

1 **Title**

2 “A qualitative examination of the factors affecting the adoption of injury focused wearable
3 technologies in recreational runners”

4

5 **Author List**

6 **Aisling Lacey**. School of Health and Human Performance, Dublin City University, Dublin
7 Ireland. Insight SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics.

8 **Dr. Enda Whyte**. Centre for Injury Prevention and Performance, School of Health and
9 Human Performance, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland.

10 **Dr. Sinéad O’Keefe**. Centre for Injury Prevention and Performance, School of Health and
11 Human Performance, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland.

12 **Dr. Siobhán O’Connor**. Centre for Injury Prevention and Performance, School of Health
13 and Human Performance, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland.

14 **Prof. Kieran Moran**. School of Health and Human Performance, Dublin City University,
15 Dublin Ireland. Insight SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics.

41 2. **Introduction**

42 Wearable technologies, including mobile phones and smart watches, are devices that can
43 be worn or carried by an individual that can include measurement capabilities used to assess
44 and monitor physical activity, movement, health and well-being (1) (2). Advancements in
45 wearable technologies have made it possible for continuous, accurate and objective
46 monitoring of individuals (3). The use of wearable technologies has become increasingly
47 popular within the running community, with approximately 90% of runners using some form
48 of technology to monitor their training (4). Primarily, wearable devices in this market
49 function to collect data and provide summary reports to assist running performance (5,6,7).
50 This is achieved by the tracking of personal running data (8,9), planning of running goals
51 (10), and/or by increasing a runner's motivation to train (9,11). However, despite the high
52 incidence of running related injuries (RRIs) (12,13), and the popular use of wearable devices
53 to manage other illnesses and injuries (14,15,16), there is a dearth of research investigating
54 the perceived usefulness of injury focused wearable technologies in runners.

55 Understanding the underlying factors that drive adoption of wearable technologies is a
56 crucial step in ensuring their successful uptake (17). One such factor is the perceived
57 usefulness of a device to the user (18,19). Adapting the six-stage Translating Research into
58 Injury Prevention Practice (TRIPP) framework (20) to the current context, it is clear that
59 understanding and including the factors contributing to RRI's, while understanding the
60 perceptions and behaviours of potential users in their own sporting context is pivotal in
61 developing a useful device. Therefore, identifying the metrics perceived as important to
62 recreational runners for monitoring injury risk is a crucial step in ensuring successful injury
63 focused technology adoption.

64 Identifying runners' perceived barriers and facilitators to the use of wearable technologies
65 is also deemed essential for technology adoption (21); however, the majority of this research

66 has to date focused on *performance* insights as motivators to the use of wearable technologies
67 (21,22,23,24,25) rather than on injury. Only one study (Clermont et al., 2019) appears to have
68 examined the barriers and facilitators to the use of running technologies for reducing RRIs.
69 This topic clearly requires further investigation.

70 Previous research investigating runners' usage of wearable technologies in relation to
71 performance and injury has predominantly used questionnaires and surveys as the
72 methodological approach (8,21,22,23,24). However, to further explore runners' perceptions
73 of such topics, a qualitative study would provide more insightful and detailed understanding
74 (26,27). Therefore, the aim of this study was to conduct a qualitative examination of the
75 factors affecting the adoption of injury focused technologies in recreational runners, by (i)
76 identifying the metrics perceived as important for monitoring RRI risk, and (ii) identifying
77 the perceived barriers and facilitators to the use of injury focused technologies.

78

79 **3. Materials & Methods**

80 **3.1. Design**

81 Constructivist grounded theory was deemed an appropriate methodological choice for
82 the current study, as a theory addressing the factors affecting the adoption of injury focused
83 running technologies in recreational runners is yet to be identified. Grounded theory (GT)
84 consists of strategies for developing theories through the analysis of qualitative data (28,29).
85 It allows for the investigation of how and why people, communities or organisations
86 experience and respond to events, challenges and problematic situations (30), and elicits rich,
87 narrative accounts of this experience in order to generate an inductive theory (31).
88 Constructivist grounded theory (CGT) is similar to GT in the sense that it involves constant
89 comparative analysis and saturation; however, CGT assumes that rather than theories being
90 discovered as in GT, we construct theories through past and present experiences and

91 interactions with people, perspectives and practices (31). Constructivist grounded theory is an
92 iterative process that follows repeated cycles of data collection and analysis to allow for
93 continuous improvement, expansion and clarity of the emerging theory (32). There was a
94 need to identify both the perceived barriers and facilitators to adoption as certain factors may
95 act in a bi-directional manner, serving as both barriers and facilitators (33,34). Ethical
96 approval was granted by the local university's Ethics Committee. A semi-structured focus
97 group schedule was developed by the researchers, and followed an iterative process
98 throughout the pilot study phase (Supplementary Material A).

99

100 **3.2. Participants**

101 A purposive sample of 27 adult recreational runners were recruited from local running
102 clubs via email. The sample included 13 male and 14 female recreational runners, aged 35.0
103 years \pm 10.7 years. A recreational runner was defined as someone running at least once per
104 week, for at least 6 months (35).

105

106 **3.3. Pilot study**

107 To educate and train the primary author in efficient focus group moderation
108 techniques, and in the use of an analytical framework for analysing qualitative data for the
109 specific purposes of this study, a pilot study was conducted. Four male and five female
110 recreational runners were recruited as a convenience sample, aged 25.1 years \pm 2.2 years.
111 Four separate focus groups were facilitated by the primary author, each taking place via
112 remote video conferencing software (Zoom, version 5.7.0) and lasted 39.1 minutes \pm 5.4
113 minutes.

114

115 **3.4. Main Study Procedures**

116 Prior to taking part in a focus group, participants were required to provide informed
117 consent and complete a short pre-focus group questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to
118 gather demographic information, as well as details on participants' running habits, their usage
119 of running technologies and their experience with RRI's (Supplementary Material B). A RRI
120 was defined as any musculoskeletal pain in the lower back/lower limbs that causes a
121 restriction to or stoppage of running for at least 7 days or 3 consecutive scheduled sessions,
122 or that causes a runner to consult a healthcare professional (36). On completion of the
123 questionnaire, participants were contacted via email to arrange a suitable focus group time.
124 To encourage as much interaction as possible, the focus groups were stratified to include
125 participants of similar age, with similar running backgrounds.

126 Nine separate focus groups took place with 27 recreational runners (range= 2-4,
127 median = 3 participants per group). Focus groups were moderated by the primary author and
128 lasted 45.1 minutes \pm 11.4 minutes. Each focus group began with a brief introduction to the
129 study and the aims of the focus group were outlined (Supplementary Material A). Participants
130 were encouraged to speak freely and given the opportunity to ask questions throughout.
131 Group discussion began by each participant describing the types of running technologies they
132 use. Following this, a discussion regarding the barriers and facilitators to technology use
133 progressed, with a specific emphasis placed on injury focused running technologies.
134 Conversation then moved to discuss participants' perceived risk factors for RRIs, and the
135 metrics they deemed important to monitor for RRI risk. On the closing of the focus groups,
136 participants were given another opportunity to ask questions and to provide further comments
137 or statements that they felt may be important. A reflective and iterative approach was taken
138 with regard to focus group moderation and the content of the focus group schedule.
139 Following each focus group, its success and the success of each discussion topic were

140 considered by the research team, with any potential changes being discussed and agreed
141 upon, prior to execution.

142

143 **3.5. Data Analysis**

144 Frequencies and descriptive statistics were generated from the questionnaire
145 responses using SPSS (version 27.0; IBM Corporation). Focus groups were audio and video
146 recorded using built in software available in Zoom (version 5.7.0), and transcribed verbatim
147 by the primary author. Participants were allocated an identification number during
148 transcription to maintain anonymity and protect their confidentiality, with responses coded by
149 participant gender (e.g., male = M; female = F). The transcribed focus groups were coded by
150 the primary author using NVivo (QSR International). Constant comparative analysis was
151 conducted, initiated after transcription of the first focus group, and continued throughout the
152 data collection phase (37), and theoretical sampling continued until data saturation was
153 reached (38). A coding framework was developed and updated by the primary author
154 throughout the data collection phase, and was used in the coding of the transcribed focus
155 groups (Supplementary Material C). Braun and Clarke's (2006) methodology for thematic
156 analysis was utilised during data analysis, which involved six key features: familiarisation
157 with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and
158 naming themes, and producing the report (39). From the identified codes, core categories
159 were identified, with subsequent themes and sub-themes emerging. The Standards for
160 Reporting Qualitative Research (40) (Supplementary Material D) were adhered to.

161

162 **3.6. Trustworthiness**

163 Multiple methods of trustworthiness were undertaken to ensure the rigorous and
164 accurate presentation of findings. A critical friend approach was used to enhance the

165 analytical process (41), and to establish reliability and ensure rigour of results (42). The goal
166 of critical friends is not to reach consensus or agree on all aspects of the findings, but rather
167 ‘encourage reflexivity by challenging each other’s construction of knowledge’ (42,43). The
168 approach also gives the opportunity for researchers to explore multiple interpretations of the
169 data, reducing the effect of researcher bias (42,44). After all transcripts had been coded by
170 the primary author, a percentage of transcripts were coded by an external researcher with
171 experience in qualitative research (SOK). Taking a critical friend approach, researchers (AL
172 and SOK) met on multiple occasions to conduct a coding consistency check on the coded
173 transcripts. Codes, sub-themes, themes and core categories were critically reviewed and
174 discussed. A high level of agreement was reached, while any disagreements during the
175 analysis were discussed, with varying interpretations presented. This stage of analysis led to
176 the development of some additional codes, as well as the merging of existing codes.

