

**Title:** Effects of midfoot joint mobilization on perceived ankle-foot function in chronic ankle instability. A crossover clinical trial.

Abbis Jaffri, PT, PhD<sup>1, 2</sup>  
abbisjaffri@creighton.edu ; ORCID: 0000-0003-4134-8540

John J. Fraser, PT, DPT, PhD, FACSM<sup>1, 3</sup>  
John.j.fraser8.mil@mail.mil; ORCID: 0000-0001-9697-3795, Twitter: @NavyPT

Rachel M. Koldenhoven, PhD, ATC<sup>1, 4</sup>  
rnr214@txstate.edu; ORCID: 0000-0002-2569-9052

Jay Hertel, PhD, ATC<sup>1</sup>  
jnh7g@virginia.edu; ORCID: 0000-0003-0680-6534

1. Department of Kinesiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA
2. School of Pharmacy and Health Professions, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, USA
3. Operational Readiness & Health Directorate, US Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA, USA
4. Department of Health and Human Performance, Texas State University, San Marcos, TX, USA

**Conflicts of Interest:** We affirm that we have no financial affiliation or involvement with any commercial, organization that has a direct financial interest in any matter included in this manuscript.

**Disclosures:** This study was funded in part by the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education Foundation and the Navy Medicine Professional Development Center. The views

expressed in this manuscript reflect the results of research conducted by the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, nor the U.S. Government. Commander John J. Fraser is a military service member and this work was prepared as part of his official duties. Title 17, USC, §105 provides that ‘Copyright protection under this title is not available for any work of the U.S. Government.’ Title 17, USC, §101 defines a U.S. Government work as a work prepared by a military service member or employee of the U.S. Government as part of that person’s official duties. All participants provided informed consent and this study was approved by the Institutional Review Board for Health Sciences Research at the University of Virginia in compliance with all applicable Federal regulations governing the protection of human subjects.

The preprint of this manuscript is archived on MedRxiv at doi: 10.1101/XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Acknowledgements: Stephan Bodkin, PhD, ATC for his assistance with allocation. Navy Medicine Professional Development Center and the University of Virginia’s Curry School of Education Foundation for their generosity in providing funding.

Corresponding Author: John J Fraser, Operational Readiness & Health Directorate, US Naval Health Research Center, 140 Sylvester Road, San Diego, CA 92106 Phone: 757-438-0390  
Email: john.j.fraser8.mil@mail.mil ORCID: 0000-0001-9697-3795 Twitter: @NavyPT

Key Words: Ankle Injuries; Recovery of Function; Musculoskeletal Manipulations; Pain Perception; Therapeutics; Treatment Outcome

**Title:** Effects of midfoot joint mobilization on perceived ankle-foot function in chronic ankle instability. A crossover clinical trial.

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Chronic ankle instability (CAI) is a complex clinical entity that commonly  
3 includes ankle-foot impairment.

4 **Objective:** To investigate the effects of midfoot joint mobilizations and a one-week home  
5 exercise program (HEP) compared to a sham intervention and HEP on pain, patient-reported  
6 outcomes (PROs), ankle-foot joint mobility, and neuromotor function in young adults with CAI.

7 **Methods:** Twenty participants with CAI were instructed in a stretching, strengthening, and  
8 balance HEP and were randomized *a priori* to receive midfoot joint mobilizations (forefoot  
9 supination, cuboid glide and plantar 1<sup>st</sup> tarsometatarsal) or a sham laying-of-hands. Changes in  
10 foot morphology, joint mobility, strength, dynamic balance, and PROs assessing pain, physical,  
11 and psychological function were assessed pre-to-post treatment and one-week following.

12 Participants crossed-over to receive the alternate treatment and were assessed pre-to-post  
13 treatment and one-week following. Linear modelling was used to assess changes in outcomes.

14 **Results:** Participants who received midfoot mobilization demonstrated significantly greater  
15 perceived improvement immediately posttreatment in the single assessment numeric evaluation  
16 (Sham: 5.0±10.2%; Mobilization: 43.9±26.2%;  $\beta$ : 6.8  $p<0.001$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.17) and Global Rating  
17 of Change (Sham: -0.1±1.1; Mobilization: 1.1±3.0;  $\beta$ : 1.8  $p=0.01$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.12). Following the  
18 mobilization intervention, participants demonstrated greater improved rearfoot inversion  
19 mobility (Sham: 4.4±8.4°; Mobilization: -1.6±6.1°;  $\beta$ : -6.37,  $p=0.01$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.19), plantarflexion  
20 mobility (Sham: 2.7°±6.4; Mobilization: -1.7°±4.3;  $\beta$ : -4.36,  $p=0.02$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.07), and  
21 posteromedial dynamic balance (Sham: 2.4±5.9%; Mobilization: 6.0±5.4%;  $\beta$ : 3.88,  $p=0.04$ , Adj  
22  $R^2$ :0.10) compared to controls at 1-week post-treatment.

23 **Conclusion:** Participants with CAI who received midfoot joint mobilization had greater  
24 perceived improvement and physical signs that may benefit this clinical population.

25

26 **Key Words:** Ankle Injuries; Recovery of Function; Musculoskeletal Manipulations; Pain  
27 Perception; Therapeutics; Treatment Outcome

28

29 Word Count:

30

## INTRODUCTION

31

Ankle sprains are the most common injury in orthopaedics and sport medicine.<sup>1</sup>

32

Individuals who incur ankle sprains often have difficulty returning to pre-injury functional levels

33

and frequently experience injury recurrence.<sup>2</sup> While many recover without residual deficit, 40%

34

of the people who have an ankle sprain progress to develop chronic ankle instability (CAI) at

35

least 12 months beyond the index ankle sprain.<sup>3</sup> CAI is a clinical condition that includes

36

mechanical and functional instability, along with residual symptoms in the ankle after a lateral

37

ankle sprain.<sup>4</sup> Mechanical deficits may include joint laxity, arthrokinematics restrictions,

38

osteoarthritic changes, and synovial changes.<sup>2,5</sup> Functional insufficiencies constitute

39

proprioceptive deficits, loss in muscle strength, and neuromuscular alterations.<sup>2,5</sup>

40

Foot impairments such as altered joint motion, ligamentous laxity and pain, and strength

41

deficits contribute to activity limitation and diminished quality of life in patients with CAI.<sup>6</sup>

