Effect of rearfoot strikes on the hip and knee rotational kinetic chain during the early phase of cuttings in female athletes

Issei Ogasawara,^{1,3} Yohei Shimokochi,² Shoji Konda,^{1,3} Tatsuo Mae,² Ken Nakata¹

¹Department of Health and Sports Sciences, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka University, 1-17 Machikaneyama-cho, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan

²Department of Health and Sport Management, Osaka University of Health and Sport Sciences, 1-1 Asashirodai, Kumatori-cho, Sennan-gun, Osaka 590-0496, Japan

³Department of Sports Medical Biomechanics, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka University, 2-2 Yamada-oka, Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

Corresponding author:

Issei Ogasawara

Department of Health and Sports Sciences, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka University, 1-17

Machikaneyama-cho, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan; Email: ogasawaraissei@hss.osaka-u.ac.jp,

[Tel:+81-6-6850-6032](tel:+81-6-6850-6032), Fax:+81-6-6850-6030

Key words: foot strike pattern, rotational destabilization, horizontal-plane kinetic chain, deceleration motion, anterior cruciate ligament injury

Manuscript details: Abstract = 264, Main text = 4365, Tables = 1, Figures = 4

Running title: Rearfoot strike induces hip internal rotation

Financial disclosure related to research: None.

Conflict of interests: None.

26 Abstract

27 Purpose: Biomechanical factors affecting horizontal-plane hip and knee kinetic-chain and anterior
28 cruciate ligament (ACL) injury risks during cutting maneuvers remains unclear. This study aimed to
29 examine whether different foot strike patterns alter horizontal-plane hip and knee kinetics and
30 kinematics during a cutting maneuver in female athletes and clarify the individual force contribution
31 for producing high-risk hip and knee loadings.

32

33 Methods: Twenty-five healthy female athletes performed a 60° cutting task with forefoot and
34 rearfoot first strike conditions. Horizontal-plane hip and knee moment components, angles, and
35 angular velocities were calculated using synchronized data of the marker positions on the body
36 landmarks and ground reaction forces (GRF) during the task. The one-dimensional statistical
37 parametric mapping paired t-test was used to identify the significant difference in kinetic and
38 kinematic time-series data between foot strike conditions.

39

40 Results: In the rearfoot strike condition, large hip and knee internal rotation loadings were produced
41 during the first 5% of stance due to the application of GRFs, causing a significantly larger hip
42 internal rotation excursion than that of the forefoot strike condition. Dissimilarly, neither initial hip
43 internal rotation displacement nor knee internal rotation GRF loadings were observed in the forefoot
44 strike condition.

45

46 Conclusion: Rearfoot strike during cutting appears to increase noncontact ACL injury risks as the
47 GRF tend to produce combined hip and knee internal rotation moments and the high-risk lower limb
48 configuration. Conversely, forefoot strike during cutting appears to be an ACL-protecting strategy as
49 the ACL-harmful joint loadings and lower-extremity configurations do not tend to be produced. Thus,
50 improving foot strike patterns during cutting should be incorporated into ACL injury prevention
51 programs.

52

53 Key words:

54 foot strike pattern, rotational destabilization, horizontal-plane kinetic chain, deceleration motion,
55 anterior cruciate ligament injury

56 Introduction

57 Knee injuries are the second most occurrence injuries to ankle injuries in sports (Silvers-Granelli et
58 al., 2015). Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries consist of 20.3% of all these knee injuries
59 (Majewski et al., 2006). Female athletes have 2–4 times higher ACL injury incidence rates than male
60 counter parts (Agel et al., 2005; Arendt and Dick, 1995; Montalvo et al., 2019; Waldén et al., 2010)
61 with females of younger than 25 years old are most likely to sustain an ACL tear (Schilaty et al.,
62 2017). ACL injured people at their younger age results in an increased risk of the early onset
63 posttraumatic knee osteoarthritis and considerable spoil the quality of life (Lohmander et al., 2004).
64 More than 70% of those occur without any direct blow to the knee from others (Boden et al., 2000)
65 during the sharp deceleration motion, such as a cutting or landing in a short period of time from the
66 initial foot contact (Krosshaug et al., 2007). Thus, understanding the mechanisms of noncontact ACL
67 injuries as well as risky and safe movement skills for sharp decelerating motions are essential,
68 especially for young female athletes, to prevent sports-related ACL injuries.

69
70 Hip internal rotation combined with knee valgus and internal rotation observed at the time of
71 noncontact ACL injuries was considered as a risky lower limb configuration for ACL injuries
72 (Boden et al., 2000; Ireland, 1999; Quatman and Hewett, 2009). A video analysis study (Koga et al.,
73 2018) reported that hip internal rotation followed by subsequent knee internal rotation was
74 commonly observed in 10 injury cases. A lab-controlled study supported the effect of the
75 horizontal-plane hip configuration on the knee loadings that the hip internal rotation at foot impact is
76 a significant predictor of knee valgus loading during cutting maneuvers in female athletes (McLean
77 et al., 2005; Pollard et al., 2007; Sigward et al., 2015). Collectively, these previous studies suggested
78 that the loss of rotational hip control at initial contact (IC) may indirectly alter the mechanical status
79 of the knee, resulting in high loading on the passive knee structures including the ACL. Therefore,
80 identifying the mechanical and technical factor that induces the horizontal hip and knee rotational
81 instability is very interesting from the perspective of ACL injury risk.

82
83 Given the noncontact mechanism of ACL injuries, the ground reaction force (GRF) exerted at the
84 center of pressure (CoP) of the landing foot would be a primary external force which is capable of
85 developing the abnormal hip and knee rotational configurations in this time frame. Previous
86 lab-controlled studies have tried to identify the specific joint loading patterns associated with the
87 risky hip and knee configurations (Havens and Sigward, 2015a; McLean et al., 2005; Pollard et al.,
88 2007, 2018). In the most of those studies, only the resultant moment acting on the joint of interest

89 was evaluated as a measure of joint loading, however, how each of the external force component,
90 such as translational and rotational inertia, gravity, free moment and GRF, developed that resultant
91 moment was not well focused in the context of ACL injury. Specifically, knowing the GRF's
92 contribution on the final joint kinematics may provide an insight into the mechanical cause of the hip
93 and knee kinetic chain observed in the situation of the noncontact ACL injury.

