

Prescribed footwear and orthoses are not prophylactic in preventing lower extremity injuries in military tactical athletes. A systematic review with meta-analysis.

Scott L. Paradise, MD^{1,2,3}
scott.l.paradise.mil@mail.mil

Joshua R. Beer, DO^{1,4}
joshua.r.beer.mil@mail.mil

Chris A. Cruz, MD⁵
chris.a.cruz.mil@mail.mil

Ken M. Fechner, MD^{1,5}
kenneth.m.fechner.mil@mail.mil

Andrew J. MacGregor, PhD, MPH⁶
andrewmacgregor@protonmail.com

John J. Fraser, PT, DPT, PhD, FACSM^{1,6}
email: john.j.fraser8.mil@mail.mil, ORCID: 0000-0001-9697-3795, Twitter: @NavyPT

1. Primary Care Sports Medicine Fellowship, Naval Hospital Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, CA, USA
2. United States Navy Medicine Readiness and Training Command Guam, Agana, GU, USA
3. Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, MD, USA
4. United States Navy Medicine Readiness and Training Unit, Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island, Parris Island, SC, USA
5. United States Navy Medicine Readiness and Training Command Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, CA, USA
6. Directorate for Operational Readiness & Health, Naval Health Research Center, 140 Sylvester Road, San Diego, CA, USA

*Correspondence to: Scott L. Paradise, PSC 455, Box 208, Department of Orthopaedics, FPO, AP 96540; 671-488-5011; scott.l.paradise.mil@mail.mil

Disclaimer: The authors are military service member or employees of the U.S. Government.

This work was prepared as part of their official duties. Title 17, U.S.C. §105 provides that copyright protection under this title is not available for any work of the U.S. Government. Title

17, U.S.C. §101 defines a U.S. Government work as work prepared by a military service member or employee of the U.S. Government as part of that person's official duties. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, nor the U.S. Government.

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Military members are exposed to high cumulative physical loads that frequently lead to injury. Prescribed footwear and orthoses have been used to prevent injury. The purpose of this systematic review with meta-analysis was to assess if prescribed prophylactic footwear or foot orthoses reduced lower extremity injury risk in military tactical athletes.

Methods: MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, CINAHL, SportDiscus, and DTIC databases were searched for randomized controlled trials published at any time that compared foot orthoses or prescribed footwear (to include shock-absorbing insoles and socks) to a placebo intervention or a no-treatment control. Methodological quality was assessed and numbers of injuries, population at risk, and the duration of the study epoch were extracted and relative risk (RR) calculated. An *omnibus* meta-analysis was performed assessing all prescribed footwear and orthoses intervention studies, with subgroup analyses conducted on studies with similar interventions [i.e., basketball athletic shoes; athletic shoes (prescribed by foot type); foot orthoses; shock-absorbing insoles; socks; tropical combat boots].

Results: Of 1,673 studies identified, 22 studies were included. Three of eight studies that employed orthoses demonstrated significantly reduced overuse injuries compared to no treatment controls (RR range: 0.34-0.68); one study showed neoprene insoles significantly decreased overuse injuries (RR: 0.75). There were no other significant effects in the individual studies, and no protective effects observed in the *omnibus* meta-analysis or in the component sub analyses.

Conclusions: Prescribed footwear and orthoses do not appear to have a prophylactic effect on lower quarter MSKI in military members and cannot be recommended at this time.

INTRODUCTION

Musculoskeletal injuries (MSKI) are common during military training and operations and can adversely affect medical readiness, warfighter performance, and mission accomplishment. MSKI, primarily of the lower quarter, were leading reasons for outpatient medical encounters in 2019 in the Military Health System.[1,2] These injuries substantially contribute to medical-related attrition and the multibillion per-annum direct and indirect healthcare cost for active military members and veterans.[2] The etiology of many non-battle related MSKI are repetitive, microtraumatic overuse injuries resulting from high intensity exercises and cumulative loads incurred primarily during marching and running.[3,4] The substantial burden imposed by MSKI warrants in-depth assessment of preventive interventions used to mitigate these injuries.

