

1 **Which assessments are used to analyze neuromuscular control by**  
2 **electromyography after an anterior cruciate ligament injury to**  
3 **determine readiness to return to sports? A systematic review**

4

5

6 Angela Blasimann<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, MSc, Irene Koenig<sup>a</sup>, PhD, Isabel Baert<sup>b</sup>, PhD, Heiner Baur<sup>a</sup>, Prof., Dirk  
7 Vissers<sup>b</sup>, Prof.

8 <sup>a</sup>Bern University of Applied Sciences, Department of Health Professions, Division of  
9 Physiotherapy, Murtenstrasse 10, Bern CH-3008, Switzerland

10 <sup>b</sup>University of Antwerp, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of  
11 Rehabilitation Sciences and Physiotherapy, Campus Drie Eiken, Universiteitsplein 1, Wilrijk  
12 B-2610, Belgium

13

14 \*Corresponding author:

15 Bern University of Applied Sciences

16 Department of Health Professions

17 Angela Blasimann

18 Murtenstrasse 10

19 CH-3008 Bern

20 Phone: +41 31 848 45 27

21 E-Mail: [angela.blasimann@bfh.ch](mailto:angela.blasimann@bfh.ch)

22

23

24

25

26

27

## 28 **Abstract**

29 **Background:** Adequate neuromuscular control of the knee could be one element to prevent  
30 secondary injuries after an anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury. To assess neuromuscular  
31 control in terms of time, amplitude and activity, electromyography (EMG) is used. However, it  
32 is unclear which assessments using EMG could be used for a safe return to sports (RTS).  
33 Therefore, we aimed to summarize EMG-related assessments for neuromuscular control of  
34 the knee in adult patients after an ACL injury to decide upon readiness for RTS.

35 **Methods:** This systematic review followed guidelines of Preferred Reporting of Items for  
36 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) and Cochrane recommendations.  
37 MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, Physiotherapy Evidence  
38 Database (PEDro), SPORTDiscus and the Web of Science were searched from inception to  
39 March 2019 and updated in November 2020. Studies identifying electromyographic  
40 assessments for neuromuscular control during dynamic tasks in adult, physically active  
41 patients with an anterior cruciate ligament injury were eligible and qualitatively synthesized.  
42 Two independent reviewers used a modified Downs and Black checklist to assess risk of  
43 bias of included studies.

44 **Results:** From initially 1388 hits, 38 mainly cross-sectional, case-controlled studies were  
45 included for qualitative analysis. Most studies provided EMG outcomes of thigh muscles  
46 during jumping, running or squatting. Outcomes measures described neuromuscular control  
47 of the knee in domains of time, amplitude or activity. Risk of bias was medium to high due to  
48 an unclear description of participants and prior interventions, confounding factors and  
49 incompletely reported results.

50 **Conclusions:** Despite a wide range of EMG outcome measures for neuromuscular control,  
51 none was used to decide upon return to sports in these patients. Additional studies are  
52 needed to define readiness towards RTS by assessing neuromuscular control in adult ACL  
53 patients with EMG. Further research should aim at finding reliable and valid, EMG-related

54 variables to be used as diagnostic tool for neuromuscular control. Moreover, future studies  
55 should aim at more homogenous groups including adequately matched healthy subjects,  
56 evaluate gender separately and use sport-specific tasks.

57 **Registration:** The protocol for this systematic review was indexed beforehand in the  
58 International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) and registered as  
59 CRD42019122188.

60

## 61 **Keywords**

62 Knee, Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injuries, ACL, Electromyography, EMG, Rehabilitation,  
63 Patient Outcome Assessment, neuromuscular control, return to sports, RTS

64

## 65 **Background**

66 Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries happen quite frequently and concern athletes (0.15  
67 injuries per 1000 athletic exposures (AEs)) but also the active part of the general population  
68 (1, 2). Most ACL injuries are due to a non-contact, multiplane mechanism (3) and may lead  
69 to instability, secondary meniscal injury or even knee osteoarthritis in the long run (4).  
70 Consequently, this injury means several months or even years of physical impairment with  
71 wide consequences for the patients concerning return to work, return to activity or return to  
72 sport (RTS). RTS rates between 63 and 97% are reported for patients after ACLR (5, 6).  
73 Most elite athletes return to sports return earlier than non-elite athletes (5), on average within  
74 12 months (6). However, it remains unclear whether this approach is safe (6), omitting further  
75 injury, respectively. Athletes after ACLR returning to high-demanding sports (including  
76 jumping, pivoting and hard cutting) show a more than fourfold increase in reinjury rates over  
77 two years (7). More than 5% of athletes with an ACLR sustain a re-rupture of the graft (6, 8)  
78 in the ipsilateral knee after RTS. The risk for an ACL tear in the contralateral knee is as

79 double as high (11.8%) even five years or longer after an ACLR (8). Overall, the recurrence  
80 rates even after successful ACLR and subsequent rehabilitation are high (29.5% or  
81 1.82/1000 AEs), with a tear of the ACL graft (9.0%), an ACL injury of the opposite leg  
82 (20.5%), muscle injuries on the ipsilateral side or even bilateral consequences (9, 10).

83 It is known that ipsilateral deficits in clinical knee function and knee laxity persist even years  
84 after ACLR (11, 12). ACL patients show altered kinematics and kinetics (13) and different  
85 neuromuscular strategies during walking (14), not only in the injured limb but also in the non-  
86 affected side (13, 15). These changes are referred to neuromuscular adaptations due to  
87 altered sensorimotor control (16) and are caused by altered afferent inputs to the central  
88 nervous system due to the loss of the mechanoreceptors of the native (original) ACL (17).  
89 Current literature regarding in ACL patients emphasises the importance of understanding  
90 consequences of ACL injury regarding neuromuscular control and kinematics (18-20). To  
91 describe neuromuscular control in terms of simultaneously activated agonist/antagonist  
92 muscle pairs, generalized knee muscle co-contraction parameters are used (21, 22).

93 In daily clinical practice, physical performance tests batteries including jumps and tests of  
94 muscle function (23) are often used to assess neuromuscular control for RTS. However,  
95 there is only limited evidence that passing RTS test batteries – interpreted as having  
96 achieved adequate levels of mobility, stability, strength, balance, and neuromuscular control  
97 for RTS - reduces the risk for a second ACL injury (24). Moreover, it remains unclear which  
98 measures should be used to bring athletes safely back to RTS with a low risk of re-injury  
99 (25). In conclusion, the currently suggested RTS criteria do not seem to be adequate to  
100 assess neuromuscular control of the knee joint to judge upon a safe RTS or even  
101 competition. Therefore, meaningful, reliable, valid and accurate diagnostic tools for patients  
102 with an ACL injury (either treated surgically or conservatively) are needed and may aid  
103 clinical decision-making towards a safe RTS following ACLR. Objective measurements of  
104 neuromuscular control should include electromyography (EMG) of involved muscles to judge  
105 upon quantity, quality and timing of voluntary activation and reflex activity (13, 20, 26).

106 However, up to date it is unclear which EMG-related measurements for neuromuscular  
107 control are used in patients with an ACL injury to decide upon a safe RTS.

## 108 Objectives

109 The first objective of this systematic review was therefore to summarize the scientific  
110 literature regarding EMG-related assessments for neuromuscular control in adult, physically  
111 active patients with an ACL injury (either treated surgically or conservatively) during  
112 functional tasks. The second aim was to analyze whether these assessments for  
113 neuromuscular control were used to decide upon readiness for RTS in these patients.

114

## 115 Methods

116 This systematic review was planned, conducted and analyzed according to the guidelines of  
117 Preferred Reporting of Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (27) and  
118 followed the recommendations of Cochrane group (28).

119 The protocol for this systematic review was indexed beforehand in the International  
120 Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) and got the registration number  
121 CRD42019122188.

## 122 Eligibility criteria

123 To define the relevant key words for the literature search, the Participants-Intervention-  
124 Control-Outcome-Study design (PICOS) scheme was used as follows (Table 1):

125 Table 1: Overview of PICOS criteria for key word definitions

Parameter	Criteria
Participants (P)	Adult people (age of 18 – 65 years) who sustained an ACL injury, either treated conservatively or surgically (repaired with an autograft)
Intervention (I)	Assessment of neuromuscular control, active knee stability, sensorimotor control, active

---

	stability of the lower limb or similar during dynamic activities
Control (C)	Uninjured limb / contralateral side or contralateral lower limb of the ACL-injured participant, or a healthy control group
Outcomes (O)	Any EMG-related outcome describing neuromuscular activity/control in domains of time, amplitude etc.; parameters describing EMG activity of lower limb muscles; related to EMG variables, such as amplitude, timing, mean or peak activity, duration of activity, onset and offset / on-off-pattern respectively, pre-activity, latency, reflex response (14, 20)
Study design (S)	Any laboratory or interventional study, cross-sectional or longitudinal such as randomized controlled trials, clinically controlled trials without randomization, laboratory/experimental controlled trials etc.

---

126

127 Studies were considered eligible for this systematic review if they met the following inclusion  
128 criteria: Study participants – either females, males or both - had to be 18 years or older,  
129 suffer from an ACL injury - either treated conservatively or surgically - with a time since  
130 injury/surgery of six months at least, be athletes or physically active people who participate in  
131 sports activities on a regular basis (as defined by each study, e.g. Tegner Activity Score  
132 (TAS)  $\geq 3$ ) to get data to decide upon RTS. Moreover, included studies had to have used  
133 active or functional tasks such as walking, stair climbing or jumps, applied assessments for  
134 neuromuscular control of lower limb muscles using EMG, be original articles published in  
135 peer-reviewed, scientific journals in English, German, French, Italian or Dutch, and available  
136 as full texts. Exclusion criteria were model-driven approaches, animals or cadavers,  
137 comparisons of surgical techniques, passive or non-functional tasks (such as isokinetic  
138 measurements for strength and isometric muscle activity), editorials, conference abstracts,  
139 book chapters, theses, systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

#### 140 **Data sources**

141 The search was effectuated from inception until March 2019 and updated in November 27<sup>th</sup>,  
142 2020 in the electronic databases MEDLINE/PubMed, EMBASE, CINAHL, Cochrane Library,  
143 Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro), SPORTDiscus and in the Web of Science. To

144 ensure new articles matching the search terms, e-mail alerts were established from each of  
145 the databases if possible (29). Furthermore, a hand search was done using the reference  
146 lists of included articles to identify additional and potentially eligible articles that had been  
147 missed in the electronic database searches. The hits from these two additional sources were  
148 also screened for eligibility applying the same criteria as for the articles from the database  
149 search.

## 150 **Search strategy**

151 In all sources, the advanced search mode was used if available. A search matrix combining  
152 relevant keywords (if possible MeSH-terms) with the Boolean operators AND and OR was  
153 used and customized for searches in all databases if necessary (see Appendix A): “anterior  
154 cruciate ligament/anterior cranial cruciate ligament/ACL”; “anterior cruciate ligament  
155 injuries/strains and sprains/rupture/tear/injury/deficiency”; “anterior ligament  
156 reconstruction/anterior cruciate ligament/surgery/reconstructive surgical  
157 procedures/orthopedic procedure/orthopedic procedure/tendon graft/tendon  
158 transfer/conservative treatment/non-surgical/rehabilitation/physical therapy  
159 modalities/physiotherapy/kinesiotherapy/ exercise/ instruction/resistance  
160 training/neuromuscular training/postoperative care”; “neuromuscular control/neuromuscular  
161 activity/sensorimotor control/muscle activity/active stability”;  
162 “electromyography/EMG/electromyogram/amplitude/timing/mean activity/peak  
163 activity/duration of activity/onset/offset/on-off-pattern/pre-activity/latency/reflex response”. In  
164 the updated search, articles were filtered by date of publication, with the aim of including only  
165 those published between March 2019 and November 2020.

## 166 **Study selection**

167 All hits obtained by the database searches were downloaded to the Rayyan reference  
168 management platform (30) and inserted into EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia,  
169 USA). Prior to screening, duplicates were removed. Two authors (AB and IK) independently  
170 screened title and abstract of the records, one by using the software EndNote (Clarivate

171 Analytics, Philadelphia, USA) and the other with the help of the free software “rayyan” (30).  
172 After screening, full texts of relevant hits were read by the two authors (IK, AB) to decide  
173 upon in- or exclusion. If their decisions did not match, discussion took place until consensus  
174 was achieved. If consensus would not have been reached, a third author (IB or HB) would  
175 have finally decided upon in- or exclusion of the record in question; however, this was not  
176 necessary.

#### 177 **Data collection process and data extraction**

178 After final decision of all studies, data extraction for each eligible study was performed by the  
179 first author (AB) with a predefined Microsoft® Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond WA,  
180 USA) spreadsheet as piloted form. The first author (AB) extracted necessary information  
181 from each article describing the study design, groups measured and their characteristics, the  
182 tasks to be fulfilled by all participants, and all EMG-related assessments or methods used to  
183 evaluate neuromuscular control. Furthermore, the chosen assessment for neuromuscular  
184 control were judged whether they were used to clear the participants for RTS. The second  
185 author (IK) checked the extracted data at random. As all included studies provided enough  
186 information to be qualitatively analyzed, it was not necessary to contact corresponding  
187 authors for obtaining or confirming data.

#### 188 **Assessment of risk of bias in included studies**

189 The risk of bias of all the included articles was independently assessed by two raters (AB, IK)  
190 by using the Downs and Black checklist (31) in a modified form (29, 32). The following  
191 categories were evaluated: (i) reporting bias: objectives/hypothesis, main outcomes, patients’  
192 characteristics, interventions, principal confounders, main findings, estimates of random  
193 variability, actual probability values; (ii) external validity bias: study  
194 subjects/staff/places/facilities representative; (iii) internal validity bias: blinding  
195 subjects/assessors, data dredging present, different lengths of follow-up/same time period  
196 between intervention and outcome for cases and controls, statistical tests/main outcome  
197 measures appropriate; (iv) selection bias: patients and controls from same population and



198 over same period of time, randomization, allocation concealed, adjustments for confounding,  
199 loss to follow-up; and (v) power analysis (see Appendix B). Each question of the categories  
200 was scored with 1 or 2 points if the criterium was fulfilled (answer “yes”), zero points if the  
201 answer was “no”, “not fulfilled” and an “X” if the criterium was not applicable, e.g.  
202 randomization for a case-control or cross-sectional study, “IC” for intrasubject comparison,  
203 respectively.