94
95 The rearfoot strike (RFS), as a potential technical factor, has been reported to be frequently
96 associated with noncontact ACL injuries (Boden et al., 2009; Koga et al., 2018; Montgomery et al.,
97 2016; Waldén et al., 2015). Lab-controlled studies have also suggested that the different foot strike
98 pattern (Cortes et al., 2012; David et al., 2017) or foot orientation relative to the floor (Kristianslund
99 et al., 2014; Shimokochi et al., 2016) altered the knee loading pattern during cutting or landing
100 maneuvers. Further, our group recently reported that the GRF acting at the rearfoot is more likely to
101 apply to the combined knee valgus and tibial internal rotation moment in the early phase of cutting
102 maneuvers (Ogasawara et al., 2020). Although the previous studies revealed the link between the
103 foot strike pattern and knee loading pattern, it is still unknown whether different foot strike patterns
104 affect the hip and knee horizontal-plane kinetics and kinematics during the deceleration phase of
105 cutting maneuvers in female athletes.

106
107 Therefore, the purpose of this study was to i) clarify the individual external force contributions for
108 producing high-risk hip and knee loadings, and ii) investigate whether the different foot strike
109 patterns, forefoot strike (FFS) and RFS, alter the horizontal-plane hip and knee kinetics and
110 kinematics during a cutting maneuver in female athletes. We hypothesized that i) the moment
111 derived from the GRF, among the other types of external forces, significantly determine the
112 magnitude of the hip and knee resultant moments, and ii) on the basis of the potential risk of RFSs,
113 we hypothesized that the RFS would produce a significantly greater GRF-driven internal rotation
114 moment of hip and knee than FFS, and further this GRF loading would produce a greater hip and
115 knee internal rotation angular excursion and angular velocities than the FFS during the early phase
116 of the cutting maneuver.

117

118 **Methods**

119 **Ethics statement**

120 The ethics board approved this experiment (Mukogawa Women's University, No. 12-13), and written
121 informed consent was obtained from all participants.

122

123 Participants

124 Twenty-five healthy female collegiate handball players participated in this study. All athletes trained
125 2–3 hours per day and were familiar with the change of direction movements. Athletes who had a
126 history of severe knee injuries, such as an ACL tear, or minor lower limb trauma, such as an ankle
127 sprain, in the 6 months preceding the date of initiation of the experiment were excluded.

128

129 Procedure

130 Seventeen reflective markers (diameter, 14 mm) were attached to 17 landmarks (Figure 1A, Table 1)
131 by the same researcher (IO). The participants were instructed to change the running direction with a
132 single step (cutting task) at an angle of 60° (Besier et al., 2001; Ogasawara et al., 2020). The
133 reference cone was placed on the floor at an angle of 60° from the approach line to guide the
134 participant. The test leg was determined by asking the participants which leg was preferred to
135 control the foot-floor contact point at the instance of impact.

136

137

138 *Figure 1. Reflective marker attachment site and orientations of the local coordinate systems*

139 (A) Location of reflective markers on the right leg. (B) The kinematic model consists of 4 segments (foot, shank, thigh, and pelvis)
140 and 3 joints (ankle, knee, and hip). The local coordinate system for each segment is defined as a 3×3 rotation matrix consisting of 3
141 common perpendicular unit base vectors: the x-axis is the anterior/posterior axis pointing forward, y-axis is the vertical axis along
142 with the longitudinal line of the segment pointing upward, and z-axis is the medial/lateral axis pointing to the right of the segment.

143

Table 1 Locations of the reflective body markers on the cutting limb and pelvis.

Toe	On the most anterior point of the toe, over the shoe
Medial toe	Medial aspect of the most prominent point of the first MP joint, over the shoe
Lateral toe	Lateral aspect of the most prominent point of the fifth MP joint, over the shoe
Dorsal foot	Dorsal aspect of the midpoint of the second and third MP joints, over the shoe
Medial ankle	On the most prominent point of the medial malleolus
Lateral ankle	On the most prominent point of the lateral malleolus
Heel	On the most posterior point of the shoe heel and 2 cm above the floor level when the subject is standing stationary
Medial knee	On the most prominent point of the medial femoral epicondyle
Lateral knee	On the most prominent point of the lateral femoral epicondyle
Tibial tuberosity	On the most prominent point and anterior aspect of the tibial tuberosity
Great trochanter	On the most prominent point of the great trochanters (both sides)
Mid thigh	On the halfway (approximately) point of the anterior aspect of the thigh
ASIS	On the most prominent point of the ASISs (both sides)
PSISs	On the most prominent point of the PSISs (both sides)

ASIS, anterior superior iliac spine; PSIS, posterior superior iliac spine; MP, metatarsophalangeal

144

Two different foot strike conditions (RFS versus [vs.] FFS) were tested. In the RFS condition, participants were required to hit the force plate with their heel first to locate the CoP of the rearfoot at the beginning of the stance phase and then move their weight to the forefoot to push off. For the FFS condition, participants were asked to touch the force plate with their forefoot throughout the stance phase. Since we acknowledged that the GRF more frequently applies the combined knee valgus and tibial internal rotation loads when CoP is at the rearfoot (Ogasawara et al., 2020), the approach speed was set at less than 2.0 m/s to reduce the magnitude of the GRF for participants' safety. The approach speed was monitored online with the data streaming feature of the motion capture system (NatNet, Motive Body 1.1, NaturalPoint, Inc., Corvallis, OR, USA).

After task familiarization was complete, a static standing pose was recorded as the reference for neutral joint angles, and 10 successful trials for each foot condition were recorded. A 3-minute rest between conditions and an approximately 30-second interval between trials were provided to minimize fatigue. To equalize the possible effect of fatigue between foot strike conditions, the order of the 2 conditions was randomized for each participant. The success of the foot strike pattern was visually judged by 2 researchers (IO and assistant YK, CA or KM) for each trial. If a consensus was not achieved, that trial was discarded, and the participant was requested to execute an additional trial. The three-dimensional marker positions were captured using 12 optical cameras (OptiTrack S250e with 250-Hz sampling; software: Motive Body 1.1, NaturalPoint, Inc.) simultaneously with the GRF recordings (force plate: type 9281B, Kistler, Winterthur, Switzerland; data acquisition device: USB-6218 BNC with 1-kHz sampling, National Instruments, Austin, TX, USA). A clock device (eSync, NaturalPoint, Inc.) was used to generate the timing signal to synchronize the onset of the camera and force plate recordings.

