with a primary complaint of medial plantar pain. The primary
178 findings of this case control study were that runners with medial plantar pain had a significant
179 decrease in pressure pain threshold prior to and following a 9.7 km (6-mile) run at the apex of
180 the arch and the posterior tibialis muscle compared to a similarly matched control group that did
181 not experience a change. Both groups demonstrated a significantly decreased threshold in
182 pressure pain at the plantar fascia origin and sensation at the base of the 5th metatarsal and
183 increased 1st tarsometatarsal dorsiflexion, and weight bearing dorsiflexion motion following their
184 run.

185 *Neurosensory Function*

186 Decreased pressure pain thresholds in the apex of the arch and the posterior tibialis
187 muscle after the run is likely attributed to a combination of local nociception of tissue reactivity
188 originating in the medial longitudinal arch and central neurosensory effects. The decreased
189 pressure pain threshold at the posterior tibialis had a large effect size (**Figure 4**), supporting
190 central sensitization as a plausible explanation.

191 Central sensitization is a phenomenon that results from up regulation of afferent
192 nociceptive pathways in the spinal dorsal horn which is facilitated by pain generation in adjacent
193 pain pathways.²⁶ This nociceptive up regulation results in regional hyperalgesia and remote
194 sensory changes away from the primary pain generator.²⁶ The medial longitudinal arch is
195 innervated by the medial plantar nerve, a branch of the tibial nerve. Since the posterior tibialis
196 shares the same innervation proximally in the deep posterior compartment of the leg, it is
197 plausible that the observed proximal changes in pressure pain thresholds were the results of
198 central sensitization caused by pain generators in the medial plantar foot.

199 It is also plausible that the symptomatic group had a peripheral neuropathic contributor to
200 their symptoms. While conceivable, our findings do not support this mechanism. Participants
201 with medial plantar pain did not present with paresthesia, sensory loss, and or motor loss during
202 the heel raise screening or strength testing, alterations of foot morphology across loading, or
203 tibial nerve provocation before or following the 9.7 km run.

204 Healthy and symptomatic groups experienced decreased pressure pain thresholds in the
205 plantar fascia and decreased sensory thresholds at the plantar aspect of the 5th metatarsal base
206 following the run. These findings are likely related to physiological sensory changes that have
207 been associated with exercise. Hosseinzadeh et al.²⁷ found pressure pain thresholds decrease after
208 a repeated bout of eccentric exercise, suggesting a hypersensitization of local soft tissue. It is
209 also conceivable that variability of sensory testing with monofilaments or anticipation of pain
210 during algometric assessment may also explain our findings.

211 *Ankle-Foot Morphology, Mobility, and Neuromotor Strength*

212 We observed an absence of group differences or changes in foot morphology, midfoot
213 joint motion, or strength after the run. These results are suggestive that medial arch pain in our
214 sample was not a mechanical problem. Previous research has theorized that decreased medial
215 longitudinal arch height may induce a greater strain on the supporting structures of the foot that
216 may result injury.⁵ Our findings do not substantiate this supposition.

217 The observed increase in ankle dorsiflexion following the our participants' run is
218 consistent with changes found following dynamic warm-up exercise.²⁸ Exercise has previously
219 been demonstrated to increase muscle and connective tissue temperature and therefore increase
220 tissue pliability.²⁸ While we did not assess muscle temperature in our study, we can assume that

221 our participants experienced increased core temperature following the exercise that likely
222 resulted in increased tissue elasticity.

223 *Clinical Implications*

224 Our results identified clinical characteristics of medial plantar pain in long distance
225 runners. Clinicians should be cognizant that medial plantar pain is complex, may encompass
226 multiple potential pain generators, and may involve central pain mechanisms. We recommend
227 that clinicians take a holistic approach during examination of these patients and assess the
228 multiple segments of the ankle-foot complex. Neurosensory testing that includes monofilament
229 testing and pressure pain thresholds may have clinical utility in the assessment of these patients
230 and should be performed as part of a comprehensive evaluation in patients presenting with
231 medial plantar pain.

