

1 **THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FOOT AND ANKLE STRUCTURE WITH**
2 **OVERUSE INJURIES IN LICENSED FOOTBALLERS, A PROSPECTIVE**
3 **COHORT**

4
5 Ali Sahillioglu, MD¹, Lale Cerrahoglu, MD²

6
7 ¹Physiatrist, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Sisli Hamidiye
8 Etfal Training and Research Hospital, Istanbul, Turkey.

9 ²Professor, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Celal Bayar
10 University Medical Scholl, Manisa, Turkey

11
12 Corresponding Author: Ali Sahillioglu, MD

13 Adress: Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Sisli Hamidiye Etfal
14 Training and Research Hospital, Sisli, Istanbul 34360, Turkey

15 E-mail adress: dralisahillioglu@gmail.com

16
17 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

18 All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest. The authors also declare
19 that this study has received no financial support from any person or organization.

20
21 **ABSTRACT**

22 The main purpose of this study was to compare the values determined in the clinical
23 examination of the foot and ankle and the plantar pressure measurements of the foot
24 in athletes who developed an overuse-type disability and in athletes who did not
25 develop overuse-type disability, and was to find factors that might predispose to
26 disability, during the one-year follow-up. 100 licensed football players were included
27 in the study. Presence of joint hypermobility, foot posture assessment, ankle and first
28 metatarsophalangeal (MTP) joint range of motion (ROM) measurements,
29 pedobarographic plantar pressure assessment of foot was carried out. Then, the
30 footballers were followed for 12 months for the development of new foot and ankle
31 overuse injuries and the clinical and pedobarographic data of the footballers with at
32 least one injury were compared with the group without injury. We found asymmetric
33 pressure distribution between the preferred and non-preferred foot in the group who
34 had an injury in the pedobarographic static foot plantar pressure measurements ($p =$
35 $.040$). When we compared the ROM values of footballers who had an injury and
36 footballers who did not have an injury, we found a significant limitation in the group
37 that suffered an injury, in the ankle eversion, first MTP joint dorsiflexion and ankle
38 plantarflexion degrees ($p = .029$, $p = .023$, $p = .044$, respectively). These findings
39 suggest that impairments in foot plantar pressure distribution and limitations in ankle

40 and foot joint ROM may be risk factors for the development of foot and ankle
41 overuse injury.

42 **Keywords:** Ankle, Foot, Football, Joint Hypermobility, Overuse Injury

43 1. INTRODUCTION

44 Football is one of the most popular sport branches in the world with the spectator
45 potential and the economy it creates. Game rules, tactical developments, and the
46 quality of the football players increase the speed, intensity, and quality of the game.
47 This situation has brought a competitive environment to football and accordingly the
48 increase in the speed of the game has increased the number of double struggles and
49 the severity of the game. Therefore, football has a high incidence of injury compared
50 to other sports.¹

51 Foot and ankle are some of the most frequently injured places in football players'
52 bodies.² Disturbances in the structure and function of the foot can lead to prominent
53 restrictions on the activity and performance level of the athlete. The full functioning
54 of the foot is not only important in terms of foot health, but it is also necessary for the
55 health of our entire body, especially neighboring joints.^{1,3}

56 According to consensus statements, for football, overuse injury is defined as “one
57 caused by repeated micro-trauma without a single, identifiable event responsible for
58 the injury”.⁴ Overuse injuries have insidious onset and can restrain athletes from
59 sports temporary or even permanently.^{5,6} Lower leg and in particular ankle and foot
60 are highly involved in many sports and are vulnerable to overuse injuries. The most
61 common types of foot and ankle overuse injuries are Achilles tendinopathy,
62 metatarsalgia, metatarsal stress fracture and plantar fasciitis.⁷

63 It is thought that the risk factors that may cause injury can be shown by revealing the
64 soles of the foot and the corrections to be made can contribute to the improvement of
65 sports performance. Foot loading patterns in football have been described in previous
66 studies, and alterations in biomechanical loads have been suggested to be closely
67 associated with foot and ankle overuse injuries. Various foot and ankle problems
68 result from repetitive high loads on the foot.⁸⁻¹⁰

69 Our aim was to compare the values determined in the clinical examination of the foot
70 and ankle and in the plantar pressure measurements of the foot in athletes who
71 developed overuse disability and in athletes who did not develop overuse disability.
72 Thereby we aimed to identify the factors that might predispose to overuse injury with
73 the data we obtained during the one-year follow-up.

74 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

75 2.1. Subjects

76 Participants were evaluated at the Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Polyclinic of
77 Celal Bayar University Medical Faculty Hospital. A total of 104 football players, who
78 played football in the A2 league, which is the league of the second teams of the
79 professional teams, who regularly practice football in Izmir and Manisa provinces,
80 were planned to be included in the study. 4 of the players did not fit the inclusion
81 criteria. For this reason, a total of 100 licensed football players were included in the

82 study. Age, height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) values of all the subjects
83 were measured.

84 **2.2. Selection Criteria of Study**

85 Verbal and written information was given about the purpose of the work to be done
86 and the nature of the practice to the participants. Participants who wanted to
87 participate in the study were informed about the subject and individual approvals
88 were obtained. It was determined that the weekly training program was on average for
89 3 days a week and 2 hours a day in each team. Weekly training programs were asked
90 to the participants and their coaches in order to avoid any difference in exercise load
91 among the participants. Football players who will train an average of 3 days a week
92 and an average of 2 hours a day were included in the study. Both feet of the cases
93 were evaluated separately. The structural properties of the foot have been studied.
94 Patients with known systemic, inflammatory, neurological and degenerative diseases,
95 those with lower back or lower extremity pain, those with lower extremity joint
96 deformity, those with lower extremity operation history and those with using insoles
97 were excluded from the study. Our work was presented to the ethics committee for
98 approval and accepted with the ethics committee numbered 20478486-369 dated
99 19.11.2014.