204 For this systematic review, studies with a total score of 17 or above out of 25 (more than 2/3  
205 of the maximum total score) were considered as being of high methodological quality,  
206 showing a “low” risk of bias respectively (29). Studies which reached 13 to 16 points (more  
207 than 50% of the maximum total score) were rated as being of “medium” quality, and total  
208 scores below 13 were rated as being of low methodological quality, “high” risk of bias  
209 respectively. As the aim of this systematic review was to summarize the applied measures  
210 for neuromuscular control, the methodological quality of the included studies was of  
211 secondary interest. Therefore, no study was excluded due to a low total score in the risk of  
212 bias assessment.

213

## 214 **Results**

### 215 **Study selection**

216 Hits from the first and the updated database search including e-mail alerts and hand search  
217 were screened for duplicates. After applying in- and exclusion criteria according to PRISMA  
218 flowchart (27), a total of 38 articles involving 1236 subjects – 809 participants with ACLR or  
219 ACL deficiency and 427 healthy controls - could be used for qualitative analysis. Reasons  
220 for exclusion were participants younger than 18 years, not able to achieve RTS, time since  
221 injury or surgery less than six months, static or non-functional task, study design (e.g.  
222 systematic review, study protocol), unclear or inadequate outcome, healthy participants or  
223 without ACL injury. Included studies had mainly a cross-sectional, case-controlled study

224 design. Details about every step of the search are illustrated in the following flowchart (Figure  
225 1).

226 *Insert Figure 1 about here.*

227 Figure 1: Flowchart of literature search according to guidelines of PRISMA (27)

228 Legends: PEDro = Physiotherapy Evidence Database; PRISMA = Preferred Reporting of Items for Systematic Reviews and  
229 Meta-Analyses

### 230 **Risk of bias assessment**

231 Risk of bias of half (19 studies, 50.0%) of the included studies was medium (13, 33-50), six  
232 (15.8%) showed high methodological quality (51-56) and 13 studies (34.2%) were of low  
233 quality (57-69) (Table 2). The main reasons for a medium to low methodological quality were  
234 due to an unclear description of participants and prior interventions, confounding factors, and  
235 incompletely reported results. Table 2 provides details about the risk of bias assessment for  
236 each included study.

237 *Insert Table 2 about here.*

238

### 239 **Characteristics of included studies**

240 *Study design:* All included studies were case-control studies, except two which were case  
241 series (56) or a single-case study (69). Two reported a retrospective or secondary data  
242 analysis (52, 55) or provided a subgroup analysis from a larger trial (45, 47-49, 65-67) (Table  
243 2). Thirty-five studies compared the ACL participants with at least one control group (other  
244 ACL treatment, e.g. surgical versus conservative, or healthy controls), the remaining three  
245 studies made a comparison between the injured and the non-injured leg of the participants  
246 (42, 44) or compared the pre-injury status with follow-up data from pre- and post-surgery  
247 (69).

248 *Participants:* The number of included, adult participants with ACL injury varied from N = 1  
249 (69) to a maximum of N = 70 (62) with a wide range of described physical activity from  
250 “normal” (58), “regular” (64), “active in at least one sport” (61), TAS  $\geq$  3 (50), minimal

251 2h/week (33, 34) to athletes at level I sports including jumping, pivoting and hard cutting (42,  
252 57, 59), elite soccer players (35, 38, 67, 69) or elite skiers (50). Some authors restricted  
253 study participation to either males (33, 34, 36, 39, 44-46, 50, 58, 60, 67) or females (50, 51,  
254 64-66, 68, 69), others measured females and males (13, 35, 37, 40, 41, 47-49, 52, 54-57, 59,  
255 61, 62). Three studies did not provide any data about the gender of their participants (42, 53,  
256 63). More patient characteristics of included studies can be found in Table 3.

257 *Insert Table 3 about here.*

258 Details regarding methodological aspects of all included studies are presented in Table 4  
259 below.

260 *Interventions:* The number of muscles assessed ranged from one (37, 45, 61) to ten (59).  
261 Mainly muscle activity of four muscles of the thigh, vastus lateralis, vastus medialis, biceps  
262 femoris and semitendinosus, had been assessed. However, there were also studies  
263 measuring the adductor longus (39, 62), gluteus medius (39, 65, 66), gluteus maximus (41,  
264 52, 54-56, 59, 65, 66), and calf muscles such as soleus, medial and lateral gastrocnemius  
265 (47-49, 54-56, 59, 60, 63).

266 The tasks used were very diverse: there were activities of daily life such as walking on even  
267 ground and downhill (33, 47, 53, 57, 58, 62, 63, 68), and stair climbing (13, 49). Other  
268 activities went more towards sports such as running (44, 45, 60, 67, 68) and jumping (36, 37,  
269 39-42, 48, 50-52, 54-56, 59, 61, 65, 66, 68) where mainly the single-leg hop for distance,  
270 drop jumps and countermovement jumps were used. Some authors chose typical  
271 rehabilitation exercises such as forward lunges (34), Nordic hamstrings or hamstrings curls  
272 (35) and squats (64). At the other end of the scale, more complex, highly demanding, sport-  
273 specific tasks such as an instep soccer kick (38) or a sidecutting maneuver (69) were  
274 reported. Only few research groups used perturbation platforms to simulate injury  
275 mechanisms during walking (53) or squatting (46, 64), or applied devices to stress the ACL in  
276 the posterior-anterior direction (50). In addition, two studies even investigated the influence  
277 of fatigue on neuromuscular control (41, 52).

278 *Outcomes:* All included studies used surface EMG as method to assess neuromuscular  
279 control and provided EMG-related variables such as peak and mean amplitudes, timing and  
280 peak of muscle activity, preparatory and reactive muscle activity, on- and offset of muscular  
281 activation, co-activation/co-contraction ratios, or asymmetry index. The outcome variables  
282 were expressed as percentage of maximum voluntary (isometric) contraction (%MVIC or  
283 %MVC) or reported in microvolts or milliseconds according to the variable chosen in  
284 amplitude or time domain.

285

#### 286 *Decision for Return to Sports RTS*

287 None of the included studies used the surface EMG measurements to decide upon readiness  
288 for RTS (Table 4). However, the results from about a third of the studies (31.6%, 12 studies)  
289 could provide useful information by the choice of the assessed groups such as copers versus  
290 non-copers (33, 34, 47-49, 57), intervention and control group from the same team or  
291 level/league (35, 38, 40), data from pre-injury/pre-surgery including post-surgical follow up  
292 (62, 69) or participants with full RTS versus limited RTS (53). In addition, two studies even  
293 investigated the influence of fatigue on neuromuscular control (41, 52).

294 *Insert Table 4 about here.*

295

## 296 **Discussion**

297 The aim of this systematic review was to summarize the scientific literature regarding EMG-  
298 related assessments for neuromuscular control in patients with an ACL injury (either treated  
299 surgically or conservatively). The second aim was to analyze whether these assessments for  
300 neuromuscular control were used to decide upon readiness for RTS in these patients.

301 There were many factors present which could have an influence on neuromuscular control:

302 *Influence by type of comparison (intra- versus inter-subject)*

303 The use of the contralateral, non-injured leg in intra-subject comparison, without a “real”  
304 control group (42, 44) may lead to an overestimation of the physical performance in the ACL  
305 reconstructed or -injured leg. After ACLR, functional performance is often expressed with the  
306 LSI (70). As the non-affected limb may also have deteriorated, the LSI may overestimate the  
307 right time for a safe RTS, and therefore, the risk for secondary injury may be higher (23). In  
308 acutely injured ACL patients, intra-individual comparison showed bilateral consequences  
309 during stair ascent and indicates an alteration in the motor program (“pre-programmed  
310 activity”) (71). In addition, in case of a case-controlled study design, the subjects in the  
311 control group should be matched to the ACL participants regarding sex, age, body mass,  
312 height, activity level and leg dominance.

#### 313 *Influence by level of activity and fatigue*

314 Some of the included studies used very challenging, sports-specific task to assess  
315 neuromuscular control, some even assessed neuromuscular control after fatiguing tasks. It is  
316 known that most of ACL tears are non-contact injuries happening at the end of a training  
317 session or a play (72). Therefore, the closer the task to the sports and injury-risky situation,  
318 the safer the decision towards full RTS or even return to competition will be. However,  
319 assessing performance-based tests or movement quality may be more difficult to  
320 standardize, require more complex equipment and large amounts of space. But if only  
321 impairments will be tested, there will be a lack of information regarding an “athlete’s capacity  
322 to cope with the physical and mental demands of playing sport” (73). It is therefore  
323 recommended to search for a standardized assessment close to the injury mechanism.

#### 324 *Influence by gender*

325 Not all included studies reported findings of mixed groups separately by gender. Some did  
326 not even state whether study participants were male or female. This could partly be  
327 explained by the date of publication as gender difference in ACL patients has not been in the  
328 focus of former ACL research. It is known that female athletes are more likely to sustain an  
329 ACL injury than men (74, 75); the increased risk is probably multifactorial (76). Several

330 studies indicate that hormonal factors play a role (3, 77) contributing to an increased laxity of  
331 ligaments in the first half of the menstrual cycle. However, biomechanical and neuromuscular  
332 aspects as indicators are discussed controversially in literature: Gender-specific  
333 neuromuscular adaptations and biomechanical landing techniques are considered being the  
334 most important ones to explain the increased risk of injury in women (78, 79). The higher risk  
335 for females to suffer from an ACL injury can be explained by motion and loading of the knee  
336 joint during performance (74). Female athletes typically perform movements in sports with a  
337 greater knee valgus angle than men. Therefore, the amount of stress on the ACL in these  
338 situations is higher caused by a high activation of the quadriceps despite limited knee and  
339 hip flexion, greater hip adduction and a large knee adduction moment (80, 81). The  
340 dominance of the quadriceps muscle in women could contribute to increased anterior tibial  
341 translation (82, 83) and was found in various activities such as jumps and cutting maneuvers  
342 (84-86). Moreover, females typically land with an internally or externally rotated tibia (87),  
343 leading to an increased knee valgus stress due to greater and more laterally orientated  
344 ground reaction forces (83). In contrast, other researchers did not find any gender-specific  
345 differences in the quadriceps-hamstrings ratio (88), not even in landing and cutting  
346 maneuvers (89). A systematic review summarized biomechanical gender differences and  
347 stated that these were based on questionable clinical relevance (89). In addition, strength-  
348 paired women and men showed no significant differences in neuromuscular activity (90).

349 *Influence* *by* *treatment*

350 The included studies reported different treatment options (ACLR with different graft types,  
351 conservative treatment). Depending on the classification of the participants in copers and  
352 non-copers, the results in neuromuscular control may differ from a population of ACLR  
353 participants. Therefore, all researchers who worked with copers and non-copers made intra-  
354 and inter-group comparisons without an ACLR group. A Cochrane review revealed low  
355 evidence for no difference in young, active adults after two and five years after the injury,  
356 assessed with patient-reported outcomes. However, many participants described as “non-  
357 copers” with unstable knee with conservative treatments remain symptomatic, and therefore,

358 later opt for ACL surgery (91). It has been described that persistent co-contraction and joint  
359 stiffening in these “non-copers” is likely to be due to an abnormal neuromuscular strategy  
360 failing to restore joint stability in these ACL deficient group (92). Furthermore, the choice of  
361 graft would influence the neuromuscular control of measured muscles due to the morbidity of  
362 the harvesting site of the graft (e.g. hamstrings).

363

364

### 365 *EMG variables*

366 If the researchers mentioned the procedures for collecting EMG data, they referred to  
367 standardized applications and guidelines such as SENIAM (Surface ElectroMyoGraphy for  
368 the Non-Invasive Assessment of Muscles) (93). The provided EMG-related variables were in  
369 accordance to the ones mentioned in a systematic review searching for knee muscle activity  
370 in ACL deficient patients and healthy controls during gait (14). Current literature suggests  
371 greater co-contraction indices, increased joint stiffness and earlier muscle activation onset  
372 times as measures of neuromuscular function reflecting the incomplete restoration of normal  
373 joint stability (19, 92). Some of the included studies reported values of muscle onset activity  
374 in milliseconds and percentage of gait cycle as a systematic review did by summarizing and  
375 quantitatively analyzing muscle onset activity prior to landing in patients after ACL injury (20).  
376 However, no cut-off values out of EMG-related variables were provided to determine an  
377 adequate level of neuromuscular control. Moreover, some of the researchers only provided  
378 integrated EMG values which would make it difficult to be compared to other studies using  
379 the respective units (milliseconds, millivolts) or widely used percentage values (%MVIC,  
380 %MVC).

### 381 *Return to sports (RTS)*

382 Regarding the determination of RTS after ACLR, there is some evidence for the use of  
383 functional performance tests, which had also been widely used in the included studies.  
384 Multiple functional performance measures – a battery including strength and hop tests,

385 quality of movement and psychological tests (25) - might be more useful for the  
386 determination of RTS than a single performance measure. However, it is still unclear, which  
387 measures should be used to bring athletes safely back to RTS with a low risk of a second  
388 ACL injury (25). Currently used RTS criteria or assessments, such as time, strength tests,  
389 hop tests, patient-reports, clinical examination, thigh circumference, ligamentous stability,  
390 range of motion, effusion and performance-based criteria, may be suboptimal at reducing the  
391 risk of a second ACL injury (73, 94). Recovery of neuromuscular function was mentioned to  
392 be important because of the existing connection between the variables time since surgery  
393 and the risk for re-injury of the knee joint; but adequate assessment procedures to assess  
394 neuromuscular function are still a matter of debate (7). In contrast, authors of an included  
395 study stated that “studies like ours that focus on the objective measurement of the change of  
396 the muscle latency time over time may allow patients to return to full activity and to sports  
397 earlier than the standard time of 6–12 months” (42). However, this statement only based on  
398 one outcome measure and contrasts with current criterion- and time-based  
399 recommendations for RTS. Therefore, this recommendation seems to be rather dangerous.