Data processing

The position data were smoothed using a second-order low-pass zero-lag digital Butterworth filter at cut-off frequencies of 12–15 Hz, which were determined by residual analysis (Winter, 2005). The GRF data were smoothed at the same cut-off frequencies as those used for smoothing the marker data (Bisseling and Hof, 2006). The weight acceptance phases (vertical GRF >10 N) of the position and GRF data were extracted and time-normalized (0–100%) throughout the stance phase. The kinematic model was consisted of 4 segments (foot, shank, thigh, and pelvis) with 3 joints (ankle, knee, and hip) (Figure 2). The ankle and knee joint centers were calculated as the midpoint between medial and lateral markers for the ankle and knee joints. The hip joint center was calculated using a

178 previously reported method (Bell et al., 1990). The local coordinate system (LCS) of each segment
179 was defined as a 3×3 rotation matrix consisting of common perpendicular unit base vectors where
180 the x-axis ($e_{i,x}$) was the anterior/posterior axis pointing to the anterior of the segment, y-axis ($e_{i,y}$)
181 was the vertical axis along with the longitudinal line of the segment pointing upward, and z-axis
182 ($e_{i,z}$) was the medial/lateral axis pointing right of the body (Grood and Suntay, 1983; Wu et al.,
183 2002). The segmental mass, position of mass center, and inertia moment were estimated based on the
184 data of Japanese athletes (Ae et al., 1992). The hip and knee internal(+) / external(-) rotations were
185 defined as the segmental rotation around the y-axis of the thigh and shank segments, respectively,
186 and those angles were calculated using Derrick et al.'s (Derrick et al., 2020) method for the hip joint
187 and Grood and Suntay's method (Grood and Suntay, 1983) for the knee joint. The calculated
188 internal/external rotation angles were offset with the angle at the static pose. In addition, the
189 internal/external rotation angular excursions were calculated by subtracting with the angle at IC of
190 each trial to quantify the angular displacements that occurred after foot contact. The internal/external
191 rotational joint angular velocities of the hip and knee were obtained by using the numerical
192 differentiation of the joint angle. See Supplemental Content for the detail of joint angle and angular
193 velocity calculation.
194
195

Figure 2. Three-dimensional four-link kinematic model

Schematic frontal view of the kinematic model used in this study. For visibility, each segment is visualized separately at the joint, but they are actually connected.

The Newton-Euler equation of motion was solved to obtain all of the moment components, e.g., 1) resultant moment, 2) moment of GRF, 3) rotational inertia moment, 4) gyroscopic moment, 5) moment of linear inertial force, 6) moment of gravity acting at the segmental mass center, and 7) joint moment due to friction moment acting around the vertical axis at CoP (See Figure s1 in Supplemental Content for the free-body-diagram and the mathematical detail of the inverse

206 dynamics model).

207 For each moment component, the projections onto the y-axis of the thigh and shank segments were
208 calculated to extract the internal(+) / external(-) rotation components. This process corresponded to
209 express the resultant moment in the LCS of the distal segment (Derrick et al., 2020). According to
210 the joint structure, the resultant hip internal/external rotation moment was assumed to be produced
211 mainly by the hip rotators to balance the external loadings. In contrast, the resultant knee
212 internal/external rotation moment was regarded as a resistive moment derived from the stretched
213 passive structures including the ACL (Derrick et al., 2020), under the presence of the external
214 loadings on the knee. All of the numerical calculations were done with the custom scripts of Scilab
215 6.0.0 (<https://www.scilab.org/>).

216

217 **Statistical analysis**

218 An a priori power analysis using G*Power 3.1.9.4 suggested that the appropriate sample size for the
219 paired t-test was n=22 to achieve 80% power at a statistical significance criterion of 0.01, with a
220 large effect size (ES) (Cohen d >0.8).

221

222 To confirm whether the approach speeds differed between foot strike conditions, the average speeds
223 of the midpoint between both anterior superior iliac spine markers from -40 to 0 ms before foot
224 contact were compared using the paired t-test (P<0.05).

225

226 To examine the contribution of each moment component on the magnitude of the resultant hip and
227 knee moments, the time-series data of each moment component was normalized by the resultant
228 moment in a point-by-point manner and averaged over the stance phase (0–100%) as

229

$$230 \quad c_j = \frac{1}{101} \sum_{i=0}^{100} (\tau_{j,i} / \tau_{RES,i}),$$

231

232 where c_j is the relative contribution, τ_j is the each moment component (j=1:resultant, j=2:GRF,
233 j=3:rotational inertia, j=4:gyroscopic, j=5:linear inertia, j=6:gravity, and j=7:friction moment), and
234 τ_{RES} is the resultant moment. Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (moment components $\times$ foot
235 strike conditions) with a post-hoc Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) test was conducted
236 to determine the component-wise difference of contribution c_j (P<0.01).

237

238 Time-series changes in joint angles, angular excursions, angular velocities, and moment component

were compared between foot strike conditions using the statistical parametric mapping (SPM) two-tailed paired t-test (Pataky et al., 2013). The alpha level for the SPM test was set at 0.01. To quantify the ES of significant difference, the point-by-point Cohen d value was calculated and averaged over the phase when the SPM test detected a significant difference. Significant differences with a Cohen d value >0.8 was regarded as a large ES (Cohen, 1988). All SPM tests were implemented using the spm1d code (www.spm1d.org) in Python 3.6.3 (<https://www.python.org/downloads/release/python-363/>).

Results

Demographic and anthropometric characteristics

Participants' mean height was 160.5 (standard deviation [SD] 5.1) cm, mean weight was 55.6 (SD 5.6) kg, and mean age was 21.2 (SD 0.9) years. Twenty-three participants used their right leg, and 2 selected their left leg.