100 **2.3. Demographic Data**

101 After recording the personal information of each individual such as age, position,
102 medical history and family history, preferred and non-preferred foot and the weekly
103 training programs were also questioned. Then the evaluation methods below were
104 applied to each participant in the same way.

105 **2.4. Clinical Assessment**

106 **2.4.1. General Anthropometric Measurements**

107 For general anthropometric measurements, the body weights (kilograms) and height
108 (meters) of the cases (with a Charder MS-3400 height-weight meter) were measured
109 and the body mass index (kilograms / square meter) was calculated. The foot numbers
110 of the cases were measured with Heider Mass device.

111 **2.4.2. Sports Injury Detection Form**

112 For all participants, a sports injury detection form was initially filled. Then, new
113 injuries during the follow-up were recorded, too. Injuries were registered by the same
114 physician. The subjects were able to freely consult this physician. The sports injury
115 detection form to be used here was created using the injury detection form created by
116 the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) Injury Consensus
117 Group.⁴

118 **2.4.3. Joint Hypermobility Assessment**

119 There are controversies in the literature about whether joint hypermobility is a risk
120 factor for injury development in athletes. We included hypermobility evaluation in
121 our study in order to contribute to the literature on this matter. Beighton scoring was
122 used to assess hypermobility. People with a total Beighton score of four points or

123 more were considered hypermobile. Although Beighton's diagnostic criteria are not
124 including shoulder, hip, ankle, and foot, it is generally accepted because of its
125 comprehensive, easy to apply, and symmetrical evaluation of joints.¹¹⁻¹³

126 **2.4.4. Foot Posture Assessment**

127 There are studies investigating the relationship between foot posture and injury
128 development in athletes, but contradictory results have been reported between these
129 studies. We aimed to determine the foot posture using FPI-6 scale and to investigate
130 the relationship of these identified foot postures with the development of disability
131 and to contribute to the literature. FPI-6 is a practical and reliable method of
132 evaluating foot posture and its validity and reliability are proven.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ FPI-6
133 evaluation is performed when the patient is comfortable standing with both legs
134 pressed. Both feet are evaluated separately. A total of 6 points on the front foot and
135 the back foot are assigned a score of -2 to +2 according to their position, and as a
136 result, all scores are evaluated to determine whether the foot is neutral, supine, or
137 pronated. A value of -2 indicates an excess of supination for each point, while a value
138 of +2 indicates for excessive pronation, and 0 indicates a neutral position.
139

140 The FPI-6 score was determined and recorded and each participant's feet photographs
141 simultaneously were taken. These scores were evaluated by two individuals and it
142 was determined that there was no difference. First step of FPI-6 scale (assessment of
143 the position of the forefoot relative to the back foot) was shown in Figure 1.

144 **2.4.5. Evaluation of Joint Range of Motion (ROM) with Inclinometer**

145 There are studies in the literature investigating the relationship between ankle range
146 of motion and development of disability.¹⁷ However, most of these studies focused on
147 ankle dorsiflexion and plantarflexion. Few studies have investigated the relationship
148 between ankle inversion and eversion measurements and the development of
149 disability. We made four different joint range of motion measurements, including
150 inversion and eversion ROM measurements of the ankle, which we think will
151 contribute to the literature, and investigated their relationship to the development of
152 disability. Measurements were made using (JTECH Medical Dualer IQ brand, USA)
153 an inclinometer. Four movement capacities of each foot were recorded, separately for
154 the right and left feet of the patients. Each measurement was made three times and
155 averages recorded. Before the evaluation of the inclinometer, the subject was laid on
156 his back on the examination table and was inspected using a right-angled wooden
157 brace to reveal that both feet were 90 degrees in angle. This position was accepted as
158 the starting point for the measurement of plantar and dorsal flexion movements.
159 Before measurement, the inclinometer was reset to 90 degrees on the wall. For
160 measurement, the probe of the inclinometer was placed on the footwell. First, dorsal
161 and then plantar flexion movement widths were measured. Plantarflexion range of
162 motion assesment was shown in Figure 2.

163 For the measurement of inversion-eversion movements, the subject was placed on the
164 examination table as aside. While both hips were in extension, the knee on the side of
165 assessment was held in extension while the other knee was on flexion. During the
166 measurement, the instrument was reset by placing the probe of the inclinometer so
167 that it is perpendicular to the first metatarsal on the medial arc of the foot. The

168 inversion movements were first measured, then the eversion movements were
169 measured and the averages were noted.

170 **2.4.6. Evaluation of first Metatarsophalangeal Joint (MTP) Range of Motion**

171 Although the first MTP joint is generally ignored during the examination, it has been
172 reported in the literature that its evaluation will have important contributions to the
173 physician in the examination of the foot.¹⁸ Participants' first MTP joint dorsiflexion
174 and plantarflexion values of both feet were measured 3 times with goniometer while
175 participants were in the supine position. Then all measurements were averaged.

176 **2.5. Plantar Pressure Evaluation (Pedobarographic evaluation)**

177 Foot loading patterns in football have been described in previous studies, and
178 alterations in biomechanical loads have been suggested to be closely associated with
179 foot and ankle overuse injuries.^{8,10} However, in static and dynamic pedobarographic
180 measurements of the foot, data on the relationship between pressure values detected
181 in various areas of the foot and disability development are contradictory. We aimed to
182 determine the relationship between the values we detect and the development of
183 disability by making static and dynamic pedobarographic measurements and to
184 contribute to the literature in this way.

185 Measurements of the foot plantar pressures of the cases were made with a
186 pedobarograph device (RsScan International pedobarograph device, 1m, 3D Scientific
187 + Balance software model, Belgium). This system measures the pressure of the foot
188 base as static (standing) and dynamic (walking). The pressure measuring platform of
189 the device has a 975x325 mm sensor area within a general frame of size
190 1068x418x12 mm, with a total of 8192 sensors, with 4 sensors per cm² falling. The
191 frequency is 500 Hz, the pressure range is 0-200 N / cm², the temperature range is
192 15°-40° C, connection power is 220/110 volts.