Foot orthoses, shock-absorbing insoles, and other prescribed footwear have been used for the prevention of overuse injuries in athletes and military recruits.[5–7] These interventions alter lower quarter biomechanics by attenuating ground reaction forces, distributing plantar pressures, and altering kinematics during functional tasks.[5,8–10] However, there is mounting scrutiny regarding the effectiveness of footwear prescription for running-related prophylaxis.[11] While prescribed orthoses or footwear may mediate potential intrinsic risk factors, such as foot phenotype, this does not necessarily translate to reduction of injury. With the types and volume of exposure, unique hazards, and a “mission first” culture unique to the military that precludes care-seeking,[12] it is unclear whether prophylactic orthoses or prescribed footwear would be effective in MSKI prophylaxis in this unique population.

The physical demands placed on military tactical athletes during training are inherently different than those incurred by their civilian counterparts. Military members are exposed to high

cumulative physical loads resulting from frequent and high intensity training, often with little respite. Given the unique exposures specific to the military, it is unclear whether foot orthoses, shock-absorbing insoles, or prescribed footwear would be protective against MSKI. While prior systematic reviews have evaluated whether prophylactic footwear or ankle-foot orthosis prescription were able to reduce injury in the civilian population,[6,7,14] none at the time of writing have evaluated MSKI prophylaxis in the military specifically. Therefore, the purpose of this systematic review with meta-analysis was to assess if prescribed prophylactic footwear or foot orthoses reduced lower extremity injury risk in military tactical athletes.

METHODS

The protocol for this study was registered *a priori* in PROSPERO (CRD42020183403, <http://bit.ly/CRD42020183403>). The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)[15] and A Measurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews version 2 (AMSTAR 2)[16] were used to guide study reporting.

Eligibility Criteria

Studies were eligible for inclusion if they were randomized controlled trials that compared foot orthoses or prescribed footwear (to include shock-absorbing insoles and socks) to a placebo intervention or a no-treatment control. All studies must have reported the inclusion of military tactical athletes, the burden (number, rate, or proportion) of lower extremity injuries for both the intervention and control groups, the at-risk population size, and the duration of the study epoch. If the required information could not be ascertained from the published study, the corresponding authors were contacted. Studies were excluded if they were systematic reviews or

retrospective studies, if the interventions were not randomized, or if the data was not available for extraction.

Search Strategy

A research librarian was consulted to develop the search strategy. The search strategy, comprised of MeSH terms, is detailed in the Supplemental Table 1 (<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX>). The searches were limited to records in English, the native language of the study team, published at any time of inquiry. MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, CINAHL, SportDiscus, and the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) databases were queried on January 10, 2020. DTIC (<https://discover.dtic.mil/>) serves as the research repository of the U.S. Department of Defense. Records were organized and duplicates were removed using Rayyan QCRI, an application used to facilitate study selection for systematic reviews (<https://rayyan.qcri.org/>). Two reviewers (SLP and JB) independently reviewed each record by title and then abstract for inclusion. A third author (KF) resolved any disagreements. Study selection is detailed in the PRISMA flowsheet (Figure 1).

Data Extraction

Two reviewers (SLP and JRB) independently assessed each report for extractable data using the Cochrane Collaboration Data Collection Form for RCTs and non-RCTs. The number of injuries, the number of the population at risk, and the duration of the study epoch were extracted. Studies that reported incidence or prevalence measures were reverse calculated to extract count data. Study characteristics pertaining to participant demographics, trial setting, method of randomization, and intervention characteristics are reported in Supplemental Table 2 (<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX>). Any disagreements were resolved by consensus. If consensus could not be achieved, a third author (KF) resolved any disagreements. Cumulative incidence of

lower quarter MSKI for both intervention and control groups were calculated using the number of injuries during the study epoch and the population size at the time of allocation. Calculations of relative risk with 95% confidence intervals (CI), attributable risk (AR), and number needed to treat (NNT) were used to assess prophylactic effects for each study.