Approach speed

The average approach speed was not significantly different between the foot contact conditions (RFS: 1.47 [SD 0.29] m/s, FFS: 1.50 [SD 0.34] m/s, $P=0.21$, Cohen $d=0.09$). All the trials satisfied with the safety criteria of approach speed < 2.0 m/s.

Joint moment

Two-way ANOVA demonstrated a significant main effect of moment components (hip: $P<0.01$, $F=650.0$; knee: $P<0.01$, $F=1936.9$) on the contribution to the magnitude of the resultant hip and knee moments but not the foot strike conditions (hip: $P=0.75$, $F=0.095$; knee: $P=0.07$, $F=3.22$). A significant interaction between the foot strike conditions and moment components was found in the knee ($P<0.01$, $F=3.59$) but not in the hip ($P=0.15$, $F=1.59$). For the hip and knee, the moments of GRF showed large but opposite contributions relative to the resultant moments, indicating that those 2 moment components were almost counterbalanced (Figure 3). Additionally, since the contributions of the other moment components were significantly small relative to the moment of GRFs, this study focused on the resultant moments and moments of GRF for the report of the SPM test.

Figure 3. The contribution of the moment variables in the Newton-Euler equation of motion relative to the magnitude of the resultant moment.

Since the two-way analysis of variance suggested that the foot strike condition has no significant effect, a post-hoc Tukey's honestly significant difference test is used without consideration of the foot strike condition and displayed here. The results indicate that the moment of GRF has a dominant but negative contribution to the resultant moment, whereas the other moment variables show a small contribution to rotational kinetics of the hip and knee. Asterisk denotes a significant difference. GRF: ground reaction force.

For the hip and knee, the moments of GRF and resultant moments showed similar temporal patterns but in the opposite direction (Figure 4A, 4B, 4F, 4G). For the hip joint, the RFS produced a rapid increase of internally directed moment of GRF during the first 5% of the stance phase and suddenly switched to externally directed moment during the next 10–20% of the stance phase (Figure 4A). The internally directed moment of GRF at hip was significantly greater with RFS than with FFS, and it showed a very large ES (RFS: 0.12 [SD 0.03] vs. FFS: 0.01 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg, Cohen d=1.55, Figure 4A). The externally directed hip resultant moment in RFS counteracted the initial internally directed moment of GRF during the first 5% of the stance phase; however, there was no significant

287 difference between foot strike conditions during this phase (Figure 4B). At approximately 10% of
288 the stance phase, RFS showed significantly greater internally directed hip resultant moment than
289 FFS did (RFS: 0.07 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg vs. FFS: -0.03 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg, Cohen d=1.29, Figure 4B).

290

291 Moment of GRF at the knee joint was in the opposite direction with RFS and FFS during the first
292 10% of the stance phase (e.g., RFS was internal, whereas FFS was external), and the ES was very
293 large (RFS: 0.01 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg vs. FFS: -0.04 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg, Cohen d=1.83 and RFS: 0.02
294 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg vs FFS: -0.03 [SD 0.01] Nm/kg, Cohen d=1.20, Figure 4G). The direction of the
295 resultant moment in both foot strike conditions were externally directed, and the RFS showed
296 significantly greater magnitude at about 1–10% of the stance phase with large ESs (RFS: -0.07 [SD
297 0.00] Nm/kg vs. FFS: -0.02 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg, Cohen d=1.58 and RFS: -0.06 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg vs.
298 FFS:0.002 [SD 0.00] Nm/kg, Cohen d=1.45, Figure 4G).

299

300 **Joint angles and Joint angle excursions**

301 The hip was in an internally rotated position throughout the stance phase for both foot strike
302 conditions, and there was no large ES significant difference in the hip joint angle between foot strike
303 conditions (Figure 4C). However, the RFS caused a greater hip internal rotation excursion after IC,
304 showing a significant difference with a large ES (RFS: 1.5 [SD1.0] deg vs. FFS: -2.14 [SD 1.20]
305 deg, Cohen d=1.03 and RFS: 0.07 [SD 0.33] deg vs. FFS: -3.71 [SD 0.49] deg, Cohen d=0.81)
306 during the 5–49% of the stance phase as compared to the FFS (Figure 4D). The knee showed similar
307 rotational patterns in both foot strike conditions. There was no large ES significant difference in the
308 knee rotational angle and excursion between the foot strike conditions (Figure 4H, 4I).

309

310 **Joint angular velocity**

311 The RFS showed an abrupt increase of internally directed hip angular velocity after IC, which was
312 significantly higher than that of FFS during the 4–11% of the stance phase (RFS: 1.21 [SD 0.23]
313 rad/s vs. FFS: -0.18 [SD 0.24] rad/s, Cohen d=1.06, Figure 4E). The knee angular velocities in both
314 foot strike conditions were commonly internally directed during the first 30% of the stance phase
315 and externally directed during the last 20% of the stance phase, with no significant difference
316 between the conditions (Figure 4J).

317

318

319

320

321 *Figure 4 Comparison of moments, joint angles, joint angular excursions and angular velocities*

322 *between foot strike patterns with SPM.*

323 Ensemble averages (standard deviations) of the moment of GRF (A, F), resultant moment (B, G), joint angle (C, H),
324 angular excursion (D, I), and angular velocity (E, J) of the hip (left column) and knee (right column). On each panel,
325 the solid line with orange shadow indicates the rearfoot strike condition, whereas the dashed line with the blue
326 shadow illustrates the forefoot strike condition. The grey shaded durations are the phases where the statistical
327 parametric mapping two-tailed paired t-test detected a significant difference with an alpha level less than 0.01. For
328 each significant difference, the Cohen d value is calculated as an effect size. The critical thresholds are shown on
329 each panel. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version
330 of this article). GRF: ground reaction force.