400

#### 401 **Limitations**

402 The sample size of all the studies was quite low, however, providing reasonable sample size  
403 calculations and depending on the variable investigated, the results were acceptable.  
404 Furthermore, the more restrictive the inclusion criteria for the participants, the more  
405 homogeneous the intervention and the control groups were, but the more challenging the  
406 recruitment process was, leading to smaller groups to be investigated.

407 The used assessment for the risk of bias, the Downs and Black checklist (31) in a modified  
408 form (29, 32) is designed for randomized and non-randomized controlled studies, however,  
409 the latter score lower in some items, get lower total scores and therefore a worse overall  
410 rating of the methodological quality. Despite this disadvantage, we decided to use the  
411 modified checklist as we could assess all studies with different designs included in this



412 systematic review. However, the use of total scores and choice of cut-off values for low,  
413 medium and high risk of bias, respectively, were arbitrary and not based on literature.

414

## 415 **Conclusions**

### 416 *Implications for clinical practice*

417 This systematic review summarized assessments using EMG variables for neuromuscular  
418 control of the knee in patients suffering from an ACL injury (either treated surgically or  
419 conservatively). Despite 38 articles providing a wide range of EMG-related assessments,  
420 none was used to decide upon readiness towards a safe and successful RTS in patients  
421 after an ACL injury. So far, there is no diagnostic measure to assess neuromuscular control  
422 and therefore, clinicians should use a multimodal approach including assessments for active  
423 and passive knee stability under different sports-related conditions but be aware of not being  
424 able to evaluate neuromuscular control in depth without EMG-related assessments.  
425 Moreover, the widely used LSI may overestimate the physical performance of an ACL patient  
426 as the non-affected limb is likely to have deteriorated, too.

### 427 *Implications for further research*

428 Additional studies are needed to define readiness towards RTS by assessing neuromuscular  
429 control in adult ACL patients with EMG. Further research should aim at finding reliable and  
430 valid, EMG-related variables to be used as diagnostic tool for neuromuscular control. Due to  
431 the heterogeneity in participants, interventions and outcomes used, future studies should aim  
432 at more homogenous patient groups, evaluate females and males separately, provide  
433 adequately matched healthy subjects (gender, height, weight, activity level etc.), control for  
434 confounding factors such as type of treatment, and use tasks close to the injury mechanism,  
435 as sport specific as possible, respectively. Moreover, it would be interesting to assess not  
436 only lower leg but pelvic and core muscles in addition. This would help to give insight in the

437 complex field of ACL injuries and subsequent rehabilitation strategies, and therefore improve  
438 knowledge towards a safe RTS in these patients.

439

## 440 **List of abbreviations**

441 ACL = anterior cruciate ligament; ACLR = anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction; EMG =  
442 electromyography; LSI = Limb Symmetry Index; PEDro = Physiotherapy Evidence Database;  
443 PICOS = Participants-Intervention-Control-Outcome-Study design; PRISMA = Preferred  
444 Reporting of Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; PROSPERO = International  
445 Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews; RTS = return to sports; SENIAM = Surface  
446 ElectroMyoGraphy for the Non-Invasive Assessment of Muscles; TAS = Tegner Activity  
447 Score

448

## 449 **Declarations**

### 450 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

451 Not applicable.

### 452 **Consent for publication**

453 Not applicable.

### 454 **Availability of data and material**

455 The datasets used and analyzed in the current study are available from the corresponding  
456 author on reasonable request.

### 457 **Competing interests**

458 Angela Blasimann, Irene Koenig, Isabel Baert, Heiner Baur and Dirk Vissers declare that  
459 they have no competing interests.

### 460 **Funding**

461 The Bern University of Applied Sciences provided working hours for AB as grant for non-  
462 tenured staff, but was not involved in the design of the study, collection, analysis and  
463 interpretation of data, in writing the manuscript and in the decision to submit the article for  
464 publication.

#### 465 **Authors' contributions**

466 AB participated in the design of the study, contributed to data collection/reduction/analysis  
467 and interpretation of results and was the main contributor in writing the manuscript; IK  
468 contributed to data collection, reduction and analysis; IB and DV participated in the design of  
469 the study; HB participated in the design of the study and was an important contributor in  
470 writing the manuscript, contributed to data analysis and interpretation of results. All authors  
471 contributed to the manuscript writing, read, and approved the final version of the manuscript  
472 and agreed with the order of authors as listed.

#### 473 **Acknowledgments**

474 We would like to thank to all the following people for their assistance and contribution  
475 regarding this work: the librarians of the Bern University (Department of Health Professions)  
476 and the University of Bern (Institute for Sports Science) for their support before and during  
477 the literature search, M. Akter for her help in extracting relevant key words and A. Busch for  
478 her critical review of the proposal and support to refine the search strategy.

#### 479 **Authors' information**

480 AB, MPTSc, MSc in Physiotherapy, PT, is Deputy Head of the research group  
481 "Neuromuscular control" and Co-Leader of the Bachelor of Science in Physiotherapy at the  
482 Bern University of Applied Sciences, Department of Health Professions, Division of  
483 Physiotherapy in Bern (Switzerland). AB is well-trained in orthopedics, sports physiotherapy  
484 and active rehabilitation in different settings. She works as lecturer and researcher and does  
485 her doctoral studies at the University of Antwerp (Belgium) in the field of neuromuscular  
486 control and ACL injuries.

487 IK, PhD, MSc in Physiotherapy, M.A. in Adult Education, PT, is Head of the research group  
488 “Pelvic Floor and Continence” and Co-Leader of the Bachelor of Science in Physiotherapy at  
489 the Bern University of Applied Sciences, Department of Health Professions, Division of  
490 Physiotherapy in Bern (Switzerland). She is well-trained in pelvic floor rehabilitation, EMG  
491 assessments and analyses with different methods.

492 IB, PhD, PT, works as tenure track lecturer at the University of Antwerp, Faculty of Medicine  
493 and Health Sciences, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences and Physiotherapy in Wilrijk  
494 (Belgium) in the Bachelor and Master study programs. Her main interests regarding research  
495 are in the field of musculoskeletal diseases (lower extremity and lumbopelvic region),  
496 assessments in physiotherapy and pain management.

497 HB, Professor, PhD in Sport and Movement Science, is Head of Applied Research and  
498 Development and Head of the research group “Neuromuscular control” at the Bern University  
499 of Applied Sciences, Department of Health Professions, Division of Physiotherapy in Bern  
500 (Switzerland). His main interests in research are development of diagnostic and  
501 interventional assessments for musculoskeletal problems, influence of neuromuscular control  
502 by external (training/exercise, therapy, aids) and internal factors (gender, age, etc.) and  
503 development of quality control measures in physiotherapy.

504 DV, Professor, PhD, PT, is senior lecturer at the at the University of Antwerp, Faculty of  
505 Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences and Physiotherapy in  
506 Wilrijk (Belgium). He has expertise in sports-related injuries, physical conditioning (muscle  
507 strength, motor control exercises), technology use in the field of physiotherapy, exercise  
508 therapy and rehabilitation in different pathologies. DV is first or co-author of several  
509 systematic reviews and meta-analysis.

510

## 511 **References**

- 512 1. Hootman JM, Dick R, Agel J. Epidemiology of collegiate injuries for 15 sports:  
513 summary and recommendations for injury prevention initiatives. *J Athl Train.* 2007;42(2):311-  
514 9.
- 515 2. Kaeding CC, Leger-St-Jean B, Magnussen RA. Epidemiology and Diagnosis of  
516 Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injuries. *Clin Sports Med.* 2017;36(1):1-8.
- 517 3. Hewett TE, Zazulak BT, Myer GD. Effects of the menstrual cycle on anterior cruciate  
518 ligament injury risk: a systematic review. *Am J Sports Med.* 2007;35(4):659-68.
- 519 4. Friel NA, Chu CR. The role of ACL injury in the development of posttraumatic knee  
520 osteoarthritis. *Clin Sports Med.* 2013;32(1):1-12.
- 521 5. Ardern CL, Webster KE, Taylor NF, Feller JA. Return to sport following anterior  
522 cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the state  
523 of play. *Br J Sports Med.* 2011;45(7):596-606.
- 524 6. Lai CCH, Feller JA, Webster KE. Fifteen-Year Audit of Anterior Cruciate Ligament  
525 Reconstructions in the Australian Football League From 1999 to 2013: Return to Play and  
526 Subsequent ACL Injury. *Am J Sports Med.* 2018;46(14):3353-60.
- 527 7. Grindem H, Snyder-Mackler L, Moksnes H, Engebretsen L, Risberg MA. Simple  
528 decision rules can reduce reinjury risk by 84% after ACL reconstruction: the Delaware-Oslo  
529 ACL cohort study. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50(13):804-8.
- 530 8. Wright RW, Magnussen RA, Dunn WR, Spindler KP. Ipsilateral graft and contralateral  
531 ACL rupture at five years or more following ACL reconstruction: a systematic review. *J Bone  
532 Joint Surg Am.* 2011;93(12):1159-65.
- 533 9. Paterno MV, Rauh MJ, Schmitt LC, Ford KR, Hewett TE. Incidence of contralateral  
534 and ipsilateral anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury after primary ACL reconstruction and  
535 return to sport. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2012;22(2):116-21.
- 536 10. Paterno MV, Rauh MJ, Schmitt LC, Ford KR, Hewett TE. Incidence of Second ACL  
537 Injuries 2 Years After Primary ACL Reconstruction and Return to Sport. *Am J Sports Med.*  
538 2014;42(7):1567-73.

- 539 11. Akelman MR, Fadale PD, Hulstyn MJ, Shalvoy RM, Garcia A, Chin KE, et al. Effect of  
540 Matching or Overconstraining Knee Laxity During Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction  
541 on Knee Osteoarthritis and Clinical Outcomes: A Randomized Controlled Trial With 84-Month  
542 Follow-up. *Am J Sports Med.* 2016;44(7):1660-70.
- 543 12. Group MK, Spindler KP, Huston LJ, Chagin KM, Kattan MW, Reinke EK, et al. Ten-  
544 Year Outcomes and Risk Factors After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: A MOON  
545 Longitudinal Prospective Cohort Study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2018;46(4):815-25.
- 546 13. Busch A, Blasimann A, Henle P, Baur H. Neuromuscular activity during stair descent  
547 in ACL reconstructed patients: A pilot study. *Knee.* 2019;26(2):310-6.
- 548 14. Shanbehzadeh S, Mohseni Bandpei MA, Ehsani F. Knee muscle activity during gait in  
549 patients with anterior cruciate ligament injury: a systematic review of electromyographic  
550 studies. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2017;25(5):1432-42.
- 551 15. Mantashloo Z, Letafatkar A, Moradi M. Vertical ground reaction force and knee  
552 muscle activation asymmetries in patients with ACL reconstruction compared to healthy  
553 individuals. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2020;28(6):2009-14.
- 554 16. Grooms DR, Page SJ, Nichols-Larsen DS, Chaudhari AM, White SE, Onate JA.  
555 Neuroplasticity Associated With Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *J Orthop Sports*  
556 *Phys Ther.* 2017;47(3):180-9.
- 557 17. Zimny ML, Schutte M, Dabezies E. Mechanoreceptors in the human anterior cruciate  
558 ligament. *Anat Rec.* 1986;214(2):204-9.
- 559 18. Lanier AS, Knarr BA, Stergiou N, Snyder-Mackler L, Buchanan TS. ACL injury and  
560 reconstruction affect control of ground reaction forces produced during a novel task that  
561 simulates cutting movements. *J Orthop Res.* 2020;38(8):1746-52.
- 562 19. Nawasreh ZH, Marmon AR, Logerstedt D, Snyder-Mackler L. The Effect of Training  
563 on a Compliant Surface on Muscle Activation and Co-Contraction after Anterior Cruciate  
564 Ligament Injury. *International journal of sports physical therapy.* 2019;14(4):3554-63.

- 565 20. Theisen D, Rada I, Brau A, Gette P, Seil R. Muscle Activity Onset Prior to Landing in  
566 Patients after Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.  
567 PLoS One. 2016;11(5):e0155277.
- 568 21. Ford KR, van den Bogert J, Myer GD, Shapiro R, Hewett TE. The effects of age and  
569 skill level on knee musculature co-contraction during functional activities: a systematic  
570 review. Br J Sports Med. 2008;42(7):561-6.
- 571 22. Tsai LC, McLean S, Colletti PM, Powers CM. Greater muscle co-contraction results in  
572 increased tibiofemoral compressive forces in females who have undergone anterior cruciate  
573 ligament reconstruction. J Orthop Res. 2012;30(12):2007-14.
- 574 23. Wellsandt E, Failla MJ, Snyder-Mackler L. Limb Symmetry Indexes Can Overestimate  
575 Knee Function After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.  
576 2017;47(5):334-8.
- 577 24. Webster KE, Feller JA. A research update on the state of play for return to sport after  
578 anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. J Orthop Traumatol. 2019;20(1):10.
- 579 25. van Melick N, van Cingel RE, Brooijmans F, Neeter C, van Tienen T, Hullegie W, et  
580 al. Evidence-based clinical practice update: practice guidelines for anterior cruciate ligament  
581 rehabilitation based on a systematic review and multidisciplinary consensus. Br J Sports  
582 Med. 2016;50(24):1506-15.
- 583 26. Bruhn S, Leukel C, Gollhofer A. Differential effects of stimulus characteristics during  
584 knee joint perturbation on hamstring and quadriceps reflex responses. Human movement  
585 science. 2011;30(6):1079-91.
- 586 27. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for  
587 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med.  
588 2009;6(7):e1000097.
- 589 28. Higgins JPT, Green, S. (editors). Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of  
590 interventions. Chichester UK: Wiley-Blackwell; 2008.

