

1 **The Effect of Headgear Use on Concussion Injury Rates in High School Lacrosse**

2
3 Daniel C. Herman, MD, PhD

4 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL,
5 USA

6
7 Shane V. Caswell, PhD, ATC, CSCS

8 Athletic Training Education Program, Sports Medicine Assessment, Research &
9 Testing (SMART) Laboratory, George Mason University, Manassas, VA, 20110, USA,

10
11 Patricia M. Kelshaw, PhD, LAT, ATC

12 Athletic Training Program, Department of Kinesiology, University of New Hampshire, Durham,
13 NH

14
15 Heather K. Vincent, PhD

16 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, UF Health Sports Performance Center,
17 University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

18
19 Andrew E. Lincoln, ScD, MS

20 MedStar Sports Medicine Research Center, MedStar Health, Baltimore, MD, USA.
21 Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Georgetown University Medical Center, Washington,
22 DC, USA.

23
24
25
26 Address correspondence to: Daniel C. Herman, MD, PhD; Department of Physical Medicine and
27 Rehabilitation, University of Florida, PO Box 112727, Gainesville, FL, USA
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Abstract

Objectives: The use of headgear is a controversial issue in girls' lacrosse. We compared concussion rates among high school lacrosse players wearing versus not wearing lacrosse headgear.

Methods: Study participants included a sample of convenience of high schools with girls' lacrosse from across the United States. Certified athletic trainers reported athlete exposure and injury data via the National Athletic Treatment, Injury and Outcomes Network during the 2019 through 2021 seasons. The Headgear cohort was inclusive of high schools from the state of Florida, which mandate the use of ASTM standard F3137 headgear, while the Non-Headgear cohort was inclusive of the remaining states, none of which have headgear mandates. Incidence Rate Ratios (IRR) and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) were calculated. IRRs with corresponding CIs that excluded 1.00 were deemed statistically significant.

Results: 141 concussions (Headgear: 25; Non-Headgear: 116) and 357,225 Athlete Exposures (AE) were reported (Headgear: 91,074AE; Non-Headgear: 266,151AE) across all games and practices. Overall, the concussion injury rate per 1000AE was significantly higher in the Non-Headgear cohort (0.44) than the Headgear Cohort (0.27) (IRR=1.59, 95% CI:1.03 - 2.45). The IRR was significantly higher for the Non-Headgear cohort during games (1.74, 95% CI: 1.00, 3.02) but not for practices (1.42, 95% CI: 0.71, 2.83).

Conclusions: These findings indicate that concussion rates among high school girls' lacrosse players not wearing headgear were 59% higher than those wearing headgear. These data support the use of protective headgear to reduce the risk of concussion among high school female lacrosse athletes.

52

53 **Summary**

54 What are the new findings?

- 55
- The use of lacrosse headgear meeting the ASTM F3137 standard was associated with a
- 56 lower risk of experiencing a concussion injury among high school girls' lacrosse players.

57

58 How might these findings impact clinical practice in the future?

- 59
- Lacrosse headgear may be warranted for use for concussion risk mitigation among high
- 60 school girls' lacrosse players.
- Lacrosse headgear may be considered for concussion risk mitigation at other levels of
- 61 play such as the youth or collegiate levels; further study is warranted.
- 62

63

64

65

Introduction

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

Girls' lacrosse continues to be the fastest growing high school sport in the United States (US).[1] Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, high school girls' lacrosse participation grew by 53.63% over the past decade in the US (2008-2009: n=64,929; 2018-2019: n=99,750).[1] Girls' lacrosse is a noncontact sport; however incidental concussions[2-5] and head impacts[6-8] associated with lacrosse game-play are common. A recent epidemiological study, observed across five years (2008-09 through 2013-14) of competitive high school girls' lacrosse, demonstrated that head/face injuries accounted for the most common game-related injuries (0.92/1000 Athlete Exposures [AE]), the majority of which were concussion (0.83/1000AE).[5] Collectively, stick contact is the leading mechanism of both head impacts[7] and subsequent concussions[5] in high school girls' lacrosse.