177 Following this, trustworthiness was further enhanced through investigator
178 triangulation, in which the primary author met with two other members of the research team
179 (KM and EW). Similar approaches were taken to review and discuss the coded data, with any
180 disagreements discussed and appropriate changes made.

181 Additionally, in the presentation of the representative and accurate findings, multiple
182 examples and direct quotations from transcripts are provided (Supplementary Material E),
183 indicating a broad and diverse contribution from participants during focus groups, reducing
184 the chance of individual bias (45). Included quotations were agreed upon by researchers.

185

186 **4. Results**

187 Nine focus groups were conducted with 13 (48.1%) male and 14 (51.9%) female
188 recreational runners. Participants were aged 35.0 years \pm 10.7 years (range: 23-53 years).
189 Running and injury histories are detailed in Table 1. All participants were currently using, or

190 had done so in the past, at least one form of wearable technology to monitor their running,
 191 with GPS watches and mobile phones being the most popular devices [used by 55.6% (n=15)
 192 and 48.1% (n=13) of participants respectively].

193
 194 Table 1: Participant running and injury history

| Running history | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Is running your main sport? (n=27) | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Unsure</i> |
| | 63% (n=17) | 33.3% (n=9) | 3.7% (n=1) |
| How long have you been running? (n=27) | <i>Less than 3 years</i> | <i>4-5 years</i> | <i>More than 5 years</i> |
| | 14.8% (n=4) | 3.7% (n=1) | 81.5% (n=22) |
| How often do you run? (n=27) | <i>Once a week or less</i> | <i>2-3 times a week</i> | <i>4 times a week or more</i> |
| | 7.4% (n=2) | 44.4% (n=12) | 48.1% (n=13) |
| Injury history | | | |
| Have you ever had a RRI? (n=27) | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | |
| | 81.5% (n=22) | 18.5% (n=5) | |
| Thinking of your worst injury, how much training did you miss? (n=21) | <i>Less than 10 days</i> | <i>2-3 weeks</i> | <i>4 weeks or more</i> |
| | 23.8% (n=5) | 23.8% (n=5) | 52.4% (n=11) |
| How many RRI's have you had in the last year? (n=21) | <i>None</i> | <i>1 RRI</i> | <i>2 RRI's</i> |
| | 23.8% (n=5) | 33.3% (n=7) | 42.9% (n=9) |
| How important is injury prevention to you? (n=22) | <i>Moderately important</i> | <i>Very important</i> | <i>Extremely important</i> |
| | 18.2% (n=4) | 27.3% (n=6) | 54.5% (n=12) |

195 n = number of participants, RRI = running-related injury

196

197 **4.1. Metrics perceived as important for monitoring RRI risk**

198 Three core categories of risk factors were identified as important for monitoring with
 199 injury focused running technologies: overtraining, training-related risk factors, and
 200 individual-related risk factors. Within each core category, various themes and sub-themes
 201 emerged (Table 2).

202 Table 2: Running-related injury risk factors perceived as important to monitor using wearable technology devices by recreational runners

| Core categories | Themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss theme) | Sub-themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss sub-theme) |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Overtraining | Excessive loading (17* participants in 9 [#] focus groups) | High accumulative load (12 participants in 7 focus groups) |
| | | High intensity training (11 participants in 8 focus groups) |
| | | In-session fatigue (5 participants in 5 focus groups) |
| | | Less running experience (2 participants in 2 focus groups) |
| | Inadequate recovery (13 participants in 7 focus groups) | Fatigue & poor sleep (6 participants in 5 focus groups) |
| | | Poor nutrition (6 participants in 4 focus groups) |
| | | Insufficient rest days (5 participants in 4 focus groups) |
| | | High stress (1 participant in 1 focus group) |
| Training-related risk factors | Training activities (13 participants in 6 focus groups) | Concurrent training activities (12 participants in 6 focus groups) |
| | | Previous training activities (2 participants in 2 focus groups) |
| | Running technique (10 participants in 5 focus groups) | Foot strike technique (5 participants in 4 focus groups) |
| | | Bilateral asymmetry (4 participants in 3 focus groups) |
| | | Cadence (3 participants in 3 focus groups) |
| | Running environment (9 participants in 7 focus groups) | Terrain (8 participants in 7 focus groups) |
| | | Weather (1 participant in 1 focus group) |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | Footwear (8 participants in 5 focus groups) | Type of footwear (6 participants in 3 focus groups) |
| | | Infrequent changing of footwear (4 participants in 4 focus groups) |
| Individual-related risk factors | Injury status & history (11 participants in 5 focus groups) | Ongoing niggle (7 participants in 6 focus groups) |
| | | Previous injury (6 participants in 3 focus groups) |
| | Population characteristics (5 participants in 3 focus groups) | Age (4 participants in 3 focus groups) |
| | | Body mass index (3 participants in 2 focus groups) |
| | | Sub-optimal biomechanics (1 participant in 1 focus group) |
| | Psychological parameters (4 participants in 4 focus groups) | Perception of run (2 participants in 2 focus groups) |
| | | Mood (2 participants in 1 focus groups) |
| | | Psychological readiness to run (1 participant in 1 focus group) |
| | Type of runner (3 participants in 2 focus groups) | Preferred distance/event (3 participants in 2 focus groups) |

203 Note: Themes and sub-themes are presented in order of those most frequently discussed. * indicates out of 27 participants. # indicates out of 9
204 focus groups.

205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230

4.1.1. Overtraining

Excessive loading and inadequate recovery were perceived to contribute to overtraining, and increase an individual’s risk for sustaining a RRI. Participants suggested that these factors be monitored by injury focused technologies. Overall, the most common theme emerging from the discussion of risk factors for RRI’s was excessive loading. Runners perceived high accumulative loads, high intensity training, in-session fatigue, and lower runner experience to contribute to excessive loading, increasing the risk for sustaining a RRI (Table 2). One participant, for example, perceived the type and intensity of training to impact the risk of injury; F6 - *“The type of running you're doing. If you're doing interval training, long distance, sprints, or the volume of training maybe... the impact of that on your injuries”*. Another participant (M2) felt that these factors should be monitored in order to make sure *“the body is able to accumulate those miles”* and how injury focused technologies could function *“to make sure that you’re not going into a red zone”* in terms of loading. Some participants also discussed how in-session fatigue can lead to inappropriate running technique, increasing the risk of sustaining an injury - M7- *“the more tired I get and if I try and stick to a particular pace, the whole form goes out, and I would think that would lead to more injuries in that regard”*. Running experience was also discussed with some participants suggesting that less experienced runners were more at risk for sustaining an injury - M8 - *“if you're new to running, you’re far more injury prone... than if you’ve been running for several years”*. Inadequate recovery was commonly discussed as a perceived risk factor for developing RRI’s (Table 2). With the first sub-theme of fatigue and poor sleep, one participant (F8) described sleep as having a *“huge impact”* on injury risk and if they *“don't get enough sleep... your muscles just don’t repair as quick, they don't recover as quick.* Insufficient rest days taken was also perceived to increase injury risk. One participant (F3) described how many runners may be *“over running”* and *“probably are injured because*

231 *they're not actually taking rest days*", while also describing the importance of monitoring this
232 to ensure *"they're not over-doing it"*. It was also perceived by some that inadequate nutrition
233 may increase the risk of a RRI, with one participant (F11) suggesting that *"so many people*
234 *don't fuel themselves properly"* and *"so many runners don't eat enough"*, which was
235 perceived as a *"huge factor"* for injury risk.

236

237 **4.1.2. Training-related risk factors**

238 Training-related risk factors for RRI onset included: training activities, running
239 technique, running environment, and footwear (Table 2). Other training activities that runners
240 may be participating in, or have done in the past, were commonly discussed. It was perceived
241 that certain activities may either reduce or increase the likelihood of sustaining a RRI, and
242 that it is *"very important to take into account what other sports they're doing"* (M2). It was
243 suggested that current and historic participation in various sports (e.g., Gaelic football, rugby,
244 golf, track events) *"predisposed"* (M2) runners to injury. Runners' who had not participated
245 in previous sports were perceived to be less at risk for injury as they haven't *"put their body*
246 *through... [a] hard slog in another sport"* (M9). Participation in activities such as yoga,
247 strength training and swimming were perceived to reduce the likelihood of injury - M3 -
248 *"Certainly with running, I've benefited by improving my stretching, by doing yoga, and I*
249 *think that makes me less injury prone"*. These factors were perceived as important to monitor
250 using injury focused technologies. With running technique, runners suggested that foot strike
251 technique, bilateral asymmetries, and cadence may be factors that influence the onset of
252 RRI's. Although unclear as to how these factors may influence RRI risk, participants
253 perceived that they were important metrics to monitor. The terrain on which people ran was
254 commonly perceived as a potential risk factor for injury, with one participant (M2) describing
255 this metric as *"really important to take into consideration"*. Although some participants

256 suggested that running on harder terrains (such as concrete) increased the risk of sustaining a
257 RRI, there was generally a lack of consensus between participants as to which surfaces posed
258 the greatest risk. However, this theme was frequently identified as an important metric to
259 monitor. Runners also perceived their type of footwear, and how the infrequent changing of
260 footwear may be important factors in relation to RRI risk. One participant (M7) described
261 their interest in understanding “*how more injury prone you are, dependent on both the age of*
262 *the runners you use, and the different brands of runner you use*”. Some participants
263 described how they would regularly change their footwear to reduce the risk of injury, and
264 how prolonged use of a single pair of shoes can increase the risk of injury; F11 - “*I feel like*
265 *so many people don't change their runners often enough and I really think that's a huge*
266 *factor in injuries*”.