- 591 29. Ramsey CA, Lamb P, Kaur M, Baxter GD, Ribeiro DC. "How are running shoes  
592 assessed? A systematic review of characteristics and measurement tools used to describe  
593 running footwear". *Journal of sports sciences*. 2019;37(14):1617-29.
- 594 30. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and mobile  
595 app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5(1):210.
- 596 31. Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the  
597 methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care  
598 interventions. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1998;52(6):377-84.
- 599 32. Pairot-de-Fontenay B, Willy RW, Elias ARC, Mizner RL, Dube MO, Roy JS. Running  
600 Biomechanics in Individuals with Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction: A Systematic  
601 Review. *Sports medicine (Auckland, NZ)*. 2019;49(9):1411-24.
- 602 33. Alkjaer T, Simonsen EB, Jorgensen U, Dyhre-Poulsen P. Evaluation of the walking  
603 pattern in two types of patients with anterior cruciate ligament deficiency: copers and non-  
604 copers. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*. 2003;89(3):301-8.
- 605 34. Alkjaer T, Simonsen EB, Peter Magnusson SP, Aagaard H, Dyhre-Poulsen P.  
606 Differences in the movement pattern of a forward lunge in two types of anterior cruciate  
607 ligament deficient patients: copers and non-copers. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*.  
608 2002;17(8):586-93.
- 609 35. Arnason SM, Birnir B, Guomundsson TE, Guonason G, Briem K. Medial hamstring  
610 muscle activation patterns are affected 1-6 years after ACL reconstruction using hamstring  
611 autograft. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2014;22(5):1024-9.
- 612 36. Bryant AL, Newton RU, Steele J. Successful feed-forward strategies following ACL  
613 injury and reconstruction. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*. 2009;19(5):988-97.
- 614 37. Burland JP, Lepley AS, Frechette L, Lepley LK. Protracted alterations in muscle  
615 activation strategies and knee mechanics in patients after Anterior Cruciate Ligament  
616 Reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2020;28(12):3766-72.
- 617 38. Cordeiro N, Cortes N, Fernandes O, Diniz A, Pezarat-Correia P. Dynamic knee stability  
618 and ballistic knee movement after ACL reconstruction: an application on instep soccer kick.



- 619 Knee surgery, sports traumatology, arthroscopy : official journal of the ESSKA.  
620 2015;23(4):1100-6.
- 621 39. Dashti Rostami K, Naderi A, Thomas A. Hip Abductor and Adductor Muscles Activity  
622 Patterns During Landing After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury. J Sport Rehabil. 2019:1-6.
- 623 40. Jordan MJ, Aagaard P, Herzog W. Asymmetry and Thigh Muscle Coactivity in  
624 Fatigued Anterior Cruciate Ligament-Reconstructed Elite Skiers. Medicine and science in  
625 sports and exercise. 2017;49(1):11-20.
- 626 41. Lessi GC, Serrao FV. Effects of fatigue on lower limb, pelvis and trunk kinematics and  
627 lower limb muscle activity during single-leg landing after anterior cruciate ligament  
628 reconstruction. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2017;25(8):2550-8.
- 629 42. Oliver G, Portabella F, Hernandez JA. A comparative study of the neuromuscular  
630 response during a dynamic activity after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. European  
631 journal of orthopaedic surgery & traumatology : orthopedie traumatologie. 2019.
- 632 43. Ortiz A, Capo-Lugo CE, Venegas-Rios HL. Biomechanical deficiencies in women with  
633 semitendinosus-gracilis anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction during drop jumps. PM & R  
634 : the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation. 2014;6(12):1097-106.
- 635 44. Patras K, Ziogas G, Ristanis S, Tsepis E, Stergiou N, Georgoulis AD. High intensity  
636 running results in an impaired neuromuscular response in ACL reconstructed individuals.  
637 Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2009;17(8):977-84.
- 638 45. Patras K, Ziogas G, Ristanis S, Tsepis E, Stergiou N, Georgoulis AD. ACL  
639 reconstructed patients with a BPTB graft present an impaired vastus lateralis neuromuscular  
640 response during high intensity running. Journal of science and medicine in sport.  
641 2010;13(6):573-7.
- 642 46. Pincheira PA, Silvestre R, Armijo-Olivo S, Guzman-Venegas R. Ankle perturbation  
643 generates bilateral alteration of knee muscle onset times after unilateral anterior cruciate  
644 ligament reconstruction. PeerJ. 2018;6:19.

- 645 47. Rudolph KS, Axe MJ, Buchanan TS, Scholz JP, Snyder-Mackler L. Dynamic stability  
646 in the anterior cruciate ligament deficient knee. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.*  
647 2001;9(2):62-71.
- 648 48. Rudolph KS, Axe MJ, Snyder-Mackler L. Dynamic stability after ACL injury: who can  
649 hop? *Knee surgery, sports traumatology, arthroscopy : official journal of the ESSKA.*  
650 2000;8(5):262-9.
- 651 49. Rudolph KS, Snyder-Mackler L. Effect of dynamic stability on a step task in ACL  
652 deficient individuals. *Journal of electromyography and kinesiology.* 2004;14(5):565-75.
- 653 50. Swanik CB, Lephart SM, Swanik KA, Stone DA, Fu FH. Neuromuscular dynamic  
654 restraint in women with anterior cruciate ligament injuries. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related*  
655 *Research.* 2004(425):189-99.
- 656 51. Briem K, Ragnarsdottir AM, Arnason SI, Sveinsson T. Altered medial versus lateral  
657 hamstring muscle activity during hop testing in female athletes 1-6 years after anterior  
658 cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee surgery, sports traumatology, arthroscopy : official*  
659 *journal of the ESSKA.* 2016;24(1):12-7.
- 660 52. Lessi GC, Silva RS, Serrao FV. Comparison of the effects of fatigue on kinematics  
661 and muscle activation between men and women after anterior cruciate ligament  
662 reconstruction. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2018;31:29-34.
- 663 53. Lustosa LP, Ocarino JM, de Andrade MA, Pertence AE, Bittencourt NF, Fonseca ST.  
664 Muscle co-contraction after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Influence of functional  
665 level. *Journal of electromyography and kinesiology : official journal of the International*  
666 *Society of Electrophysiological Kinesiology.* 2011;21(6):1050-5.
- 667 54. Nyland J, Klein S, Caborn DNM. Lower Extremity Compensatory Neuromuscular and  
668 Biomechanical Adaptations 2 to 11 Years After Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction.  
669 *Arthroscopy-the Journal of Arthroscopic and Related Surgery.* 2010;26(9):1212-25.
- 670 55. Nyland J, Mauser N, Caborn DNM. Sports involvement following ACL reconstruction  
671 is related to lower extremity neuromuscular adaptations, subjective knee function and health  
672 locus of control. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2013;21(9):2019-28.

- 673 56. Nyland J, Wera J, Klein S, Caborn DN. Lower extremity neuromuscular  
674 compensations during instrumented single leg hop testing 2-10 years following ACL  
675 reconstruction. *Knee*. 2014;21(6):1191-7.
- 676 57. Boerboom AL, Hof AL, Halbertsma JP, van Raaij JJ, Schenk W, Diercks RL, et al.  
677 Atypical hamstrings electromyographic activity as a compensatory mechanism in anterior  
678 cruciate ligament deficiency. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2001;9(4):211-6.
- 679 58. Bulgheroni P, Bulgheroni MV, Andrini L, Guffanti P, Giughello A. Gait patterns after  
680 anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*.  
681 1997;5(1):14-21.
- 682 59. Gokeler A, Hof AL, Arnold MP, Dijkstra PU, Postema K, Otten E. Abnormal landing  
683 strategies after ACL reconstruction. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*.  
684 2010;20(1):e12-9.
- 685 60. Hansen C, Einarson E, Thomson A, Whiteley R, Witvrouw E. Hamstring and calf  
686 muscle activation as a function of bodyweight support during treadmill running in ACL  
687 reconstructed athletes. *Gait and Posture*. 2017;58:154-8.
- 688 61. Klyne DM, Keays SL, Bullock-Saxton JE, Newcombe PA. The effect of anterior  
689 cruciate ligament rupture on the timing and amplitude of gastrocnemius muscle activation: a  
690 study of alterations in EMG measures and their relationship to knee joint stability. *Journal of*  
691 *electromyography and kinesiology : official journal of the International Society of*  
692 *Electrophysiological Kinesiology*. 2012;22(3):446-55.
- 693 62. Knoll Z, Kocsis L, Kiss RM. Gait patterns before and after anterior cruciate ligament  
694 reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2004;12(1):7-14.
- 695 63. Kuster M, Blatter G, Hauswirth L, Neuer W, Wood GA. [The anterior cruciate  
696 ligament, an important structure of the knee joint]. *Praxis (Bern 1994)*. 1995;84(5):134-9.
- 697 64. Madhavan S, Shields RK. Neuromuscular responses in individuals with anterior  
698 cruciate ligament repair. *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2010;122(5):997-1004.

- 699 65. Ortiz A, Olson S, Libby CL, Trudelle-Jackson E, Kwon YH, Etnyre B, et al. Landing  
700 mechanics between noninjured women and women with anterior cruciate ligament  
701 reconstruction during 2 jump tasks. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2008;36(1):149-57.
- 702 66. Ortiz A, Olson S, Trudelle-Jackson E, Rosario M, Venegas HL. Landing mechanics  
703 during side hopping and crossover hopping maneuvers in noninjured women and women  
704 with anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. *PM & R : the journal of injury, function, and  
705 rehabilitation*. 2011;3(1):13-20.
- 706 67. Patras K, Zampeli F, Ristanis S, Tsepis E, Ziogas G, Stergiou N, et al. Hamstring-  
707 dominant strategy of the bone-patellar tendon-bone graft anterior cruciate ligament-  
708 reconstructed leg versus quadriceps-dominant strategy of the contralateral intact leg during  
709 high-intensity exercise in male athletes. *Arthroscopy*. 2012;28(9):1262-70.
- 710 68. Swanik CB, Lephart SM, Giraldo JL, Demont RG, Fu FH. Reactive muscle firing of  
711 anterior cruciate ligament-injured females during functional activities. *J Athl Train*.  
712 1999;34(2):121-9.
- 713 69. Zebis MK, Andersen CH, Bencke J, Orntoft C, Linnebjerg C, Holmich P, et al.  
714 Neuromuscular Coordination Deficit Persists 12 Months after ACL Reconstruction But Can  
715 Be Modulated by 6 Weeks of Kettlebell Training: A Case Study in Women's Elite Soccer.  
716 *Case reports in orthopedics*. 2017;2017:4269575.
- 717 70. Engelen-van Melick N, van Cingel RE, Tijssen MP, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MW.  
718 Assessment of functional performance after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: a  
719 systematic review of measurement procedures. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*.  
720 2013;21(4):869-79.
- 721 71. Busch A, Helne P, Boesch L, Blasimann A, Baur H. Neuromuscular control in patients  
722 with acute ACL injury during stair ascent – A pilot study. *Sports Orthopaedics and  
723 Traumatology*. 2019;35(2):158-65.
- 724 72. Price RJ, Hawkins RD, Hulse MA, Hodson A. The Football Association medical  
725 research programme: an audit of injuries in academy youth football. *Br J Sports Med*.  
726 2004;38(4):466-71.

- 727 73. Burgi CR, Peters S, Ardern CL, Magill JR, Gomez CD, Sylvain J, et al. Which criteria  
728 are used to clear patients to return to sport after primary ACL reconstruction? A scoping  
729 review. *Br J Sports Med*. 2019;53(18):1154-61.
- 730 74. Hewett TE, Myer GD, Ford KR, Heidt RS, Jr., Colosimo AJ, McLean SG, et al.  
731 Biomechanical measures of neuromuscular control and valgus loading of the knee predict  
732 anterior cruciate ligament injury risk in female athletes: a prospective study. *Am J Sports*  
733 *Med*. 2005;33(4):492-501.
- 734 75. Montalvo AM, Schneider DK, Yut L, Webster KE, Beynnon B, Kocher MS, et al.  
735 "What's my risk of sustaining an ACL injury while playing sports?" A systematic review with  
736 meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2019;53(16):1003-12.
- 737 76. Balachandar V, Marciniak JL, Wall O, Balachandar C. Effects of the menstrual cycle  
738 on lower-limb biomechanics, neuromuscular control, and anterior cruciate ligament injury  
739 risk: a systematic review. *Muscles, ligaments and tendons journal*. 2017;7(1):136-46.
- 740 77. Belanger L, Burt D, Callaghan J, Clifton S, Gleberzon BJ. Anterior cruciate ligament  
741 laxity related to the menstrual cycle: an updated systematic review of the literature. *J Can*  
742 *Chiropr Assoc*. 2013;57(1):76-86.
- 743 78. Voskanian N. ACL Injury prevention in female athletes: review of the literature and  
744 practical considerations in implementing an ACL prevention program. *Curr Rev*  
745 *Musculoskelet Med*. 2013;6(2):158-63.
- 746 79. Wojtys EM, Wylie BB, Huston LJ. The effects of muscle fatigue on neuromuscular  
747 function and anterior tibial translation in healthy knees. *Am J Sports Med*. 1996;24(5):615-21.
- 748 80. Pappas E, Carpes FP. Lower extremity kinematic asymmetry in male and female  
749 athletes performing jump-landing tasks. *Journal of science and medicine in sport*.  
750 2012;15(1):87-92.
- 751 81. Pollard CD, Sigward SM, Powers CM. Limited hip and knee flexion during landing is  
752 associated with increased frontal plane knee motion and moments. *Clin Biomech (Bristol,*  
753 *Avon)*. 2010;25(2):142-6.