42

Moreover, midfoot injury has been reported in patients who suffered lateral ankle sprains with

43

41% having midfoot ligamentous involvement and 33% having midfoot capsular injury.<sup>7</sup> Manual

44

Therapy (MT) is often used by rehabilitation specialists following injury to improve symptoms,

45

range of motion, and sensorimotor function as a complementary treatment during return to

46

activity.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, the cascade of temporal neurophysiological effects fostered by joint

47

mobilization may have specific beneficial benefits during treatment in this clinical population.<sup>9</sup>

48

As such, manual therapy interventions to include joint mobilization are recommended for

49

inclusion in care when coupled with supervised or unsupervised exercise,<sup>10</sup> While there is

50

evidence for the use MT techniques in this population, study focus has been primarily on the

51

treatment of the talocrural joint with the foot mostly ignored.<sup>9</sup>

52           Since the rates of CAI do not appear to be decreasing and the persistent perception of  
53 “it’s just an ankle sprain,” it is important to explore complementary treatments that may provide  
54 medicinal mechanical, neurophysiological, and psychological effects.<sup>2</sup> In a related study of  
55 individuals with post-acute lateral ankle sprains, midfoot mobilizations was found to have  
56 positive psychological effects in regard to symptoms and function, facets that have are important  
57 in the mediation of intrinsic factors that are important in pain, treatment compliance, and  
58 functional outcomes.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the purpose of this crossover clinical trial was to investigate  
59 the effects of midfoot joint mobilization and a one-week home exercise program (HEP)  
60 compared to a sham intervention and HEP on patient-reported and clinical measures in young  
61 adults with CAI.

62

63

## METHODS

### DESIGN

65           This study is the second crossover clinical trial in a research line assessing the effects of  
66 midfoot mobilization in individuals with a history of ankle sprain, with the methods previously  
67 reported.<sup>11</sup> A laboratory-based, crossover clinical trial was performed where the independent  
68 variable was treatment (50% allocated to initially receive joint mobilization, 50% allocated to  
69 initially receive sham). The primary dependent variables were changes in patient-reported pain  
70 and function, foot morphology (foot mobility magnitude, arch height flexibility), joint motion  
71 (weight-bearing dorsiflexion, rearfoot goniometry, forefoot inclinometry, 1<sup>st</sup> metatarsal  
72 displacement), strength (handheld dynamometry), and dynamic balance (Star Excursion Balance  
73 Test, SEBT) immediately post-treatment and one-week following. Crossover design was selected  
74 over a parallel randomized control trial to ensure the individual factors of joint phenotype, injury

75 heterogeneity, and psychological factors were accounted for in the design.<sup>11</sup> The trial was  
76 registered with the National Institutes of Health (NCT02697461). The study was approved by the  
77 Health Science Research Institutional Review Board at the University of Virginia.

78

## 79 **PARTICIPANTS**

80 Participants in this study were part of a larger research effort assessing foot impairment in  
81 individuals with and without CAI.<sup>8,9,11</sup> A convenience sample of 20 recreationally-active  
82 individuals (9 males, 11 females) aged 18-35 with a recent history of LAS were recruited at a  
83 public university. Recreationally active was defined as participation in some form of physical  
84 activity for at least 20-minutes per day, at least three times a week. Participants must have  
85 incurred an ankle sprain  $\geq$  12-months prior to the study, experienced perceived or episodic  
86 giving way and reported deficit on the Identification of Functional Ankle Instability<sup>5</sup>  
87 (IdFAI $>$ 10), Foot and Ankle Ability Measure (FAAM) ADL  $<$ 90 and FAAM-Sport  $<$  85.<sup>14</sup>  
88 Participant demographics and self-report measures are in **Table 1**. Individuals were excluded if  
89 they had an ankle sprain within 8 weeks prior to the study, a self-reported history of leg or foot  
90 fracture, neurological or vestibular impairment that affected balance, diabetes mellitus,  
91 lumbosacral radiculopathy, soft tissue disorders such as Marfan syndrome or Ehlers-Danlos  
92 syndrome, any absolute contraindication to manual therapy, or if they were pregnant.  
93 Participants who met inclusion criteria provided informed consent. **Figure 1** details the  
94 CONSORT<sup>23</sup> flow chart from recruitment to analysis.

95

## 96 **PROCEDURES**

### 97 **Baseline Visit**



98 Participants provided demographic information, health and injury history, and completed  
99 the FAAM ADL<sup>21</sup> and Sport subscales,<sup>4</sup> IdFAI,<sup>5</sup> the Patient Reported Outcomes Measurement  
100 Information System (PROMIS) General Health Questionnaire,<sup>17</sup> the 11-item Tampa Scale of  
101 Kinesiophobia (TSK-11),<sup>27</sup> and the Godin Leisure-time Exercise Questionnaire.<sup>12</sup> Height, mass,  
102 and true leg length were measured. Foot posture was assessed in standing using the Foot Posture  
103 Index–6 item version (FPI), a categorical measure of foot type that is based on five observations  
104 and one palpatory assessment.<sup>25</sup>

105 Demographic, medical history, and FPI assessments were performed by a physical  
106 therapist and board-certified orthopaedic clinical specialist with 15-years of clinical experience.  
107 Physical examinations were performed by either an athletic trainer with three-years clinical  
108 experience or a physical therapist with two-years clinical experience who were blinded to  
109 participants' medical history, functional status, and treatment allocation.

#### 110 Morphologic Foot Assessment

111 Morphologic foot measurements were obtained using the Arch Height Index  
112 Measurement System (JAKTOOL Corporation, Cranberry, NJ). Total and truncated foot length,  
113 arch height, and foot width were measured in sitting and standing. Test-retest reliability for these  
114 measures were previously reported by the authors to be excellent.<sup>10</sup> Arch height index<sup>3</sup> and foot  
115 mobility magnitude<sup>22</sup> were calculated using the component measurements across loading  
116 conditions.