232 We recommend that clinicians assess running gait mechanics in patients with medial
233 plantar pain. Daoud and colleagues²⁹ found runners with rearfoot strike patterns to have higher
234 rates of injury compared to forefoot strike patterns. However, in our study, we found that 85.7%
235 of the symptomatic group were midfoot strikers. Therefore, it is plausible that midfoot strike
236 patterns may play a role in the pathomechanics that lead to medial plantar pain. These results
237 should be interpreted with caution because of our small sample size and should be confirmed in a
238 larger, more diverse sample of distance runners.

239 While it is unclear if decreased sensory thresholds are protective or contributory to pain
240 symptoms, we speculate that it may be beneficial for patients with medial plantar pain to perform
241 exercises barefoot on a variety of different textured surfaces such as carpet, foam, turf, grass, or
242 sand. Repeat exposure to different surfaces may desensitize these patients through habituation
243 and sensory reeducation. Manual therapy, to include myofascial release, soft tissue mobilization,

244 and joint mobilization, should be considered as a treatment modality in the management of
245 medial plantar pain due to central neurophysiologic effects in reducing pressure pain thresholds²⁰
246 and cutaneous hypersensitivity³⁰ in the foot.

247 *Limitations and Future Considerations*

248 The study is not without limitations. It is unclear whether sensory changes preceded the
249 development of medial plantar pain or if this was a consequence following the development of
250 symptoms. Our preliminary study consisted of a small convenience sample. Combined with high
251 variability of some of the measures, it is plausible that we were underpowered to establish
252 statistically significant differences for some of the mechanical outcome measures. Future
253 research using a larger sample is needed. We also did not control for orthotic use, running shoe
254 type, or time to complete the run. While these delimitations may be viewed as a potential
255 limitation, they improve generalizability. Future studies of the effects of sensitization and
256 pressure pain changes at increased distance, such as half marathon or marathon distance is
257 recommended.

258 *Conclusion*

259 Medial plantar pain is a unique pathologic entity that has not been previously well
260 described and likely caused by central sensitization. We found that long distance runners with
261 medial arch pain had a greater change in pressure pain thresholds at the arch and at the distal
262 posterior tibialis muscle compared to healthy participants after a 6-mile run. There were no
263 changes in toe flexor strength, foot motion, or tibial nerve provocation after the run suggesting
264 central sensitization plays a role in this clinical entity. Clinicians should include sensorimotor
265 testing and interventions when managing patients with medial plantar pain.