193 When making a static assessment, the attention of the cases was disseminated with
194 the questions asked so that they could not direct bodyweight to a particular side of the
195 platform. For a balanced evaluation, they were asked to look at a fixed point on the
196 wall. While standing on the platform, the average distance between the two feet was
197 determined as 8 cm. The evaluation was made at the same time for both feet.
198 Maximal pressure measurements were evaluated in seven different areas (heel-
199 medial, heel-lateral, midfoot, forefoot-medial, forefoot-middle, forefoot-lateral,
200 fingers) in N / cm². Pedobarographic static foot plantar pressure evaluation was
201 shown in Figure 3.

202 For dynamic evaluation, subjects firstly asked to walk on a 30-meter-long field for a
203 few minutes to generate normal walking speed. Then they were asked to continue
204 their normal walk and press the pressure platform with a normal step. The subjects
205 were asked to walk again in the situation of standing still on the platform or pressing
206 the platform incorrectly. Measurements were made 10 times for both feet. As
207 dynamic pedobarographic analyzes, maximum dynamic pressure assessments, and
208 load velocity assessments were performed in ten different areas (heel-medial, heel-
209 lateral, middle foot, forefoot, five metatarsal regions, thumb, and other fingers).

210 **2.6. Follow-up Evaluation**

211 After the initial evaluation, the participants were followed for 12 months in terms of
212 new foot and ankle overuse injury development. Overuse injury was defined as “one
213 caused by repeated micro-trauma without a single, identifiable event responsible for
214 the injury”.¹⁹ The type of injury and the injured body region were recorded.

215 It was planned to diagnose and record the injuries by the same physician. The
216 subjects were able to freely consult this physician. Evaluation and registration of the
217 injured football players were made by the same physician. During the follow-up, four
218 footballers were excluded because they did not meet the inclusion criteria. The
219 clinical and pedobarographical evaluations of football players with at least one foot
220 and ankle overuse injury at twelfth month and those who did not have any foot and
221 ankle overuse injury were compared between the two groups.

222 **2.7. Statistical Analyzes**

223 Power analysis was performed before the study and the size of the sample according
224 to the power analysis result is calculated as the minimum of 100 persons for $\alpha = .05$
225 $d = .40$ ($d = \text{effect size}$) and for 80% power.

226 SPSS 21.0 package program was used for the statistical analysis of the data. Mean
227 and standard deviation (SD) values were calculated as descriptors for the numerical
228 data. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare independent groups, and the
229 Wilcoxon sign test was used to compare dependent groups when the number of
230 individuals in the groups was less than 30. Independent samples t-test was used to
231 compare independent groups and a paired t-test was used to compare dependent
232 groups when the number of people in groups was 30 or more. Statistically, significant
233 significance was accepted as $p < .05$. Pearson correlation analysis was used to
234 investigate the correlation of the data.

235 **3. FINDINGS**

236 The average age of 100 participants was 20 (range, 16-33), the average height was
237 177 centimeter (range, 164-192 cm), the average weight was 71 kilogram (range, 57-
238 86 kg) and the average BMI was 23 (range, 18-27).

239 When the distribution rates of 100 footballers according to their positions were
240 examined, it was seen that the central midfielders (n: 27) followed by the centre-
241 backs (n: 19) were the most. Distribution rates of all positions are given in Table 1.

242 Footballers' Beighton scores, Foot Posture Index-6 scores, ankle joint ROM values
243 measured by digital inclinometer, and first MTF joint ROM values measured by
244 goniometer were analyzed. These values are shown in Table 2.

245 Generalized joint hypermobility conditions of the players were evaluated according to
246 the Beighton Score. Participants with a Beighton Score of 4 or above were considered
247 to have generalized joint hypermobility. While 88 of the participants had no
248 generalized joint hypermobility, this was present in 12.

249 In the follow-up of the players, at the end of the twelfth month, when 31 of the 100
250 football players who participated in the study had an overuse-type injury, and 3
251 participants had 2 injuries. The total number of injuries occurred was 37.
252 Metatarsalgia (n:17) was the most common type of injury. It was followed by plantar
253 fasciitis, achilles tendinopathy, and metatarsal stress fracture, respectively. Injury

254 types of football players who experienced injury within 12 months are shown in table
255 3.

256 The pedobarographic plantar static pressure values of the group who had at least one
257 injury and the group without any injury were compared using the T-test at the end of
258 the twelfth month. Static forefoot mid-zone pressures of non-preferred foot were
259 significantly higher in the group with at least one injury compared to the group
260 without injury ($p = .040$). In other pressure regions, no statistical difference was
261 found between the two groups.

262 The pedobarographic maximum dynamic pressure values of the group who had at
263 least one injury and the group that did not have any injury were compared using the
264 T-test at the end of the twelfth month. There was no statistical difference in the
265 dynamic pressure values between the two groups.

266 The pedobarographic load rate values of the group who had at least one injury at the
267 end of the twelfth month and the group without any injury were compared using the
268 T-test. There was no statistical difference in load speed values between the two
269 groups.

270 The ankle and first MTP joint range of motion values of the group that had at least
271 one injury and the group that did not have any injury were compared using the T-test.
272 In the group with at least one injury, non-preferred side ankle plantarflexion,
273 preferred side ankle eversion, and non-preferred side first MTP joint dorsiflexion
274 ROM values were significantly decreased compared to the group without injury ($p =$
275 $.044$, $p = .029$, $p = .023$, *respectively*). There was no statistically significant
276 difference in other findings.

277 Foot postures determined according to the FPI-6 scale of the footballers at the end of
278 the 12-month follow-up were compared between the group with at least one injury
279 and the group without any injury. In the evaluation for the preferred foot, 3 of 11
280 footballers with supine foot posture developed an injury, while 31 (34.8%) of 89
281 football players with neutral foot posture developed an injury. To determine whether
282 there is a statistical increase in the risk of injury in players with a supine foot posture,
283 the injury rates between footballers with a supine foot posture and those with a
284 neutral foot posture were compared for the preferred and non-preferred foot using the
285 Pearson chi-square test. There was no statistically significant difference between the
286 two groups ($p: .448$, $p: .226$, *respectively*).