Due to the non-contact rules for girls' lacrosse, mandated protective equipment is limited to mouthguards and eyewear.[9 10] However, in response to the growing concerns regarding the mechanisms of concussion in girls' lacrosse from incidental contact, rules allowing for the use of soft-shell headgear have been adopted as of January 1, 2017.[9] Specifically, girls' lacrosse headgear must meet the ASTM International F3137 performance standard.[11] As stated in the standard, the headgear was designed "*...to address the forces of some incidental stick and ball to headgear impacts to non-goaltending field players.*"[1] However, headgear effectiveness at mitigating concussion risk remains unclear.[6 12] Despite this lack of clarity, in 2018 the Florida High School Athletic Association mandated the use of headgear meeting the ASTM standard headgear for lacrosse participation.

Substantial debate exists among the lacrosse community regarding implementing headgear in a noncontact sport that often exhibits incidental contact-related injury.[13-16]

88 Competing arguments have pitted the potential benefits of protective headgear (i.e. decreasing
89 severity of impacts could thus decrease the risk of injury) versus the potential for increased
90 aggression and related injury due to risk compensation (i.e. the Peltzman Effect).[17] Until now,
91 there has been insufficient evidence regarding the effectiveness of lacrosse headgear for reducing
92 the risk of concussion among girls' lacrosse players to support either argument. Preliminary
93 evidence at the high school level of girls' lacrosse suggests that headgear may be associated with
94 reduced head impact magnitudes,[6] may not be associated with risk compensatory
95 behaviors,[18] and may be associated with lower rates of concussion injuries during game-
96 play.[19] Therefore, in an effort to better evaluate the implementation of headgear in high school
97 girls' lacrosse, we compared concussion rates among high school girls' lacrosse players in the
98 United States wearing headgear versus without headgear. We hypothesized that the rates of
99 concussion among those players wearing headgear would not be different compared to those
100 players not wearing headgear.

101

102 **Methods**

103 Our approach utilized a quasi-experimental comparison that leveraged the mandatory
104 policy of headgear use in the state of Florida, and compared outcomes to non-headgear-
105 mandating states across the United States (US). This approach utilized an existing national high
106 school injury registry: the High School National Athletic Treatment, Injury and Outcomes
107 Network (NATION). NATION is an athletic trainer-driven injury reporting registry which
108 utilizes a set of common data elements. It is administered by the Datalys Center for Sports Injury
109 Research and Prevention (Indianapolis, IN) and has numerous publications stemming from its

110 use.[20] Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or
111 dissemination plans of our research

112

113 *Recruitment*

114 In order to obtain a high number of player activity exposures, high school athletic trainers
115 were recruited to report data for high school girls' lacrosse to NATION. Athletic trainers (ATs)
116 were incentivised with a \$150 payment for each full season of reporting to NATION. ATs were
117 recruited using publicly available contact information, outreach in collaboration with the
118 National Athletic Trainers Association and the Athletic Training Locations and Services Project,
119 and word-of-mouth. ATs were eligible to report data for the study if: (i) their high school
120 offered a school sponsored girls' lacrosse team, (ii) the AT provided regular onsite care and
121 athletic training services to the athletes, and (iii) the status of a headgear mandate at the local
122 level (i.e., Florida teams must implement headgear, versus teams from non-Florida states could
123 not mandate headgear).

124

125 *Data Reporting*

126 ATs who agreed to participate were referred to Datalys Center, Inc, which provided
127 training on account management and use of the system to report athlete exposure and injury data.
128 A detailed description of the NATION injury-surveillance methods has been published.[21] In
129 brief, ATs who participate in NATION injury-surveillance efforts collected and entered injury
130 and exposure data into a certified electronic medical record that enabled the exporting of data to
131 NATION.[21] Deidentified exposure and injury data were then extracted from these records and
132 checked for errors by trained, experienced NATION data quality-control staff.[21] The NATION

133 injury-surveillance registry has been approved by the Western Institutional Review Board
134 (Puyallup, WA), and the current investigation was approved by the Institutional Review Board
135 (IRB #201802880) at the University of Florida.