266
267

REFERENCES

- 268
269
270 1. Hollander K, Rahlf AL, Wilke J, et al. Sex-Specific Differences in Running Injuries: A
271 Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression. *Sports Med*. Published
272 online January 12, 2021. doi:10.1007/s40279-020-01412-7
- 273 2. Kindred J, Trubey C, Simons SM. Foot Injuries in Runners: *Curr Sports Med Rep*.
274 2011;10(5):249-254. doi:10.1249/JSR.0b013e31822d3ea4
- 275 3. Kaufman KR, Brodine SK, Shaffer RA, Johnson CW, Cullison TR. The Effect of Foot
276 Structure and Range of Motion on Musculoskeletal Overuse Injuries. *Am J Sports Med*.
277 1999;27(5):585-593.
- 278 4. Dudley RI, Pamukoff DN, Lynn SK, Kersey RD, Noffal GJ. A prospective comparison of
279 lower extremity kinematics and kinetics between injured and non-injured collegiate cross
280 country runners. *Hum Mov Sci*. 2017;52:197-202. doi:10.1016/j.humov.2017.02.007
- 281 5. Wearing SC, Smeathers JE, Urry SR, Hennig EM, Hills AP. The pathomechanics of plantar
282 fasciitis. *Sports Med Auckl NZ*. 2006;36(7):585-611.
- 283 6. Zarins B. Soft tissue injury and repair-biomechanical aspects. *Int J Sports Med*. 1982;3(S
284 1):S9-S11.
- 285 7. Petraglia F, Ramazzina I, Costantino C. Plantar fasciitis in athletes: diagnostic and
286 treatment strategies. A systematic review. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J*. 2017;7(1):107-
287 118. doi:10.11138/mltj/2017.7.1.107
- 288 8. McSweeney SC, Cichero M. Tarsal tunnel syndrome—A narrative literature review. *The*
289 *Foot*. 2015;25(4):244-250. doi:10.1016/j.foot.2015.08.008
- 290 9. Bubra PS, Keighley G, Rateesh S, Carmody D. Posterior Tibial Tendon Dysfunction: An
291 Overlooked Cause of Foot Deformity. *J Fam Med Prim Care*. 2015;4(1):26-29.
292 doi:10.4103/2249-4863.152245
- 293 10. DeOrio JK, Shapiro SA, McNeil RB, Stansel J. Validity of the Posterior Tibial Edema Sign
294 in Posterior Tibial Tendon Dysfunction. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2011;32(2):189-192.
295 doi:10.3113/FAI.2011.0189
- 296 11. Gross CE, Nunley JA. Navicular Stress Fractures. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2015;36(9):1117-1122.
297 doi:10.1177/1071100715600495
- 298 12. Gotha HE, Lareau CR, Fellars TA. Diagnosis and Management of Lisfranc Injuries and
299 Metatarsal Fractures. *R I Med J*. 2013;96(5):33-36.
- 300 13. Bradley LN, Blakey SC. Single-Leg Hop Test in the Evaluation of Stress Injuries. *Athl*
301 *Train Sports Health Care J Pract Clin*. 2014;6(5):201-202.

- 302 14. Bachmann LM. Accuracy of Ottawa ankle rules to exclude fractures of the ankle and mid-
303 foot: systematic review. *BMJ*. 2003;326(7386):417-417. doi:10.1136/bmj.326.7386.417
- 304 15. Reeve BB, Hays RD, Bjorner JB, et al. Psychometric Evaluation and Calibration of Health-
305 Related Quality of Life Item Banks: Plans for the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement
306 Information System (PROMIS). *Med Care*. 2007;45(Suppl 1):S22-S31.
307 doi:10.1097/01.mlr.0000250483.85507.04
- 308 16. Martin RL, Irrgang JJ, Burdett RG, Conti SF, Swearingen JMV. Evidence of Validity for
309 the Foot and Ankle Ability Measure (FAAM). *Foot Ankle Int*. 2005;26(11):968-983.
310 doi:10.1177/107110070502601113
- 311 17. Tkachuk GA, Harris CA. Psychometric Properties of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia-
312 11 (TSK-11). *J Pain*. 2012;13(10):970-977. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2012.07.001
- 313 18. Duckworth AL, Quinn PD. Development and Validation of the Short Grit Scale (Grit-S). *J*
314 *Pers Assess*. 2009;91(2):166-174. doi:10.1080/00223890802634290
- 315 19. Wikstrom EA, Allen G. Reliability of two-point discrimination thresholds using a 4-2-1
316 stepping algorithm. *Somatosens Mot Res*. 2016;0(0):1-5.
317 doi:10.1080/08990220.2016.1227313
- 318 20. Ajimsha MS, Binsu D, Chithra S. Effectiveness of myofascial release in the management of
319 plantar heel pain: A randomized controlled trial. *The Foot*. 2014;24(2):66-71.
320 doi:10.1016/j.foot.2014.03.005
- 321 21. Alshami AM, Babri AS, Souvlis T, Coppieters MW. Strain in the Tibial and Plantar Nerves
322 With Foot and Ankle Movements and the Influence of Adjacent Joint Positions. *J Appl*
323 *Biomech*. 2008;24(4):368-376.
- 324 22. Fraser JJ, Koldenhoven RM, Saliba SA, Hertel J. Reliability of ankle-foot morphology,
325 mobility, strength, and motor performance measures. *Int J Sports Phys Ther*.
326 2017;12(7):1134-1149. doi:10.16603/ijsp20171134
- 327 23. Jam B. Evaluation and retraining of the intrinsic foot muscles for pain syndromes related to
328 abnormal control of pronation. *Adv Phys Ther Educ Inst*. Published online 2006.
- 329 24. Norman G. Likert scales, levels of measurement and the “laws” of statistics. *Adv Health Sci*
330 *Educ*. 2010;15(5):625-632. doi:10.1007/s10459-010-9222-y
- 331 25. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Routledge; 2013.
- 332 26. Woolf CJ. Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. *Pain*.
333 2011;152(3 Suppl):S2-S15. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2010.09.030
- 334 27. Hosseinzadeh M, Andersen OK, Arendt-Nielsen L, Madeleine P. Pain sensitivity is
335 normalized after a repeated bout of eccentric exercise. *Eur J Appl Physiol*.
336 2013;113(10):2595-2602. doi:10.1007/s00421-013-2701-0