287 **4. DISCUSSION**

288 This study consisted of 100 licensed football players between the ages of 16-33 who
289 played football in the A2 team, which is the second team of the clubs, who regularly
290 train and participate in football competitions in Izmir and Manisa provinces. It was
291 aimed to determine the structure of foot and ankle of the players with clinical
292 examination and FPI-6 scale, to reveal the ROM values of the ankle and first MTP
293 joint, to determine the pedobarographic static and dynamic pressures and loading
294 rates of the foot and to determine the hypermobility status of the players according to
295 the Beighton Score. Then, the players who had an overuse injury at foot and ankle
296 region were identified in the follow-up, so the clinical and laboratory values of the

297 injury and non-injury group were compared and the risk factors that might prepare the
298 ground for the occurrence of overuse injury were determined.

299 Football is the most popular sport in the World. FIFA (Fédération Internationale de
300 Football Association) has approximately 250 million licensed players from 204
301 countries. About 1% of these players are professionals.^{20,21} Football requires high
302 coordination and skill of the body, especially the lower limbs. It is known that body
303 structure is important for sports performance. The foot structure is important in
304 functions such as standing, walking, running, and jumping in many sports branches
305 and is effective in the performance and success of the athlete.^{22,23}

306 The foot is easy to examine but difficult to diagnose because of its complex
307 functional anatomy. Disturbances in the structure and function of the foot can lead to
308 prominent restrictions on the activity and performance level of the athlete. It is
309 thought that the risk factors that may cause injury can be shown by revealing the soles
310 of the foot and the corrections to be made can contribute to the improvement of sports
311 performance.^{24,25} The full functioning of the foot is not only important in terms of
312 foot health, but it is also necessary for the health of our entire body, especially
313 neighboring joints.^{1,3} Foot pressures caused by unbalanced anatomical positions are
314 the cause of physiological disorders in the body and musculoskeletal system. These
315 repetitive abnormal effects can directly affect the ankle and structures adjacent to the
316 ankle, even vertebral column diseases. A direct relationship was found between
317 pressure distribution disorders in various parts of the sole and an increase in scoliosis
318 level.²⁶

319 Foot loading patterns in football have been described in previous studies, and
320 alterations in biomechanical loads have been suggested to be closely associated with
321 foot and ankle overuse injuries. A recent study assessing plantar pressure under static
322 conditions observed larger pressure values for the nonpreferred foot in young soccer
323 players than in the control group.¹ Various foot and ankle problems result from
324 repetitive high loads on the foot.⁸ It has also been reported that stress fracture is
325 common among soccer players, and that 38% (9/24) of players on the US team
326 developed stress fractures during the 1994 FIFA World Cup.¹⁰

327 Reports on the association between static foot plantar pressure and injuries are
328 contradictory. In their prospective cohort study, Brund et al.²⁷ reported that runners
329 displaying a more medial pressure during stance phase at baseline sustained a greater
330 amount of foot and ankle overuse injuries compared to those displaying a lateral shod
331 pressure during stance phase.

332 In a study by Azevedo et al.¹, they found that asymmetry between foot soles
333 pressures in football players is associated with stress injuries. The foot pressure of 15
334 young footballers and the control group of 15 people was measured with the Matscan
335 (Tekscan, Inc., Boston, USA) device while the footballers were standing barefoot on
336 the platform and higher pressure values were determined in the non-dominant
337 standing thumb, fifth metatarsal region and heel medial.

338 We found asymmetric pressure distribution between the preferred and non-preferred
339 foot in the group who had an injury in the pedobarographic static foot plantar pressure
340 measurements. We compared the foot static pedobarographic maximum pressure

341 values of the football players who had an injury with the static maximum pressure
342 values of the group who did not have any injury during 12 months of follow-up. We
343 detected increased pressures in the anteromedial area of non-preferred foot ($p =$
344 $.040$). We think that, asymmetry in foot plantar pressure distribution between
345 preferred and non-preferred foot and pressure elevations detected in forefoot in static
346 measurements may be a predisposing factor for injury formation in football players.
347 Relationships between injury history and static plantar pressure measurements are
348 shown in Table 4.

349
350 Wong et al.⁹ investigated the relationship between the movements performed during
351 the football game and the soles of the feet and determined high-pressure values on the
352 medial side of the foot. They interpreted this situation as a condition that would
353 predispose to injury. 15 male football players (mean age 20.90 ± 1.3) were included
354 in the study and recorded with 99 sensor pressure recording devices placed in the
355 soccer shoe and these pressures were recorded by dividing the foot into 10 regions.
356 The highest pressure values were recorded in the thumb and heel medial and it was
357 thought that these high-pressure values may cause a decrease in the comfort of the
358 foot and chronic injury.

359 Willems et al.²⁸ examined possible risk factors for exercise-related lower leg pain
360 (ERLLP) related to walking and running style in 400 physical education students
361 (Age range: 17-28, mean age: 18.4). They determined the jogging and walking
362 structures of 400 students at the beginning of the academic semester through plantar
363 pressure measurement and 3D walking kinematics. After these measurements, all
364 sports injuries occurring throughout the study were recorded by the same sports
365 physician and followed for 26 weeks by giving a similar sports program. Compared
366 to the pre-injury controls of patients with ERLLP, they found an increase in pressure
367 at the medial edge of the foot, a decrease in pressure at the lateral edge, and increased
368 pronation.

369 We compared the data obtained from the pedobarographic measurement of foot
370 plantar maximum dynamic pressures of football players who had at least one injury in
371 12 months of follow-up with the foot plantar maximum dynamic pressure data of
372 football players who never had an injury. There was no statistical relationship
373 between the injuries and the dynamic plantar pressure measurements. Unlike the
374 studies we mentioned in the literature, we could not find a statistically significant
375 relationship between dynamic plantar pressure measurements and injury
376 development.