Risk of Bias Assessment

Risk of bias for each study were assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration tool.[17] Each study was assessed in seven domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting, and other. Each domain was independently rated by two authors (SLP and JRB) as high risk of bias, low risk of bias, or marked as unclear. Reviewers resolved disagreements by consensus, and a third author (KF) was consulted to resolve disagreements if needed. A study was judged to have overall high risk of bias if at least one domain was rated as having high risk, or if there were concerns in multiple domains that substantially lowered confidence in its results.[17]

Synthesis Methods

An *omnibus* meta-analysis was performed assessing all prescribed footwear and orthoses intervention studies, with subgroup analyses conducted on studies with similar interventions [athletic shoes (basketball); athletic shoes (prescribed by foot type); foot orthoses; shock-absorbing insoles; socks; tropical combat boots]. Pooled outcomes were calculated using the Mantel-Haenszel method with the Hartung-Knapp adjustment for random effects models.[18,19] Heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 and χ^2 statistics and conclusions were contextualized according to risk of bias. I^2 statistics were interpreted as suggested by Higgins and colleagues, with higher values indicating greater heterogeneity.[20] A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis and

Baujat plot[21] were used to diagnose specific studies contributing to heterogeneity. Reporting bias was assessed with a funnel plot and Egger's statistic to evaluate symmetry. Data synthesis was performed using the 'meta' package (version 4.18-0) for R version 4.0.3 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

RESULTS

Study Selection

The search strategy yielded 1673 records after duplicates were removed (Figure 1). Four additional records were identified through cross-referencing citations.[22–25] Of these, 39 full-text records were assessed for eligibility, and 22 included in the systematic review. Three studies were excluded as these were not randomized intervention trials.[26–28] Simkin et al.[29] and Finestone et al.[30] met inclusion criteria, however they were extensions of the studies conducted by Milgrom et al. in 1985[31] and 1992[30], respectively, and were excluded. Sherman et al. [32] was included in the systematic review but excluded from the meta-analysis because the study epoch was not specified. Mundermann et al.[22] was included in the systematic review but excluded from the meta-analysis due to insufficient data.

Study Characteristics

Supplemental Table 2 (<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX>) details the extracted study characteristics that include the setting, population at risk, intervention, comparison, time at risk, and injury outcome of interest. Eight studies evaluated the effect of biomechanical orthoses on overuse injury incidence in military recruits.[10,31,33–38] Six studies evaluated the effect of shock-absorbing inserts.[9,22,25,32,39,40] One study evaluated the effect of shock-absorbing heel cups with and without heel-cord stretches.[24] Six studies evaluated the prophylactic effect

of prescribed footwear,[30,41–45] and one study evaluated the effect of padded and double-layered socks.[23]

Three trials employed cluster randomization to enhance participant blinding.[9,23,32] The remaining trials randomized each participant. It was otherwise impossible for trials to maintain blinding of orthosis or insert among military units who often live and train together in close confines, so four studies made use of a sham insert to minimize bias.[9,10,34,40] Studies included predominantly male participants (range: 56% to 100%), a finding attributed to conscription practices[37,38] or training site demographics.[44] Trials typically occurred over the course of an initial recruit training course or initial period of service which ranged from 6 weeks[45] to 6 months.[38] Andrish et al.[24] specified only that training occurred over the summer. Since “Plebe Summer” at the US Naval Academy is 7 weeks in duration, it was assumed that this was the study duration. Sherman et al.[32] also did not specify the epoch length, but did mention that it occurred during Army basic training that was 8 weeks long at the time of the study.