331

332

333 **Discussion**

334 This study is the first to report that the foot strike pattern differentiated the horizontal-plane hip and
335 knee kinetics and kinematics during the early stance phase of a cutting maneuver in female athletes.
336 Specifically, the RFS produced a rapid increase of internally directed moment of GRF at the hip
337 during the first 5% of the stance phase, subsequent increase of the hip internally directed joint
338 angular velocity during 4–11% of the stance phase, and hip internal rotational excursion peaking at
339 approximately 10% of the stance phase (Figure 4A,E,D). Those characteristics were not found in the
340 FFS condition. The critical difference found in the knee kinetics was that the RFS and FFS
341 demonstrated the opposing directions of the moment of GRF during 1–10% of the stance phase, i.e.,
342 the RFS produced the internally directed while the FFS showed the externally directed moment of
343 GRF (Figure 4F, G). For both hip and knee joint, the moments of GRF were the significant
344 determinants of the resultant joint moments (Figure 3), providing insight into the generation of the
345 high-risk hip and knee loading patterns during the cuttings in females. Generally, those findings
346 supported our hypotheses.

347

348 The key finding of this study was that the hip and knee loading patterns (direction of the moment of
349 GRF at hip and knee) was different between foot strike pattern and this difference may explain the
350 discrepancy in the ACL injury risk associated with the foot strike pattern. The RFS exhibited the
351 combination of internal directed hip and knee moments of GRF at first 10% of stance (Figure 4A, F),
352 and the hip and knee internal rotation excursions (Figure 4D,I). Contrary to this, the FFS showed the
353 combination of externally directed hip and knee moments of GRF at the same time frame (Figure 4A,
354 F). The increased hip internal rotation excursion in female athletes during the functional movements

has been interpreted as a risk factor for ACL injury (McLean et al., 2005; Pollard et al., 2007; Sigward et al., 2015) because the hip internal rotation in weight bearing situation results in the subsequent the knee valgus kinetic chain (McLean et al., 2005). In addition, the internal tibial rotation moment has been reported to increase the in-situ force on the ACL (Kiapour et al., 2016) and is associated with the mechanism of ACL injury (Koga et al., 2010; Shimokochi and Shultz, 2008), whereas the tibial external rotation has opposite mechanical effect on ACL (Markolf et al., 1995). In this study, even in a slow approach speed (< 2.0 m/s) relative to the previous cutting studies (Sigward et al., 2015; Vanrenterghem et al., 2012), the significant differences of hip and knee rotational GRF loading pattern with the opposite directions were found between the foot strike patterns. Those directional discrepancy in the GRF loading pattern is expected to expand in a more demanding cutting. Therefore, from the perspective of the horizontal-plane hip and knee kinetic chain, it is suggested that the RFS potentially add the risk of ACL injury whereas the FFS is relatively an ACL-protective foot landing technique.

The initial increase of hip internal rotation angular velocity in the RFS was obviously caused by the prominent increase of the internally directed moment of GRF at the hip (Figure 4A,E). In a more demanding situation, the effect of this GRF loading would change the orientation of the entire stance limb relative to the direction of travel at early phase. In such a stance limb configuration, the knee extension/flexion axis will no longer maintain an appropriate orientation along the GRF line of action when the full weight acceptance phase, resulting in a risky knee loading patterns such as the combined knee valgus and tibial internal rotation loading (Ogasawara et al., 2020). In this sense, the initial hip internal rotation in the early phase of RFS may be a precursor mechanism developing the subsequent knee misorientation relative to the GRF vector and may change the knee kinetics.

In this study, the hip internal rotation excursion in RFS showed a temporal increase peaking around 10 % of stance but it did not maintain over the stance phase (Figure 4D). Similarly, the temporal hip internal rotation at early stance phase was consistent among the lab-controlled cutting studies which the ACL injury was not observed during their experiments (Havens and Sigward, 2015b; Imwalle et al., 2009). This implied that, in the previous lab-controlled studies as well as this study, the magnitude of hip internal rotation moment due to GRF was not large enough to develop a complete hip internal displacement which was sufficient to threaten the ACL. The quantitative video analyses of the actual ACL injury event have demonstrated that the initial hip internal rotation continued until the ACL injury occurred (Koga et al., 2018). In contrast, the video analysis of the high-risk motion

388 with non-injury situation demonstrated no prominent hip internal rotations within 40 ms after IC as
389 well as the knee valgus and tibial internal rotation (Sasaki et al., 2017). Therefore, it may be
390 speculated that the presence of the complete hip internal rotation at the beginning of the stance phase
391 determines the subsequent stance limb configuration and affects the risk of ACL injury.

392

393 Limited hip internal rotation range of motion (RoM) has been reported to be associated with the
394 incidence of noncontact ACL injury (Boutris et al., 2018) and rerupture of the ACL (Gomes et al.,
395 2014). This information seems to be contradictory to our aforementioned proposal. However, we
396 believe that those clinical findings and our proposal do not conflict because the time scopes were
397 different. As aforementioned, we suggested that the initial hip internal rotation due to internally
398 directed GRF moment acting at hip may be problematic for subsequent alignment control; therefore,
399 this concern would be pronounced in the pre-injury phase (e.g., period from IC to ligamentous
400 rupture). Contrary to this, a narrow hip rotational RoM may become problematic at about the
401 terminal of hip RoM since cadaveric studies demonstrated that the knee rotational stress increases as
402 the hip rotation is mechanically constrained by the limit of RoM (Beaulieu et al., 2014). Hence,
403 these mechanics may occur around the “rupture phase” of ACL injury. It could be also speculated
404 that if the narrow hip internal rotation RoM reflects the dysfunction of hip external rotator muscles,
405 such as contracture by muscle fatigue, it may not adequately counteract the internally directed GRF
406 loading acting at hip at the foot impact phase. However, the effect of passive structures, such as an
407 increased femoral alpha angle in the anteroposterior view (VandenBerg et al., 2016), could also
408 contribute to the limited hip internal RoM and be associated with noncontact ACL injury; therefore,
409 the dysfunction of hip external rotators alone does not fully explain the association between the
410 static measure of hip rotation RoM and the mechanism of ACL injury. Further study about the
411 relationship between the static hip RoM and dynamic hip and knee kinetic chain during functional
412 activities will be needed to clarify this issue.