377 Whether hypermobility is a risk factor for disability in athletes is controversial and
378 there are studies in the literature that provide an opposing opinion on this issue. Smith
379 et al.²⁹ investigated the incidence of hypermobility in young female netball players
380 and the relationship between hypermobility and injuries; and hypermobility was
381 significantly associated with increased injury prevalence in young netball players. On
382 the other hand, Richard et al.³⁰ studied the relationship between generalized joint
383 hypermobility and injury in the study of 33 male professional football players playing
384 in England second League, and found the injury rate similar between groups with and
385 without hypermobility.

386 In our study, all football players were evaluated in terms of joint hypermobility
387 syndrome (JHS) with Beighton scoring. According to the Beighton score, the players
388 scoring four and above are considered to be hypermobile. JHS was detected in 12
389 players, while JHS was not detected in 88 players. It was observed that 25% of the
390 footballers who had JHS had an injury, and 25% of the players without JHS had an
391 injury in the evaluation we made in the twelfth month. Whether hypermobility is a
392 risk factor for injury, when compared between the two groups using Pearson chi-
393 square test, there was no significant difference in terms of hypermobility between the
394 two groups. ($p = .140$, $p = .653$).

395 FPI-6 is a practical and reliable evaluation method that is used to evaluate foot
396 posture, validity, and reliability.¹⁶ With the FPI-6 used in our study, the total score is
397 obtained between -12 and +12 as a result of the evaluation made by looking at the 6
398 different points of the foot. It shows the supination posture from 0 to -12 and the
399 pronation posture from 0 to +12. In the literature, studies have been carried out to
400 determine the normal values of FPI-6. In the study conducted by Redmond et al.³¹,
401 the FPI-6 scores were categorized and reported that the scores between -12 and -5
402 were highly supine feet, values between -4 and -1 were supine feet, values between 0
403 and +5 were neutral feet and they reported that values between +6 and +9 reflect
404 prone to foot, and values between +10 and +12 reflect a high degree of prone foot
405 posture. In the literature, different score ranges have been reported in various studies
406 (14,29,31,32) regarding the cut-off values of the FPI-6 scale to be used in supine,
407 neutral, and prone foot categorization. We used the cut-off values determined by
408 Redmond et al. in our study.

409 Cain et al.³² found that there was a statistically significant risk factor for foot/ankle
410 overuse injuries in adolescent football players with mild prone (FPI-6 score +2 and
411 below) and supine foot posture in their studies of 76 adolescent male football players
412 using the FPI-6 assessment scale.

413 100 players were included in our study and FPI-6 scores were examined and recorded
414 separately for both feet at the start of the study. Afterward, we compared the FPI-6
415 scores of the players who had at least one injury in the twelfth month with the group
416 who never had any injury. We did not find a statistically significant relationship
417 between the group who suffered from an injury and the group that did not have any
418 injury, to determine the predictive value of the FPI-6 score for injury, using the
419 Pearson chi-square test for the right and left foot separately ($p > .05$).

420 However, in our study, we did not detect any moderate or severe prone foot type with
421 FPI-6. As one of the possible reasons for this, we thought that people with moderate
422 to high prone foot structure would not be in this population since they would have
423 difficulty doing a sport that requires speed, balance, and condition like football. We
424 think that different cut-off values should be determined for relatively healthy, active
425 sports people with a low foot arch to define the foot posture classification. We think
426 that more extensive further studies are needed for this population.

427 Cerrahoglu et al.¹⁷ reported that the restriction of joint movements in the foot causes
428 mechanical stress and therefore, it is predisposed to increase in plantar pressure and
429 foot/ankle injuries. Although the first MTP joint is generally ignored during the

430 examination, it has been reported in the literature that its evaluation will have
431 important contributions to the physician in the examination of the foot.¹⁸

432 Plantar fasciitis is the most common diagnosis (10% to 15%) for patients with foot
433 and ankle pain. Plantar fasciitis has a multifactorial etiology. It was previously
434 thought to be an inflammatory syndrome; however, recent studies have emphasized
435 that a degenerative process is more dominant. In their study, Ulusoy et al. described
436 the factors thought to be associated with the disease include biomechanical
437 dysfunction, mechanical overload, obesity, overuse, achilles tendon strain, decreased
438 ankle dorsiflexion, atrophy of the intrinsic muscles, and a pronated foot type.³³

439 In the study conducted by Halabchi et al.²² for intrinsic risk factors that will
440 predispose ankle injuries, 58 footballers were included in the study, and the
441 relationship between ankle ROM and injury was investigated. They reported that the
442 limitation of left foot plantarflexion was statistically significantly associated with
443 acute and chronic ankle injuries in athletes. They did not find the same significant
444 relationship in the ankle dorsiflexion.

445 When we compared the ROM values of footballers who had an injury and footballers
446 who did not have an injury, we found a significant limitation in the group that
447 suffered an injury, in the ankle eversion, first MTP joint dorsiflexion and ankle
448 plantarflexion degrees ($p = .029$, $p = .023$, $p = .044$, respectively). Injury and joint
449 ROM relationships are shown in Table 5.

450 In parallel with the literature, we think that ankle plantarflexion and first MTP joint
451 ROM limitations are associated with foot/ankle overuse injuries. There are few
452 studies in the literature about the relationship between ankle inversion and eversion
453 limitations and injury. In our study, we found a significant relationship between ankle
454 eversion restriction and the risk of developing an injury. We think that ankle and first
455 MTP joint ROM limitations cause mechanical stress in the foot, disrupt foot
456 biomechanics, and thus cause susceptibility to foot/ankle injuries. We believe that
457 ankle and first MTP joint ROM examination in football players is important in terms
458 of revealing an underlying ROM limitation and preventing possible future injuries by
459 taking precautions for this.

460 The loading speed or time pressure integral (N / cm² sec) is a parameter that can be
461 measured pedobarographically, which is defined as the amount of time that must pass
462 before the evaluated foot region reaches maximum pressure. It is an expected and
463 necessary situation in footballers that the loading speed is lower than the general
464 population. This can be explained by the rapid displacement of the footballers and the
465 reaction times of the foot soles from the contacted surfaces quickly due to the
466 minimal reaction times.