136 Reported concussions were operationally defined as injuries that occurred as a result of
137 participation in a girls' high school lacrosse game or practice and were diagnosed by an AT,
138 physician, or other health care professional.[21] Mechanisms of concussion were categorized as
139 player contact, surface contact, contact with equipment, or other/unknown. Time loss for the
140 concussion injuries was defined as the number of days from the injury to return to play. An
141 athlete-exposure (AE) was defined as a single athlete participating in one high school-sanctioned
142 practice or game, regardless of duration, in which the athlete was exposed to the risk of
143 injury.[21] A game exposure required that the athlete participate in the game event to be
144 considered exposed (i.e., athletes on the sideline were not included).[21] Per USA Lacrosse
145 guidelines, individual players from the No Headgear cohort (i.e., non-Florida states) were not
146 restricted from the using headgear during lacrosse participation, and the de-identification process
147 used by High School NATION precluded segregation of injuries and AEs from players using
148 headgear in the No Headgear cohort.

149

150 *Power Analysis*

151 A power analysis was performed using publicly available data from the High School
152 Reporting Information Online data registry.[22] Using data from high school girls' lacrosse from
153 2014 through 2017, an estimate of 1.4 total concussions (from games and practices) per 1000
154 game exposures was used to approximate a baseline non-helmeted player concussion injury rate.
155 A Poisson-distributed model with 80% power and 5% type 1 error rate and a 1:2 cohort ratio was

156 then used to obtain an estimate of 24,509 game exposures in Florida and 49,018 exposures
157 outside of Florida in order to resolve a difference of one concussion per 1000 game exposures.
158 Using an estimate of approximately 375 game exposures per high school (i.e., 25 players over 15
159 games), approximately 65 school-seasons in Florida and 130 school-seasons outside of Florida
160 would be need to provide appropriate power for the study.

161

162 *Data Analysis*

163 Concussion incidence rates (IRs) were calculated as the number (i.e., frequency) of
164 documented concussions divided by the athletic-exposures for games or practices where players
165 had an opportunity to experience a concussion multiplied by 1000. Concussions experienced by
166 goalkeepers were excluded from the analyses. Incident rate ratios (IRRs) were calculated as the
167 ratio of the incident rate for the No Headgear cohort divided by that for the Headgear cohort.
168 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated for both rates and rate ratios using standard
169 techniques. Exploratory analyses were conducted of incidence rates based on mechanism of
170 injury. IRRs with corresponding CIs that excluded 1.00 were deemed statistically significant.

171

172 **Results**

173 A combined 76 school-seasons of data from high schools in the state of Florida and 166
174 school-seasons of data from high schools outside of the state of Florida were reported during the
175 2019 and 2021 seasons (See Table 1). Twenty partial school-seasons of data from high schools in
176 the state of Florida and 27 partial school-seasons of data from high schools outside of the state of
177 Florida were reported during the 2020 season prior to cancellation due to the coronavirus
178 pandemic. Table 1 includes the AEs reported during each of these seasons.

179 Over the three seasons there were a total of 141 documented concussions that occurred
180 over 357,225 AEs, resulting in an overall rate of 0.39 concussions per 1000 AE (95% CI: 0.33,
181 0.46) (See Table 2). The Headgear cohort experienced 25 concussions (17.7%, IR=0.27 per 1000
182 AE, 95% CI: 0.17, 0.38) while the No Headgear cohort had 116 concussions (82.3%, IR=0.27
183 per 1000 AE, 95% CI: 0.36, 0.52). The IRs during games were dramatically higher for both the
184 Headgear (0.58, 95% CI: 0.29, 0.88) and No Headgear (1.01, 95% CI: 0.78, 1.24) cohorts than
185 during practices. The IRRs were significantly higher for the No Headgear cohort during games
186 (1.74, 95% CI: 1.00, 3.02) and overall (1.59, 95% CI: 1.03, 2.45), but not for practices (1.42,
187 95% CI: 0.71, 2.83).