267

268 **4.1.3. Individual-related risk factors**

269 The final core category of risk factors surrounded individual-related risk factors
270 (Table 2). Participants discussed the importance of tracking the ongoing injuries and/or
271 “*niggles*” (F2) that they may have, and how monitoring these may give further insight into
272 the development or prevention of a more serious RRI. One participant (M7) queried whether
273 “*niggles*” were “*precursors to an injury*” or if they were “*just the little aches and pains that*
274 *we all get?*”. Some participants also described the impact that previous injuries may have on
275 the risk for further injuries, suggesting they should be monitored by injury focused
276 technologies. One participant (M6) described the relationship between previous injuries and
277 their current running, stating; “*the injuries I have, they're all... rugby related and contact*
278 *related, so I find the issues I have running are probably tied back to the issues that I've had*
279 *playing rugby*”. In relation to population characteristics, participants generally perceived that
280 older age increased the risk of injury and how “*when you're getting older, you're probably*

281 *going to get more injury prone”* (M8). A greater body mass index (BMI) was also perceived
282 by some to be a risk factor for injury, as *“the more you weigh... the higher your impact*
283 *forces, and I guess that that will be a straight impact... on the risk factors”* (M8). A runner’s
284 perception of a run was also perceived to be important for monitoring injury risk, as one
285 participant (F14) described; *“how hard did the run feel... were you tired before starting, tired*
286 *during, tired after”*. Mood and *“feelings”* (M10) were also discussed by some participants,
287 with the perception that they *“play a part in your training”* (M10) and should be monitored.
288 As the final sub-theme, it was perceived that the *“type of runner”* (M8) and differences in
289 preferred running distance may influence susceptibility to injury. It was suggested (M4) that
290 *“different types”* of runners *“would have different injuries”*, and that because of their
291 ‘differences’, runners *“don't have a lot in common in relation to the type of injuries that*
292 *[they’re] likely to pick up”* (M9).

293

294 **4.2. Barriers to the use of injury focused running technologies**

295 Difficulty of use and useless feedback received were identified as core categories of
296 barriers to the use of injury focused running technologies (Table 3).

297 Table 3: Core categories, themes and sub-themes of perceived barriers to the use of injury focused running technologies.

| Core categories | Themes | Sub-themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss sub-theme) | Secondary sub-themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss secondary sub-theme) | Tertiary sub-themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss tertiary sub-theme) |
|------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Difficulty of use | Application design | User input requirement (16* participants in 7 [#] focus groups) | Time consuming (>5 minutes) (13 participants in 6 focus groups) | |
| | | | High quantity of questions (>4 questions) (6 participants in 4 focus groups) | |
| | | | Repetitive/Irrelevant data required (6 participants in 3 focus groups) | |
| | | | High text input requirement (2 participants in 1 focus group) | |
| | | Data use (2 participants in 1 focus group) | Ambiguity of data use (2 participants in 1 focus group) | |
| | Device design | Attachment method (12 participants in 6 focus groups) | Uncomfortable/Irritating (8 participants in 5 focus groups) | |
| | | | Time consuming set up (3 participants in 3 focus groups) | |
| | | | Adapting/Additional clothing required (2 participants 2 focus groups) | |
| | | | Belt mechanism (5 participants in 3 focus groups) | Irritating/Uncomfortable (4 participants in 2 focus groups) |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Not secure <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | |
| | Location <i>(11 participants in 4 focus groups)</i> | Lower back/Waist <i>(8 participants in 3 focus groups)</i> | Uncomfortable/Irritating <i>(4 participants in 3 focus groups)</i> | Not secure <i>(4 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | Wrist/Arm <i>(3 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | Uncomfortable/Irritating <i>(2 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | Not secure <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> |
| | | Obvious/Noticeable to others <i>(3 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | | | |
| | | Foot/Shoe <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | Inconvenient <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | | |
| | | Chest/Torso <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | Uncomfortable/Irritating <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | Not secure <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Specifications of device <i>(9 participants in 7 focus groups)</i> | Bulky <i>(8 participants in 7 focus groups)</i> | | |
| | | | Large <i>(3 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | Technical issues (4 participants in 2 focus groups) | Frequent charging (3 participants in 2 focus groups) | |
| | | | Bluetooth connection issues (1 participant 1 focus group) | |
| | | | Broken device (1 participant in 1 focus group) | |
| | | | Unclean device (1 participant in 1 focus group) | |
| Useless feedback received | Irrelevant feedback (2 participants in 2 focus groups) | | | |
| | Too much feedback (2 participants in 2 focus groups) | | | |
| | Inaccurate feedback (1 participant in 1 focus group) | | | |
| | Feedback delivery (2 participant in 1 focus group) | Email (2 participants in 1 focus group) | | |

298 Note: Themes and sub-themes are presented in order of those most frequently discussed. * indicates out of 27 participants. # indicates out of 9
299 focus groups.

300
301

4.2.1. Application design

302 Participants discussed the potential of the application design acting as a barrier to
303 injury focused technology use, with a high demand on the user serving as a barrier. A large
304 time requirement was identified as a potential barrier to technology use, with M5 suggesting:
305 *“realistically if it’ll be any more than a couple minutes and people get bored putting in the*
306 *data”*. Participants discussed their tolerance and willingness to engage with such an
307 application, and it was identified that five minutes was deemed the maximum amount of time
308 runners were willing to spend using an application - M6 - *“five minutes probably would be*
309 *my max”*. A high quantity of questions was described as *“onerous”* (F8) therefore identifying
310 a further potential barrier. Questions deemed as irrelevant and repetitive were also described
311 as *“tedious”* by one participant (M11) and suggest a further potential barrier.

312

4.2.2. Device design

314 The second theme of barriers to the use of injury focused wearable technologies was
315 device design. Sub-themes of barriers included: attachment method, location, specifications
316 of the device, and technical issues (Table 3). Personal preference varied in relation to
317 unfavourable device attachment methods. The general consensus suggested that attachment
318 methods which would *“take too long to get in place”* (F11), required the runner to wear
319 *“some contraption”* (M8), may *“cause any discomfort or blistering”* (M10), or one that was
320 loose-fitting, *“bouncing around”* (F6) or *“going to fall off”* (F6), were potential barriers to
321 use. Differences in the preferred locations of a wearable device were evident, with some
322 describing the lower back as an undesirable location as it was perceived as uncomfortable or
323 that it may *“rub against your skin and get a bit sore”* (M8). Others suggested that wrist or
324 arm-based devices would be unsuitable as they *“get annoying after a while”* (M2). Variance
325 in the opinion made it difficult to determine any specific location as a barrier to use; however,

326 the general consensus was that locations perceived as uncomfortable, one's which resulted in
327 excessive movement of the device, or were "*very obvious*" (F11) to others would result in
328 reduced compliance, and therefore act as barriers to usage. It was frequently suggested that a
329 "*bulky*" (F9), "*chunky*" (M13) or "*heavy*" (F6) device would act as a barrier to technology
330 use, as runners perceived it may "*impact their running*" (F9) and may "*annoy [them] during*
331 *the run*" (M10). Finally, participants reported that a device with a short battery life which
332 would require frequent charging may discourage use as it can "*put me off if the battery is low*
333 *on it*" (F3).

334

335 **4.2.3. Useless feedback received**

336 It was also mentioned by some participants that irrelevant or inaccurate data, or what
337 they perceived to be "*too much*" feedback would potentially discourage their use of injury
338 focused technologies. Some participants discussed their perception that useless data wasn't
339 "*going to help [them]*" (F1) in their training or recovery from injury.

340

341 **4.3. Facilitators to the use of injury focused running technologies**

342 Finally, ease of use and receiving useful feedback were identified as core categories
343 of facilitators to the use of injury focused running technologies (Table 4).

344 Table 4: Core categories, themes and sub-themes of perceived facilitators to the use of injury focused running technologies.