467 When we examined the literature, we found that studies about the pedobarographic
468 loading rate in the literature are few. Uzun et al.³⁴ evaluated the loading speed in their
469 study with 22 female footballers (18,80 ± 2,2 years) and 28 female volunteers (27,5 ±
470 6,6 years) as a control group. They found that there were significant differences in
471 loading speed values between the female footballer and the control group in the
472 second and third metatarsal heads of the right foot and the heel medial, heel lateral,
473 and in the second, third and fourth metatarsal heads of the left foot.

474 In our study, we evaluated the pedobarographic foot loading speeds of footballers
475 from 10 different parts of the foot (thumb, second-fifth fingers, five metatarsal
476 regions, middle foot, heel medial, and lateral). When we compared the foot loading
477 speed values of the footballers who had an injury in the follow-up and the footballers
478 who had no injury, to determine the relationship between the foot loading speed
479 values of the participants with the injury, we did not find a statistical difference
480 between the two groups ($p > .05$).

481 **Study Limitations**

482 A limitation of this study is the fact that the subjects underwent plantar pressure
483 measurements during barefoot walking and the foot–shoe–ground interface was not
484 taken into account (as running shoes might correct or even exacerbate plantar
485 pressure distributions). Nevertheless, we choosed barefoot instead of with-shoe
486 walking because this condition permits focusing on intrinsic foot biomechanics
487 without interference of different or unusual footwear. Willems et al.²⁸ showed that
488 intrinsic plantar pressure risk factors for ERLLP were less pronounced in shod
489 compared with barefoot running. Therefore, those authors advised the use of barefoot
490 running to be implemented first.

491 **5. CONCLUSION**

492 The main purpose of this study was to compare the values determined in the clinical
493 examination of the foot and ankle and the plantar pressure measurements of the foot
494 in athletes who developed an overuse-type disability and in athletes who did not
495 develop overuse-type disability, and was to find factors that might predispose to
496 disability, during the one-year follow-up. If we summarize what we found from these
497 parameters;

498 I. We found that asymmetry in foot plantar pressure distribution and pressure
499 elevations detected in anteromedial regions of foot in static measurements, may be a
500 predisposing factor for foot and ankle overuse injury formation in football players.

501 II. In parallel with the literature, we found that ankle plantarflexion and first MTP
502 joint ROM limitations are associated with foot and ankle overuse injuries. Also, we
503 found a significant relationship between ankle eversion restriction and the risk of
504 developing an injury. We believe that ankle and first MTP joint ROM examination in
505 football players is important in terms of revealing an underlying ROM limitation and
506 preventing possible future injuries by taking precautions for this.

507 III. When we compared the injury rates of the group with and without hypermobility,
508 we did not find a significant difference between the two groups. We do not think that
509 hypermobility is a risk factor for injury development.

510 **6. PERSPECTIVE**

511 These findings suggest that limitations in ankle and foot ROM and impairments in
512 foot plantar pressure distribution may be risk factors for the development of an
513 overuse injury. For this reason, we recommend that early and routine joint ROM
514 evaluation and plantar pressure evaluation be included in footballers' examinations.
515 We believe that correcting foot and ankle abnormalities that may occur with these

516 evaluations can be effective in preventing possible overuse injuries and further
517 studies are needed on this subject.

518

519 REFERENCES

- 520 1. Azevedo RR, da Rocha ES, Franco PS, Carpes FP. Plantar pressure asymmetry
521 and risk of stress injuries in the foot of young soccer players. *Phys Ther Sport*.
522 2017;24:39-43.
- 523 2. Collinge R, Simmonds J V. Hypermobility, injury rate and rehabilitation in a
524 professional football squad—A preliminary study. *Phys Ther Sport*.
525 2009;10(3):91-96.
- 526 3. Beynnon BD, Murphy DF, Alosa DM. Predictive factors for lateral ankle
527 sprains: a literature review. *J Athl Train*. 2002;37(4):376.
- 528 4. Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, Andersen TE, Bahr R, Dvorak J, Hägglund
529 M, McCrory P, Meeuwisse WH. Consensus statement on injury definitions and
530 data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. *Br J Sports*
531 *Med*. 2006 Mar;40(3):193-201.
- 532 5. Van Tiggelen D, Wickes S, Stevens V, Roosen P, Witvrouw E. Effective
533 prevention of sports injuries: a model integrating efficacy, efficiency,
534 compliance and risk-taking behaviour. *Br J Sports Med*. 2008;42(8):648-652.
535 doi:10.1136/bjism.2008.046441.
- 536 6. Bahr R. No injuries, but plenty of pain? On the methodology for recording
537 overuse symptoms in sports. *Br J Sports Med*. 2009;43(13):966-972.
538 doi:10.1136/bjism.2009.066936.
- 539 7. Sobhani S, Dekker R, Postema K, Dijkstra PU. Epidemiology of ankle and foot
540 overuse injuries in sports: A systematic review. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*.
541 2013;23(6):669-686. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01509.x.
- 542 8. Baur H, Hirschmüller A, Jahn M, Müller S, Mayer F. Therapeutic efficiency
543 and biomechanical effects of sport insoles in female runners. *J Foot Ankle Res*.
544 2008 Sep 26;1(Suppl 1):O14. doi: 10.1186/1757-1146-1-S1-O14. PMCID:
545 PMC2562093.
- 546 9. Wong P, Chamari K, Chaouachi A, Mao DW, Wisløff U, Hong Y. Difference
547 in plantar pressure between the preferred and non-preferred feet in four soccer-
548 related movements. *Br J Sports Med*. 2007;41(2):84 LP-92.
549 doi:10.1136/bjism.2006.030908.
- 550 10. Wong P, Chamari K, Wisløff U, Hong Y. Higher plantar pressure on the
551 medial side in four soccer-related movements. *Br J Sports Med*. 2007;41(2):93-
552 100.
- 553 11. Hakim AJ, Grahame R. A simple questionnaire to detect hypermobility: an
554 adjunct to the assessment of patients with diffuse musculoskeletal pain. *Int J*
555 *Clin Pract*. 2003;57(3):163-166.
- 556 12. Simpson MR. Benign joint hypermobility syndrome: evaluation, diagnosis, and
557 management. *J Am Osteopath Assoc*. 2006;106(9):531-536. doi:106/9/531
558 [pii].
- 559 13. Vieira RB, Bertolini FM, Vieira TC, Aguiar RM, Pinheiro GB, Lasmar RC.