- 754 82. Hanson AM, Padua DA, Troy Blackburn J, Prentice WE, Hirth CJ. Muscle activation  
755 during side-step cutting maneuvers in male and female soccer athletes. *J Athl Train.*  
756 2008;43(2):133-43.
- 757 83. Sigward SM, Powers CM. Loading characteristics of females exhibiting excessive  
758 valgus moments during cutting. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).* 2007;22(7):827-33.
- 759 84. Malinzak RA, Colby SM, Kirkendall DT, Yu B, Garrett WE. A comparison of knee joint  
760 motion patterns between men and women in selected athletic tasks. *Clin Biomech (Bristol,*  
761 *Avon).* 2001;16(5):438-45.
- 762 85. Myer GD, Ford KR, Hewett TE. The effects of gender on quadriceps muscle activation  
763 strategies during a maneuver that mimics a high ACL injury risk position. *Journal of*  
764 *electromyography and kinesiology : official journal of the International Society of*  
765 *Electrophysiological Kinesiology.* 2005;15(2):181-9.
- 766 86. Padua DA, Carcia CR, Arnold BL, Granata KP. Gender differences in leg stiffness  
767 and stiffness recruitment strategy during two-legged hopping. *J Mot Behav.* 2005;37(2):111-  
768 25.
- 769 87. Nagano Y, Ida H, Akai M, Fukubayashi T. Gender differences in knee kinematics and  
770 muscle activity during single limb drop landing. *Knee.* 2007;14(3):218-23.
- 771 88. Hannah R, Folland JP, Smith SL, Minshull C. Explosive hamstrings-to-quadriceps  
772 force ratio of males versus females. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2015;115(4):837-47.
- 773 89. Benjaminse A, Gokeler A, Fleisig GS, Sell TC, Otten B. What is the true evidence for  
774 gender-related differences during plant and cut maneuvers? A systematic review. *Knee Surg*  
775 *Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2011;19(1):42-54.
- 776 90. Nimphius S, McBride JM, Rice PE, Goodman-Capps CL, Capps CR. Comparison of  
777 Quadriceps and Hamstring Muscle Activity during an Isometric Squat between Strength-  
778 Matched Men and Women. *Journal of sports science & medicine.* 2019;18(1):101-8.
- 779 91. Monk AP, Davies LJ, Hopewell S, Harris K, Beard DJ, Price AJ. Surgical versus  
780 conservative interventions for treating anterior cruciate ligament injuries. *The Cochrane*  
781 *database of systematic reviews.* 2016;4:CD011166.

- 782 92. Behnke AL, Parola LR, Karamchedu NP, Badger GJ, Fleming BC, Beveridge JE.  
783 Neuromuscular function in anterior cruciate ligament reconstructed patients at long-term  
784 follow-up. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon). 2020:105231.
- 785 93. Hermens HJ, Freriks B, Disselhorst-Klug C, Rau G. Development of  
786 recommendations for SEMG sensors and sensor placement procedures. Journal of  
787 electromyography and kinesiology : official journal of the International Society of  
788 Electrophysiological Kinesiology. 2000;10(5):361-74.
- 789 94. Losciale JM, Zdeb RM, Ledbetter L, Reiman MP, Sell TC. The Association Between  
790 Passing Return-to-Sport Criteria and Second Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury Risk: A  
791 Systematic Review With Meta-analysis. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2019;49(2):43-54.
- 792

Table 2: Risk of Bias assessment with modified Downs & Black checklist (29, 31, 32)

Authors & Year	Design	Reporting							External validity					Internal validity							Power	Score	RoB				
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	20	21	22				23	24	25	26
Busch et al. (2019) (13)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	14	medium
Alkjaer et al. (2003) (33)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	14	medium
Alkjaer et al. (2002) (34)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	1	0	15	medium
Arnason et al. (2014) (35)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	1	X	0	15	medium
Bryant et al. (2009) (36)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	X	1	X	0	16	medium
Burland et al. (2020) (37)	CSS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	X	X	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	1	X	1	15	medium
Cordeiro et al. (2015) (38)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	14	medium
Dashti Rostami et al. (2019) (39)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	15	medium
Jordan et al. (2016) (40)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	14	medium
Lessi et al. (2017) (41)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	1	14	medium
Oliver et al. (2018) (42)	P, CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	IC	1	X	X	IC	X	0	14	medium
Ortiz et al. (2014) (43)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	0	1	0	15	medium



Patras et al. (2009) (44)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	0	1	1	IC	X	X	X	IC	X	0	12	medium
Patras et al. (2010) (45)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	1	X	0	13	medium
Pincheira et al. (2018) (46)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	1	13	medium
Rudolph et al. (2001) (47)	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	0	15	medium
Rudolph et al. (2000) (48)	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	0	15	medium
Rudolph & Snyder-Mackler (2004) (49)	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	0	13	medium
Swanik et al. (2004) (50)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	1	13	medium
Briem et al. (2016) (51)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	1	18	low
Lessi et al. (2018) (52)	R, CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	0	X	X	1	X	1	17	low
Lustosa et al. (2011) (53)	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	0	17	low
Nyland et al. (2010) (54)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	0	X	0	17	low
Nyland et al. (2013) (55)	R, CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	1	X	0	18	low
Nyland et al. (2014) (56)	CS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	1	1	1	X	1	X	X	1	X	0	17	low
Boerboom et al. (2001) (57)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	X	X	1	X	X	1	0	1	0	0	X	X	X	1	X	0	11	high
Bulgheroni et al. (1997) (58)	CCS	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	X	X	1	X	X	1	0	1	1	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	9	high

Gokeler et al. (2010) (59)	CCS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high
Hansen et al. (2017) (60)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high
Klyne et al. (2012) (61)	CCS	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high	
Knoll et al. (2004) (62)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	X	X	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	10	high	
Kuster et al. (1995) (63)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	X	X	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	12	high	
Madhavan & Shields (2011) (64)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	9	high	
Ortiz et al. (2008) (65)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	11	high	
Ortiz et al. (2011) (66)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	10	high	
Patras et al. (2012) (67)	CCS	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	X	0	0	X	X	0	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	8	high	
Swanik et al. (1999) (68)	CCS	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	X	0	0	X	X	1	X	1	1	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	10	high	
Zebis et al. (2017) (69)	CS	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	X	0	1	X	X	1	X	1	1	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	11	high	

Abbreviations: CCS = case-control study, CS = case study, IC = intrasubject comparison (injured leg versus healthy leg), P = prospective, R = retrospective (secondary analysis), RoB = risk of bias, X = not applicable or unclear

Table 3: Participants' characteristics of included studies

Authors & Year	Number of participants (age, sex, group-specific inclusion criteria)	Diagnosis & treatment (only ACL)	Level of activity or sports (RTA, RTS, RTP)	Intervention Group	Control Group 1 (ACL patients)	Control Group 2 (healthy people)	significant difference between groups?
Busch et al. (2019) (13)	N = 20; N = 10 ACLR (age: 26 ± 10 yrs; height: 175 ± 6 cm; mass: 75 ± 14 kg) and N = 10 healthy matched controls (age: 31 ± 7 yrs; height: 175 ± 7 cm; mass: 68 ± 10 kg)	N = 10 ACLR (13.2 ± 2 months since repair), quadriceps tendon graft by same surgeon, some with additional injuries which needed surgery	TAS mind. 4	N = 10 ACLR participants; age 26 ± 10 yrs, height 175 ± 7 cm, weight 75 ± 14kg, 3 females & 7 males, TAS 7 ± 2	n.a.	N = 10 healthy participants without prior injury of the knee, age 31 ± 7 yrs, height 175 ± 8 cm, weight 68 ± 10kg, 3 females & 7 males, TAS 6 ± 1; matched according to age, height, weight, gender, (sports) activity level and leg dominance	no
Alkjaer et al. (2003) (33)	N = 29; N = 19, all male, complete chronic (post-injury time 6 months or more) ACLD and N = 10 healthy males as controls for EMG	complete chronic ACLD, min. 6 months of rehab program after injury, ACL injury clinically diagnosed by experienced orthopedic surgeons with Lachman, Anterior Drawer and Pivot-Shift Tests; TLS scores applied to separate ACLD-participants in copers and non-copers	min. 2h/wk of physical activity	N=9; male copers; (mass: 76.7 (14.3)kg, height: 1.81 (0.06) m, age: 28.3 (6.1) yrs); mean TLS scores: 87.1 (5.8) and 6.1 (0.6) respectively; mean time after injury: 39.1 (42.3) (range 6.0–120.0) months	N=10; male non-copers; mass: 80.4 kg (SD 6.7); height: 1.79 m (SD 0.05), age: 31.7 yrs (SD 5.9); mean TLS scores: 74.0 (SD 7.1) and 3.8 (SD 0.6), respectively; mean time after injury: 55.0 months (SD 42.7) (range 6.0–144.0)	N=10; male healthy; mass: 77.5 kg (SD 7.9), height: 1.82 m (SD 0.05), age: 31.0 yrs (SD 2.8)	no
Alkjaer et al. (2002) (34)	N = 23 all male; N = 17 males with complete ACLD, N = 6 healthy controls	complete ACLD, min. 6months of rehab program after injury; TLS scores applied to separate ACLD-participants in copers and non-copers	min. 2h/wk	N=8; male copers; weight: 76.6 kg (SD 14.8); height: 1.81 m (SD 0.06), age: 26.0 yrs (SD 4.0); mean TLS scores: 85.5 (SD 5.3) and 6.25 (SD 0.5), respectively, mean time after injury: 34.0 months (SD 39.2) (range 6.0–120.0)	N=9; male non-copers; weight: 80.6 kg (SD 7.1); height: 1.79 m (SD 0.06), age: 31.2 yrs (SD 6.0); mean TLS scores: 74.0 (SD 7.1) and 3.8 (SD 0.6), respectively; mean time after injury: 51.8 months (SD 44.0) (range 6.0–144.0)	N=6; male healthy; weight: 73.8 kg (SD 7.9), height: 1.81 m (SD 0.05), age: 31.0 yrs (SD 1)	no

Arnason et al. (2014) (35)	N = 36; N = 18, female and male soccer players with ACLR (post-injury time 1 – 6 yrs) and N = 18 healthy female and male soccer players from the same team (men's and women's top league in Iceland), matched for gender, height, body mass and "involved" side designation, as controls	ACLR: successful return to full participation in soccer; no muscle strain injury in knee flexors in past 3 months, no orthopedic condition excluding from soccer	full participation in soccer (Icelandic top leagues)	N=18 ACLR participants in total; N = 8 males, N = 10 females; all participants mean mass: 69.2 (11.8) kg, height: 1.73 (0.09)m, age: 23.7 (3.6) yrs; mean BMI 23.0 (2.4) kg/m <sup>2</sup> ; left/right dominance 2/16; involved/uninvolved is the dominant leg 8/10; time since injury 1 – 6 yrs	n.a.	N=18 healthy participants; N = 8 males, N = 10 females; all participants mean mass: 68.6 (11.2) kg, height: 1.73 (0.08) m, age: 20.5 (3.7) yrs; mean BMI 22.7 (2.0) kg/m <sup>2</sup>	no
Bryant et al. (2009) (36)	N = 59; N = 10 males with ACLD (18–35 yrs); N= 27 matched males with ACLR (14 with patella tendon graft, 13 with combined ST and gracilis graft); N = 22 matched-controls	Cincinnati Knee Rating System (0 – 100 points); ACLD: full ROM, neg. Lachman, neg. Pivot-Shift; confirmed isolated ACL rupture (arthroscopic) min. 1yr before testing; same orthopedic surgeon for all ACLR	n.m., but hopping required	N = 10 male with ACLD (18–35 yrs)	N= 27 matched males with ACLR (14 with patella tendon graft, 13 with combined ST and gracilis graft)	N = 22 matched (age, activity level, anthropometrics), healthy controls no history of trauma or disease in either knee & no evidence of abnormality on clinical examination	no
Burland et al. (2020) (37)	N = 36; N = 16 females ACLR, N = 10 males ACLR, N = 8 healthy controls (N = 4 females, N = 4 males)	unilateral ACLR, 21 subjects with BPTB graft, 5 with hamstrings graft; enrolled in physician-directed rehabilitation program, able to do single limb forward hop	Not mentioned as criteria for in-/exclusion; minimum TAS of 5 preinjury/ after surgery	N = 26 with ACLR, age 20.2 ± 2.7 yrs, mean time since injury 2.2 ± 2.7 yrs, TAS preinjury median 8.0 (range 5.0–10.0), after surgery 7.0 (range 5.0–9.0) points, cleared for unrestricted RTS	n.a.	N = 8 healthy controls, age 23.3 ± 1.8 yrs, TAS median 9.0 (range 5.0–10.0) points	no, except age
Cordeiro et al. (2015) (38)	N = 17 males; N = 8 with ACLR and N = 9 healthy controls	ACLR: mind. 6 months post-surgery on dominant leg, bone-tendon-bone arthroscopy, no problems at end of physiotherapy phase	soccer, professional level	N = 8 N = 8 professional male soccer players (age = 24.6 ± 3.5 yrs, height = 1.83 ± 0.06 m, mass = 77.3 ± 7 kg) with ACLR mind. 6 months since surgery	n.a.	N = 9 healthy controls; professional male soccer players (age = 24.0 ± 3.5 yrs, height = 1.76 ± 0.05 m, mass = 72.9 ± 3.5 kg), no knee or leg injuries or previous ACL surgeries	no

Dashti Rostami et al. (2019) (39)	N = 36; N = 12 ACLD, N = 12 ACLR; N = 12 healthy controls; all male athletes	for patients: primary unilateral ACL injury	athletes, regular sports participation, ACLD = copers	N = 12 males, 18 to 36 months post-ACLR	N = 12 males, 18 to 36 months after ACL rupture (= ACLD, copers); grade 2 or 3 rupture including the following definition of copers: athletes with ACLD for at least 18 months, no symptoms of knee instability during regular sports participation	N = 12 healthy males, matched controls; no knee injury, no knee pain	no
Jordan et al. (2016) (40)	N = 22; N = 11 ACLR, N = 11 control; elite skiing athletes from Canada's national alpine skiing and skier cross team	ACLR: primary ACL injury, at least 12 months post-surgery, actively competing athletes at the Federation International de Ski World Cup level with full medical clearance to compete	elite ski racers, TAS 10, competing at international level	N = 11 actively competing ACLR skiers (females, n = 5: age = 23.6 ± 1.8 yrs, mass = 61.0 ± 5.3 kg; males, n = 6: age = 26.5 ± 5.8 yrs, mass = 84.4 ± 9.0 kg; 7 subjects with ST autograft, 1 with BPTB autograft, 3 with cadaver allograft	n.a.	N = 11 matched controls with no history of ACL injury (females, n = 5: age = 21.8 ± 3.2 yrs, mass = 63.7 ± 4.6 kg; males, n = 6: age = 23.3 ± 3.3 yr, mass = 84.7 ± 5.1 kg; active competitors at the international level defined as participation in the Federation International de Ski World Cup circuit	n.m.
Lessi et al. (2017) (41)	N = 40; N = 20 with ACLR, N = 20 healthy controls	ACLR: non-contact ACL injury, unilateral reconstruction of the ACL with no prior history of a contralateral ACL injury, no recent history of an ankle, hip, spine, or contralateral knee injury in the past 12 months; rehabilitation completed, cleared to RTS by both their physician and physical therapist	recreational sports, meaning aerobic or athletic activity at least 3x/wk	N = 20 with ACLR, 13 males, 7 females, at least 12 months post-surgery, 13 with hamstring ipsilateral autografts, 7 with BPTB ipsilateral autograft),	n.a.	N = 20 healthy controls, 13 males, 7 females, no history of any dysfunction or previous joint trauma, no prior history of ACL injury or injury of lower extremity in last 12 months; were matched by age, sex, weight, and current sporting activity type	no