| Core categories | Themes | Sub-themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss sub-theme) | Secondary sub-themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss secondary sub-theme) | Tertiary sub-themes (number of participants & focus groups to discuss tertiary sub-theme) |
|------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Ease of use | Application design (25* participants in 9# focus groups) | User-friendly system (22 participants in 9 focus groups) | Quick input session (17 participants in 9 focus groups) | |
| | | | Multiple choice questions (7 participants in 5 focus groups) | |
| | | | Synced with other applications/devices (7 participants in 5 focus groups) | |
| | | | Notification reminders (6 participants in 4 focus groups) | |
| | | | Automatic downloading of data from device (5 participants in 3 focus groups) | |
| | | Current usage habits (13 participants in 8 focus groups) | Fits with current usage habits (13 participants in 8 focus groups) | |
| | Device design (20 participants in 8 focus groups) | Location (13 participants in 8 focus groups) | Lower back/Waist (8 participants in 6 focus groups) | Convenient (7 participants 5 focus groups) |
| | | | | Discrete (2 participants 2 focus groups) |
| | | | Foot/Shoe (8 participants in 5 focus groups) | Convenient (8 participants in 5 focus groups) |
| | | | | Stable (1 participant in 1 focus group) |
| | | | Wrist/Arm (5 participants in 5 focus groups) | Convenient (5 participants in 5 focus groups) |
| | | | Chest/Torso (5 participants in 4 focus groups) | Convenient (5 participants in 4 focus groups) |
| | Ankle (2 participants in 2 focus groups) | Convenient (2 participants in 2 focus groups) | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | Discrete <i>(2 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | Thigh <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | Discrete <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | |
| | | Attachment method <i>(11 participants in 8 focus groups)</i> | | Discrete (non-specific attachment method) <i>(7 participants in 5 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | | Comfortable (non-specific attachment method) <i>(6 participants in 5 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | | Convenient (non-specific attachment method) <i>(6 participants in 5 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | | Belt mechanism <i>(5 participants in 4 focus groups)</i> | Convenient <i>(3 participants in 3 focus groups)</i> |
| | | | | | Stable <i>(2 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> |
| | | | | Clip mechanism <i>(3 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | Convenient <i>(3 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> |
| | | Specifications of device <i>(8 participants in 5 focus groups)</i> | Small <i>(5 participants in 4 focus groups)</i> | | |
| | | | Lightweight <i>(5 participants in 4 focus groups)</i> | | |
| | | Good technical features <i>(3 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | Infrequent charging of device <i>(3 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | | |
| | | | Strong Bluetooth connection <i>(1 participants in 1 focus group)</i> | | |
| Receiving useful feedback | Injury-related feedback <i>(20 participants in 7 focus groups)</i> | Reduce injury risk <i>(11 participants in 7 focus groups)</i> | | | |
| | | Monitor rehabilitation from injury <i>(10 participants in 5 focus groups)</i> | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | Understand injury mechanisms <i>(7 participants in 6 focus groups)</i> | | |
| | | Advice/Recommendations <i>(6 participants in 3 focus groups)</i> | | |
| | | Extend running career <i>(3 participants in 1 focus group)</i> | | |
| | | Comparison to other users <i>(2 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | | |
| | Enhanced data <i>(8 participants in 4 focus groups)</i> | Performance insights <i>(4 participants in 4 focus groups)</i> | Performance progressions <i>(2 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | Optimizing performance <i>(2 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | Additional data <i>(3 participants in 3 focus groups)</i> | Cadence/Stride information <i>(3 participants in 3 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | Technique <i>(2 participants in 2 focus groups)</i> | |
| | | | Power <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | |
| | | | Comparison to other users <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | |
| | | Feedback delivery <i>(2 participants in 1 focus group)</i> | Monitor recovery from training <i>(1 participant in 1 focus group)</i> | |
| | | | WhatsApp/Text <i>(2 participants in 1 focus group)</i> | |
| | | Choice of feedback delivery <i>(2 participants in 1 focus group)</i> | | |

345 Note: Themes and sub-themes are presented in order of those most frequently discussed. * indicated out of 27 participants. # indicates out of 9
346 focus groups.

347 **4.3.1. Ease of use**

348 Perceived ease of use was the first core category identified, with application design
349 and device design emerging as themes (Table 4). In relation to the application design,
350 participants suggested a “*user-friendly system*” (M2) that fitted with their current usage
351 habits would facilitate use. In particular, technologies with quick and easy input sessions,
352 multiple choice and visual-based questions would encourage use. Participants suggested that
353 a time requirement of 30 seconds to 2 minutes would be optimal and facilitate their use. The
354 ability to sync a runner’s current applications and technologies with a new device was
355 suggested by many as a facilitator. This was perceived to reduce the burden placed on users,
356 while optimizing the reception of new and useful data; M3 - “*especially if the information is*
357 *already there, maybe you can get it from Strava and tie it in*”. Participants suggested that
358 being prompted by their smartphone would enhance engagement and facilitate their use of an
359 application; F9 - “*a reminder... a notification coming up is really handy, because it's easy to*
360 *forget*”. It was suggested (M5) that data collected by a wearable device that “*updates*
361 *automatically*” would be “*great*” as reducing user demand would increase compliance; M5 -
362 “*the less that data we have to put in, the better*”. It was also commonly suggested that a
363 system and device that fitted into participants’ current technology usage habits would be
364 easily adoptable. One runner described how “*at the end of the training session or running*
365 *session, I would automatically go to my smartphone, look at the Garmin app*” (F8).

366

367 With regard to device design, the location, attachment method, and specifications of
368 the device were sub-themes of facilitators identified (Table 4). Although some locations were
369 deemed more preferable than others, there was a lack of agreement between participants on
370 the most preferable location. Participants suggested that once the location was comfortable,
371 convenient and allowed for the device to be stable, this would facilitate their use. One

372 participant (F11) described their perception of the lower back as a potential location and felt
373 that “*your shorts would hold it in place*” and “*it wouldn't be moving around too much*”.
374 Another other (M9) participant described the convenience of the foot/shoe as a potential
375 location because “*if it's on my runners... I'm much more likely to just leave it there... rather*
376 *than forget about it*”. Similar to that identified as a barrier, participants felt the attachment
377 method of a device may act as a facilitator to device use. Personal preference varied amongst
378 participants, however the overwhelming consensus suggests that a stable, comfortable,
379 discrete and convenient attachment method would facilitate device use. Participants
380 suggested that “*if it fits... properly*” (M6), and “*can be easily worn and it's not... impacting*
381 *you in any way*” (F8), and “*as long as it's not a cumbersome thing that's interfering with the*
382 *running*” (M1), they would have “*no problem wearing it*” (M1). Participants discussed the
383 favourability of a “*lightweight*” (M8) and “*unobtrusive*” (M8) device, where “*the smaller [it*
384 *was] the better*” (M10), and how this would facilitate use. Finally, it was suggested that a
385 device with a “*good battery life*” (F1) would enhance user compliance and facilitate device
386 use.

387

388 **4.3.2. Receiving useful feedback**

389 Participants discussed their willingness to engage with a device should it reduce their
390 risk of sustaining an injury and how potentially beneficial “*a device that you can put in your*
391 *back pocket that will measure when you're putting your body under a level of stress that is*
392 *likely to cause an injury*” (M1) could be. Others discussed the commonality of injury and
393 how “*everyone picks up a few niggles a year*” (F11), or how there is “*always that chance*
394 *that you're going to get injured*” (F1), and their interest in using such a device to reduce this
395 risk; “*I think we've all had our fair share of niggles and injuries that you'd rather not have*”
396 (F1). Others discussed the benefits of a device that could monitor their rehabilitation from

397 injury and potentially provide them with data to explain the mechanics of injury; “*I’m sure*
398 *often there’s obvious reasons that we don’t even notice, but sure by having an app you’d be*
399 *like ‘Oh well, I did this, and I did this and I shouldn’t have done this’*” (F11). Others
400 described their interest in a device that could provide recommendations for “*preventing the*
401 *injury developing further*” (F5), or receiving advice on “*whatever you should do*” (F5) to
402 best manage injuries. One final facilitator to encourage use of injury focused technologies
403 was enhanced data that runners could receive. Some participants described the desire for
404 additional data that may give them “*an edge*” (F2) and that could potentially “*improve*
405 *[them] as a runner*” (M2). Participants suggested that receiving data related to performance
406 progressions would facilitate their use, while some expressed their interest in receiving “*the*
407 *extra thing*” (F1) that they may not be getting with their current devices. Examples included
408 information regarding cadence, stride length, or the “*biomechanics*” (M13) of running
409 technique, while others were interested in “*reaffirming some data that I’m collecting*
410 *already*” (M13).

411

412 **5. Discussion**

413 The main objectives of the current study were to provide a qualitative examination of
414 recreational runners’ opinions on: (i) the important metrics to monitor for RRI risk, and (ii)
415 the perceived barriers and facilitators to the use of injury focused running technologies.
416 Overtraining, training-related, and individual-related risk factors are essential metrics that
417 need to be monitored for RRI risk. The most common metrics deemed important to monitor
418 were excessive loading, followed by inadequate recovery, running environment, and training
419 activities. Injury status and history, running technique, footwear, and population
420 characteristics were less commonly discussed. Difficulty of use of a device may act as a
421 barrier to the use of injury focused running technologies, while ease of use and receiving

422 useful feedback will act as facilitators. Common themes of barriers and facilitators were
423 identified, implying that many factors can act as barriers as well as facilitators (33). These are
424 important findings as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (18) and the Unified Theory
425 of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) (19) indicate that the perceived ease of use
426 and perceived usefulness of a device will influence usage behaviour and technology adoption
427 (46).

428

429 **5.1. Metrics important for monitoring RRI risk**

430 The broad range metrics perceived as important for monitoring RRI risk highlights
431 participants' awareness of the multifactorial aetiology associated with RRI's, as shown by
432 multiple systematic reviews (47,48,49,50). Overtraining, consisting of excessive loading and
433 inadequate recovery, was perceived as a leading risk factor for the development of RRI's in
434 the current study, similar to the perceptions of recreational runners in previous studies
435 (27,47,52). Also similar to the findings of Clermont and colleagues (8), the current
436 participants identified longer distances and higher intensity sessions to be important metrics
437 to monitor for excessive load, and subsequent injury risk. Inadequate recovery, which
438 included the sub-themes of fatigue and poor sleep, insufficient rest days, and poor nutrition
439 were also perceived to contribute to overtraining. Similar perceptions of the importance of
440 sleep and food intake for preventing injury have previously been reported by recreational
441 runners (8). Our findings in relation to overtraining also map to the biomechanical model of
442 injury, whereby loading of tissues beyond their adaptive capability, combined with
443 insufficient recovery, results in injury (51,53).