- 560 IINCIDENCE OF ANKLE SPRAINS IN SOCCER PLAYERS WITH JOINT
561 HYPERMOBILITY SYNDROME. *Rev Bras Ortop.* 2015;47(6):710-713.
562 Published 2015 Nov 4. doi:10.1016/S2255-4971(15)30026-4.
- 563 14. Cornwall MW, McPoil TG, Lebec M, Vicenzino B, Wilson J. Reliability of the
564 Modified Foot Posture Index. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc.* 2008;98(1):7-13.
565 doi:10.7547/0980007.
- 566 15. Evans AM, Copper AW, Scharfbillig RW, Scutter SD, Williams MT.
567 Reliability of the foot posture index and traditional measures of foot position. *J*
568 *Am Podiatr Med Assoc.* 93(3):203-213.
569 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12756311>.
- 570 16. Redmond AC, Crane YZ, Menz HB. Normative values for the Foot Posture
571 Index. *J Foot Ankle Res.* 2008;1(1):6. doi:10.1186/1757-1146-1-6.
- 572 17. Cerrahoglu L, Koşan U, Sirin TC, Ulusoy A. Range of Motion and Plantar
573 Pressure Evaluation for the Effects of Self-Care Foot Exercises on Diabetic
574 Patients with and Without Neuropathy. *Http://DxDoiOrg/107547/14-095.*
575 2016;106(3):189-200.
- 576 18. Creighton DS, Olson VL. Evaluation of range of motion of the first
577 metatarsophalangeal joint in runners with plantar faciitis. *J Orthop Sport Phys*
578 *Ther.* 1987;8(7):357-361.
- 579 19. Hägglund M, Waldén M, Bahr R, Ekstrand J. Methods for epidemiological
580 study of injuries to professional football players: developing the UEFA model.
581 *Br J Sports Med.* 2005;39(6):340-346.
- 582 20. Junge A, Dvorak J. Soccer injuries: A review on incidence and prevention.
583 *Sport Med.* 2004;34(13):929-938. doi:10.2165/00007256-200434130-00004.
- 584 21. Junge A, Dvořák J. Football injuries during the 2014 FIFA World Cup. *Br J*
585 *Sports Med.* 2015;49(9):599-602.
- 586 22. Halabchi F, Angoorani H, Mirshahi M, Shahi MHP, Mansourmia MA. The
587 prevalence of selected intrinsic risk factors for ankle sprain among elite
588 football and basketball players. *Asian J Sports Med.* 2016;7(3).
- 589 23. Kaufman KR, Brodine SK, Shaffer RA, Johnson CW, Cullison TR. The Effect
590 of Foot Structure and Range of Motion on Musculoskeletal Overuse Injuries.
591 *Am J Sports Med.* 1999;27(5):585-593. doi:10.1177/03635465990270050701.
- 592 24. Landorf KB, Ackland CA, Bonanno DR, Menz HB, Forghany S. Effects of
593 metatarsal domes on plantar pressures in older people with a history of forefoot
594 pain. *J Foot Ankle Res.* 2020;13(1):18. doi:10.1186/s13047-020-00388-x.
- 595 25. Murat Ozer C, Professor Cagatay Barut A. Evaluation of football players' sole
596 morphology ISMJ International SportMed Journal Evaluation of the sole
597 morphology of professional football players. *Int Sport J Off J FIMS*
598 *(International Fed Sport Med.* 2012;13(1):8-17. <http://www.ismj.com>.
- 599 26. Park J-H, Noh SC, Jang HS, Yu WJ, Park MK, Choi HH. The study of
600 correlation between foot-pressure distribution and scoliosis. In: *13th*
601 *International Conference on Biomedical Engineering.* Springer; 2009:974-978.
- 602 27. Brund RBK, Rasmussen S, Nielsen RO, Kersting UG, Laessoe U, Voigt M.
603 Medial shoe-ground pressure and specific running injuries: A 1-year
604 prospective cohort study. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2017;20(9):830-834.

605 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2017.04.001.

- 606 28. Willems TM, De Clercq D, Delbaere K, Vanderstraeten G, De Cock A,
607 Witvrouw E. A prospective study of gait related risk factors for exercise-
608 related lower leg pain. *Gait Posture*. 2006;23(1):91-98.
- 609 29. Smith R, Damodaran AK, Swaminathan S, Campbell R, Barnsley L.
610 Hypermobility and sports injuries in junior netball players. *Br J Sports Med*.
611 2005;39(9):628 LP-631. doi:10.1136/bjism.2004.015271.
- 612 30. Hawkins RD, Fuller CW. A prospective epidemiological study of injuries in
613 four English professional football clubs. *Br J Sports Med*. 1999;33(3):196-203.
- 614 31. Redmond AC, Crosbie J, Ouvrier RA. Development and validation of a novel
615 rating system for scoring standing foot posture: the Foot Posture Index. *Clin*
616 *Biomech*. 2006;21(1):89-98.
- 617 32. Cain LE, Nicholson LL, Adams RD, Burns J. Foot morphology and foot/ankle
618 injury in indoor football. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2007;10(5):311-319.
- 619 33. Ulusoy A, Cerrahoglu L, Orguc S. Magnetic resonance imaging and clinical
620 outcomes of laser therapy, ultrasound therapy, and extracorporeal shock wave
621 therapy for treatment of plantar fasciitis: a randomized controlled trial. *J Foot*
622 *Ankle Surg*. 2017;56(4):762-767.
- 623 34. Uzun, A , Aydos, L , Kaya, M , Kanatlı, U , Esen, E . (2013). DISTRIBUTION
624 OF SOLE PRESSURE IN FEMALE FOOTBALL PLAYERS . *Beden Eğitimi*
625 *ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi* , 7 (3) , 230-241 . Retrieved from
626 <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/bsd/issue/53532/712922>.