Five studies described a protocol to confirm stress fractures or other injuries with the use of radiographs[9,38] and Technetium bone scans.[30,31,34] One study confirmed stress fractures with magnetic resonance imaging.[35] Bonanno et al.[10] was the only study that referenced a previously published research protocol and specified use of standardized clinical assessments. Three studies counted any injury severe enough to cause a limitation in training.[35,38,40] One study required a limitation in training of at least one day,[39] and one study only counted injuries severe enough to limit training for a period of three days.[33] The remaining studies either specified a clinical exam by a healthcare provider or study team member, review of diagnostic codes from a patient record, or did not specify diagnostic criteria.[22–25,32,36,37,41,41,43–45]

Risk of Bias Assessment

Only one study was rated as having low risk of bias (Table 1).[10] The remaining studies were unclear or had high risk of bias. Four studies were rated as low risk in the majority of the assessment categories.[10,37,38,44] Lack of blinding of participants, or the failure to report blinding, was the primary threat to validity across the majority of studies. To a lesser extent, uncertainty pertaining to blinding of outcome data due to lack of granularity in methodological reporting was also common.[22–25,30–33,35,36,39–42] Finally, there were a considerable number of trials that were rated as unclear or high risk of bias pertaining to allocation concealment and random sequence generation.[9,22–25,30–34,39,41–43,45] Milgrom et al.[31] observed substantial dropout in the orthosis intervention group (21.0%) due to discomfort and analyzed only the remaining participants, which posed a substantial source of attrition bias. Esterman et al.[33] observed substantially low compliance in injured recruits introducing differential bias, and was excluded from the meta-analysis.

Study Findings

Orthoses

Three of the eight studies that employed orthoses demonstrated significantly reduced overuse injuries when compared to no treatment controls (RR range: 0.34 to 0.68).[31,35,37] Finestone et al.[34] reported a significant protective effect by combining semi-rigid polypropylene and soft polyurethane intervention arms. When analyzed individually, both polypropylene (RR: 0.59) and polyethylene (RR: 0.61) orthoses had wide 95% CIs that were statistically non-significant. Lastly, the intervention group in the study conducted by Hesarikia et al.[36] was approximately twice as likely to experience an injury while wearing orthoses

compared to the no-treatment controls (AR: 14.2 per 1000 person-weeks, NNT Harm: 9). There were no further significant findings in studies assessing prophylactic orthoses.

Shock-Absorbing Insoles

Two studies reported a reduction in overuse injuries in recruits provided with shock-absorbing insoles compared to no treatment controls.[25,39] Of these, one study showed neoprene insoles significantly decreased overuse injuries (RR: 0.75, NNT Benefit: 15), but not stress fractures.[39] While Smith[25] reported improved injury rates for US Coast Guard recruits who were provided either Spenco (9.5%) or Poron (8.7%) insoles compared to no treatment controls (29.2%), calculations of RR with 95% CI using extracted data were non-significant [Spenco: 0.29 (0.06, 1.26); Poron: 0.29 (0.06, 1.26)]. There were no further significant findings in studies assessing prophylactic insoles.

Prescribed Footwear

Studies of prescribed athletic footwear by arch height in military recruits reported no significant effects.[43–45] However, our calculations of RR using extracted data suggest that the prescribed footwear may have actually have had a significant, but small, increase in injury risk in Air Force recruits (RR: 1.11, NNT Harm: 29).[45] In a study assessing prescribed tropical combat boots compared to standard issue leather boot controls in Marine recruits, the intervention group were reported to have significantly higher occurrence of retrocalcaneal bursitis, but not other overuse injuries.[41] Calculations of RR based on overall injury occurrence suggest no significant effect. In a follow-on study conducted with Army recruits,[42] the intervention group that wore the tropical combat boot had significantly more injuries (RR: 1.39, NNT Harm: 17) than the standard leather boot control group.[42] In a study assessing the prophylactic effects of padded polyester socks or a two-sock system (a thin, inner polyester sock

worn under a thick, outer cotton-wool sock) compared to the standard issue uniform sock, padded polyester socks prevented blisters (RR: 0.53, NNT Benefit: 3), an outcome the authors used as a surrogate for knee joint overuse injury.[23]

Results of Syntheses

There were no significant protective effects observed in the *omnibus* meta-analysis or in the component analyses assessing pooled effects of athletic shoes prescribed by foot type, foot orthoses, shock-absorbing insoles, socks, or tropical combat boots compared to controls. There was considerable heterogeneity observed in the *omnibus* synthesis (Figure 2). In the subanalyses of similar interventions, heterogeneity ranged from low (shock absorbing insoles) to substantial and considerable (foot orthoses, tropical boots). Subanalyses of interventions with the highest degree of heterogeneity also had the fewest number of studies included (socks, tropical boots), with exception of foot orthoses. While there were studies that contributed a substantial degree of heterogeneity identified on the Baujat plot (Figure 3), the sensitivity analysis found that omission of these studies would only minimally reduce total heterogeneity (Supplemental Table 3, <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX>).