- 337 28. Safran MR, Garrett WE, Seaber AV, Glisson RR, Ribbeck BM. The role of warmup in
338 muscular injury prevention. *Am J Sports Med.* 1988;16(2):123-129.
339 doi:10.1177/036354658801600206
- 340 29. Daoud AI, Geissler GJ, Wang F, Saretsky J, Daoud YA, Lieberman DE. Foot Strike and
341 Injury Rates in Endurance Runners: A Retrospective Study. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
342 2012;44(7):1325-1334. doi:10.1249/MSS.0b013e3182465115
- 343 30. Martins DF, Bobinski F, Mazzardo-Martins L, et al. Ankle joint mobilization decreases
344 hypersensitivity by activation of peripheral opioid receptors in a mouse model of
345 postoperative pain. *Pain Med.* 2012;13(8):1049-1058.
- 346

Table 1. Means and (Standard Deviations) for Participant Characteristics

Characteristics		Healthy (n = 7)	Symptomatic (n = 7)	(p-value)
Demographics	Age, mean (SD), mo.	20.3 (0.9)	22.3 (3.7)	.21
	Height, mean (SD), cm	166.6 (6.0)	174.3 (11.1)	.14
	Weight, mean (SD), kg	60.8 (4.6)	67.1 (8.2)	.11
	BMI, mean (SD), kg*(m²)⁻¹	22.0 (1.7)	22.3 (3.5)	.85
Patient Reported Outcomes	# previous ankle sprains	0.0 (0.0)	0.7 (1.2)	.26
	# foot sprains	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.00
	PROMIS Physical	19.0 (0.6)	17.4 (1.7)	.05
	PROMIS Mental	17.4 (1.3)	17.7 (1.8)	.74
	EQ5D	0.8 (0.0)	0.8 (0.1)	.34
	TSK 11	13.0 (2.8)	16.0 (5.1)	.21
	Grit	3.8 (0.6)	4.2 (0.2)	.09
	FAAM Sport	100.0 (0.0)	89.4 (11.9)	.04
	FAAM SANE	100.0 (0.0)	95.0 (7.6)	.11
	FPI	2.6 (2.4)	0.4 (1.7)	.08
Shoe Type	Trainers	16.7%	14.3%	
	Flats	83.3%	85.7%	
	Spikes	0.0%	0.0%	
Foot Strike	Forefoot	33.3%	0.0%	
	Midfoot	33.3%	85.7%	
	Rearfoot	33.3%	14.3%	

*Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System, European Quality of Life-5 Dimensions, Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia-11, Short Grit Scale, Foot and Ankle Ability Measure-Sport, Foot and Ankle Ability Measure Single Assessment Numeric Evaluation, Visual Analog Score, Foot Posture Index-6