413

414 The component-wise analysis of the equation of motion demonstrated that the externally directed hip
415 resultant moment (muscle moment) counteracted the internally directed moment of GRF exerted at
416 the hip (Figure 4A, B), suggesting that adequate hip muscular control was essential to maintain a
417 neutral hip orientation after IC of the cutting maneuver. This was also supported by our results that
418 the magnitudes of the other moment components were too small to balance the moment of GRF,
419 suggesting that the hip muscle moment was a primary counterpart of the moment of GRF (Figure 3).
420 If the hip rotator muscles failed to increase the horizontal-plane joint impedance prior to foot impact

and could not adequately balance the internally directed moment of GRF exerted at the hip, the initial hip internal excursion would become more pronounced. Leetun et al.(LEETUN et al., 2004) reported that female athletes had significantly decreased hip external rotation isometric strength (percentage body weight) than male athletes, and they prospectively revealed that hip external rotation strength was the effective predictor of the likelihood of sustaining noncontact injuries, including ACL rupture. Omi et al. (Omi et al., 2018) suggested the use of a “hip-focused” training to increase hip rotational strength and hip neuromuscular control; they achieved 62% reduction of noncontact ACL injuries in female basketball players. Collectively, these clinical findings highlight the importance of hip external rotator strength for managing the risk of ACL injury (McLean et al., 2005). Our results support the mechanical rationale underlying those previous findings regarding how hip external rotator moments contribute to the control of hip rotational kinematics during athletic maneuvers.

The limitation of this study was that the current results were from female participants, so caution is needed when generalizing our findings to male athletes. Sex disparities are known to exist in the hip and knee biomechanics during cutting maneuvers (Pollard et al., 2007); thus, this study used female participants to isolate the effect of foot strike pattern. The slow approach speed could be a limitation of this study from the perspective of the small magnitudes of the vector quantities. However, the temporal patterns of the hip and knee kinetics and kinematics were consistent with results of the previous similar cutting studies (Pollard et al., 2004), suggesting the conclusion of this study regarding the GRF loading patterns (direction of the GRF moments on the hip and knee) was not affected by the slow approach speed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the RFS showed a greater hip internal rotation angular velocity combined with knee internal rotation during the early phase of the cutting task which was not seen in FFS. Such a hip and knee kinetic combination in the RFS would potentially increase the risk of ACL injury in female athletes. Hence, FFS is recommended as a safer cutting strategy than RFS in female athletes.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge support from Chisa Aoyama, Mai Kitaura and Yui Kawano for the assistance in data collection. All authors have no conflicts of interest related to this study. The

454 authors declare that the results of this study are presented clearly, honestly, and without fabrication,
455 falsification, or inappropriate data manipulation.

456

457 **Data availability statement**

458 Data that support the findings of this study will be made available from the corresponding author
459 upon reasonable request.

460

461 **Funding**

462 This study was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) project [grant number:
463 24700716] funded by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT),
464 Japan.

465

466 **Contributions**

467 I.O., Y.S., S.K., and K.N. conceptualized and designed the study.

468 I.O. organized the experiments.

469 I.O. performed the experiments and data collection.

470 I.O., Y.S., and S.K. analyzed the data and performed the statistical analysis.

471 I.O., Y.S., S.K., and K.N. wrote the manuscript.

472 I.O., Y.S., S.K., T.M., and K.N. reviewed the manuscript, suggested corrections and approved its
473 final version.

474

475

476 **Figure legends**

477 **Figure 1.** *Reflective marker attachment site and orientations of the local coordinate systems*

478 (A) Location of reflective markers on the right leg. (B) The kinematic model consists of 4 segments
479 (foot, shank, thigh, and pelvis) and 3 joints (ankle, knee, and hip). The local coordinate system for
480 each segment is defined as a 3×3 rotation matrix consisting of 3 common perpendicular unit base
481 vectors: the x-axis is the anterior/posterior axis pointing forward, y-axis is the vertical axis along
482 with the longitudinal line of the segment pointing upward, and z-axis is the medial/lateral axis
483 pointing to the right of the segment.

484

485 **Figure 2.** *Three-dimensional four-link kinematic model*

486 Schematic frontal view of the kinematic model used in this study. For visibility, each segment is

487 visualized separately at the joint, but they are actually connected.

488

489 **Figure 3.** *The contribution of the moment variables in the Newton-Euler equation of motion relative*
490 *to the magnitude of the resultant moment.*

491 Since the two-way analysis of variance suggested that the foot strike condition has no significant
492 effect, a post-hoc Tukey's honestly significant difference test is used without consideration of the
493 foot strike condition and displayed here. The results indicate that the moment of GRF has a
494 dominant but negative contribution to the resultant moment, whereas the other moment variables
495 show a small contribution to rotational kinetics of the hip and knee. Asterisk denotes a significant
496 difference. GRF: ground reaction force.

497

498 **Figure 4.** *Comparison of moments, joint angles, joint angular excursions and angular velocities*
499 *between foot strike patterns with SPM.*

500 Ensemble averages (standard deviations) of the moment of GRF (A, F), resultant moment (B, G),
501 joint angle (C, H), angular displacement (D, I), and angular velocity (E, J) of the hip
502 (left column) and knee (right column). On each panel, the solid line with orange shadow indicates
503 the rearfoot strike condition, whereas the dashed line with the blue shadow illustrates the forefoot
504 strike condition. The grey shaded durations are the phases where the statistical parametric mapping
505 two-tailed paired t-test detected a significant difference with an alpha level less than 0.01. For each
506 significant difference, the Cohen d value is calculated as an effect size. The critical thresholds are
507 shown on each panel. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is
508 referred to the web version of this article). GRF: ground reaction force.

509

510

511

512

513 **References**

514

515

516 Ae, M., Tang, H.P., Yokoi, T., 1992. Estimation of Inertia Properties of the Body segments in
517 Japanese Athletes. *Biomechanism* 11, 23–33.

518 Beaulieu, M.L., Oh, Y.K., Bedi, A., Ashton-Miller, J.A., Wojtys, E.M., 2014. Does Limited Internal
519 Femoral Rotation Increase Peak Anterior Cruciate Ligament Strain During a Simulated Pivot
520 Landing? *Am J Sports Medicine* 42, 2955–2963. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546514549446>

521 Bell, A.L., Pedersen, D.R., Brand, R.A., 1990. A comparison of the accuracy of several hip center
522 location prediction methods. *J Biomech* 23, 617–621.
523 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290\(90\)90054-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(90)90054-7)

524 Besier, T.F., Lloyd, D.G., Cochrane, J.L., Ackland, T.R., 2001. External loading of the knee joint
525 during running and cutting maneuvers. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* 33, 1168–1175.