Reporting Bias

Significant asymmetry was found in the Eggers test, which is visualized in the funnel plot (Figure 4). At the apex of the funnel, there was greater symmetry in the studies with the lowest standard errors. As standard error increased, it appears that there was bias toward studies that demonstrated protective effects.

DISCUSSION

The primary finding of this study was that orthosis, insole, or footwear prescription did not have a pooled prophylactic effect on lower quarter MSKI in military members. Since most of the included studies that prescribed interventions did not consider the individual characteristics or needs of the military member, the widespread application of the non-specific interventions employed in these studies cannot be recommended at this time. Due to the substantial heterogeneity and the risks of bias observed across the reviewed studies, these findings should be interpreted based on the limitations of these trials.

Our findings agree with those reported by Knapik et al.[46], Yeung et al.[7], and Rome et al.[6] that found inconclusive evidence for the use of prescribed orthoses, insoles, or footwear for the prevention of injury. Among these studies, only the synthesis conducted by Knapik et al.[46] employed a military-only study population in the aggregation of their previous three studies of Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force recruits.[43–45] While our findings pertaining to prescribed shock-absorbing insoles agree with the those found in the meta-analysis conducted by Bonanno et al.,[14] our findings pertaining to the lack of prophylactic effects of foot orthoses diverge.[14] Their analysis found that orthoses were effective in preventing overall MSKI. [14] In the meta-analysis of injury type, this was found to be limited to stress fractures and not soft tissue injuries.[14] The divergence in our findings may have been a result of combining all injuries from each study prior to inclusion in the analyses.

From a clinical perspective, widespread and non-specific prescription of orthoses, insoles, or footwear cannot be recommended at this time. Bullock et al.[3] similarly concluded that there was insufficient evidence to recommend prescribed footwear based on arch height, the use of shock-absorbing insoles, or replacement of footwear at regular intervals for the prevention of injury. This should not be interpreted to preclude the utilization of these interventions for

specific clinical indications identified during examination of trained medical professionals. From a research perspective, our findings raise more questions than answers. There is a need for high quality prevention studies using contemporary research methods, specifically those outlined in the CONSORT guidelines.[47] Furthermore, it is unclear if policies such as the obligatory use of Berry Amendment compliant shoes, which are regulated to be domestically manufactured and issued based on foot type in US military recruits,[48,49] has an effect on injury and warrants future investigation.

There are limitations to this study. We utilized cumulative incidence measures at the time of allocation for calculations of relative risk. While this measure is consistent with the intention to treat principle, it does not account for attrition due to administrative reasons, which may have biased the results. While it can be assumed there was equity in both groups leading to non-differential bias, this is an assumption. We looked at overall injury burden and did not investigate if these interventions were protective against specific types of injuries. It is plausible that specific findings may have become non-significant by employing this approach. Lastly, we used non-peer reviewed research reports to mitigate the effects of publication bias. While this may have affected methodological quality of these studies, these studies[41,42] were not dissimilar from other studies that were vetted by peer reviewers.

CONCLUSIONS

Prescribed footwear and orthoses do not appear to have a prophylactic effect on lower quarter MSKI in military members. Since most of the included studies that prescribed interventions did not consider the individual characteristics or needs of the military member, the widespread application of the non-specific interventions employed in these studies cannot be

recommended at this time. These findings should be tempered based on the limitations of the studies in this area.

Support

No external financial support was received for this study. We greatly appreciate the assistance of Simona Konecna for her assistance in developing the search strategy and executing the search.