#### 117 Joint Motion Measures

118 Weight bearing dorsiflexion (WBDF)<sup>1</sup>, ankle plantarflexion, inversion, and eversion, and  
119 forefoot inversion and eversion joint motion measures<sup>10</sup> were performed using previously  
120 described methods. WBDF was reported as the linear distance measured from the wall to the toes

121 in centimeters. Joint motion measures of rearfoot plantarflexion, inversion, and eversion were  
122 performed using a 30.5-cm plastic goniometer (Merck Corporation, Kenilworth, NJ) and  
123 reported in degrees. Forefoot inversion and eversion was measured using a digital inclinometer  
124 (Fabrication Enterprises, White Plains, NY) and reported in degrees. Linear excursion of first  
125 metatarsal (MT) dorsiflexion and plantarflexion were measured utilizing a custom measuring  
126 device consisting of two metal rulers bent to 90° and reported in millimeters.<sup>13</sup> Test-retest  
127 reliability for these measures were previously reported by the authors to be good to excellent.<sup>10,13</sup>

### 128 Muscle Strength

129 Ankle dorsiflexion, plantarflexion, inversion, eversion, and hallux flexion and lesser toe  
130 flexion strength were assessed with a handheld dynamometer (Hoggan Health Industries, West  
131 Jordan, UT).<sup>10</sup> For toe flexion strength measures, the ankle was positioned in 45° plantarflexion  
132 to reduce contribution of the extrinsic foot muscles and increase demand of the intrinsic foot  
133 muscles.<sup>16</sup> Strength measures were based on the highest value of three trials. An estimate of  
134 torque was derived from the product of force and segment length, normalized to body mass, and  
135 reported in Nmkg<sup>-1</sup>. Test-retest reliability for these measures were previously reported by the  
136 authors to be excellent.<sup>10</sup>

### 137 Dynamic Balance

138 Dynamic balance was assessed using the anterior, posteromedial, and posterolateral  
139 directions of the Star Excursion Balance Test (SEBT),<sup>18</sup> a measure has been found to have  
140 excellent test-retest reliability.<sup>20</sup> Reach distance was normalized to leg length.<sup>15</sup>

### 141 **Intervention**

142 Following baseline assessment, all participants were instructed in a HEP consisting of  
143 triceps surae stretching; four-way stretch of the rearfoot, midfoot, and forefoot; isotonic

144 inversion, eversion and dorsiflexion exercises against resistance tubing; single-limb heel raising;  
145 and a single limb balance exercise (**Figure 2**).<sup>7,11</sup> Participants were asked to perform all exercises  
146 thrice daily, were provided a handout detailing the exercises, and verbalized understanding  
147 following instruction. The decision to utilize a HEP over supervised rehabilitation was to better  
148 elucidate the specific treatment effects of the midfoot joint mobilizations.<sup>11</sup>

149 Participants were randomized *a priori* using a random number generator by the senior  
150 author and stratified by sex to receive either the midfoot joint mobilizations or sham intervention  
151 on the initial visit. Allocation was performed by an otherwise uninvolved laboratory assistant,  
152 concealed in a sealed opaque envelope, and opened by the treating clinician who was a board-  
153 certified orthopaedic physical therapist with 15-years of clinical experience. Participants  
154 allocated to receive midfoot mobilizations were provided a dorsolateral cuboid glide with  
155 forefoot supination and 1<sup>st</sup> tarsometatarsal plantar glides.<sup>6</sup> Each mobilization technique was an  
156 oscillatory Maitland Grade IV applied for 30-seconds duration. If cavitation was not experienced  
157 during the first bout of oscillations, a second 30-second bout was provided. In the case where the  
158 participant did not exhibit midfoot hypomobility on physical examination (n=3), joint  
159 mobilizations were deferred, and the participant was provided the sham treatment only.  
160 Participants allocated to the sham treatment were told that they were to receive a gentle soft-  
161 tissue technique similar to massage and were provided a “laying of hands” for 30-seconds using  
162 the same hand position and contacts used for the joint mobilizations. Participants rated the  
163 change of symptoms using a single assessment numeric evaluation (SANE, -100%=full  
164 exacerbation, 0=no change, 100%=full resolution) immediately post-intervention and completed  
165 the Global Rating of Change (GROC, -7= A very great deal worse, 0= About the same, 7= A  
166 very great deal better).

167 **Follow-up Visit**

168 Participants returned to the laboratory following a one-week washout for reassessment.  
169 They completed the PROMIS, Godin, FAAM-ADL and Sport, SANE, and GROC. HEP  
170 compliance was assessed by having the participants demonstrate the instructed exercises.  
171 Participants were rated by the treating clinician whether or not they could demonstrate the  
172 exercises without hesitation and with appropriate technique. Participants self-rated their  
173 compliance using a SANE, with 0% reflective of complete non-compliance with all home  
174 exercises and 100% representing performance of all exercises thrice daily. Any deficiencies in  
175 exercise technique were corrected and participants were provided encouragement to continue.

176 Repeat physical examinations were performed pre-and post-intervention. Following the  
177 pre-intervention physical examination, participants crossed over to receive the second  
178 intervention (i.e. individuals who initially received the sham intervention now received the  
179 midfoot joint mobilizations). Participants rated treatment response (SANE) immediately post-  
180 intervention and at the end of the visit and completed the GROC.

181 **Final Visit**

182 Participants returned to the laboratory one-week later for the final reassessment visit  
183 consisting of HEP compliance, patient-reported outcomes, and physical examination.

184 **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

185 *A priori* sample size estimation of 14 participants were needed based on an anticipated 15-  
186 point change in the FAAM Sport, an  $\alpha=.05$ , and  $\beta=.20$ .<sup>19</sup> Descriptive statistics were calculated for  
187 demographic and self-reported measures for each subset of the sample allocated to receive either  
188 sham or midfoot mobilization during the first visit. Effectiveness of the two interventions  
189 (midfoot joint mobilization, sham) and the order of treatments were assessed using multivariate

190 linear regression. Ordinal measures that had greater than five items (GROC) were treated as  
191 continuous data during analysis.<sup>24,26</sup> Participants were analyzed per allocation using intention to  
192 treat. Data was analyzed using R Version 3.5.1 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing,  
193 Vienna, Austria). The level of significance was  $p \leq .05$  for all analyses.

194

195

## RESULTS

196 Self-reported compliance with the HEP was high following both interventions at Week 1  
197 (Mobilization intervention first: 65.9±25.6%; Sham intervention first: 69.6±22.2%; Hedge's  $g$ :  
198 0.15±0.98) and Week 2 (Mobilization intervention first: 71.9±17.3%; Sham intervention first:  
199 61.3±26.7%; Hedge's  $g$ : 0.45±0.96). When asked to demonstrate the home program, the group  
200 that was provided the sham treatment first had a substantially higher proportion of the sample  
201 that were able to recall and perform the HEP (75.0%) compared to the participants that initially  
202 were provided the midfoot mobilization (33.3%). At Week 2, the ability to recall and perform the  
203 HEP was more consistent between groups (Sham intervention first group: 66.7%; Mobilization  
204 intervention first group: 83.3%).