444

445 Participants also identified the importance of monitoring certain training-related
446 metrics for risk of RRI's. It was perceived that terrain, concurrent and previous training

447 activities, running technique and footwear should be included in injury focused technologies.
448 Terrain received significant attention as an important risk factor. While some perceived
449 harder terrains to increase the risk of injury, there was a lack of consensus as to which type of
450 terrain poses greater risks. Harder terrains with less deformation have been hypothesized to
451 result in higher impact forces, increasing the risk of injury (54,55). However, while some
452 individual studies have found harder surfaces to produce higher loading (54,56,57), other
453 studies have not (55,58). Previous systematic reviews (50,59) have not found terrain to be a
454 significant risk factor for injury. Our participants perceived that participation in other sports
455 (such as rugby, Gaelic football, golf and track events), both concurrently and in the past,
456 increased a runner's risk of RRIs. It has been suggested that additional participation in other
457 sports adds to the cumulative stress placed on the body (60); however, a recent systematic
458 review identified high quality evidence to indicate that previous sport activity is not
459 associated with increased RRI risk (50). Furthermore, a prospective study found that
460 increased weekly volume of other sport participation (i.e., concurrent training) reduced the
461 risk of RRI's (61). Running technique was also perceived as important to monitor by
462 participants. They suggested foot strike technique, cadence, and bilateral asymmetry are
463 important, although they did not describe how these factors influenced RRI risk. In a similar
464 study, certain aspects of running technique (such as joint motion, ground contact time, and
465 centre of mass motion) were actually the lowest ranked metrics by participants amongst a list
466 of factors presented to them by the authors as potentially preventing RRI's (8). Systematic
467 reviews and meta-analyses have been unable to identify strong justifications for the role of
468 specific biomechanical risk factors in the onset of RRI's (62,63). Regarding foot strike
469 technique, while it has been suggested to be causative of RRI's, based on the increased load
470 that some techniques produce [especially rear-foot strike (64,65)], a systematic review
471 concluded that there is very low evidence to suggest a relationship with RRI's in general

472 (66). In relation to increased cadence, while a systematic review found that increasing
473 cadence reduces the magnitude of key biomechanical factors (such as joint kinematics and
474 kinetics, and whole body loading) associated with RRI's (67), a recent systematic review and
475 meta-analysis concluded that average cadence does not differ between injured and uninjured
476 runners (68). Regarding bilateral asymmetry, it has been suggested as a risk factor for RRI's
477 based on the premise that because one leg is subjected to more loading, it is predisposed to
478 injury (69,70). Again the literature is contrasting, with some studies finding significant limb
479 asymmetries in injured runners both retrospectively (71) and prospectively (72) compared to
480 uninjured runners, while some studies report no differences in asymmetry (69,74). No
481 systematic review drawing an overall conclusion has been published to date. Footwear was
482 the final sub-theme of training-related metrics identified, with perceptions that older shoe age
483 increased injury risk. This perception may be associated with the theory that shoe cushioning
484 decreases loading on the body (74,75), and a decrease in cushioning capacity with extended
485 use increases the risk of RRI's (76,77). However, a recent systematic review concluded that
486 no evidence-based recommendations could be made for shoe age and preventing RRI's (78).

487

488 The final core category identified as important for monitoring RRI risk was
489 individual-related factors, including injury status and history, and population characteristics.
490 As a sub-theme of injury status and history, previous injury was only discussed in one third
491 of focus groups, despite being found to be the strongest risk factor for further RRI's in a
492 recent systematic review (50). A failure of runners to acknowledge the importance of
493 previous injury has also been reported (52). While this may reflect a sense of being 'unable to
494 change' the occurrence of having a previous injury, it clearly should be taken into account
495 when monitoring for the purpose of preventing re-injury. A second sub-theme of injury status
496 and history was ongoing 'niggles', which was mentioned more than previous injury.

497 Different from an injury, in which a runner is forced to reduce or stop training for a period of
498 time (36), our participants' perception of 'niggles' is similar to previous research where
499 runners described 'complaints' as 'small pains' which they can continue to run with (27).
500 Population characteristics, including age and BMI, were mentioned by some participants in
501 the current study. It was perceived that older age and greater BMI increased the risk of RRI;
502 however a recent systematic review found conflicting and inconsistent findings for both age
503 and BMI as a risk factor for RRI in short and long-distance runners (50).

504

505 It is also important to note that some risk factors for RRI's were not mentioned in the
506 current study, despite being shown as potential risk factors in the literature. For example, sex
507 was not mentioned but has received some attention in the literature. Although findings are
508 mixed, systematic reviews have reported males (50, 79) and females (80,81) to be at a greater
509 risk for specific RRI's. Additionally, monitoring ground reaction forces (peak and rate) as an
510 indication of how hard someone strikes the ground was not mentioned by participants in the
511 current study, but previous systematic reviews (82) and meta-analyses (62,75) have
512 investigated the relationship to RRI risk. While there are 'conflicting' (62) and 'inconsistent'
513 (Ceyssens et al., 2019) results for a relationship with *general* RRI's, high peak and rates of
514 loading have been found to contribute to the development of *specific* RRI's (74,75).

515

516 The findings of the current study both expand on the current evidence and report new
517 findings in relation to the metrics deemed important by runners for monitoring RRI risk when
518 using wearable technologies. Clearly, injury focused technologies should monitor risk factors
519 that are deemed important by runners, where evidence-based research supports their
520 relevance (e.g. excessive loading and inadequate recovery). The question for manufacturers is
521 whether to monitor risk factors that are: (i) not deemed important by runners, but research

522 does support their relevance (e.g. previous injury), or/and (ii) that are deemed important by
523 runners, but current research does not support their relevance (e.g. terrain and foot strike
524 technique). In the case of the first point, the authors would strongly advocate for including
525 factors supported by evidence-based research, with efforts made by manufacturers to educate
526 runners to why the metrics are potentially valuable. This is important in order to improve the
527 perceived usefulness of devices (18,19,20). In the case of the second point, the inclusion of
528 these metrics may be useful if they encourage technology adoption and uptake. However, this
529 must be balanced against overly complicating data capture, especially if monitoring the
530 metric requires the user to wear additional or more bulky sensors, or requires the input of
531 additional data, both of which can act as barriers to technology usage (discussed below).
532 Also, a lack of research evidence (or mixed evidence) to support a relationship between a
533 metric and an increased risk of a RRI may not indicate that the relationship does not exist, but
534 may more reflect the limitations of current research. For example, examining the relationship
535 between running impact loading and injury has been predominantly limited to a one-off
536 assessment, frequently in a laboratory environment (83). Development of an app which
537 incorporates a wearable sensor (e.g. an accelerometer) to monitor impact loading and collect
538 user input data on injury status would allow long-term and ongoing monitoring of runners in
539 their natural environment. This would provide more precise and ecologically valid data to
540 better explore whether a relationship does exist.

541

542 The above findings are not only relevant to manufacturers, they are also important to
543 coaches and clinicians in developing intervention strategies for injury prevention, where
544 uptake and adherence by runners is improved when runner perception and intervention design
545 are aligned (20). The findings also raise the question about how runners form their opinions
546 that a metric is a risk factor for RRIs, when the research evidence would suggest it is not a

547 risk factor. These perceptions may be due to available information on popular running
548 websites. For example, a low cadence (84), heel-striking (85), and harder terrains such as
549 concrete (86) have been described as risk factors for RRI's on such websites. Clearly there is
550 a need for the science community to better educate runners.

551

552 **5.2. Difficulty/Ease of use**

553 The first identified core category of both barriers and facilitators was in relation to the
554 perceived difficulty and ease of use of injury focused technologies.

555

556 **5.2.1. Device design**

557 Participants indicated that excessive device weight and size are potential barriers to
558 technology use, with unobtrusive and comfortable devices facilitating use. They also
559 suggested that the attachment method of a device could act as a potential barrier and/or
560 facilitator to use. Varied preferences existed, however the overwhelming consensus
561 suggested that if a device caused irritation or was excessively mobile on the body and
562 interfered with running, this would act as a barrier to use; while a device that was stable and
563 discrete would facilitate use. These perceptions align with previous findings for comfort
564 (87,88,89,90,91), obtrusiveness (90,91) and device aesthetics (91) in wearable technologies
565 in general.

566

567 One sub-theme which generated a large amount of discussion was where the device
568 was to be worn (wear-location); however no one location dominated as either a barrier or
569 facilitator. For example, some participants perceived the foot or shoe to be a highly suitable
570 location (a facilitator), while others perceived this location to be very unsuitable (a barrier).
571 To the best of the authors' knowledge, sensor location has not been previously investigated in

572 runners. However, it has been suggested that athletes of varying sports (e.g., volleyball) may
573 find device location to be a potential barrier to use (92). Additionally, some participants
574 suggested that they would not like a device to be noticeable or obvious to others as they
575 would not like to be seen to be self-monitoring, a finding that has not previously been
576 identified in recreational runners but has been found in relation to health based monitoring
577 with wearables (93). Therefore a device that could be worn on a variety of locations without
578 negatively impacting on the accuracy of the captured information would be advantageous.
579 Finally, a device with a short battery life was identified as a further barrier to technology use,
580 in line with previous studies on wearable devices (87,90,94).

581

582 **5.2.2. Application design**

583 Participants reported that their use of a device would be positively influenced by a
584 user-friendly system, with minimal user input requirement, in line with previous findings for
585 sport tracking technologies (92). Our participants suggested that as the time requirement and
586 manual input demand to engage with an application increased, their interest and tolerance to
587 engage would decrease. Additionally, it was found that the format of questions within an
588 application could influence compliance. Questions requiring a high amount of text input
589 would discourage engagement, whereas questions formatted visually, with a quick response-
590 time (e.g., tick-the-box) would encourage engagement. These findings have been reported in
591 previous research for users of a weight-loss application (95), and an athlete self-reported
592 measure (monitoring metrics including training, well-being, injury and nutrition) (96).