188 In terms of mechanism of injury, contact with stick/ball resulted in the majority of
189 concussions (n=74, 52.5%), followed by contact with player (n=38, 27.0%) and contact with
190 ground (n=26, 18.4%) (See Table 3). The IRRs were not significantly higher among the No
191 Headgear cohort for player contact with equipment (1.77, 95% CI: 0.95, 3.28), player (2.26, 95%
192 CI: 0.88, 5.79), or ground (0.93, 95% CI: 0.39, 2.21).

193

194 Discussion

195 Our findings provide much needed information about concussion rates among high
196 school girls' lacrosse players in Florida, which mandates lacrosse headgear, compared to those
197 states having no headgear mandate. We observed that girls' participating in states not mandating
198 lacrosse headgear had a 59% greater overall incidence of concussion than those required to wear
199 headgear. Moreover, a 74% greater incidence of concussion was observed during game play in
200 states not mandating headgear. However, headgear use was not associated with any significant
201 differences in concussion incidence during practice. Collectively, these findings suggest that use

202 of lacrosse headgear is associated with a lower incidence of concussion incidence in girls' high
203 school lacrosse.

204

205 *Comparison to Previous Investigations*

206 Our findings are consistent with a previous smaller investigation that studied this issue
207 regionally.[19] Baron et. al. followed girls' high school lacrosse athletes from the Public Schools
208 Athletic League of New York City, which has a headgear mandate in place. The authors
209 compared concussion rates among their cohort from the 2017 and 2018 seasons to that of the
210 High School RIO nationwide injury registry from 2009-2016. The use of headgear was
211 associated with a lower overall concussion rates (0.089 per 1000AE) compared to the nationwide
212 cohort (0.375 per 1000AE).

213 While the concussion rates of the headgear cohort were low compared to the headgear
214 cohort in the present investigation, the study by Baron et. al. was limited by the relatively small
215 number of athlete exposures (22,397AE) among the headgear cohort. In contrast, our study
216 leveraged over four times the headgear cohort AE of this prior study. Furthermore, we used a
217 contemporaneous cohort without headgear for comparison, as opposed to Baron et. al. which
218 used historical data from a previous period with a much wider range of seasons. Additionally,
219 game exposures in our study consisted of all participants playing with headgear or all
220 participants playing without headgear; conversely, the game exposures in the headgear group for
221 Baron et. al. consisted of games with one or both teams wearing headgear. Finally, all of the data
222 recorded in this study were derived from the one data collection registry with one data collection
223 technique rather than a combination of methodologies. These advantages allow for a more robust
224 interpretation of the associations of concussion incidence with headgear use in girls' lacrosse.

225

226 *Mechanisms of Injury*

227 Although not the primary purpose of the study, the relationship between headgear use,
228 concussion and mechanisms of injury were explored. The findings show there was a reduction in
229 the rate of concussion by nearly half with headgear in situations where equipment (i.e. ball or
230 stick) versus player were involved. While this was not statistically significant, this is a
231 compelling avenue for additional research. Prior research suggests the most common mechanism
232 of concussion in girl's lacrosse is via equipment versus player contact.[5] The magnitude of
233 impacts associated with this mechanism of injury have the potential to be particularly high, with
234 linear and rotational acceleration magnitudes from ball and stick impacts second only to
235 falls.[23] Thus, any reduction in concussion risk from this mechanism is clinically important.
236 Previous investigations support the ability of headgear meeting the ASTM F3137 standard in
237 reducing impact magnitudes. Laboratory research using lacrosse headgear meeting the ASTM
238 F3137 standard report a reduction in both linear and rotational accelerations.[24] Similarly, a
239 recent study investigated the effect of headgear versus no headgear conditions on peak linear
240 accelerations and peak rotational velocities during actual game play on high school girls lacrosse
241 players instrumented with wearable sensors.[6] The headgear condition resulted in slight
242 reductions to the mean impact magnitudes experienced by the players.[6] Our findings may lend
243 support to the notion that the headgear are effective at mitigating such impacts that may result in
244 concussion among this cohort; however, further investigation is needed using study designs that
245 are appropriately powered to assess concussion incidence based on mechanism of injury.