205 Table 2 details the baseline and change measures for patient-reported outcomes of pain,  
206 function, and perceived improvement. Participant demonstrated significantly greater perceived  
207 improvement immediately posttreatment in the single assessment numeric evaluation (Sham:  
208 5.0±10.2%; Mobilization: 43.9±26.2%;  $\beta$ : 6.8  $p < 0.001$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.17) and Global Rating of  
209 Change (Sham: -0.1±1.1; Mobilization: 1.1±3.0;  $\beta$ : 1.8  $p = 0.01$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.12). Tables 3 and 4  
210 details the baseline and change measures for ankle-foot morphological, joint mobility,  
211 neuromotor function, and dynamic balance outcome measures following the midfoot  
212 mobilization, regardless of order. Additionally, greater improved rearfoot inversion mobility

213 (Sham:  $4.4 \pm 8.4^\circ$ ; Mobilization:  $-1.6 \pm 6.1^\circ$ ;  $\beta$ : -6.37,  $p=0.01$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.19), plantarflexion mobility  
214 (Sham:  $2.7^\circ \pm 6.4$ ; Mobilization:  $-1.7^\circ \pm 4.3$ ;  $\beta$ : -4.36,  $p=0.02$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.07), and posteromedial  
215 dynamic balance (Sham:  $2.4 \pm 5.9\%$ ; Mobilization:  $6.0 \pm 5.4\%$ ;  $\beta$ : 3.88,  $p=0.04$ , Adj  $R^2$ :0.10) was  
216 observed following midfoot mobilization compared to the sham at 1-week post-treatment. Order  
217 of interventions was not a significant factor for any of the outcome measures. There were no  
218 other significant findings.

219

220

## DISCUSSION

221 The primary findings of this crossover clinical trial were that CAI patients who received  
222 midfoot joint mobilization and a HEP resulted in greater perceived improvement and global  
223 rating of change immediately following treatment compared to the receipt of a sham treatment  
224 and HEP. At one-week post treatment, patients receiving the midfoot joint mobilization also  
225 demonstrated reduced rearfoot inversion and plantarflexion joint mobility and improvements in  
226 posteromedial reach distance in the assessment of dynamic balance, whereas those receiving the  
227 sham treatment did not.

228 The findings of greater perceived improvement study are consistent with what was  
229 observed in the related study of midfoot mobilization in individuals with subacute LAS.<sup>11</sup> MT is  
230 purported to work through the interplay of biomechanical, psychological and neurophysiological  
231 mechanisms.<sup>12</sup> In the related study assessing midfoot mobilization in individuals with LAS, the  
232 experimental intervention similarly yielded moderate to large magnitude perceived  
233 improvements compared to the sham intervention. In the updated model of CAI, psychological  
234 status has been highlighted as an important mediator for functional outcomes.<sup>2</sup> This is substantial

235 since individual with CAI have been found to have increased pain-related fear<sup>13</sup>, a finding that  
236 similarly observed in our sample.

237 While there were only trivial and non-significant improvements in dynamic balance  
238 immediately post-treatment, there was a meaningful significant improvement observed one week  
239 after receipt of mobilization. Previous study of MT in this population found that rearfoot joint  
240 mobilizations and plantar massage increased dynamic balance through likely mechanical and  
241 neurophysiological mechanism, improvements that persisted up to one-month following  
242 treatment.<sup>14</sup> Due to the delay in observed improvements, other plausible mechanisms may  
243 explain our findings. Specifically, improvements in psychological status may have influenced the  
244 changes in dynamic balance, a salient factor that has been found to mediate functional movement  
245 performance.<sup>15</sup> Mitigation of fear in patients with CAI has been associated with improvements  
246 in physical performance outcomes, such as dynamic balance.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, improved  
247 psychological readiness resulting from increased knowledge of testing procedures, beliefs of  
248 improvement, and attitudes toward performance execution following the experimental  
249 intervention quite possibly influenced these outcomes through improved self-efficacy.<sup>17</sup>

250 A small, but significant, decrease in rearfoot inversion mobility (mean:  $-1.6^\circ$ , 95% CI:  $-4.4$   
251 to  $1.2^\circ$ ) and plantarflexion mobility (mean:  $-1.7^\circ$ , 95% CI:  $-3.7$  to  $0.3^\circ$ ) was observed 1-week  
252 following joint mobilization, whereas the sham treatment resulted in an increase in these  
253 measures (inversion, mean:  $4.4^\circ$ , 95% CI:  $0.7$  to  $8.1^\circ$ ; plantarflexion, mean:  $2.7^\circ$ , 95% CI:  $0.8$  to  
254  $4.6^\circ$ ). Individuals with CAI have been found to have a more inverted and plantarflexed rearfoot  
255 during functional activities such as walking.<sup>18</sup> It is plausible that reduced rearfoot joint motion  
256 may be advantageous and result from improved midfoot mobility and rearfoot mechanics during  
257 function in the week following treatment. Restoring normal ankle-foot biomechanics may help to

258 reduce the abnormal stresses placed on the ligaments of the complex and prevent further  
259 injuries.<sup>19</sup> These suppositions require substantiation in future study.

260

## 261 **CLINICAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

262 Higher perceived improvement was observed in the treatment group following joint  
263 mobilization compared to sham. This is clinically meaningful because patient preferences form  
264 an integral component of evidence-based medicine when it comes to informed clinical decision  
265 making.<sup>20</sup> There are wide range of emotions reported after the injury that may include anxiety, fear,  
266 and anger. Some athletes may be affected more by the severity of the injury translating in to  
267 depressed mental state. This emotional toll that an athlete goes through because of injury has certain  
268 implications in rehabilitation and may persist beyond rehabilitation programs.<sup>21</sup> It has been  
269 suggested that because of an injury, athletes may fall in to a vicious cycle of a general lack of  
270 movement that may result in decrease in strength and reinjury which makes them more prone to  
271 reinjury.<sup>21</sup> While there were only modest physical effects observed with the experimental  
272 intervention, the positive psychological effects of the inclusion of midfoot joint mobilization  
273 may help to bolster a comprehensive rehabilitation program when treating individuals with CAI.  
274 Positive psychological characteristics such as high resiliency and self-efficacy are considered of  
275 seminal importance in rehabilitation and return to activity.<sup>22</sup> Lastly, based on the proportion of  
276 CAI patients with observed side to side midfoot hypomobility observed in this study, it is  
277 imperative that clinicians examine and treat all the segments of the ankle-foot complex when  
278 managing this patient population.