526 Bisseling, R.W., Hof, A.L., 2006. Handling of impact forces in inverse dynamics. *J Biomech* 39,
527 2438–2444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2005.07.021>

528 Boden, B.P., Dean, G.S., Feagin, J.A.J., Garrett, W.E.J., 2000. Mechanisms of anterior cruciate
529 ligament injury. *Orthopedics* 23, 573–578.

530 Boden, B.P., Torg, J.S., Knowles, S.B., Hewett, T.E., 2009. Video Analysis of Anterior Cruciate
531 Ligament Injury. *Am J Sports Medicine* 37, 252–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546508328107>

532 Boutris, N., Byrne, R.A., Delgado, D.A., Hewett, T.E., McCulloch, P.C., Lintner, D.M., Harris, J.D.,
533 2018. Is There an Association Between Noncontact Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injuries and
534 Decreased Hip Internal Rotation or Radiographic Femoroacetabular Impingement? A Systematic
535 Review. *Arthrosc J Arthrosc Relat Surg* 34, 943–950.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arthro.2017.08.302>

537 Cohen, J., 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* 2nd Edition. Lawrence
538 Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>

539 Cortes, N., Morrison, S., Lunen, B.L.V., Onate, J.A., 2012. Landing technique affects knee loading
540 and position during athletic tasks. *J Sci Med Sport* 15, 175–181.
541 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2011.09.005>

542 David, S., Komnik, I., Peters, M., Funken, J., Potthast, W., 2017. Identification and risk estimation
543 of movement strategies during cutting maneuvers. *J Sci Med Sport* 20, 1075–1080.
544 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2017.05.011>

545 Derrick, T.R., Bogert, A.J. van den, Cereatti, A., Dumas, R., Fantozzi, S., Leardini, A., 2020. ISB

546 recommendations on the reporting of intersegmental forces and moments during human motion
547 analysis. *J Biomech* 99, 109533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2019.109533>

548 Gomes, J.L.E., Palma, H.M., Ruthner, R., 2014. Influence of hip restriction on noncontact ACL
549 rerupture. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatology Arthrosc* 22, 188–191.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-012-2348-0>

551 Grood, E.S., Suntay, W.J., 1983. A Joint Coordinate System for the Clinical Description of
552 Three-Dimensional Motions: Application to the Knee. *J Biomechanical Eng* 105, 136–144.
553 <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3138397>

554 Havens, K.L., Sigward, S.M., 2015a. Cutting mechanics: relation to performance and anterior
555 cruciate ligament injury risk. *Medicine Sci Sports Exerc* 47, 818–824.
556 <https://doi.org/10.1249/mss.0000000000000470>

557 Havens, K.L., Sigward, S.M., 2015b. Joint and segmental mechanics differ between cutting
558 maneuvers in skilled athletes. *Gait Posture* 41, 33–38.
559 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.08.005>

560 Imwalle, L.E., Myer, G.D., Ford, K.R., Hewett, T.E., 2009. Relationship between hip and knee
561 kinematics in athletic women during cutting maneuvers: a possible link to noncontact anterior
562 cruciate ligament injury and prevention. *J Strength Cond Res National Strength Cond Assoc* 23,
563 2223–30. <https://doi.org/10.1519/jsc.0b013e3181bc1a02>

564 Ireland, M.L., 1999. Anterior cruciate ligament injury in female athletes: epidemiology. *Journal of*
565 *athletic training* 34, 150–154.

566 Kiapour, A.M., Demetropoulos, C.K., Kiapour, A., Quatman, C.E., Wordeman, S.C., Goel, V.K.,
567 Hewett, T.E., 2016. Strain Response of the Anterior Cruciate Ligament to Uniplanar and
568 Multiplanar Loads During Simulated Landings. *Am J Sports Medicine* 44, 2087–2096.
569 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546516640499>

570 Koga, H., Nakamae, A., Shima, Y., Bahr, R., Krosshaug, T., 2018. Hip and Ankle Kinematics in
571 Noncontact Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury Situations: Video Analysis Using Model-Based
572 Image Matching. *Am J Sports Medicine* 46, 333–340.
573 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546517732750>

574 Koga, H., Nakamae, A., Shima, Y., Iwasa, J., Myklebust, G., Engebretsen, L., Bahr, R., Krosshaug,
575 T., 2010. Mechanisms for Noncontact Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injuries. *Am J Sports*
576 *Medicine* 38, 2218–2225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546510373570>

577 Kristianslund, E., Faul, O., Bahr, R., Myklebust, G., Krosshaug, T., 2014. Sidestep cutting technique
578 and knee abduction loading: implications for ACL prevention exercises. *Brit J Sport Med* 48, 779

783. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2012-091370>

Krosshaug, T., Nakamae, A., Boden, B.P., Engebretsen, L., Smith, G., Slauterbeck, J.R., Hewett, T.E., Bahr, R., 2007. Mechanisms of Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury in Basketball: Video Analysis of 39 Cases. *Am J Sports Medicine* 35, 359–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546506293899>

LEETUN, D.T., IRELAND, M.L., WILLSON, J.D., BALLANTYNE, B.T., DAVIS, I.M., 2004. Core Stability Measures as Risk Factors for Lower Extremity Injury in Athletes. *Medicine Sci Sports Exerc* 36, 926–934. <https://doi.org/10.1249/01.mss.0000128145.75199.c3>

Lohmander, L.S., Ostenberg, A., Englund, M., Roos, H., 2004. High prevalence of knee osteoarthritis, pain, and functional limitations in female soccer players twelve years after anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Arthritis Rheumatism* 50, 3145–3152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/art.20589>

Majewski, M., Susanne, H., Klaus, S., 2006. Epidemiology of athletic knee injuries: A 10-year study. *Knee* 13, 184–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2006.01.005>