593

594 It was identified that if the use of an injury focused device could conform with
595 participants' current usage habits, it would also facilitate use. Similarly, easily integrating
596 new technologies with existing routines, and the absence of a need for behavioural change

597 has been reported as means of enhancing technology adoption (97,98). Compatibility
598 between participants' current wearable devices and/or monitoring applications and a new
599 injury focused device was also identified as a facilitator. Our participants perceived that this
600 would reduce the manual input demand on the user, and result in more accurate and useful
601 information; factors which have been found to enhance wearable technology use
602 (25,87,89,96,98). This is important as minimising burden and maximising interest in users
603 leads to improved initial and sustained device compliance (96).

604

605 **5.3. Receiving useful feedback**

606 One final core category of facilitators identified was receiving useful feedback.
607 Receiving relevant, useful and accurate data regarding RRI risk was identified as a facilitator,
608 with participants describing their desire for feedback that could reduce their injury risk,
609 monitor their rehabilitation from injury, and help them understand the mechanisms of injury.
610 It is well understood that maintaining user interest (94,99) and receiving useful and accurate
611 data (89,98) can facilitate the use of wearable technologies; while the collection and reporting
612 of inaccurate data and useless information have been suggested as barriers to use of physical
613 activity tracking technologies (25,87,88,89,90,92). In line with the TRIPP model for
614 enhancing injury prevention practices (20), and considering the TAM (18) and UTAUT (19)
615 models for predicting technology usage, runners are more likely to use technologies if they
616 provide runners with an understanding of the mechanisms of injury, and prove to be useful in
617 preventing injury. Additionally, some participants suggested that receiving enhanced data,
618 specifically related to running performance, beyond what they are currently collecting would
619 facilitate their use of injury focused technologies. In the interest of developing a useful injury
620 focused device, these findings are particularly beneficial as they may help to improve
621 perceived usefulness, and ultimately adoption and usage behaviour.

622 **6. Strengths and Limitations**

623 The current study provides a qualitative informative insight into the factors affecting
624 the adoption of injury focused technologies in recreational runners. A representative sample
625 was included, gathering the perceptions of runners of various ages and running backgrounds.
626 Constant comparative analysis throughout the data collection phase, prior to data saturation,
627 highlights another strength. Furthermore, during data analysis, the involvement of multiple
628 coders with different research and lifestyle backgrounds reduced the impact of potential
629 researcher biases on the interpretation of findings, enhancing the credibility of results.

630 Although all participants in the current study had used at least one form of wearable
631 technology to monitor their running, bringing valuable experiences in the formation of
632 opinions; the authors believe that the thoughts and opinions of non-users, and those who
633 stopped using wearable technologies are equally as valuable, and should be included in
634 further research. Participants were recruited from Irish running clubs, and therefore findings
635 may not accurately represent the opinions of the global population of recreational runners.
636 The current study did not stratify participants into ‘type of runner’ (e.g., casual, social or
637 competitive) as in previous studies of recreational runners (8,21). Variance in opinion may
638 potentially exist between types of recreational runner, and to examine this could yield further
639 insights into the means of enhancing compliance. Finally, there was potential scope for
640 additional probing during the data collection phase, with some topics requiring further
641 exploration and explanation. This may potentially yield further information; an observation
642 that should be considered by future researchers.

643

644 **7. Conclusion**

645 Overtraining, training-related, and individual-related risk factors are essential metrics
646 that need to be monitored using wearable technologies for RRI risk. Some of the metrics

647 valued by participants are supported by scientific evidence (e.g., excessive loading and
648 inadequate recovery); however, they also identified factors that are not clearly supported by
649 scientific evidence (e.g., terrain and foot strike technique), and placed less importance on
650 some factors that are more strongly supported by scientific evidence (e.g., previous injury).
651 Technology developers should include metrics deemed important by runners, once there is
652 supporting evidence-based research. Manufacturers should consider the impact of the
653 inclusion of any additional metrics (i.e., those perceived as useful but not supported by
654 evidence, and those supported by evidence but not perceived as useful) and their effect on
655 sensor wearability and excessive user input requirement. Difficulty of use of a device will act
656 as a barrier to the use of injury focused running technologies, while ease of use and receiving
657 useful feedback will act as facilitators. To further enhance user compliance, the authors
658 suggest technology developers manufacture an unobtrusive, discrete and comfortable device,
659 designed with a user-friendly system. Findings suggest that if individual users could dictate
660 device location and attachment method, without affecting the accuracy of the technology to
661 monitor risk of injury, this would address these barriers. Preference was given to devices that
662 would also provide runners with information on reducing their individual injury risk, monitor
663 rehabilitation from injury, and provide insight into the mechanisms of injury. Overall, there is
664 a clear willingness from recreational runners to adopt an injury focused wearable device
665 whilst running.

666

667

668

669 **8. Acknowledgements**

670 The authors would like to thank the focus groups participants for their participation.

671 This publication has emanated from research supported by Science Foundation Ireland (SFI)

672 under Grant Number SFI/12/RC/2289_P2, co-founded by the European Regional

673 Development Fund.

674

675 **9. Author Contributions**

676 Conceptualization: AL, EW, KM

677 Data curation: AL, EW, KM

678 Formal analysis: AL, EW, SOK, KM

679 Funding acquisition: KM

680 Investigation: AL

681 Methodology: AL, EW, SOK, KM

682 Supervision: EW, KM

683 Visualisation: AL, EW, SOK, SOC, KM

684 Writing - original draft: AL, EW, KM

685 Writing - review & editing: AL, EW, SOK, SOC, KM

686 **10. References**

687

688 1. Patel S, Park H, Bonato P, Chan L, Rodgers M. A review of wearable sensors
689 and systems with application in rehabilitation. *Journal of Neuroengineering*
690 and Rehabilitation. 2012; 9(21).

691

692 2. Bunn JA, Navalta JW, Fountaine CJ, Reece JD. Current State of Commercial
693 Wearable Technology in Physical Activity Monitoring 2015-2017.
694 *International Journal of Exercise Science*. 2018; 11(7):503-15.

695

696 3. Malasinghe LP, Ramzan N, Dahal K. Remote patient monitoring: a
697 comprehensive study. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized*
698 *Computing*. 2019; 10(1):57-76.

699

700 4. De Jong AF, Fish PN, Hertel J. Running behaviors, motivations, and injury
701 risk during the COVID-19 pandemic: A survey of 1147 runners. *PLoS ONE*.
702 2021; 16(2):e0246300.

703

704 5. Giraldo-Pedroza,A, Chiu-Chun Lee W, Lam,WK, Coman R, Alici G. Effects
705 of Wearable Devices with Biofeedback on Biomechanical Performance of
706 Running - A Systematic Review. *Sensors*. 2020; 20(22):6637.

707

708 6. Moore IS, Willy RW. Use of Wearables: Tracking and Retraining in
709 Endurance Runners. *Current Sports Medicine Reports*. 2019; 18(12):437-44.

710

- 711 7. Jensen MM, Mueller F. Running with technology: Where are we heading? In:
712 Proceedings of the 26th Australian Computer-Human Interaction Conference
713 on Designing Futures: The Future of Design. 2014; Sydney, New South
714 Wales, Australia, December 2014. p. 527-30. Available at:
715 <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2686612.2686696>.
716
- 717 8. Clermont CA, Duffett-Leger L, Hettinga BA, Ferber R. Runners' Perspectives
718 on 'Smart' Wearable Technology and Its Use for Preventing Injury.
719 International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction. 2019; 36(1):31-40.
720
- 721 9. Wiesner M, Zowalla R, Suleder J, Westers M, Pobiruchin M. Technology
722 Adoption, Motivation Aspects, and Privacy Concerns of Wearables in the
723 German Running Community: Field Study. JMIR Mhealth and Uhealth. 2018;
724 6(12):e201.
725
- 726 10. Karahanoglu A, Gouveia R, Reenalda J, Ludden G. How Are Sports-Trackers
727 Used by Runners? Running-Related Data, Personal Goals, and Self-Tracking
728 in Running. Sensors. 2021; 21(11):3687.
729
- 730 11. Menheere D, Lallemand C, van der Spek E, Megens C, Vande Moere A, Funk
731 M, Vos S. The Runner's Journey: Identifying Design Opportunities for
732 Running Motivation Technology. In: Proceedings of the 11th Nordic
733 Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Shaping Society. 2020; New
734 York, NY, USA. p. 1-14.
735

- 736 12. Kakouris N, Yener N, Fong, DTP. A systematic review of running-related
737 musculoskeletal injuries in runners. *Journal of Sport and Health Science*. 2021
738
- 739 13. Desai P, Jungmalm J, Borjesson M, Karlsson J, Grau S. Recreational Runners
740 With a History of Injury Are Twice as Likely to Sustain a Running-Related
741 Injury as Runners With No History of Injury: A 1-Year Prospective Cohort
742 Study. *The Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy*. 2021;
743 51(3):144-50.
744
- 745 14. Celik Y, Stuart S, Woo WL, Godfrey A. Gait analysis in neurological
746 populations: Progression in the use of wearables. *Medical Engineering and*
747 *Physics*. 2021; 87:9-29.
748
- 749 15. Jalloul N. Wearable sensors for the monitoring of movement disorders.
750 *Biomedical Journal*. 2018; 41:249-53.
751
- 752 16. Papi E, Isei-Kuffour D, Chen YMA, McGregor AH. Use of wearable
753 technology for performance assessment: A validation study. *Medical*
754 *Engineering & Physics*. 2015; 37(7):698-704.
755
- 756 17. Kalantari M. Consumers' adoption of wearable technologies: literature review,
757 synthesis, and future research agenda. *International Journal of Technology*
758 *Marketing*. 2017; 12(3):274-307.
759