Oliver et al. (2018) (42)	N = 25 ACLD, mean age 22 ± 4.61 yrs, mean mass 71.18 ± 10.57 kg, mean height was 177.55 ± 9.69 cm; N = 18 males (72%); N = 2 lost to follow-up due to personal issues, all remaining 23 patients concluded the study (pre-surgery, 4 and 6 months post-surgery for questionnaires, at 6 months for jumps)	complete ACL tear was based on clinical symptoms, on positive Lachman's and pivot shift tests, and was confirmed by magnetic resonance imaging; reconstruction 2–3 months after the injury by same surgeon using BTB-technique	more than 200 h of sports activity per year, including jumping, pivoting and twisting actions	injured knee	non-injured knee	n.a.	n.a.
Ortiz et al. (2014) (43)	N = 31 females; N = 15 ACLR, N = 16 healthy females	ACLR: same orthopedic surgeon, same rehabilitation protocol, N = 13 were injured while participating in competitive volleyball at the collegiate or professional level; at least 12 months post-surgery, full RTS allowed (without restrictions) to pre-injury level	sports-specific physical activities as described by the Activity Rating Scale, scores from 12 to 16, consistent with activities such as running, cutting, decelerating, and pivoting more than 2x/wk = high level of participation	N = 15 ACLR with SG graft, age range 21 – 35 yrs (height: 167.71 ± 9.0 cm, body mass: 67.68 ± 11.66 kg), time since surgery was between 12 months and 5 yrs, full RTS allowed (pre-injury level); N = 1 drop-out due to inability to perform tasks	n.a.	N = 16 healthy females, participating in volleyball, basketball, and soccer at the collegiate or intramural sports level, age range 21 – 35 yrs, height: 160.50 ± 5.17 cm, body mass: 59.35 ± 10.37 kg	no for age and activity, height and weight
Patras et al. (2009) (44)	N = 9 males with ACLR	ACLR: unilateral ACL tear confirmed by MRI and arthroscopy, BPTB graft within 6 months after injury, same rehabilitation protocol, RTS permitted 6 months post-surgery	athletes, amateur soccer players, at least TAS 7	N = 9 males with ACLR, mean age: 27.7 ± 3.5 yrs, mean weight: 79.5 ± 7.3 kg, mean height: 178 ± 5.9 cm, mean time since surgery: 19.2 ± 5.7 months, median Lysholm score: 95 (range 94–96), TAS: 8 (range 7–9), resumed their sports activities	n.a.	n.a., non-injured side respectively	n.a.

Patras et al. (2010) (45)	N = 28 males; N = 14 ACLR, N = 14 healthy controls	ACLR: unilateral ACL tear confirmed by MRI and arthroscopy, BPTB graft, performed within 6 months after injury, same surgeon, same rehabilitation, RTS permitted after 6 months post-surgery	amateur soccer players	N = 14 males with ACLR, mean age: 24.8 ± 5.3 yrs; mean height: 177 ± 5.3 cm, mean weight 77.3 ± 7.5 kg, time since surgery: mean 18.5 ± 4.3 months, pre-injury level of sports participation, median Lysholm score 95 (range 94–100) and TAS 8 (range 7–9)	n.a.	N = 14 healthy males, mean age: 21.7±4.4 yrs; mean height: 180 ± 9.0 cm, mean weight 72.2 ± 8.3 kg, never suffered of any kind of orthopedic or neurological condition; left leg = control leg	n.m.
Pincheira et al. (2018) (46)	N = 50 male soccer players; N = 25 with unilateral ACLR, N = 25 uninjured controls	ACLR: unilateral ACLR with ST-gracilis graft, same surgical team, at least 6 months post surgery; non-contact mechanism during soccer match on the dominant limb	amateur soccer players, playing at least 2x/wk	N = 25 males with ACLR, age 28.36 ± 7.87 yrs; weight 77.56 ± 6.35 kg, height 169 ± 7 cm, time after surgery 9 ± 3 months, time between ACL injury and surgery 3.4 ± 1 months; at time of measurements cleared for full RTS	n.a.	N = 25 healthy males, age 24.16 ± 2.67 yrs; weight 78.16 ± 5.46 kg, height 172 ± 5 cm; without injury or surgery on lower limb	no
Rudolph et al. (2001) (47)	one component of a larger study; N = 31; N = 10 healthy controls, N = 11 ACLD copers, N = 10 ACLD non-copers	ACLD: full range of motion in both knees, no visible or palpable knee effusion, no symptoms of locking, an uninvolved, healthy knee	athletes, regular activity in level I sports (involving jumping, pivoting, and hard cutting) and level II sports (involving lateral motions) before injury	N = 11 ACLD copers (2 females, 9 males), ages 22–43 yrs, mean 30.7, high-level athletes with ACLD for at least 1 year (confirmed by MRI, any knee instability during regular participation in level I and II sports, no more than one episode of giving way, even during sports, since injury	N = 10 noncopers ACLD (4 females, 6 males), ages 16–43 yrs, mean 28.1; more than one episode of giving way since injury, instability during ADL, not returned to sports	N = 10 uninjured individuals, matched by age and activity level to the coper subjects (2 females, 8 men), ages 23–41 yrs, mean 32.2)	no (age and joint laxity)

Rudolph et al. (2000) (48)	one component of a larger study; N = 31; N = 10 healthy controls, N = 11 ACLD copers, N = 10 ACLD non-copers	ACLD: full range of motion in both knees, no visible or palpable knee effusion, no symptoms of locking, an uninjured, healthy knee	athletes, regular activity in level I sports (involving jumping, pivoting, and hard cutting) and level II sports (involving lateral motions) before injury	N = 11 ACLD copers (2 females, 9 males), ages 22–43 yrs, mean 30.7, high-level athletes with ACLD for at least 1 year (confirmed by MRI, any knee instability during regular participation in level I and II sports, no more than one episode of giving way, even during sports, since injury)	N = 10 noncopers ACLD (4 females, 6 males), ages 16–43 yrs, mean 28.1; more than one episode of giving way since injury, instability during ADL, not returned to sports	N = 10 uninjured individuals, matched by age and activity level to the copers subjects (2 females, 8 men), ages 23–41 yrs, mean 32.2)	n.m.
Rudolph & Snyder-Mackler (2004) (49)	one component of a larger study; N = 31; N = 10 healthy controls, N = 11 ACLD copers, N = 10 ACLD non-copers	ACLD: full range of motion in both knees, no visible or palpable knee effusion, no symptoms of locking, an uninjured, healthy knee	athletes, regular activity in level I sports (involving jumping, pivoting, and hard cutting) and level II sports (involving lateral motions) before injury	N = 11 ACLD copers (2 females, 9 males), ages 22–43 yrs, mean 30.7, high-level athletes with ACLD for at least 1 year (confirmed by MRI, any knee instability during regular participation in level I and II sports, no more than one episode of giving way, even during sports, since injury)	N = 10 noncopers ACLD (4 females, 6 males), ages 16–43 yrs, mean 28.1; more than one episode of giving way since injury, instability during ADL, not returned to sports	N = 10 uninjured individuals, matched by sex, age and activity level to the copers subjects (2 females, 8 men), ages 23–41 yrs, mean 32.2)	no (age and leg length)
Swanik et al. (2004) (50)	N = 29; N = 12 female ACLD, N = 17 female controls	complete unilateral ACL tear, at least 1 year after injury, mechanical instability (positive Lachman & Pivot-Shift tests), rehabilitation program completed, no ACL surgery	minimum TAS of 3	N = 12 females with ACLD, age 25.2 ± 7.3 yrs, mean time since injury 33.6 ± 5.2 months, TAS 5.4 ± 1.83 points	n.a.	N = 17 healthy females, age 22.7 ± 4.0 yrs, TAS 5.41 ± 1.5 points	n.m.



Briem et al. (2016) (51)	N = 36; N = 18, female players with ACLR (post-injury time 1 – 6 yrs) and N = 18 healthy female players from the same team (from Icelandic women's top league in handball, football, basketball), matched for gender, height, body mass and "involved" side designation, as controls	no information about diagnosis or treatment; exclusion criteria: current musculoskeletal injury, lower limb muscle strain within 3 previous months, not being able to do single-limb hops	ACLR: successful return to competition with their teams; healthy: full participation in soccer (Icelandic top leagues)	N = 18 females, ACLR, recruited via advertisement from teams competing in the tip leagues in three sports team handball (n = 5), basketball (n = 4), and football (n = 9)]. In 12 instances, the surgical limb was the individual's dominant one. Characteristics: mean mass: 67.2 (7.8) kg, height: 1.714 (0.05) m, age: 22.7 (3.5) yrs; mean BMI 22.8 (2.4) kg/m <sup>2</sup> ; involved/uninvolved is the dominant leg 12/18; time since injury 1 – 6 yrs	n.a.	N = 18 healthy females recruited from the same teams, matched for age, height, weight. Characteristics mean mass: 66.3 (7.1) kg, height: 1.708 (0.05) m, age: 21.5 (2.7) yrs; mean BMI 22.7 (2.2) kg/m <sup>2</sup>	no
Lessi et al. (2018) (52)	N = 14 ACLR (7 males, 7 females) from study of Lessi et al. (2017) (41)	non-contact ACL injury; unilateral ACLR with autologous ipsilateral graft at least 12 months before recruitment; undergone a rehabilitation program; returned to sports participation; no contralateral ACL injury	recreational sports	N = 7 males ACLR, age 23.90 ± 2.80 yrs, height 1.80 ± 0.1m, body mass 83.3 ± 7.8 kg, 3 with BPTB graft, 4 with flexor tendons grafts	N = 7 females ACLR, age 24.7 ± 5.3 yrs, height 1.63 ± 0.1m, body mass 65.9 ± 9.0 kg, 2 with BPTB graft, 5 with flexor tendons grafts	n.a.	no, except men were taller than women (P < 0.001) and performed a higher number of sets of the protocol before becoming fatigued their reconstruct ed limb (P = 0.006).
Lustosa et al. (2011) (53)	N = 25 ACLR; N = 15 with Cincinnati Knee Rating System (CKRS) > 90 points (full RTS), N = 10 with CKRS < 85 points (limited RTS)	at least 2 yrs post-surgery, same rehabilitation program which allowed full RTS activities 7 months post-surgery	full RTS allowed, not further specified	N = 10 ACLR with CKRS 77.30 ± 6.14 points, age 33.4 ± 7.53 yrs, time between injury and surgery 52.20 ± 31.33 months, 3 with associated meniscal injuries, 7 without	N = 15 ACLR with CKRS 96.87 ± 2.75 points, age 34.5 ± 8.85 yrs, time between injury and surgery 67.3 ± 28.5 months, 3 with associated meniscal injuries, 12 without	n.a.	no

Nyland et al. (2010) (54)	N = 70 ACLR; N = 35 males; N = 35 females, 5.3 ± 3 yrs post-surgery	minimum of 2 yrs since unilateral primary ACL reconstruction with allografts performed by same surgeon, standard rehabilitation program with sufficient adherence	met or exceeded standard accepted return-to-sports activity goals of a minimum 85% bilateral equivalence with single-leg hop-for-distance testing and 60°/s isokinetic peak knee extensor and flexor torque testing	N = 35 males with ACLR, age n.m., height 180.3 ± 6.9cm, weight 88.9 ± 13.3kg, time after surgery 5.6 ± 3.2 yrs	N = 35 females with ACLR, age n.m., height 166.6 ± 7.1cm, weight 68.2 ± 18.9kg, time after surgery 5.1 ± 2.6 yrs	n.a.	n.m.
Nyland et al. (2013) (55)	N = 70 ACLR; 35 male and 35 females, 5.3 ± 3 yrs after surgery; secondary analysis of Nyland et al., 2010 (54)	minimum of 2 yrs since unilateral primary ACL reconstruction with allografts performed by same surgeon, standard rehabilitation program with sufficient adherence	met or exceeded standard accepted return-to-sports activity goals of a minimum 85% bilateral equivalence with single-leg hop-for-distance testing and 60°/s isokinetic peak knee extensor and flexor torque testing	N = 24 ACLR well-trained/frequently sporting, 50% males, age at surgery 29.8 ± 11.4 yrs, height 172.5 ± 8.6 cm, weight 77.1 ± 18.2 kg, time post-surgery 5.7 ± 2.8 yrs, IKDC 87.3 ± 11.5	N = 26 ACLR only sporting sometimes, 50% males, age at surgery 33.1 ± 13.5 yrs, height 171.7 ± 9.7 cm, weight 79.4 ± 23.2 kg, time post-surgery 5.4 ± 3.1 yrs, IKDC 87.3 ± 11.5	no healthy control group, but N = 20 ACLR highly competitive subjects, 50% males, age at surgery 26.5 ± 9.4 yrs, height 176.5 ± 9.4 cm, weight 76.8 ± 13.9 kg, time post-surgery 4.6 ± 3.0 yrs, IKDC 91.0 ± 9.4	no
Nyland et al. (2014) (56)	N = 65 ACLR; 32 male and 33 females, 5.2 ± 2.9 yrs after surgery; Subject group assignments were made based on how they responded to the following question: "Compared to prior to your knee	minimum of 2 yrs since unilateral primary ACL reconstruction with allografts performed by same surgeon, standard rehabilitation program with sufficient adherence	met or exceeded standard accepted return-to-sports activity goals of a minimum 85% bilateral equivalence	N = 23 "capable = group 2", 52.2% males, age at surgery 29.3 [95% CI: 24.1, 34.4] yrs, height 172.8 [168.4, 177.3] cm, weight 76.8 [68.3, 85.2] kg, time post-surgery 5.4 [4.2, 6.6] yrs, IKDC 87.2 [82.1, 92.4]	N = 22 "not capable = group 3", 45.5% males, age at surgery 33.6 [95% CI: 26.4, 39.1] yrs, height 172.1 [167.1, 177.1] cm, weight 79.7 [68.0, 91.3] kg, time post-surgery 5.2 [3.8, 6.5] yrs, IKDC 78.6 [71.7, 85.5]	no healthy control group, but N = 20 "very capable = group 1", 50% males, age at surgery 26.5 [95% CI: 21.9, 31.8] yrs, height 176.5 [170.4, 180.1] cm, weight 76.8 [67.4, 80.3] kg, time post-surgery 4.6 [2.8, 6.2] yrs, IKDC 91.0 [84.1, 94.6]	no