Markolf, K.L., Burchfield, D.M., Shapiro, M.M., Shepard, M.F., Finerman, G.A., Slauterbeck, J.L., 1995. Combined knee loading states that generate high anterior cruciate ligament forces. *J Orthopaed Res* 13, 930–935. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jor.1100130618>

McLean, S.G., Huang, X., Bogert, A.J. van den, 2005. Association between lower extremity posture at contact and peak knee valgus moment during sidestepping: Implications for ACL injury. *Clin Biomech* 20, 863–870. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2005.05.007>

Montgomery, C., Blackburn, J., Withers, D., Tierney, G., Moran, C., Simms, C., 2016. Mechanisms of ACL injury in professional rugby union: a systematic video analysis of 36 cases. *Br J Sports Med* 52, 994–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2016-096425>

Ogasawara, I., Shimokochi, Y., Mae, T., Nakata, K., 2020. Rearfoot strikes more frequently apply combined knee valgus and tibial internal rotation moments than forefoot strikes in females during the early phase of cutting maneuvers. *Gait Posture* 76, 364–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.11.014>

Omi, Y., Sugimoto, D., Kuriyama, S., Kurihara, T., Miyamoto, K., Yun, S., Kawashima, T., Hirose, N., 2018. Effect of Hip-Focused Injury Prevention Training for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury Reduction in Female Basketball Players: A 12-Year Prospective Intervention Study. *Am J Sports Medicine* 46, 852–861. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546517749474>

Pataky, T.C., Robinson, M.A., Vanrenterghem, J., 2013. Vector field statistical analysis of kinematic and force trajectories. *J Biomech* 46, 2394–2401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2013.07.031>

Pollard, C.D., Davis, I.M., Hamill, J., 2004. Influence of gender on hip and knee mechanics during a randomly cued cutting maneuver. *Clin Biomech* 19, 1022–1031.

612 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2004.07.007>

613 Pollard, C.D., Norcross, M.F., Johnson, S.T., Stone, A.E., Chang, E., Hoffman, M.A., 2018. A
614 biomechanical comparison of dominant and non-dominant limbs during a side-step cutting task.
615 Sport Biomech 19, 271–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14763141.2018.1461236>

616 Pollard, C.D., Sigward, S.M., Powers, C.M., 2007. Gender Differences in Hip Joint Kinematics and
617 Kinetics During Side-Step Cutting Maneuver. Clin J Sport Med 17, 38–42.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1097/jsm.0b013e3180305de8>

619 Quatman, C.E., Hewett, T.E., 2009. The anterior cruciate ligament injury controversy: is “valgus
620 collapse” a sex-specific mechanism? Brit J Sport Med 43, 328–335.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2009.059139>

622 Sasaki, S., Koga, H., Krosshaug, T., Kaneko, S., Fukubayashi, T., 2017. Kinematic analysis of
623 pressing situations in female collegiate football games: New insight into anterior cruciate
624 ligament injury causation. Scand J Med Sci Spor 28, 1263–1271.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13018>

626 Schilaty, N.D., Bates, N.A., Sanders, T.L., Krych, A.J., Stuart, M.J., Hewett, T.E., 2017. Incidence of
627 Second Anterior Cruciate Ligament Tears (1990-2000) and Associated Factors in a Specific
628 Geographic Locale. Am J Sports Medicine 45, 1567–1573.
629 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546517694026>

630 Shimokochi, Y., Ambegaonkar, J.P., Meyer, E.G., 2016. Changing Sagittal-Plane Landing Styles to
631 Modulate Impact and Tibiofemoral Force Magnitude and Directions Relative to the Tibia. J Athl
632 Training 51, 669–681. <https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-51.10.15>

633 Shimokochi, Y., Shultz, S.J., 2008. Mechanisms of noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injury. J
634 Athl Training 43, 396–408. <https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-43.4.396>

635 Sigward, S.M., Cesar, G.M., Havens, K.L., 2015. Predictors of Frontal Plane Knee Moments During
636 Side-Step Cutting to 45 and 110 Degrees in Men and Women: Implications for Anterior Cruciate
637 Ligament Injury. Clin J Sport Med 25, 529–534. <https://doi.org/10.1097/jsm.0000000000000155>

638 Silvers-Granelli, H., Mandelbaum, B., Adeniji, O., Insler, S., Bizzini, M., Pohlig, R., Junge, A.,
639 Snyder-Mackler, L., Dvorak, J., 2015. Efficacy of the FIFA 11+ Injury Prevention Program in the
640 Collegiate Male Soccer Player. Am J Sports Medicine 43, 2628–2637.
641 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546515602009>

642 VandenBerg, C., Crawford, E.A., Enselman, E.S., Robbins, C.B., Wojtys, E.M., Bedi, A., 2016.
643 Restricted Hip Rotation Is Correlated With an Increased Risk for Anterior Cruciate Ligament
644 Injury. Arthrosc J Arthrosc Relat Surg Official Publ Arthrosc Assoc North Am Int Arthrosc Assoc

645 33, 317–325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arthro.2016.08.014>

646 Vanrenterghem, J., Venables, E., Pataky, T., Robinson, M.A., 2012. The effect of running speed on

647 knee mechanical loading in females during side cutting. *J Biomech* 45, 2444–2449.

648 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2012.06.029>

649 Waldén, M., Krosshaug, T., Bjørneboe, J., Andersen, T.E., Faul, O., Hägglund, M., 2015. Three

650 distinct mechanisms predominate in non-contact anterior cruciate ligament injuries in male

651 professional football players: a systematic video analysis of 39 cases. *Brit J Sport Med* 49,

652 *bjsports-2014-094573*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2014-094573>

653 Winter, D.A., 2005. *Biomechanics and motor control of human movement third edition*, John Wiley

654 & Sons, Inc. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

655 Wu, G., Siegler, S., Allard, P., Kirtley, C., Leardini, A., Rosenbaum, D., Whittle, M., D’Lima, D.D.,

656 Cristofolini, L., Witte, H., Schmid, O., Stokes, I., 2002. ISB recommendation on definitions of

657 joint coordinate system of various joints for the reporting of human joint motion—part I: ankle,

658 hip, and spine. *J Biomech* 35, 543–548. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0021-9290\(01\)00222-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0021-9290(01)00222-6)

659

660

661