- 760 18. Davis FD. Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance
761 of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*. 1989; 13(3):319-40.
762
- 763 19. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User Acceptance of
764 Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Quarterly*. 2003;
765 27(3):425-78.
766
- 767 20. Finch C. A new framework for research leading to sports injury prevention.
768 *Journal of science and medicine in sport*. 2006; 9(1-2):3-9.
769
- 770 21. Janssen M, Walravens R, Thibaut E, Scheerder J, Brombacher A, Vos S.
771 Understanding Different Types of Recreational Runners and How They Use
772 Running-Related Technology. *International Journal of Environmental
773 Research and Public Health*. 2020; 17(7):2276.
774
- 775 22. Feng Y, Agosto DE. From health to performance: Amateur runners' personal
776 health information management with activity tracking technology. *Aslib
777 Journal Information Management*. 2019; 71(2).
778
- 779 23. Stragier J, Vanden Abeele M, De Marez L. Recreational athletes' running
780 motivations as predictors of their use of online fitness community features.
781 *Behaviour & Information Technology*. 2018; 37(8):815-27.
782
- 783 24. Pobiruchin M, Suleder J, Zowalla R, Wiesner M. Accuracy and Adoption of
784 Wearable Technology Used by Active Citizens: A Marathon Event Field
Study. *JMIR Mhealth and Uhealth*. 2017; 5(2):e24.

785

786

25. Vos S, Janssen M, Goudsmit J, Lauwerijssen C, Brombacher A. From Problem to Solution: Developing a Personalised Smartphone Application for Recreational Runners following a Three-step Design Approach. *Procedia Engineering*. 2016; 147:799-805.

790

791

26. Verhagen E, Bolling C. We are to ask new questions. Are we also brave enough to change our approaches. *Translational Sports Medicine*. 2018; 1(1):54-5.

792

793

794

795

27. Verhagen E, Warsen M, Bolling CS. “I JUST WANT TO RUN”: how recreational runners perceive and deal with injuries. *BJM Open Sport and Medicine*. 2021; 7(3):e001117.

796

797

798

799

28. Glaser B, Strauss A. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press; 1967.

800

801

802

29. Charmaz K. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage; 2017

803

804

805

30. Holt NL. Doing grounded theory in sport and exercise. In: Smith B, Sparkes AC, editors. *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*, London (GB): Routledge; 2016. p. 46-58.

806

807

808

- 809 31. Gill MJ. How can I study who you are? Comparing grounded theory and
810 phenomenology as methodological approaches to identity work research. The
811 Oxford Handbook of Identities in Organisations. 2020; 295-310.
812
- 813 32. Kennedy TJT, Lingard LA. Making sense of grounded theory in medical
814 education. Medical Education. 2006; 40(2): 101-8.
815
- 816 33. Busetto L, Luijkx K, Calciolari S, González Ortiz LG, Vrijhoef HJM. Barriers
817 and facilitators to workforce changes in integrated care. International Journal
818 of Integrated Care. 2018; 18(2):17.
819
- 820 34. Goswami SP., Mathews S, Rao A, Kasturi VJ. Factors of recovery as barriers
821 and facilitators: Two sides of the same coin. International Journal of Mind,
822 Brain and Cognition. 2019; 10(1-2).
823
- 824 35. Mulvad B, Nielsen RO, Lind M, Ramskov D. Diagnoses and time to recovery
825 among injured recreational runners in the RUN CLEVER trial. PloS One.
826 2018; 13(10):p.e0204742.
827
- 828 36. Yamato TP, Saragiotto BT, Dias Lopes A. A consensus definition of running-
829 related injury in recreational runners: A modified Delphi approach. Journal of
830 Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy. 2015; 45(5):375-80.
831
- 832 37. Boeije H. A Purposeful Approach to the Constant Comparative Method in the
833 Analysis of Qualitative Interviews. Quality & Quantity. 2002; 36:391-409.

834

835 38. Aldiabat KM, Le Navenec CL. Data Saturation: The Mysterious Step in
836 Grounded Theory Methodology. *The Qualitative Report*. 2018; 23(1):245-61.

837

838 39. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*
839 *research in psychology*. 2006; 3(2):77-101.

840

841 40. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standard for
842 reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Academic*
843 *Medicine*. 2014; 89(9):1251-54.

844

845 41. McGannon KR, Smith B, Kendellen K, Gonsalves CA. Qualitative research in
846 six sport and exercise psychology journals between 2010 and 2017: An
847 updated and expanded review of trends and interpretations. *International*
848 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. 2021;19(3):359-79.

849

850 42. Smith B, McGannon KR. Developing rigor in qualitative research: problems
851 and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review*
852 *of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. 2018; 11(1):101-21.

853

854 43. Cowan D, Taylor IM. 'I'm proud of what I achieved; I'm also ashamed of what
855 I done': a soccer coach's tale of sport, status, and criminal behaviour.
856 *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*. 2016; 8(5):505-18.

857

- 858 44. Sparkes AC, Smith B. Qualitative research methods on sport, exercise and
859 health: From process to product. London: Routledge; 2014.
860
- 861 45. Tracy SJ. Qualitative Quality: Eight “Big-Tent” Criteria for Excellent
862 Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 2010; 16(10):837-51.
863
- 864 46. Kim T, Chiu W. Consumer acceptance of sports wearable technology: the role
865 of technology readiness. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and*
866 *Sponsorship*. 2018; 20(1).
867
- 868 47. Saragiotto BT, Yamato TP, Junior LCH, Rainbow MJ, Davis IS, Dias Lopes
869 A. What are the main risk factors for running-related injuries? *Sports*
870 *medicine*. 2014; 44(8):1153-63.
871
- 872 48. Gijon-Nogueron G, Fernandez-Villarejo M. Risk factors and protective factors
873 for lower-extremity running injuries. *Journal of the American Podiatric*
874 *Medical Association*. 2015; 105(6):532-40.
875
- 876 49. Hulme A, Nielsen RO, Timpka T, Verhagen E, Finch C. Risk and protective
877 factors for middle-and-long-distance running-related injury. *Sports Medicine*.
878 2017; 47(5):869-86.
879
- 880 50. Van Poppel D, van der Worp M, Slabbekoorn A, van der Heuvel SSP, van
881 Middelkop M, Koes BW, Verhagen AP, Scholten-Peeters GGM. Risk factors

- 882 for overuse injuries in short-and-long-distance running: A systematic review.
883 Journal of sport and health science. 2021; 10(1):14-28.
884
- 885 51. Hreljac A. Etiology, prevention, and early intervention of overuse injuries in
886 runners: a biomechanical perspective. Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
887 Clinics. 2005; 16(3):651-67.
888
- 889 52. Saragiotto BT, Yamato TP, Dias Lopes A. What do recreational runners think
890 about risk factors for injury? A descriptive study of their beliefs and opinions.
891 Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy. 2014; 44(10):733-8.
892
- 893 53. Bertelsen ML, Hulme A, Petersen J, Brunf RK, Sørensen H, Finch CF, Parner
894 ET, Nielsen RO. A framework for the etiology of running-related injuries.
895 Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports. 2017; 27(11):1170-80.
896
- 897 54. Tessutti V, Ribeiro AP, Trombini-Souza F, Sacco ICN. Attenuation of foot
898 pressure during running on four difference surfaces: Asphalt, concrete, rubber,
899 and natural grass. Journal of Sport Sciences. 2012; 30(14):1545-50.
900
- 901 55. Van der Worp MP, De Wijer A, van Cingel R, Verbeek ALM, Nijhuis-van der
902 Sanden MWG, Stall JB. The 5- or 10-km Marikenloop Run: A prospective
903 study of the etiology of running-related injuries in women. Journal of
904 Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy. 2016; 46(6):462-70.
905

- 906 56. Dixon SJ, Collop AC, Batt ME. Surface effects on ground reaction forces and
907 lower extremity kinematics in running. *Medicine and Science in Sports and*
908 *Exercise*. 2002; 32(11):1919-26.
- 909
- 910 57. Wang L, Hong Y, Li JX, Zhou JH. Comparison of plantar loads during
911 running on different overground surfaces. *Research in Sports Medicine*. 2012;
912 20(2):75-85.
- 913
- 914 58. Taunton J, Ryan M, Clement D, McKenzie D, Lloyd-Smith D, Zumbo B. A
915 prospective study of running injuries: the Vancouver Sun Run "In Training"
916 clinics. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2003; 37(3):239-44.
- 917
- 918 59. Van Gent RN, Siem M, van Middelkoop M, van Os AG, Bierma-Zienstra
919 SMA, Koes BW. Incidence and determinants of lower extremity running
920 injuries in long distance runners: a systematic review. *British Journal of Sports*
921 *Medicine*. 2007; 41(8):469-80.
- 922
- 923 60. Satterthwaite P, Norton R, Larmer P, Robinson E. Risk factors for injuries and
924 other health problems sustained in a marathon. *British Journal of Sports*
925 *Medicine*. 1999; 33:22-6.
- 926
- 927 61. Malisoux L, Ramesh J, Mann R, Seil R, Urhausen A, Theisen D. Can parallel
928 use of different running shoes decrease running-related injury risk?
929 *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*. 2015; 25(1):110-5.
- 930