279

## 280 **LIMITATIONS**



281           There are limitations to this study. One of the primary limitations of the cross-over  
282 designs is the potential for carryover effects. Comfort maybe taken that we did not observe any  
283 significant order effects or treatment by order interactions in any of our primary outcomes. In  
284 addition, the choice to use change scores was made *a priori* to mitigate potential carryover  
285 effects. Outcomes measures were assessed immediately and one week post mobilization. It is  
286 unclear if any observed improvements persisted beyond the study epoch. Therefore, future  
287 studies that assess long-term outcomes is warranted. Also, while the use of single mobilization  
288 treatment in conjunction with a 1-week HEP was purposeful to specifically assess the perceptual  
289 and physical effects of the specific treatment, this does not reflect the standards of practice. As  
290 such, external validity of these finds are limited. More research is warranted to investigate the  
291 effects of mid-foot mobilization incorporated in a comprehensive rehabilitation program. The  
292 time between the application of the intervention and the follow up was deliberately short to  
293 mitigate the effects of time and healing. This delimitation precluded assessment of potential  
294 longer term effects. Finally, we used a range of outcomes measures to account for potential  
295 improvements in physical impairment and activity, in addition to psychological mediators. This  
296 could potentially increase the risk of Type I error. Acknowledging this risk, we did not rely  
297 solely on p-values for determining treatment effectiveness and also considered the magnitude of  
298 change in our interpretation of results.

299

300

## CONCLUSION

301 A single session midfoot joint mobilization, when used in conjunction with a HEP consisting of  
302 stretching, strengthening, and balance was highly effective in improving patient`s perceived  
303 improvement when compared to a sham treatment. In addition, modest improvements in dynamic

304 balance and rearfoot inversion and plantar flexion motion were also observed in the experimental  
305 group. Integration of midfoot joint mobilization should be considered as part of a larger  
306 comprehensive rehabilitation program for individuals with CAI.

307

308

309

## REFERENCES

- 310 1. Bennell K, Talbot R, Wajswelner H, Techovanich W, Kelly D, Hall A. Intra-rater and inter-  
311 rater reliability of a weight-bearing lunge measure of ankle dorsiflexion. *Aust J Physiother.*  
312 1998;44(3):175-180. doi:10.1016/S0004-9514(14)60377-9
- 313 2. Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Price DD, Robinso{Citation}n ME, George SZ. The Mechanisms  
314 of Manual Therapy in the Treatment of Musculoskeletal Pain: A Comprehensive Model.  
315 *Man Ther.* 2009;14(5):531-538. doi:10.1016/j.math.2008.09.001
- 316 3. Butler RJ, Hillstrom H, Song J, Richards CJ, Davis IS. Arch Height Index Measurement  
317 System: Establishment of Reliability and Normative Values. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc.*  
318 2008;98(2):102-106. doi:10.7547/0980102
- 319 4. Carcia CR, Martin RL, Drouin JM. Validity of the Foot and Ankle Ability Measure in  
320 Athletes With Chronic Ankle Instability. *J Athl Train.* 2008;43(2):179-183.
- 321 5. Donahue M, Simon J, Docherty CL. Reliability and validity of a new questionnaire created  
322 to establish the presence of functional ankle instability: the IdFAI. *Athl Train Sports Health*  
323 *Care.* 2013;5(1):38-43. doi:10.3928/19425864-20121212-02
- 324 6. Fraser JJ, Feger MA, Hertel J. Clinical commentary on midfoot and forefoot involvement in  
325 lateral ankle sprains and chronic ankle instability. part 2: clinical considerations. *Int J*  
326 *Sports Phys Ther.* 2016;11(7):1191-1203.
- 327 7. Fraser JJ, Hertel J. Preinjury to postinjury disablement and recovery after a lateral ankle  
328 sprain: A case report. *J Athl Train.* 2018;53(8):776-781. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-114-17
- 329 8. Fraser JJ, Koldenhoven RM, Hertel J. Ultrasound measures of intrinsic foot muscle size and  
330 activation following lateral ankle sprain and chronic ankle instability. *J Sport Rehabil.*  
331 2021;In press. doi:10.1123/jsr.2020-0372
- 332 9. Fraser JJ, Koldenhoven RM, Jaffri AH, et al. Foot impairments contribute to functional  
333 limitation in individuals with ankle sprain and chronic ankle instability. *Knee Surg Sports*  
334 *Traumatol Arthrosc.* Published online July 6, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00167-018-5028-x
- 335 10. Fraser JJ, Koldenhoven RM, Saliba SA, Hertel J. Reliability of ankle-foot morphology,  
336 mobility, strength, and motor performance measures. *Int J Sports Phys Ther.*  
337 2017;12(7):1134-1149. doi:10.16603/ijsp20171134
- 338 11. Fraser JJ, Saliba SA, Hart JM, Park JS, Hertel J. Effects of midfoot joint mobilization on  
339 ankle-foot morphology and function following acute ankle sprain. A crossover clinical trial.  
340 *Musculoskelet Sci Pract.* 2020;46:102130. doi:10.1016/j.msksp.2020.102130
- 341 12. Godin G, Shephard RJ. Godin leisure-time exercise questionnaire. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*  
342 1997;29(6):36-38.