246 Similarly, there was a non-significant reduction in the incidence of concussion by a
247 player versus player mechanism of injury by over half with headgear use. We are unable to

248 discern a rationale for a potential protective effect of lacrosse headgear for concussions resulting
249 from player contact mechanisms; however, our data may provide insight into the potential role of
250 risk compensation, also known as the Peltzman Effect.[17] This postulates that individuals may
251 act with less caution when they have a greater level of protection; or, when applied to gameplay
252 scenarios such as lacrosse, players may act with greater aggression towards an opponent that
253 they feel has a greater level of protection. If the headgear was protective but significant risk
254 compensation also occurred, players in the headgear cohort may have experienced a reduction in
255 equipment vs player concussions but a greater rate of player versus player or player versus
256 ground concussions. However, this was not observed, which speaks against any effect of risk
257 compensation on the study results. Collectively, our findings along with prior observations of
258 perceptions of headgear use,[18] may dispel some concerns regarding compensatory aggressive
259 behaviors subsequent to headgear use in girls' lacrosse. Again, given the fact that our study was
260 not adequately powered to make comparisons based on mechanism of injury, this possibility
261 should be treated with caution.

262

263 *Limitations*

264 The primary limitation of this study is the lack of randomisation regarding the use of
265 protective headgear. The use of players at high schools in the state of Florida for the headgear
266 cohort was necessary owing to the fact that Florida is the only state in the United States with a
267 protective headgear mandate for girls' lacrosse. Regardless, this design may introduce potential
268 confounding elements that would bias the results. Possible confounders may be regional
269 differences in game play and officiating between the state of Florida and the remainder of the
270 United State.

271 It was assumed that all players in the No Headgear cohort in fact did not use headgear;
272 however, as noted previously, players were not restricted from using headgear and the nature of
273 the reporting system precluded segregation of data from such players in the No Headgear cohort.
274 Anecdotally, the use of headgear among states outside of Florida and in areas without a local
275 helmet mandate is exceedingly low, and thus we feel the contribution of injury and AE data from
276 athletes using headgear in the No Headgear cohort to be trivial. Furthermore, given the
277 demonstrated association of headgear use with a reduced risk of concussion, any contributions
278 from such athletes in the No Headgear cohort would serve to strengthen the findings rather than
279 diminish the relationship.

280 However, this assumption does pose another limitation to the current study. The
281 comparison cohorts included games in which all players used headgear versus when all players
282 did not use headgear; as such we are unable to make conclusions regarding games featuring
283 players in games with mixed headgear status (e.g. one team using headgear while the other team
284 does not). It is possible that any contribution from risk compensation may be different under
285 such circumstances, although the prior biomechanical study by Caswell et. al., which was
286 conducted using such an environment, suggests otherwise.[6]

287

288 *Conclusion and Future Directions*

289 The results of this study are highly encouraging for athlete safety in high school girls'
290 lacrosse. The data indicate that the use of protective headgear is associated with significantly
291 lower risk of experiencing a concussion injury; as such, we feel that this supports the use of the
292 ASTM F3137 standard headgear for the sport in this age cohort.