	injury how capable are you now in performing sports activities", very capable (group 1 → see field for healthy controls), capable (group 2), or not capable (group 3)		with single-leg hop-for-distance testing and 60°/s isokinetic peak knee extensor and flexor torque testing				
Boerboom et al. (2001) (57)	N = 20; N = 10 ACLD (5 copers, 5 noncopers), N = 10 controls	ACLD: ACL rupture confirmed by physical examination and arthroscopy, conservative treatment	before injury: all ACLD participants at level I (of the IKDC score), after injury: level I (all copers), level II and III (noncopers)	N = 5 copers (all males) with ACLD, median age 32 yrs, range 21–46, median time between primary injury and gait analysis: 39 months (13–67), acting at same level of sports and daily activities (level I) as before the injury	N = 5 noncopers (3 males, 2 females) with ACLD, with functional instability, median age 27 yrs, range 23–35, median time between injury and gait analysis: 22 months (16–87), acting at lower level (4 at level III, 1 at level II)	N = 10 healthy males, without a history of knee injury, median age was 22 yrs (range 18–24)	no in patient groups (age, time between injury and gait analysis), in comparison with healthy controls: n.m.
Bulgheroni et al. (1997) (58)	N = 30 all males; N = 15 with ACLR, N = 10 with ACLD, N = 5 healthy controls	ACLR: BPTB graft	normal activity	N = 15 males with ACLR, age 25 ± 3 yrs, time after reconstruction: 17 ± 5 months, normal activity	N = 10 males with ACLD, age 27 ± 6 yrs, mean time after injury: 20.4 months after injury (range 8–48 months), knee instability	N = 5 males, healthy controls, age 28 ± 3 yrs, no history of musculoskeletal pathology	n.m.
Gokeler et al. (2010) (59)	N = 20; N = 9 ACLR patients, N = 11 healthy controls	ACLR: six months after surgery, isolated ACL lesion, no major meniscal or cartilage lesion, normal limb alignment, no relevant previous surgery at any other joint of the limbs, same rehab program at same institution, unrestricted RTS allowed after 9 months post-surgery	level I-II athletes	N = 9 ACLR patients (6 males, 3 females), mean age 28.4 ± 9.7 yrs, 27 ± 1.5 wk postoperatively (BPTB technique, same surgeon),	n.a.	N = 11 healthy subjects (8 males, 3 females), level I-II athletes,	n.m.

Hansen et al. (2017) (60)	N = 37; N = 18 male patients, N = 19 healthy participants	ACLR: discharged from rehabilitation facility,	ready to return to on-fields sports specific activity	N = 18 male ACLR at the end of their rehabilitation and allowed to running, 7 ± 2 months post-surgery; N = 8 with a BPTB graft, age 27 ± 7.69 yrs, weight 80.40 ± 9.44 kg, height: 178.49 ± 7.29 cm; N = 10 with a hamstring graft, age 26 ± 3.84 yrs, weight 74.16 ± 7.19 kg, height 176.89 ± 5.6 cm	n.a.	N = 19 injury-free male controls, age 35.4 ± 7.8 yrs, weight 77.6 ± 8.4 kg, height 179.1 ± 5.6 cm	n.m.
Klyne et al. (2012) (61)	N = 26; N = 15 ACLD, N = 11 healthy controls	ACLD: chronic, unilateral ACL rupture demonstrated with a positive pivot shift and confirmed by orthopedic surgeon, plus a history of subjective stability and a right skill preference in the lower limb, without previous ACL surgery	active in at least one sport	N = 15 ACLD, 10 males and 5 females, 28 ± 7 yrs, average time since injury of 34 months (±17 months), sustained injury while playing sport	n.a.	N = 11 healthy controls, 9 males, 2 females (29 ± 8 yrs), active in at least one sport, no other musculoskeletal problems, right skill preferred in their lower limb, matched for age and activity level	n.m.
Knoll et al. (2004) (62)	N = 76; N = 25 ACLR (pre- and postsurgery), N = 51 healthy controls	no previous injury, no meniscal damage, BPTB graft, rehabilitation program	non-professional athletes pursuing some sports two to three times/wk	N = 25 with ACLD (before surgery, later ACLR), 18 males, 7 females; first subgroup: 9 male with acute ACLD (mean age: 29.86 ± 6.52 yrs, mean height 1.77 ± 0.8 meters, mean mass 81.40 kg ± 9.06 kg); second subgroup: 9 males with chronic ACLD (mean age: 39.70 ± 2.1 yrs mean height: 1.70 ± 0.21 meters, mean mass: 88.1 ± 20.2 kg) and 7 females with chronic ACLD (mean age: 30.31 ± 9.48 yrs, mean height: 1.64 ± 0.32 meters, mean mass: 62.0 ± 8.4 kg). The chronic ACLD group was examined an	same population of ACLD, but after surgery → ACLR, measured at wk 6, and 4, 8, and 12 months post-surgery	N = 51 healthy controls, 31 males, 20 females, mean age: 31.70 ± 4.1 yrs, mean height: 1.71 ± 0.12 meters, mean mass 72.1 ± 25.2 kg, no pathology that would affect gait, unfamiliar with treadmill walking	n.m.

				average of 28.2 months after injury (ranging from 24 to 52 months), but before surgery			
Kuster et al. (1995) (63)	N = 33; N = 21 with ACLD, N = 12 healthy controls	ACLD: arthroscopically confirmed complete ACL ruptures at least 1 year previously	ACLD: TAS 6-10 (mean 8.2) before injury and 3-9 (mean 5.3) after injury; controls: TAS range 4-8 (mean 6.1)	N = 19 with 21 ACLD, mean age: 28.2 yrs (range 19-42), mean height: 174.1cm (156-187.6), mean weight: 77.9kg (50-112), mean time since injury: 45 months (range of 12-108), mean Lysholm score 82 (range 55-100),	n.a.	N = 12 healthy controls, similar in height and weight, mean height: 171.2 cm and weight 70.8 kg, no lower limb injury	unclear (similar for height and weight)
Madhavan & Shields (2011) (64)	N = 24 females; N = 12 with ACLR, N = 12 healthy controls	complete reconstruction of the ACL with BPTB or HS autograft, ability to climb stairs without difficulty, full joint ROM, SR-36, KOOS, IKDC	regular physical activity, TAS	N = 12 females ACLR, age 22.4 ± 2.4 yrs, mean time from surgery 3.7 ± 1.8 yrs, weight 144.1 ± 19kg, height 164.5 ± 5.28cm, TAS (current) 7.1 ± 2.4	n.a.	N = 12 healthy females, no previous history of knee pathology, age 24.1 ± 3.2 yrs, weight 136.5 ± 20.3kg, height 163.8 ± 7.3cm, TAS (current) 6.9 ± 2.1; matched to age	no
Ortiz et al. (2008) (65)	N = 28 females; N = 13 ACLR, N = 15 non-injured controls	not controlled for graft/surgery or rehabilitation protocol (only similarities); at least 1-year post surgery, no multiple surgeries on the same knee	recreational fitness activities such as jogging, running, and weightlifting, none of the participants formed part of any intercollegiate, varsity, or competitive sport team	N = 14 physically active young women with ACLR (age, 25.4 ± 3.1 yrs; height, 167.5 ± 5.9 cm; body mass, 63.2 ± 6.7 kg; mean time after surgery 7.2 ± 4.2 yrs (1-16 yrs after reconstruction)); N = 9 with BPTB graft, N = 3 with gracilis-ST-graft, N = 2 with Achilles tendon graft; N = 1 excluded due to inability to perform tasks	n.a.	N = 15 healthy, noninjured young women from physiotherapy school (age, 24.6 ± 2.6 yrs; height, 164.7 ± 6.5 cm; body mass, 58.4 ± 8.9 kg)	n.m.
Ortiz et al. (2011) (66)	N = 28 females; N = 13 ACLR, N = 15 non-injured controls (same group as for Ortiz et al., 2008 (65))	not controlled for graft/surgery or rehabilitation protocol (only similarities); at least 1-year post surgery, no multiple surgeries on the same	recreational fitness activities such as jogging, running, and weightlifting, none of the participants	N = 14 physically active young women with ACLR (age, 25.4 ± 3.1 yrs; height, 167.5 ± 5.9 cm; body mass, 63.2 ± 6.7 kg; mean time after surgery 7.2 ± 4.2 yrs (1-16 yrs after reconstruction)); N =	n.a.	N = 15 healthy, non-injured young women from physiotherapy school (age, 24.6 ± 2.6 yrs; height, 164.7 ± 6.5 cm; body mass, 58.4 ± 8.9 kg)	n.m.

		knee	formed part of any intercollegiate, varsity, or competitive sport team	9 with BPTB graft, N = 3 with gracilis-ST-graft, N = 2 with Achilles tendon graft; N = 1 excluded due to inability to perform tasks			
Patras et al. (2012) (67)	N = 28 males; N = 14 ACLR and N = 14 healthy controls	ACLR: performed sub-acutely within 6 months after the injury from the same surgeon (range 1 to 4 months), unilateral ACL tear confirmed by MRI and arthroscopy; full RTS allowed 6 months post-surgery	competitive soccer players	N = 14 ACLR with BPTB autograft, age 24.8 ± 5.3 yrs, weight 77.3 ± 7.5 kg and height 177 ± 5.3 cm, mean time since surgery 18.5 ± 4.3 months; TAS 8 (range 7-9), Lysholm score 95 (range 94 – 100).	n.a.	N = 14 healthy male controls, age 21.7 ± 4.4 yrs, weight 72.2 ± 8.3 kg and height 180 ± 9.0 cm	n.m.
Swanik et al. (1999) (68)	N = 24 females, mean age = 29.4 ± 10.4 yrs; mean height = 168 + 10.7 cm; mean weight = 61.2 ± 6 kg; N = 6 ACLD, N = 12 ACLR, N = 6 controls	complete unilateral ACL tear, ACLR: BPTB grafts, testing 6 – 30 months after surgery, rehabilitation program completed, attempt to previous level of activity	recreational activity at least for healthy controls, TAS of experimental groups 6.8 ± 1.5 points, Lysholm Knee Scoring Scale of experimental groups 92.9 ± 5.4	N = 6 females with ACLD	N = 12 females with ACLR	N = 6 females, healthy controls, recreational activity, no previous history of knee pathology, dominant limb (leg to kick a ball with)	n.m.
Zebis et al. (2017) (69)	N = 1 female, age: 21 yrs	non-contact ACL injury (video-recorded) in the right knee during match play, ST-gracilis graft, standardized rehabilitation	elite soccer players	N = 1 female elite soccer player at high level with no previous history of ACL injury	n.a.	screening of elite soccer players pre-season	n.a.

Legends: ACLD = anterior cruciate ligament deficiency (conservative/non-surgical treatment); ACLR = anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction/repair (surgery); BPTB = bone-patella-tendon-bone technique for ACLR; CI = confidence interval; IKDC = International Knee Documentation Committee; Level I: sports are described as jumping, pivoting and hard cutting sports; Level II sports: also involve lateral motion, but with less jumping or hard cutting than level I; n.a. = not applicable; n.m. = not mentioned; RTA = return to activity (return to participation); RTS = return to sports; RTP = return to performance; SD = standard deviation; ST = semitendinosus muscle; TAS = Tegner Activity Score; TLS = Tegner & Lysholm Score; TSK = Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia; vs. = versus; wk = week; yrs = years

Table 4 Characteristics of methods of included studies

Authors & Year	tasks: number of repetitions, duration, frequency	muscles/legs measured	EMG related outcome measure(s), variables	direct link to RTS?
Busch et al. (2019) (13)	10x stair descent, Warm-up on treadmill with 5km/h for 10min -> individual, submaximal normalization of EMG data (KOOS, Tegner Activity Score, VAS for pain & general well-being)	VM, VL, BF, ST bilaterally	Normalized root mean squares for each muscle, limb and movement phase (preactivation, weight acceptance, push-off) were calculated (%subMVC)	no
Alkjaer et al. (2003) (33)	six trials of walking across two force plates at a speed of 4.5km/h	VL, VM, ST, BF of injured leg of patients and right leg of healthy controls	mean amplitudes during weight acceptance (%maxEMG); coactivation between VL & BF (method by Rudolph et al. 2001 [45]) (%maxEMG)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Alkjaer et al. (2002) (34)	15 consecutive forward lunges with recordings from hitting a force plate (rest between trials if wanted)	VL, VM, ST, BF of injured leg of patients and right leg of healthy controls	peak and mean values of EMG amplitudes (microvolts)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Arnason et al. (2014) (35)	3 trials of Nordic hamstring exercise, 3 trials of TRX hamstring curl exercise; order of exercises was randomized, time	MH, LH bilaterally	peak normalized muscle activation (%MVIC)	(no) --> soccer
Bryant et al. (2009) (36)	ACLD and ACLR: involved limb; healthy controls: both limbs; maximal single limb hop for distance on their involved limb from a standing position. 5 trials with 1min rest in between trials, landing in a fixed position on the takeoff foot.	VL, VM, ST, BF	timing of the onset of muscle activity relative to IC (onset-IC; ms) and timing of the peak of muscle activity relative to IC (ms)	no
Burland et al. (2020) (37)	single limb forward hop task, distance of their limb length (tip of the greater trochanter to the tip of the lateral malleolus) -> unlimited practice trials, 3 successful trials captured consecutively for each limb (trial = successful when participants landed on force platform and balanced on injured limb for a least 1s); task performed bilaterally, order of limb testing was randomized	VL bilaterally	<p>peak muscle activity of the VL: EMG signals from heel strike (defined as 10.0 N) to when peak knee extension moment (PKEM) was reached were used for statistical analysis. Mean peak muscle activity obtained from this period of interest across the 3 trials was used.</p> <p>Dynamic EMG data recorded during task were then normalized to the peak muscle activity recorded across all trials. Muscle activity onset times of VL relative to PKEM (EMG onset = time of PKEM - time of EMG "on") were established using the Teager-Kaiser Energy Operator (EMG onset = median + 3SD)</p>	no