- 343 13. Greisberg J, Prince D, Sperber L. First ray mobility increase in patients with metatarsalgia.  
344 *Foot Ankle Int.* 2010;31(11):954-958. doi:10.3113/FAI.2010.0954
- 345 14. Gribble PA, Delahunt E, Bleakley C, et al. Selection criteria for patients with chronic ankle  
346 instability in controlled research: a position statement of the International Ankle  
347 Consortium. *Br J Sports Med.* 2014;48(13):1014-1018. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2013-093175
- 348 15. Gribble PA, Hertel J. Considerations for normalizing measures of the star excursion balance  
349 test. *Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci.* 2003;7(2):89-100. doi:10.1207/S15327841MPEE0702\_3
- 350 16. Hashimoto T, Sakuraba K. Assessment of effective ankle joint positioning in strength  
351 training for intrinsic foot flexor muscles: a comparison of intrinsic foot flexor muscle  
352 activity in a position intermediate to plantar and dorsiflexion with that in maximum plantar  
353 flexion using needle electromyography. *J Phys Ther Sci.* 2014;26(3):451-454.  
354 doi:10.1589/jpts.26.451
- 355 17. Hays RD, Bjorner JB, Revicki DA, Spritzer KL, Cella D. Development of physical and  
356 mental health summary scores from the patient-reported outcomes measurement  
357 information system (PROMIS) global items. *Qual Life Res.* 2009;18(7):873-880.  
358 doi:10.1007/s11136-009-9496-9
- 359 18. Hertel J, Braham RA, Hale SA, Olmsted-Kramer LC. Simplifying the star excursion balance  
360 test: analyses of subjects with and without chronic ankle instability. *J Orthop Sports Phys  
361 Ther.* 2006;36(3):131-137.
- 362 19. Hoch MC, Andreatta RD, Mullineaux DR, et al. Two-week joint mobilization intervention  
363 improves self-reported function, range of motion, and dynamic balance in those with  
364 chronic ankle instability. *J Orthop Res.* 2012;30(11):1798-1804. doi:10.1002/jor.22150
- 365 20. Kinzey SJ, Armstrong CW. The reliability of the star-excursion test in assessing dynamic  
366 balance. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 1998;27(5):356-360.
- 367 21. Martin RL, Irrgang JJ, Burdett RG, Conti SF, Van Swearingen JM. Evidence of validity for  
368 the foot and ankle ability measure (FAAM). *Foot Ankle Int.* 2005;26(11):968-983.
- 369 22. McPoil TG, Vicenzino B, Cornwall MW, Collins N, Warren M. Reliability and normative  
370 values for the foot mobility magnitude: a composite measure of vertical and medial-lateral  
371 mobility of the midfoot. *J Foot Ankle Res.* 2009;2(1):6. doi:10.1186/1757-1146-2-6
- 372 23. Moher D, Schulz KF, Altman D, Group C, others. The CONSORT Statement: revised  
373 recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomized trials  
374 2001. *Explore J Sci Heal.* 2005;1(1):40-45.
- 375 24. Norman G. Likert scales, levels of measurement and the “laws” of statistics. *Adv Health Sci  
376 Educ.* 2010;15(5):625-632. doi:10.1007/s10459-010-9222-y

- 377 25. Redmond AC, Crosbie J, Ouvrier RA. Development and validation of a novel rating system  
378 for scoring standing foot posture: The Foot Posture Index. *Clin Biomech.* 2006;21(1):89-98.  
379 doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2005.08.002
- 380 26. Rhemtulla M, Brosseau-Liard PÉ, Savalei V. When can categorical variables be treated as  
381 continuous? A comparison of robust continuous and categorical SEM estimation methods  
382 under suboptimal conditions. *Psychol Methods.* 2012;17(3):354-373. doi:10.1037/a0029315
- 383 27. Woby SR, Roach NK, Urmston M, Watson PJ. Psychometric properties of the TSK-11: A  
384 shortened version of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia: *Pain.* 2005;117(1):137-144.  
385 doi:10.1016/j.pain.2005.05.029
- 386
- 387

388 **List of Tables**

389 **Table 1.** Demographic, injury history, and patient-reported outcome measures in  
390 individuals with chronic ankle instability

391 **Table 2.** Comparison of treatment on change in patient-reported outcome measures in  
392 individuals with chronic ankle instability

393 **Table 3.** Comparison of treatment on change in ankle-foot joint morphological and  
394 mobility outcome measures in individuals with chronic ankle instability

395 **Table 4.** Comparison of treatment on change in neuromotor and dynamic balance  
396 outcome measures in individuals with chronic ankle instability

397

398 **List of Figures**

399 **Figure 1.** CONSORT Flow Diagram.

400 **Figure 2.** Home exercise program. From Fraser JJ, Hertel J. Preinjury to postinjury  
401 disablement and recovery after a lateral ankle sprain: A case report. *Journal of Athletic Training*.  
402 2018;53(8):776-781. doi:10.4085/1062-6050-114-17. Used with permission of the publisher.

**Table 1.** Demographic, injury history, and patient-reported outcome measures in individuals with chronic ankle instability

	Participants allocated to receive sham intervention first (n=11) 4 males 7 females	Participants allocated to receive midfoot mobilization first (n=9) 4 males 5 females	
	Mean ± SD		<i>p</i>
Age (years)	21.3±6.3	20.3±1.3	.64
Height (cm)	163.8±6.9	171.7±10.4	.07
Weight (kg)	70.5±13.6	70.3±16.1	.98
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	26.3±4.8	23.7±4.0	.21
Foot Posture Index	4.6±4.2	4.2±2.9	.84
Ankle sprains (n)	6.0±7.5	4.4±2.1	.52
IdFAI	23.8±3.6	23.3±3.5	.77
Kinesiophobia (TSK-11)	23.7±5.6	21.2±6.6	.38

cm=centimeters, kg=kilograms, BMI=body mass index, IdFAI=Identification of Functional Ankle Instability, TSK=Tampa Scale Kinesiophobia

**Table 2.** Comparison of treatment on change in patient-reported outcome measures in individuals with chronic ankle instability