627

628

629 TABLES

630

631 Table 1: Distribution rates of 100 footballers according to their positions

632

Position	n	%
Goalkeeper	9	9,00
Centre-Backs	19	19,00
Central Midfielders	27	27,00
Fullbacks	17	17,00
Wide Midfielders	14	14,00
Attacking Midfielders / Strikers	14	14,00
Total	100	100,00

639

640

641

642 Table 2: Participants' Beighton Scores, Foot Posture Index (FPI-6) Scores, Joint
643 Range of Motion Values

	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Beighton Score	100	0,00	6,00	1,42	1,48
FPI-6 Right Foot	100	-1,00	4,00	0,88	1,14
FPI-6 Left Foot	100	-3,00	3,00	0,68	1,13
Ankle Dorsiflexion Right Foot	100	8,00	25,00	17,82	3,24
Ankle Dorsiflexion Left Foot	100	10,00	25,00	18,00	3,40
Ankle Plantarflexion Right Foot	100	30,00	62,00	45,33	6,23
Ankle Plantarflexion Left Foot	100	30,00	63,00	45,27	6,31
Ankle Inversion Right Foot	100	20,00	52,00	35,46	5,43
Ankle Inversion Left Foot	100	18,00	60,00	34,04	5,71
Ankle Eversion Right Foot	100	8,00	28,00	16,98	4,38
Ankle Eversion Left Foot	100	5,00	31,00	16,19	4,44
First MTP Dorsiflexion Right Foot	100	20,00	66,00	44,56	7,61
First MTP Dorsiflexion Left Foot	100	20,00	60,00	45,59	6,67
First MTP Flexion Right Foot	100	15,00	50,00	38,86	7,97
First MTP Flexion Left Foot	100	15,00	50,00	38,13	8,00

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661 Table 3: Overuse Injury Types of Football Players

Injury type	n	%
Achilles Tendinopathy	7	18,9
Metatarsal Stress Fracture	4	10,8
Metatarsalgia	17	45,9
Plantar Fasciitis	9	24,3
Total	37	100,00

662

663

664 Table 4: Relationship between Injury History and Static Plantar Pressure Measurements

665

	Injury History		
	No (Mean ± SD)	Yes (Mean ± SD)	p
Static Heel Pressure Preferred Foot	87,89 ± 8,02	86,11 ± 8,77	0,312
Static Heel Pressure Non-Preferred Foot	88,00 ± 7,44	87,70 ± 9,04	0,862
Static Middle Foot Pressure Preferred Foot	37,74 ± 14,16	41,91 ± 16,51	0,191
Static Middle Foot Pressure Non-Preferred Foot	39,46 ± 16,30	41,38 ± 18,15	0,594
Static Forefoot medial Pressure Preferred Foot	51,12 ± 12,73	47,05 ± 16,41	0,175
Static Forefoot medial Pressure Non-Preferred Foot	49,81 ± 13,82	49,76 ± 15,25	0,986
Static Forefoot Middle Pressure Preferred Foot	68,80 ± 12,39	68,14 ± 13,08	0,806
Static Forefoot Middle Pressure Non-Preferred Foot	60,96 ± 10,15	65,73 ± 12,15	0,040
Static Forefoot Lateral Pressure Preferred Foot	60,00 ± 12,66	64,67 ± 16,12	0,115
Static Forefoot Lateral Pressure Non-Preferred Foot	50,57 ± 14,13	55,50 ± 16,65	0,124
Static Thumb Pressure Preferred Foot	30,77 ± 16,59	31,32 ± 17,96	0,879
Static Thumb Pressure Non-Preferred Foot	29,40 ± 15,49	27,64 ± 14,83	0,586

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675 Table 5: Injury - Joint Range of Motion Relationship

676

Injury History			
	No (Mean ± SD)	Yes (Mean ± SD)	p
Preferred Foot Ankle Dorsiflexion	17,78 ± 3,38	18,08 ± 2,02	0,482
Non-Preferred Foot Ankle Dorsiflexion	18,11 ± 3,39	17,16 ± 3,48	0,302
Preferred Foot Ankle Plantarflexion	45,15 ± 6,21	46,58 ± 6,47	0,195
Non-Preferred Foot Ankle Plantarflexion	46,18 ± 6,02	43,50 ± 6,57	0,044
Preferred Foot Ankle Inversion	35,56 ± 5,61	34,66 ± 4,00	0,298
Non-Preferred Foot Ankle Inversion	34,26 ± 5,90	32,41 ± 3,84	0,117
Preferred Foot Ankle Eversion	17,26 ± 4,49	14,91 ± 2,84	0,029
Non-Preferred Foot Ankle Eversion	16,30 ± 4,56	15,33 ± 3,47	0,242
Preferred Foot MTP Dorsiflexion	44,31 ± 7,98	46,33 ± 3,74	0,219
Non-Preferred Foot MTP Dorsiflexion	48,33 ± 3,89	45,21 ± 6,89	0,023
Preferred Foot MTP Flexion	39,07 ± 8,26	37,25 ± 5,37	0,207
Non-Preferred Foot MTP Flexion	38,27 ± 8,13	37,08 ± 7,21	0,190

677

678 FIGURE LEGENDS

679

680 Figure 1: Assessment of the position of the forefoot relative to the back foot
681 according to FPI-6

682

683 Figure 2: Plantarflexion range of motion assesment with inclinometer

684

685 Figure 3: Pedobarographic static foot plantar pressure evaluation

686



Figure 1: Assessment of the position of the forefoot relative to the back foot according to FPI-6



Figure 2: Plantarflexion range of motion assesment with inclinometer




Figure 3: Pedobarographic static foot plantar pressure evaluation