Key Messages

- Musculoskeletal injury is common in military populations and leads to impaired medical readiness and large financial costs.
- Prescribed footwear and orthoses have been proposed as measures for lower limb injury prevention.
- In military populations, prophylactic footwear and orthoses do not appear to have a preventive effect on lower limb injury rates.
- Future preventive studies should utilize high-quality, contemporary methodologies.

REFERENCES

- 1 Smith HJ, Taubman SB, Clark LL, *et al.* Absolute and relative morbidity burdens attributable to various illnesses and injuries, active component, U.S. Armed Forces, 2019. *Med Surveill Mon Rep* 2020;**7**.
- 2 Grimm PD, Mauntel TC, Potter BK. Combat and Noncombat Musculoskeletal Injuries in the US Military. *Sports Med Arthrosc Rev* 2019;**27**:84–91. doi:10.1097/JSA.0000000000000246
- 3 Bullock SH, Jones BH, Gilchrist J, *et al.* Prevention of Physical Training–Related Injuries: Recommendations for the Military and Other Active Populations Based on Expedited Systematic Reviews. *Am J Prev Med* 2010;**38**:S156–81. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.10.023
- 4 Edwards WB. Modeling Overuse Injuries in Sport as a Mechanical Fatigue Phenomenon. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 2018;**46**:224–31. doi:10.1249/JES.0000000000000163
- 5 McMillan A, Payne C. Effect of foot orthoses on lower extremity kinetics during running: a systematic literature review. *J Foot Ankle Res* 2008;**1**:13. doi:10.1186/1757-1146-1-13
- 6 Rome K, Handoll HHG, Ashford R. Interventions for preventing and treating stress fractures and stress reactions of bone of the lower limbs in young adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2005;:CD000450. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000450.pub2
- 7 Yeung SS, Yeung EW, Gillespie LD. Interventions for preventing lower limb soft-tissue running injuries. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011;:CD001256. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001256.pub2
- 8 Totah D, Menon M, Jones-Hershinow C, *et al.* The impact of ankle-foot orthosis stiffness on gait: A systematic literature review. *Gait Posture* 2019;**69**:101–11. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2019.01.020
- 9 Gardner LI, Dziados JE, Jones BH, *et al.* Prevention of lower extremity stress fractures: a controlled trial of a shock absorbent insole. *Am J Public Health* 1988;**78**:1563–7. doi:10.2105/AJPH.78.12.1563
- 10 Bonanno DR, Murley GS, Munteanu SE, *et al.* Effectiveness of foot orthoses for the prevention of lower limb overuse injuries in naval recruits: a randomised controlled trial. *Br J Sports Med* 2018;**52**:298–302. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-098273
- 11 Malisoux L, Theisen D. Can the “Appropriate” Footwear Prevent Injury in Leisure-Time Running? Evidence Versus Beliefs. *J Athl Train* 2020;**55**:1215–23. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-523-19
- 12 Fraser JJ, Schmied E, Rosenthal MD, *et al.* Physical therapy as a force multiplier: population health perspectives to address short-term readiness and long-term health of military service members. *Cardiopulm Phys Ther J* 2020;**31**:22–8. doi:10.1097/CPT.0000000000000129