	Group	Baseline 1		Baseline 2		Pre to 1-week Post Change			
		Mean±SD		Mean±SD		Mean±SD	Group Effect	Order Effect	Model Fit
<u>Pain VAS (cm)</u> At Present	Sham	2.3±2.5*		0.7±0.9 <sup>†</sup>		-0.3±1.1	β: -0.3	β: 0.3	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : 0.00
	Tx	1.1±1.3 <sup>†</sup>		1.7±2.3*		-0.7±1.2	p=0.30	p=0.32	p=0.38
Worst in the Past Week	Sham	3.4±2.7*		2.5±2.5 <sup>†</sup>		-1.2±1.7	β: 0.4	β: 0.7	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : 0.00
	Tx	3.2±1.7 <sup>†</sup>		2.3±2.5*		-0.8±1.8	p=0.48	p=0.25	p=0.37
<u>PROMIS</u> Physical Health	Sham	50.1±5.9*		53.2±7.1 <sup>†</sup>		-0.2±2.3	β: 0.5	β: -0.3	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.05
	Tx	53.0±5.6 <sup>†</sup>		49.5±5.0*		0.3±5.1	p=0.73	p=0.79	p=0.91
Mental Global Health	Sham	53.5±8.9*		57.2±8.2 <sup>†</sup>		1.6±4.5	β: -1.7	β: -0.9	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.02
	Tx	58.0±7.6 <sup>†</sup>		54.8±7.9*		-0.1±5.3	p=0.31	p=0.60	p=0.43
Godin Leisure Time Activity	Sham	71.7±53.8*		85.1±55.6 <sup>†</sup>		10.7±26.6	β: -10.0	β: 3.2	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.01
	Tx	83.3±47.8 <sup>†</sup>		76.1±62.4*		1.0±20.5	p=0.22	p=0.69	p=0.45
<u>FAAM (%)</u> ADL Score	Sham	88.6±8.0*		91.9±7.8 <sup>†</sup>		-0.5±5.3	β: 2.2	β: 0.6	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.01
	Tx	89.8±5.6 <sup>†</sup>		88.0±8.8*		1.7±5.0	p=0.22	p=0.75	p=0.43
Sport Score	Sham	69.0±17.3*		76.9±19.1 <sup>†</sup>		-1.25±11.4	β: 6.8	β: 0.8	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : 0.01
	Tx	70.9±14.3 <sup>†</sup>		65.2±18.1*		5.6±15.2	p=0.14	p=0.87	p=0.32
Treatment Response	Immediate Pre-to-Post Intervention					Pre to 1-week Post Intervention			
		Mean±SD	Group Effect	Order Effect	Model Fit	Mean±SD	Group Effect	Order Effect	Model Fit
Perceived Improvement SANE (%)	Sham	5.0±10.2	<b>β: 6.8</b>	β:-0.5	<b>Adj R<sup>2</sup>: 0.17</b>	28.9±31.0	β: 6.9	β: 9.8	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.02
	Tx	43.9±26.2	<b>p&lt;0.001</b>	p=0.70	<b>p=0.02</b>	36.5±33.7	p=0.52	p=0.37	p=0.52
Global Rating of Change	Sham	-0.1±1.1	<b>β: 1.8</b>	β:-0.47	<b>Adj R<sup>2</sup>: 0.12</b>	2.1±1.8	β: -0.6	β: -0.1	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.04
	Tx	1.1±3.0	<b>p=0.01</b>	p=0.50	<b>p=0.04</b>	2.7±2.00	p=0.39	p=0.90	p=0.69
<p>VAS = visual analogue scale, PROMIS=Patient Reported Outcome Measures Information System, FAAM=Foot and Ankle Ability Measure, ADL=activities of daily living, SANE=single assessment numeric evaluation, Tx = Treatment Group</p> <p>*Received sham intervention first, <sup>†</sup>Received midfoot joint mobilization first. Bolded values depict statistical significance.</p> <p>Immediate Pre-to-Post Change in Pain VAS in the Sham (Mean±SD: 0.1±0.6) and Treatment (Mean±SD: -0.2±1.3) groups was non-significant for group ( β: -0.3, p=0.30) or order effects ( β: 0.3, p=0.30; Model fit: Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=-0.00, p=0.38 ).</p>									



**Table 3.** Comparison of treatment on change in ankle-foot joint morphological and mobility outcome measures in individuals with chronic ankle instability

Foot Morphological Measures	Group	Baseline		Immediate Pre to Post Change			Pre to 1-week Post Change			
		Baseline 1	Baseline 2	Mean±SD	Group Effect	Model Fit	Mean±SD	Group Effect	Order Effect	Model Fit
Arch Height Index (cm kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Sham	1.59±0.65 *	1.77±0.74 †	1.76±1.84	β: 0.02	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.04	1.19±2.12	β:0.59	β:0.32	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.05
	Tx	1.77±0.74 †	1.59±0.65 *	1.75±1.54	p=0.97	p=0.70	1.71±1.61	p=0.42	p=0.67	p=0.70
Foot Mobility Magnitude (cm)	Sham	0.5±0.3 *	0.4±0.1 †	0.0±0.2	β: 0.14	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : 0.05	0.0±0.2	β: 0.07	β:-0.02	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.03
	Tx	0.6±0.2 †	0.5±0.2 *	0.1±0.3	p=0.06	p=0.16	0.1±0.3	p=0.41	p=0.79	p=0.69
<b>Joint Mobility Measures</b>										
Weightbearing Dorsiflexion (cm)	Sham	11.4±3.7 *	15.5±1.3 †	0.42±0.94	β: 0.04	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.02	0.35±1.20	β: 0.08	β:-0.12	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.06
	Tx	15.0±1.6 †	11.5±4.3 *	0.44±0.56	p=0.88	p=0.51	0.42±0.78	p=0.81	p=0.74	p=0.92
Rearfoot Dorsiflexion (°)	Sham	14.6±6.1 *	19.1±5.7 †	1.0±1.9	β: 0.41	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.01	1.9±3.0	β: -1.62	β: -1.27	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.09
	Tx	19.9±4.7 †	15.5±5.4 *	1.4±1.8	p=0.51	p=0.47	0.2±2.7	p=0.09	p=0.18	p=0.08
Plantarflexion (°)	Sham	65.7±11.3 *	66.7±14.1 †	2.1±5.0	β: -1.59	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.03	<b>2.7±6.4</b>	<b>β: -4.36</b>	β: -0.65	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.10
	Tx	68.7±12.0 †	68.8±9.4 *	0.5±4.6	p=0.33	p=0.58	<b>-1.7±4.3</b>	<b>p=0.02</b>	p=0.73	p=0.07
Inversion (°)	Sham	41.0±12.6 *	38.9±6.5 †	-0.5±4.2	β:0.18	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.05	<b>4.4±8.4</b>	<b>β: -6.37</b>	<b>β:4.76</b>	<b>Adj R<sup>2</sup>:0.19</b>
	Tx	37.9±6.9 †	43.9±12.5 *	-0.1±6.5	p=0.92	p=0.17	<b>-1.6±6.1</b>	<b>p=0.01</b>	<b>p=0.05</b>	<b>p=0.01</b>
Eversion (°)	Sham	11.5±6.0 *	11.9±4.4 †	0.5±4.2	β: -0.25	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.03	0.5±4.9	β: 0.74	β: -1.70	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.02
	Tx	12.2±4.9 †	11.8±4.2 *	0.3±2.8	p=0.84	p=0.64	1.1±4.2	p=0.63	p=0.27	p=0.49
Forefoot Inversion (°)	Sham	40.1±9.8 *	37.1±7.9 †	2.3±2.1	β: -0.42	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.04	2.1±5.6	β: -0.50	β: 0.92	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.05
	Tx	39.3±14.4 †	41.0±12.2 *	1.8±3.7	p=0.67	p=0.75	1.7±5.0	p=0.78	p=0.61	p=0.85
Forefoot Eversion (°)	Sham	18.5±5.4	18.5±7.0 †	1.7±4.1	β: -0.30	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.01	-0.4±4.4	β: 0.98	β: -0.02	Adj R <sup>2</sup> =-0.04
	Tx	17.4±7.3 †	18.0±4.3 *	1.2±3.5	p=0.82	p=0.48	0.6±3.7	p=0.48	p=0.99	p=0.78
1 <sup>st</sup> Metatarsal Dorsiflexion (mm)	Sham	6.1±2.1 *	6.2±1.3 †	0.2±0.6	β: -0.24	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.01	0.2±1.1	β:-0.33	β: -0.22	Adj R <sup>2</sup> =-0.01
	Tx	6.4±1.5 †	6.6±2.4 *	-0.1±0.8	p=0.30	p=0.48	0.1±1.0	p=0.34	p=0.52	p=0.48
1 <sup>st</sup> Metatarsal Plantarflexion (mm)	Sham	7.7±1.1 *	8.33±2.1 †	0.4±1.0	β: -0.47	Adj R <sup>2</sup> =-0.24	0.1±1.7	β: 0.36	β:-0.68	Adj R <sup>2</sup> =0.01
	Tx	7.7±3.1 †	8.2±2.4 *	-0.1±1.3	p=0.23	p=0.30	0.4±1.2	p=0.47	p=0.32	p=0.32