293 It is possible that protective headgear may have similar effects in different populations of
294 girls' lacrosse. These may include athletes at the collegiate level or higher, as well as athletes at
295 the developmental or youth levels. A measure of caution is necessary as significant differences in
296 game play, officiating performance, body control, skill development, and neck strength are likely
297 to be present at these difference levels, which may influence the association between headgear
298 and concussion risk. In light of the current results, additional investigation is warranted for these
299 populations.

300 These findings also suggest that headgear may be protective in other non-contact sports
301 with moderate-high rates of concussion that do not mandate protective equipment. Formal
302 evaluation studies in such sports would be needed to confirm any protective effects and detect
303 any potential unintended consequences.

304

305 **Funding**

306 Grant support for this study was provided by USA Lacrosse and the National Operating
307 Committee on Standards for Athletic Equipment.

308

309 **Competing Interests Statement**

310 The authors, their spouses, or their children have no associations with commercial entities
311 relevant to the submitted manuscript.

312

313 **Table 1.** Athlete Exposures

	No Headgear	Headgear	Overall
Team-Seasons			
2018-2019	48	26	74
2019-2020*	27	20	47
2020-2021	118	50	168
Total	193	96	289
Athlete Exposures			
2018-2019	89,504	26,321	115,825
2019-2020*	6,656	6,246	12,902
2020-2021	169,991	58,507	228,498
Total Games	73,125	25,733	98,858
Total Practices	193,026	65,341	258,367
Total Games and Practices	266,151	91,074	357,225

314 *Season shortened as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

315

316

317 **Table 2.** Concussion incidence among girls' high school lacrosse players wearing headgear vs.
 318 not wearing headgear by game type

	Overall		Games		Practices	
	No Headgear	Headgear	No Headgear	Headgear	No Headgear	Headgear
Frequency	116	25	74	15	42	10
AEs	266,151	91,074	73,125	25,733	193,026	65,341
Incident Rate per 1000 AEs (95% CI)	0.44 (0.36, 0.52)	0.27 (0.17, 0.38)	1.01 (0.78, 1.24)	0.58 (0.29, 0.88)	0.22 (0.15, 0.28)	0.15 (0.06, 0.25)
Incident Rate Ratio (95% CI)	1.59 (1.03, 2.45)		1.74 (1.00, 3.02)		1.42 (0.71, 2.83)	

319 AEs: Athletic-exposures

320 IRR: Incident Rate Ratio (Headgear cohort is the reference)

321

322

323 **Table 3.** Concussion incidence among girls’ high school lacrosse players wearing headgear vs.
 324 not wearing headgear by mechanism of concussion

	Equipment		Player		Ground	
	No Headgear	Headgear	No Headgear	Headgear	No Headgear	Headgear
Frequency	62	12	33	5	19	7
AEs	266,151	91,074	266,151	91,074	266,151	91,074
Incident Rate per 1000 AEs (95% CI)	0.23 (0.17, 0.29)	0.13 (0.06, 0.21)	0.12 (0.08, 0.17)	0.05 (0.01, 0.10)	0.22 (0.15, 0.28)	0.08 (0.02, 0.13)
Incident Rate Ratio (95% CI)	1.77 (0.95, 3.28)		2.26 (0.88, 5.79)		0.93 (0.39, 2.21)	