Cordeiro et al. (2015) (38)	3x instep soccer kick with dominant leg. (KOOS, TSK)	RF, VL, VM, BF, ST	muscle activation during knee extension phase (% MVC)	(no) --> soccer, instep kick
Dashti Rostami et al. (2019) (39)	Single leg vertical drop landing; 3 proper trials	GM, AL; only the injured limb of ACLR and ACLD individuals and the dominant limb of controls were tested	Preparatory and reactive muscle activity and coactivation from 100 milliseconds prior to initial contact to 250 milliseconds after contact; mean and peak activity (%MVIC); coactivation of GM:AL (method by Rudolph et al. 2001 [45])	no
Jordan et al. (2016) (40)	80s repeated squat jump test (jump test) on a dual force plate system	VL, VM, BF, ST	normalized EMG amplitudes at takeoff, at the 25-ms interval prelanding, and at postlanding for the ACLR limb (affected limb), contralateral limb, and limbs of the control subjects (control limb), (Asymmetry index, jump height of body center of mass)	(no) --> fatigue, downhill skiing
Lessi et al. (2017) (41)	Single leg landing before and after fatigue (fatigue protocol: 10 squats, 2 vertical jumps, 20 steps)	VL, BF, Gmax	EMG average amplitude of activation, expressed as a %peak EMG during landing	no
Oliver et al. (2018) (42)	single leg jump from a 25-cm tall box, with hands on hips and without gaining momentum; five times with each leg (injured/non-injured)	VM, VL, RF, ST, BF	mean values per each patient, leg, and muscle were considered in the analysis; muscle latency time over time of each muscle was defined as the time from touchdown to peak amplitude of EMG activity (RMS) in each muscle. RMS was normalized at the maximum activity of the muscles (%MVC)	no
Ortiz et al. (2014) (43)	60-cm double legged and a 40-cm single legged drop jumps to assess bilateral and unilateral landing strategies, respectively	VM, VL, RF, MH, LH measured in the involved leg of women with ACLR and the dominant leg of the control subjects	rectified normalized electromyographic activity of the quadriceps and hamstrings (amplitude and latency) in %maximum contraction; quadriceps/hamstrings electromyographic co-contraction ratio (values between 0 and 1); time to maximum neuromuscular activation (time-to-peak muscle activation) in seconds for hamstring and quadriceps muscle groups	no



Patras et al. (2009) (44)	10 min running at moderate intensity (20% below the lactate threshold) and 10 min running at high intensity (40% above the lactate threshold) on separate occasions separated by a time span of 48 h and completed within 10–12 days; moderate intensity = at 20% below the lactate threshold; high intensity = at 40% above the lactate threshold	VL, BF bilaterally	values from 15 strides averaged to calculate the mean peak amplitude during stance for each recording period	no
Patras et al. (2010) (45)	10 min running at moderate intensity and 10 min running at high intensity on separate occasions separated by a time span of 48 h; moderate intensity = at 80% of the lactate threshold; high intensity = at 40% of the difference between VO <sub>2</sub> max and lactate threshold	VL bilaterally	EMG amplitude during stance, over time respectively in microvolts	no
Pincheira et al. (2018) (46)	Two destabilizing platforms (one for each limb) generated a controlled perturbation at the ankle of each participant (30° of inversion, 10° plantarflexion simultaneously) in a weight bearing condition; time between the release and the stop (impact) of the mechanism was 200 ± 10 ms	VM, ST	muscle activation onset times (ms)	no
Rudolph et al. (2001) (47)	5 trials of walking and jogging with 1 -3min rest intervals between trials	LH, VL, SO, medial head of the gastrocnemius muscles of both limbs	peak EMG activity; onset and termination of muscular activation; duration of muscular activity; co-contraction (integrals calculated)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Rudolph et al. (2000) (48)	Single leg hops	LH, VL, SO, medial head of the gastrocnemius muscles of both limbs	peak EMG activity over 30-ms from either the dynamic or maximum isometric trials was used to normalize the EMG data (%MVIC); muscle timing variables, muscle intensity: integrating the linear envelope of the EMG curves over a weight acceptance interval (defined as the range from 100 ms prior to initial contact to the point of peak knee flexion. Muscle co-contraction: using normalized EMG data, between the VL and LH, and VL and medial gastrocnemius	(no) --> copers and non-copers

Rudolph & Snyder-Mackler (2004) (49)	step up and over a 26 cm high step; ten trials, five each with the right and left leg ascending a 26 cm step (higher than a typical step, provide a more challenging condition), EMG collected from landing limb	LH, VL, SO, medial head of the gastrocnemius muscles of both limbs	peak EMG activity (%max); onset and termination of muscular activation; duration of muscular activity; co-contraction	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Swanik et al. (2004) (50)	landing from a hop: The subject stood on a 20-cm step, balanced momentarily on test limb, and hopped to target placed 30 cm horizontally: knee perturbation (special knee perturbation device, 100-N force on the posterior aspect of the tibia --> anterior displacement of the tibia)	VL, VM, MH, LH	muscle activity before and after landing from a hop (area of integrated EMG recordings), hamstring latency after joint perturbation (reflexive muscle activity in the hamstrings assessed by measuring the onset time after anterior translation of the tibia)	no
Briem et al. (2016) (51)	3 consecutive maximal hops (triple jump, single-limb crossover hop for distance) → 2 practice trials, 1 single maximal test trial; same procedure for each limb. ACLR participants started with non-surgical limb, each matched control participant with matched limb.	MH, LH	peak activation of the normalized signal (%MVIC)	no
Lessi et al. (2018) (52)	Single leg drop vertical jump landing before and after fatigue protocol (fatigue protocol: 10 squats, 2 vertical jumps, 20 steps)	VL, GM, Gmax	mean amplitude of activation during landing (% of the peak RMS obtained during the landing task)	no
Lustosa et al. (2011) (53)	walking at self-selected speed on a 3m-walkway with two stable platforms and one electromechanical balance board that could apply a sudden perturbation (20° tilt in the frontal plane (medial/lateral) -> varus stress in the slightly flexed knee, leading to external rotation of the femur (=common etiology of ACL injury)	VL, BF	co-contraction pre- and postperturbation between groups and limbs (co-contraction levels in the 250 ms before perturbation and in the 250 ms after perturbation periods), %MVIC; muscular co-contraction calculated	(no) --> stratification of included patients (full RTS or limited RTS)
Nyland et al. (2010) (54)	Single leg CMJ performance	Gmax, VM, MH, GC	mean EMG signal amplitudes (%MVIC); EMG activation duration during propulsion and landing phase (ms)	no
Nyland et al. (2013) (55)	Single leg CMJ performance	Gmax, VM, MH, GC	EMG amplitude comparison during single leg CMJ propulsion (Difference = involved - uninvolved lower extremity) (%MVIC)	no

Nyland et al. (2014) (56)	Single leg hop test for distance	Gmax, VM, MH, GM	Standardized EMG amplitudes during single leg hop for distance propulsion [%MVIC involved lower extremity – %MVIC uninvolved lower extremity]; standardized EMG amplitudes during single leg hop for distance landing [%MVIC involved lower extremity – %MVIC uninvolved lower extremity].	no
Boerboom et al. (2001) (57)	walking at normal, slower, and faster than normal speed	VM, VL, BF, ST, GC medialis, GC lateralis; of injured leg (patients)	deviations of the normative EMG profiles (individual averaged EMG pattern during gait)	(no) --> copers and non-copers
Bulgheroni et al. (1997) (58)	at least 5 trials of walking at natural cadence (112 ± 5.1 steps/min), 20-m distance used to reach steady state of walking	VL, RF, BF, ST	amplitude of EMG activity, EMG normalized to the maximum recorded signal amplitude during a single walking cycle	no
Gokeler et al. (2010) (59)	Single leg hop test for distance (arms behind back, maintained balance for at least 1s after landing, 3 maximal trials for each limb; (IKDC, Rolimeter device for laxity testing)	Gmax, BF, ST, SM, VM, VL, RF, MG, LG, SO	mean onset times (=preparatory activity before landing) of the EMG signals of each muscle	no
Hansen et al. (2017) (60)	running on weight-supporting treadmill ("anti-gravity", Alter G, respectively) at 16km/h with 6 different body weight conditions from 50% (half weight) to 100% (full weight-bearing) in random order	SM, SL, MG, LG, MH, LH	soleus, gastrocnemius and hamstring cluster formed, SPM used to analyze entire time-dependent EMG signal, comparison of injured vs. non-injured leg and left vs. right leg; EMG signal normalized to ist MVC value during 100% BW running trials for each participant	no
Klyne et al. (2012) (61)	controlled single leg hop on each limb (arms behind back, landing position hold for at least 1-2s), length of the horizontal distance hopped was equal to the measured length of the lower leg; 3 successful trials	MG	onset and offset of MG activation relative to take-off, during flight and landing, muscle activity (RMS), 7 temporal variables (ms, %activity)	no(59)
Knoll et al. (2004) (62)	walking on treadmill at least 10 minutes at a constant speed of 2 km/h	VL, VM, BF, AL	linear envelope EMG curve determined by root mean square method and normalized to average of peak EMG signal values of six gait cycles --> EMG patterns during % of gait cycle	(no) --> pre-operatively & follow-up (6 weeks, 4, 8, 12 months post-surgery)

Kuster et al. (1995) (63)	at least 5 trials of each task in order to obtain at least ten cycles of EMG data for ensemble average processing; level walking and downhill walking on dismountable slope (6m length, -19° gradient)	RF, BF, GC	peak muscular activity at heel strike, just before heel strike; values normalized to subject's individual peak levels	no
Madhavan & Shields (2011) (64)	single leg squat maneuver with random/unexpected perturbations at the start of the flexion phase (triggered compensatory reflex activity)	VM obliquus, RF, VL, LH, MH of exercised limb (reconstructed leg of ACLR subjects, pseudorandomly selected limb of healthy controls to counterbalance ACLR limbs)	normalized long latency responses (= difference between the mean EMG of perturbation trials and the mean EMG of unperturbed trials, divided by the mean EMG of the unperturbed trials) between 50 and 200 ms after the onset of perturbation of quadriceps and hamstrings; peak velocity (cm/s); latency of peak LLR (= time to peak EMG activity between 50–200 ms following the perturbation); mean muscle EMG activity (% MVIC) in the 200 ms prior to perturbation, 50–200 ms after the perturbation, and 200–400 ms post perturbation	no
Ortiz et al. (2008) (65)	5 trials of a single legged 40-cm drop jump: standing initially on both feet on the 40-cm platform and then standing on the jumping leg, and then to drop when ready to do so, maximal-effort vertical jump on landing single legged on the center of the force plate, use of arms allowed for balance; 2 trials of a 20-cm up-down hop task, participant stood facing a 20-cm step and performed 10 consecutive jumps up to and down when ready. The 10 consecutive up and down hops composed 1 trial.	GM, GMax, RF, LH, MH; dominant leg in noninjured women and reconstructed leg in ACLR women	quadriceps/hamstring cocontraction ratios (values between 0 and 1; closer to 1 = excellent co-contraction, closer to 0 = poor co-contraction) and normalized EMG activity of lower extremity muscles (values between 0 and 1; effect sizes respectively)	no
Ortiz et al. (2011) (66)	side-to-side hopping task that consisted of hopping single legged 10 times consecutively from side to side across 2 lines marked 30 cm apart on 2 individual force plates. The task was designated as a side hopping when the hop was to the opposite side of the stance leg and as crossover hopping when the hop was toward the side of the stance leg	GM, GMax, RF, LH, MH; dominant leg in noninjured women and reconstructed leg in ACLR women	quadriceps/hamstring cocontraction ratios (values between 0 and 1; closer to 1 = excellent co-contraction, closer to 0 = poor co-contraction) and normalized EMG activity of lower extremity (values between 0 and 1; effect sizes respectively)	no
Patras et al. (2012) (67)	two 10-min treadmill runs on 2 occasions in the lab, one at a moderate (80%VO <sub>2</sub> max) and one at a high intensity (85-88% VO <sub>2</sub> max), EMG recordings at the 3rd, 5th, 7th, and 10th minute of the runs	VL, BF bilaterally: left leg of controls selected for analysis	peak EMG amplitude during the stance phase	no

Swanik et al. (1999) (68)	4 functional activities: downhill walking (15°, 0.92 m/s), level running (2.08 m/s), and hopping (self-paced) and landing from a jump (20.3 cm)	VL, VM, MH, LH	integrated EMG (microvolts x milliseconds) normalized to mean amplitude of 3 - 6 consecutive test repetitions --> mean area & peak integrated EMG of a 250ms-period after ground contact = reactive muscle activity; testing order and leg assessed by random	no
Zebis et al. (2017) (69)	standardized side cutting maneuver, CJM with the hands placed at the hip (akimbo), and maximal jump height was calculated	VL, BF, ST	EMG preactivity	(no) --> single case, risk profile retrospective, pre-/post-surgery and post-intervention

Legends: AL = adductor longus muscle; BF = biceps femoris muscle; CMJ = countermovement jump(ing); EMG = electromyography; GC = gastrocnemius muscles; GM = gluteus medius muscle; GMax = gluteus maximus muscle; GRF = ground reaction force; Hz = Hertz; LG = gastrocnemius lateral head; LH = lateral hamstring muscle; MG = gastrocnemius medial head; MH = medial hamstring muscle; ms = milliseconds; n.a. = not applicable; n.m. = not mentioned; PKEM = peak knee extension moment; RF = rectus femoris muscle; RTA = return to activity (return to participation); RTS = return to sports; RTP = return to performance; SI = symmetry index; SL = soleus lateralis muscle; SM = soleus medialis muscle; SO = soleus muscle; SPM = Statistical Parametric Mapping; ST = semitendinosus muscle; VL = vastus lateralis muscle; VM = vastus medialis muscle; vs. = versus; WA = weight acceptance