Tx, Treatment Group; \*Received sham intervention first, †Received midfoot joint mobilization first. Bolded values depict statistical significance.

**Table 4.** Comparison of treatment on change in neuromotor and dynamic balance outcome measures in individuals with chronic ankle instability

		<u>Baseline 1</u>		<u>Baseline 2</u>		<u>Immediate Pre to Post Change</u>			<u>Pre to 1-week Post Change</u>			
		Mean±SD		Mean ±SD		Group Effect	Model Fit	Mean ±SD	Group Effect	Order Effect	Model Fit	
<u>Handheld Dynamometry (normalized)</u>												
Dorsiflexion (Nm kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Sham	2.56±0.45 *	3.18±0.70 †	-0.10±0.22	β:-0.11	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.04	0.12±0.34	β:-0.17	β:-0.01	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.02		
	Tx	3.23±0.76 †	2.25±1.16 *	-0.21±0.16	p=0.10	p=0.20	-0.05±0.31	p=0.12	p=0.94	p=0.29		
Plantarflexion (Nm kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Sham	4.13±0.95 *	5.75±1.48 †	-0.13±0.57	β:-0.11	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.05	0.23±0.98	β:0.04	β: 0.01	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.06		
	Tx	5.61±1.23 †	4.56±1.60 *	-0.23±0.56	p=0.57	p=0.83	0.27±0.86	p=0.90	p=0.98	p=0.99		
Inversion (Nm kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Sham	1.73±0.50 *	2.39±0.48 †	0.05±0.30	β:-0.05	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.05	0.16±0.33	β:-0.06	β:-0.14	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.02		
	Tx	2.33±0.47 †	2.01±0.51 *	0.01±0.25	p=0.63	p=0.89	0.09±0.25	p=0.55	p=0.17	p=0.29		
Eversion (Nm kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Sham	1.79±0.42 *	2.35±0.56 †	0.06±0.28	β:-0.03	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.02	0.11±0.29	β:0.07	β:-0.15	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.05		
	Tx	2.19±0.56 †	2.09±0.49 *	0.03±0.19	p=0.75	p=0.52	0.17±0.21	p=0.38	p=0.08	p=0.17		
Hallux Flexion (Nm kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Sham	0.66±0.25 *	0.98±0.19 †	0.04±0.12	β:-0.04	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.01	0.07±0.15	β:-0.03	β:-0.07	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.02		
	Tx	0.93±0.20 †	0.80±0.20 *	0.00±0.15	p=0.36	p=0.48	0.03±0.14	p=0.50	p=0.16	p=0.27		
Lesser Toe Flexion (Nm kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Sham	0.66±0.32 *	0.88±0.17 †	0.02±0.09	β: -0.02	Adj R <sup>2</sup> : -0.05	0.08±0.14	β:0.02	β:-0.08	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.00		
	Tx	0.82±0.23 †	0.73±0.13 *	0.01±0.15	p=0.71	p=0.83	0.09±0.19	p=0.75	p=0.16	p=0.36		
<u>Star Excursion Balance Test (normalized)</u>												
Anterior (%)	Sham	65.1±8.1 *	74.7±6.4 †	-1.5±3.6	β: 2.41	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.04	0.6±5.2	β: 2.00	β: 0.11	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.01		
	Tx	71.2±8.2 †	64.8±6.6 *	0.9±4.4	p=0.08	p=0.20	2.5±4.1	p=0.23	p=0.95	p=0.48		
Posteromedial (%)	Sham	73.3±10.2 *	85.5±11.9 †	-0.7±3.8	β: 2.22	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.04	<b>2.4±5.9</b>	<b>β: 3.88</b>	β:-2.63	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :0.10		
	Tx	79.8±10.3 †	74.6±11.7 *	1.5±3.9	p=0.09	p=0.20	<b>6.0±5.4</b>	<b>p=0.04</b>	p=0.16	p=0.06		
Posterolateral (%)	Sham	83.1±8.3 *	90.6±10.6 †	-2.1±4.2	β: 1.20	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.03	1.2±3.4	β: 1.52	β: -0.12	Adj R <sup>2</sup> :-0.03		
	Tx	88.1±11.0 †	83.4±10.2 *	0.9±3.2	p=0.35	p=0.65	2.7±5.2	p=0.30	p=0.93	p=0.57		

Tx = Treatment Group, \*Received sham intervention first, †Received midfoot joint mobilization first. Bolded values depict statistical significance.