- 13 McLaughlin R, Wittert G. The obesity epidemic: implications for recruitment and retention of defence force personnel. *Obes Rev* 2009;**10**:693–9. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2009.00601.x>
- 14 Bonanno DR, Landorf KB, Munteanu SE, *et al.* Effectiveness of foot orthoses and shock-absorbing insoles for the prevention of injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;**51**:86–96.
- 15 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;**372**:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- 16 Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, *et al.* AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ* 2017;**358**:j4008. doi:10.1136/bmj.j4008
- 17 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, *et al.* The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**:d5928. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
- 18 Mantel N, Haenszel W. Statistical aspects of the analysis of data from retrospective studies of disease. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1959;**22**:719–48.
- 19 Aert RCM van, Jackson D. A new justification of the Hartung-Knapp method for random-effects meta-analysis based on weighted least squares regression. *Res Synth Methods* 2019;**10**:515–27. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1356>
- 20 Higgins J, Churchill R, Chandler J, *et al.* Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.2. 0 (updated February 2021), Cochrane, 2021. *Available Cochrane Community* 2021.
- 21 Baujat B, Mahé C, Pignon J-P, *et al.* A graphical method for exploring heterogeneity in meta-analyses: application to a meta-analysis of 65 trials. *Stat Med* 2002;**21**:2641–52. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1221>
- 22 Mundermann A, Stefanyshyn DJ, Nigg BM. Relationship between footwear comfort of shoe inserts and anthropometric and sensory factors. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2001;**33**:1939–45.
- 23 Van Tiggelen D, Wickes S, Coorevits P, *et al.* Sock systems to prevent foot blisters and the impact on overuse injuries of the knee joint. *Mil Med* 2009;**174**:183–9.
- 24 Andrish JT, Bergfeld JA, Walheim J. A prospective study on the management of shin splints. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1974;**56**:1697–700.
- 25 Smith W, Walter J, Bailey M. Effects of insoles in coast guard basic training footwear. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc* 1985;**75**. doi:10.7547/87507315-75-12-644
- 26 Finestone A, Novack V, Farfel A. A prospective study of the effect of foot orthoses composition and fabrication on comfort and the incidence of overuse injuries. *Foot Ankle Int* 2004;**25**.

- 27 Bensen CK. Effects of Four Sole Constructions for Combat Boots on Lower Extremity Injuries among Men and Women in US Army Basic Combat Training. Army Natick Research and Development Labs MA 2013.
- 28 Milgrom C, Sorkin A, Gam A, *et al.* The search for the best infantry boot. *Disaster Mil Med* 2016;**2**. doi:10.1186/s40696-016-0024-5
- 29 Simkin A, Leichter I, Giladi M, *et al.* Combined Effect of Foot Arch Structure and an Orthotic Device on Stress Fractures. *Foot Ankle* 1989;**10**:25–9. doi:10.1177/107110078901000105
- 30 Finestone A, Shlamkovitch N, Eldad A, *et al.* A prospective study of the effect of the appropriateness of foot-shoe fit and training shoe type on the incidence of overuse injuries among infantry recruits. *Mil Med* 1992;**157**:489–90. doi:10.1093/milmed/157.9.489
- 31 Milgrom C, Giladi M, Kashtan H, *et al.* A Prospective Study of the Effect of a Shock-Absorbing Orthotic Device on the Incidence of Stress Fractures in Military Recruits. *Foot Ankle* 1985;**6**:101–4. doi:10.1177/107110078500600209
- 32 Sherman R, Karstetter K, May H, *et al.* Prevention of lower limb pain in soldiers using shock-absorbing orthotic inserts. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc* 1996;**86**:117–22. doi:10.7547/87507315-86-3-117
- 33 Esterman A, Pilotto L. Foot Shape and Its Effect on Functioning in Royal Australian Air Force Recruits. Part 2: Pilot, Randomized, Controlled Trial of Orthotics in Recruits with Flat Feet. *Mil Med* 2005;**170**:629–33. doi:10.7205/MILMED.170.7.629
- 34 Finestone A, Giladi M, Elad H, *et al.* Prevention of Stress Fractures Using Custom Biomechanical Shoe Orthoses: *Clin Orthop* 1999;**360**:182–90. doi:10.1097/00003086-199903000-00022
- 35 Franklyn-Miller A, Wilson C, Bilzon J, *et al.* Foot Orthoses in the Prevention of Injury in Initial Military Training: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;**39**:30–7. doi:10.1177/0363546510382852
- 36 Hesarikia H, Nazemian SS, Rasouli HR, *et al.* Effect of Foot Orthoses on Ankle and Foot Injuries in Military Service Recruits: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Biosci Biotechnol Res Asia* 2014;**11**:1141–8. doi:10.13005/bbra/1499
- 37 Larsen K, Weidich F, Leboeuf-Yde C. Can custom-made biomechanic shoe orthoses prevent problems in the back and lower extremities? A randomized, controlled intervention trial of 146 military conscripts. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2002;**25**:326–31. doi:10.1067/mmt.2002.124419
- 38 Mattila VM, Sillanpää PJ, Salo T, *et al.* Can orthotic insoles prevent lower limb overuse injuries? A randomized-controlled trial of 228 subjects: Prevention of lower limb overuse injuries. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2011;**21**:804–8. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2010.01116.x