Table 2. Means and (Standard Deviations) for Neurosensory Assessment

Dependent Variable	Healthy		Symptomatic		Group (p-value)	Time (p-value)	Group x Time (p-value)
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
PPT Mid-Arch, mean (SD), N	83.0 (27.4)	79.5 (22.6)	90.5 (31.9)	70.1 (32.7)	.95	.005	.03
PPT Calcaneal Tuberosity, mean (SD), N	110.1 (26.7)	100.6 (21.5)	102.4 (31.6)	85.6 (34.5)	.47	.001	.25
PPT Posterior Tibialis, mean (SD), N	75.7 (19.5)	65.7 (14.2)	75.8 (20.4)	51.1 (11.9)	.41	<.001	.05
Monofilament Heel, mean (SD), g	15.7 (26.5)	8.7 (10.0)	9.5 (5.8)	10.1 (9.4)	.74	.41	.33
Monofilament Base of 5th, mean (SD), g	3.1 (3.9)	1.8 (1.9)	4.7 (3.9)	1.8 (1.8)	.55	.04	.42
Monofilament 1st metatarsal head, mean (SD), g	8.5 (10.4)	5.5 (6.6)	8.2 (5.9)	5.6 (5.4)	.97	.22	.93

SD=standard deviation, N=Newtons, g=grams

Table 3. Means and (Standard Deviations) for Ankle-Foot Morphology, Mobility, and Neuromotor Assessment

Dependent Variable	Healthy		Symptomatic		Group (p-value)	Time (p-value)	Group x Time (p-value)
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
Foot mobility magnitude, mean (SD), cm	2.5 (1.0)	1.7 (0.9)	2.2 (1.5)	2.1 (1.6)	.92	.08	.21
Arch Flexibility, mean (SD), cm*kg ⁻¹	0.04 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)	.08	.20	.43
TMT extension, mean (SD), mm	1.5 (1.0)	2.3 (1.0)	2.3 (1.9)	2.6 (1.8)	.51	.01	.16
TMT flexion, mean (SD), mm	4.1 (1.8)	3.9 (1.9)	4.2 (1.6)	4.1 (0.7)	.81	.62	1.00
Forefoot inversion, mean (SD), degrees	33.2 (7.7)	31.4 (5.0)	32.4 (2.2)	32.8 (3.5)	.90	.53	.33
Forefoot eversion, mean (SD), degrees	14.0 (2.6)	13.5 (4.2)	16.3 (3.6)	15.3 (2.1)	.18	.44	.75
WBDF, mean (SD), cm	10.4 (4.2)	11.8 (3.5)	11.7 (2.2)	12.2 (2.4)	.62	.01	.12
Lesser toe flexion, mean (SD), Nm*kg ⁻¹	128.8 (25.6)	124.6 (11.3)	120.0 (31.4)	122.0 (37.7)	.69	.86	.62
Hallux flexion, mean (SD), Nm*kg ⁻¹	141.4 (28.1)	136.5 (24.6)	142.0 (54.5)	131.1 (46.6)	.91	.28	.68
Knee Ext. with DF, mean (SD), degrees	22.2 (10.6)	20.7 (11.1)	18.1 (7.8)	19.9 (8.1)	.63	.90	.14
Knee Ext. with PF, mean (SD), degrees	13.8 (9.0)	12.7 (9.6)	10.5 (5.5)	11.5 (6.1)	.59	.17	.95

SD=standard deviation, cm=centimeters, cm*kg⁻¹=centimeters per kilogram, mm=millimeters, Nm*kg⁻¹=Newton-meters per kilogram

FIGURES




Figure 1. CONSORT Flow Chart




Figure 2. Pre and post measures of 1. pressure pain thresholds (PPT), measured in Newtons, at the three locations: apex of the medial longitudinal arch, b) calcaneal tuberosity, c) posterior to the medial malleolus along the posterior tibialis tendon and 2. plantar sensation, measured in grams, at the base of the 5th metatarsal




Figure 3. Pre and post measures of weight bearing dorsiflexion (WBD) and tarsometatarsal (TMT) extension range of motion measures.




Figure 4. Pre-to-post run effect size estimates (Cohen's d) and 95% confidence intervals.