325 AEs: Athletic-exposures

326 IRR: Incident Rate Ratio (Headgear cohort is the reference)

327 “Other” mechanism (n=3) not included

328

329

330

331 **References**

332

- 333 1. NFHS (National Federation of State High School Associations): High School Participation Survey
334 Archive. Online, 2019.
- 335 2. Caswell SV, Lincoln AE, Almquist JL, et al. Video incident analysis of head injuries in high school girls'
336 lacrosse. *Am J Sports Med* 2012;40(4):756-62.
- 337 3. Lincoln AE, Caswell SV, Almquist JL, et al. Effectiveness of the women's lacrosse protective eyewear
338 mandate in the reduction of eye injuries. *Am J Sports Med* 2012;40(3):611-4.
- 339 4. Lincoln AE, Caswell SV, Almquist JL, et al. Trends in concussion incidence in high school sports: a
340 prospective 11-year study. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39(5):958-63.
- 341 5. Pierpoint LA, Caswell SV, Walker N, et al. The First Decade of Web-Based Sports Injury Surveillance:
342 Descriptive Epidemiology of Injuries in US High School Girls' Lacrosse (2008-2009 Through 2013-
343 2014) and National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Lacrosse (2004-2005 Through 2013-
344 2014). *J Athl Train* 2019;54(1):42-54.
- 345 6. Caswell SV, Kelshaw PM, Lincoln AE, et al. The Effects of Headgear in High School Girls' Lacrosse.
346 *Orthop J Sports Med* 2020;8(12):2325967120969685.
- 347 7. Caswell SV, Lincoln AE, Stone H, et al. Characterizing Verified Head Impacts in High School Girls'
348 Lacrosse. *Am J Sports Med* 2017;45(14):3374-81.
- 349 8. Cortes N, Lincoln AE, Myer GD, et al. Video Analysis Verification of Head Impact Events Measured by
350 Wearable Sensors. *Am J Sports Med* 2017;45(10):2379-87.
- 351 9. Women's Rules. US Lacrosse. , 2016.
- 352 10. Carter EA, Westerman BJ, Lincoln AE, et al. Common game injury scenarios in men's and women's
353 lacrosse. *Int J Inj Contr Saf Promot* 2010;17(2):111-8.
- 354 11. ASTM F3137 -15 Standard Specification for Headgear Used in Women's Lacrosse (Excluding
355 Goalkeepers): ASTM International, 2015.
- 356 12. Kelshaw PM, Gould TE, Jesunathadas M, et al. Laboratory Performance Evaluation of Pristine and
357 Used Headgear for Girls' Lacrosse. *J Appl Biomech* 2019;35(4):297-302.
- 358 13. US Lacrosse Statement on Florida Girls' Headgear Mandate.
- 359 14. Pennington B. As Concussion Worries Rise, Girls' Lacrosse Turns to Headgear. *The New York Times*
360 November 23, 2017.
- 361 15. Pennington B. With Headgear Here, Girls' Lacrosse Just Got Safer. Or Did It? *The New Year Times*
362 February 16, 2011.
- 363 16. Schwarz A. In Women's Lacrosse, Headgear Could Make the Game Rougher. *The New York Times*
364 February 16, 2011.
- 365 17. Peltzman. The Effects of Automobile Safety Regulation. *J Polit Econ*. 1975;83(4):677-725.
- 366 18. Kelshaw P, Hepbrun L, Lindsey B, et al. Girls' Lacrosse Players Attitudes Towards Protective
367 Headgear. *J Athl Train*. 2018;53(6):S-310.
- 368 19. Baron SL, Veasley SJ, Kingery MT, et al. Decreased Injury Rate Following Mandated Headgear Use in
369 Women's Lacrosse. *Bull Hosp Jt Dis (2013)* 2020;78(4):260-65.
- 370 20. NATION Publications.
- 371 21. Dompier TP, Marshall SW, Kerr ZY, et al. The National Athletic Treatment, Injury and Outcomes
372 Network (NATION): Methods of the Surveillance Program, 2011-2012 Through 2013-2014. *J Athl*
373 *Train* 2015;50(8):862-9.
- 374 22. High School RIO Study Reports.
- 375 23. Clark JM, Hoshizaki TB, Gilchrist MD. Assessing women's lacrosse head impacts using finite element
376 modelling. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater* 2018;80:20-26.

377 24. McIver KG, Sankaran GN, Lee P, et al. Impact attenuation of male and female lacrosse helmets using
378 a modal impulse hammer. *J Biomech* 2019;95:109313.

379