- 39 Schweltnus MP, Jordaan G, Noakes TD. Prevention of common overuse injuries by the use
of shock absorbing insoles: A prospective study. *Am J Sports Med* 1990;**18**:636–41.
doi:10.1177/036354659001800614
- 40 Withnall R, Eastaugh J, Freemantle N. Do shock absorbing insoles in recruits undertaking
high levels of physical activity reduce lower limb injury? A randomized controlled trial. *J R
Soc Med* 2006;**99**:32–7. doi:10.1258/jrsm.99.1.32
- 41 Bensen CK. The effects of tropical and leather combat boots on lower extremity disorders
among US Marine Corps recruits. Army Natick Research and Development Labs MA 1976.
- 42 Bensen CK, Kish RN. Lower extremity disorders among men and women in Army basic
training and effects of two types of boots. Army Natick Research and Development Labs
MA 1983.
- 43 Knapik JJ, Swedler DI, Grier TL, *et al.* Injury reduction effectiveness of selecting running
shoes based on plantar shape. *J Strength Cond Res* 2009;**23**:685–97.
doi:10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181a0fc63
- 44 Knapik JJ, Trone DW, Swedler DI, *et al.* Injury reduction effectiveness of assigning running
shoes based on plantar shape in marine corps basic training. *Am J Sports Med* 2010;**38**:1759–
67. doi:10.1177/0363546510369548
- 45 Knapik JJ, Brosch LC, Venuto M, *et al.* Effect on Injuries of Assigning Shoes Based on Foot
Shape in Air Force Basic Training. *Am J Prev Med* 2010;**38**:S197–211.
doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.10.013
- 46 Knapik JJ, Trone DW, Tchandra J, *et al.* Injury-Reduction Effectiveness of Prescribing
Running Shoes on the Basis of Foot Arch Height: Summary of Military Investigations. *J
Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2014;**44**:805–12. doi:10.2519/jospt.2014.5342
- 47 Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for
reporting parallel group randomised trials. *Trials* 2010;**11**:1–8.
- 48 Fox C. Letter to Representative Tsongas from the Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense
pertaining to Berry amendment-compliant athletic shoes for recruits. 2014.
- 49 Platzer MD. Athletic Footwear for the Military: The Berry Amendment Controversy. 2016.
<https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/IN10501.html> (accessed 8 May 2021).

Table 1. Risk of bias assessment for included studies

	Andrish 1974	Bonanno 2018	Bensel 1976	Bensel 1983	Esternan 2005	Finestone 1999	Franklyn-Müller 2011	Gardner 1988	Hesarikia 2014	Knapik 2009	Knapik 2010a	Knapik 2010b	Larsen 2002	Mattila 2011	Milgrom 1985	Milgrom 1992	Mundermann 2001	Schwellnus 1990	Sherman 1996	Smith 1985	Van Tiggelen 2009	Withnall 2006
Random sequence generation	?	+	-	?	+	?	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	-	?	?	+
Allocation concealment	?	+	?	?	?	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	-	?	?	+
Blinding of participants and personnel	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	?	-	-	?	?	-
Blinding of outcome assessment	?	+	?	?	?	-	?	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Incomplete outcome data	-	+	?	?	+	-	+	+	?	?	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	?	+
Selective outcome reporting	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	?	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	?	+	?
Other	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study selection process. CINAHL, Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature; DTIC, Defense Technical Information Center.




Figure 2. Meta-analyses of lower extremity injuries by intervention




Figure 3. Baujat plot of study heterogeneity.




Figure 4. Funnel plot assessing reporting bias.