- 931 62. Vannatta CN, Heinert BL, Kernozek TW. Biomechanical risk factors for
932 running-related injury differ by sample population: A systematic review and
933 meta-analysis. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 2020; 75:104991.
934
- 935 63. Ceyskens L, Vaneldereren R, Barton C, Malliaras P, Dingenen B.
936 Biomechanical Risk Factors Associated with Running-Related Injuries: A
937 Systematic Review. *Sports Medicine*. 2019; 49(7):1095-115.
938
- 939 64. Daoud AI, Geissler GJ, Wang F, Saretsky J, Daoud YA, Lieberman DE. Foot
940 strike and injury rates in endurance runners: a retrospective study. *Medicine
941 and Science in Sports and Exercise*. 2012; 44(7):1325-34.
942
- 943 65. Goss DL, Gross MT. Relationships among self-reported shoe type, footstrike
944 pattern, and injury incidence. *US Army Medical Department Journal*. 2012;
945 25-30.
946
- 947 66. Burke A, Dillon S, O'Connor S, Whyte E, Gore S, Moran KA. Risk Factors
948 for Injuries in Runners: A Systematic Review of Foot Strike Technique and Its
949 Classification at Impact. *The Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2021;
950 9(9).
951
- 952 67. Schubert AG, Kempf J, Heiderscheid BC. Influence of stride frequency and
953 length on running mechanics: A systematic review. *Sports Health*. 2014;
954 6(3):210-7.
955

- 956 68. Brindle RA, Taylor JB, Rajek C, Weisbrod A, Ford KR. Association between
957 temporal spatial parameters and overuse injury history in runners: A
958 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine*. 2020; 50(2):331-42.
959
- 960 69. Zifchock RA, Davis I, Higginson J, McCaw S, Royer T. Side-to-side
961 differences in overuse running injury susceptibility: A retrospective study.
962 *Human Movement Science*. 2008; 27(6):888-902.
963
- 964 70. Furlong LAM, Egginton NL. Kinetic asymmetry during running at preferred
965 and nonpreferred speeds. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*. 2018;
966 50(6):1241-8.
967
- 968 71. Robadey J, Staudenmann D, Schween R, Gehring D, Gollhofer A, Taube W.
969 Lower between-limb asymmetry during running on treadmill compared to
970 overground in subjects with laterally pronounced knee osteoarthritis. *PLoS*
971 *One*. 2018; 13(10):e0205191.
972
- 973 72. Bredeweg SW, Buist I, Kluitenberg B. Differences in kinetic asymmetry
974 between injured and noninjured novice runners: A prospective cohort study.
975 *Gait & Posture*. 2013; 38(4):847-52.
976
- 977 73. Zifchock RA, Davis I, Hamill J. Kinetic asymmetry in female runners with
978 and without retrospective tibial stress fractures. *Journal of Biomechanics*.
979 2006; 39(15):2792-7.
980

- 981 74. Davis IS, Bowser BJ, Mullineaux DR. Greater vertical impact loading in
982 female runners with medically diagnosed injuries: a prospective investigation.
983 British Journal of Sports Medicine. 2016; 50(14):887-92.
984
- 985 75. Van der Worp H, Vrielink JW, Bredeweg SW. Do runners who suffer injuries
986 have higher vertical ground reaction forces than those who remain injury-free?
987 A systematic review and meta-analysis. British Journal of Sports Medicine.
988 2016; 50(8):450-7.
989
- 990 76. Baltich J, Maurer C, Nigg BM. Increased vertical impact forces and altered
991 running mechanics with softer midsole shoes. PLoS One. 2015;
992 10(4):e0125196.
993
- 994 77. Nigg BM, Baltich J, Maurer C, Federolf P. Shoe midsole hardness, sex and
995 age effects on lower extremity kinematics during running. Journal of
996 Biomechanics. 2012; 45(9):1692-7.
997
- 998 78. Malisoux L, Delattre N, Urhausen A, Theisen D. Shoe cushioning influences
999 the running injury risk according to body mass: a randomized controlled trial
1000 involving 848 recreational runners. *The American journal of sports medicine*.
1001 2020; 48(2):473-80.
1002
- 1003 79. Van der Worp MP, Ten Haaf DS, van Cingel R, de Wijer A, Nijhuis-van der
1004 Sanden MW, Staal JB. Injuries in runners; a systematic review on risk factors
1005 and sex differences. PloS One. 2015; 10(2):e0114937.

1006

1007

80. Dempster J, Dutheil F, Ugbohue UC. The Prevalence of Lower Extremity

1008

Injuries in Running and Associated Risk Factors. *Physical Activity and*

1009

Health. 2021; 5(1):133-45.

1010

1011

81. Messier SP, Martin DF, Mihalko SL, Ip E, DeVita P, Cannon DW, Love M,

1012

Beringer D, Saldana S, Fellin RE, Seay JF. A 2-year prospective cohort study

1013

of overuse running injuries: the runners and injury longitudinal study. *The*

1014

American journal of sports medicine. 2018; 46(9):2211-21.

1015

1016

82. Zadpoor AA, Nikooyan AA. The relationship between lower-extremity stress

1017

fractures and the ground reaction force: a systematic review. *Clinical*

1018

Biomechanics. 2011; 26(1):23-8.

1019

1020

83. Kiernan D, Hawkins DA, Manoukian M, McKallip M, Oelsner L, Caskey CF,

1021

Coolbaugh CL. Accelerometer-based prediction of running injury in National

1022

Collegiate Athletic Association track athletes. *Journal of biomechanics*. 2018;

1023

73:201–9.

1024

1025

84. Runkeeper. How to Prevent Injury by Improving Your Running Cadence;

1026

[update 2021; cited 28 January 2022]. Available from:

1027

<https://runkeeper.com/cms/health/how-to-prevent-injury-by-improving-your->

1028

[running-cadence/](https://runkeeper.com/cms/health/how-to-prevent-injury-by-improving-your-running-cadence/)

1029

- 1030 85. Runner's World. Injured? Could your foot strike be to blame? [updated 2018;
1031 cited 28 January 2022]. Available from:
1032 <https://www.runnersworld.com/uk/health/injury/a776362/injury-foot-strike/>
1033
- 1034 86. Runner's World. What is the best surface to run on to avoid getting
1035 injured?[updated 2015; cited 28 January 2022]. Available from:
1036 [https://www.runnersworld.com/uk/health/injury/a760152/top-10-running-](https://www.runnersworld.com/uk/health/injury/a760152/top-10-running-surfaces/)
1037 [surfaces/](https://www.runnersworld.com/uk/health/injury/a760152/top-10-running-surfaces/)
1038
- 1039 87. Kononova A, Li L, Kamp K, Bowen M, Rikard RV, Cotton S, Peng W. The
1040 use of wearable activity among older adults: focus group study of tracker
1041 perceptions, motivators, and barriers in the maintenance stage of behaviour
1042 change. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2019; 7(4):e9832.
1043
- 1044 88. Hermsen S, Moons J, Kerkhof P, Wiekens C, De Groot M. Determinants for
1045 Sustained Use of an Activity Tracker: Observational Study. *JMIR mHealth*
1046 and *uHealth*. 2017; 5(10):e164.
1047
- 1048 89. Kuru A. Exploring experience of runners with sports tracking technology.
1049 *International Journal of Human-Computer Technology*. 2016; 32(11):847-60.
1050
- 1051 90. Lazar A, Koehler C, Tanenbaum J, Nguyen DH. Why We Use and Abandon
1052 Smart Devices. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint*
1053 *Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing*. p. 635-646.
1054

- 1055 91. Shih PC, Han K, Poole ES, Rosson MB, Carroll JM. Use and adoption
1056 challenges of wearable activity trackers. In: IConference 2015 Proceedings.
1057
- 1058 92. Luczak T, Burch R, Lewis E, Chander H, Ball J. State-of-the-art review of
1059 athletic wearable technology: What 113 strength and conditioning coaches and
1060 athletic trainers from the USA said about technology in sports. International
1061 Journal of Sports Science & Coaching. 2020; 15(1):26-40.
1062
- 1063 93. Bergmann JHM, McGregor AH. Body-worn sensor design: what do patients
1064 and clinicians want?. Annals of biomedical engineering. 2011; 39(9):2299-312
1065
- 1066 94. Kinney DA, Nabors LA, Merianos AL Vidourek RA. College student use and
1067 perceptions of wearable fitness trackers. American Journal of Health
1068 Education. 2019; 50(5):298-307.
1069
- 1070 95. Alnasser A, Kyle J, Aloumi N, Al-Khalifa A, Marais D. The Twazon Arabic
1071 Weight Loss App: App-Based Intervention for Saudi Women Obesity. JMIR
1072 mHealth and uHealth. 2019; 7(5):e10923.
1073
- 1074 96. Saw AE, Main LC, Gastin PB. Impact of Sport Context and Support on the
1075 Use of a Self-Report Measure for Athlete Monitoring. Journal of Sports
1076 Science & Medicine. 2015; 14(4):732-9.
1077
- 1078 97. Rogers EM. Diffusion of innovations. London: Simon & Schuster
1079 International. 2003

1080

1081 98. Canhoto AI, Arp S. Exploring the factors that support adoption and sustained
1082 use of health and fitness wearables. *Journal of Marketing Management*. 2017;
1083 33(1-2):32-60.

1084

1085 99. Bardus M, Borgi C, El-Harakeh M, Gherbal T, Kharroubi S, Fares EJ.
1086 Exploring the Use of Mobile and Wearable Technology among University
1087 Student Athletes in Lebanon: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Sensors*. 2021;
1088 21(13):4472.

1089