

1 Title:

2 Biomechanical Risk Factors for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury in Young Female

3 Basketball Players: A pilot Study

4

5 Abstract:

6 Objectives: This study was aimed to reveal the differences in knee valgus angle at landing as a

7 static indicator and wobbling movement of the knee during landing as a dynamic indicator

8 between ACL injury and uninjured athletes.

9 Methods: This study was case-control study. There were 6 female basketball players with

10 ACL injuries and 38 female basketball players without them, whose knee kinematics were

11 measured using 2-dimensional video cameras during single-leg jump landings. The task was

12 performed from 30cm-box. Knee kinematics and wobbling of the knee which was calculated

13 by relative frontal motion to the flexion movement were compared between knees with ACL-

14 injured and uninjured.

15 Results: Six athletes who had confirmed ACL injuries, did not demonstrate significantly

16 different knee valgus angle at initial contact and maximum knee flexion during landing,

17 compared to 38 uninjured athletes. The knee valgus angles at initial contact for injured and

18 uninjured athletes were 12.3° and 14.8° ($p = 0.15$), respectively. Five of six anterior cruciate
19 ligament injured knees presented knee wobbling during landing. Relative frontal motion at
20 18° knee flexion was significantly greater in athletes with ACL-injured ($p = 0.02$).

21 Conclusions: 84% of ACL injury presented with the knee wobbling and the frontal knee
22 motion was greater with low knee flexion during knee wobbling, while the knee valgus angle
23 was not significantly different. This study suggests that knee wobbling may be a
24 biomechanical and dynamic risk factor for ACL injury in female basketball players.

25

26 Key Terms: anterior cruciate ligament injury, knee, biomechanics, female athlete, basketball

27

28 **Summary Box**

29 What is already known on this topic – summarise the state of scientific knowledge on this
30 subject before you did your study and why this study needed to be done

31 Biomechanical risk factor for ACL injury was revealed as dynamic knee valgus and low knee
32 flexion which increases ACL strain. However, previous study focused only static index which
33 are knee angle at initial contact or maximum. This study aimed to establish new dynamic
34 index for screening of ACL injury.

35 What this study adds – summarise what we now know as a result of this study that we did not

36 know before

37 Although a previous study identified knee valgus angle and knee valgus moment as predictors

38 of ACL injury, many athletes who demonstrates knee valgus motion does not suffer ACL

39 injury. Cadaveric studies show that ACL strain did not increase when knee valgus occurred

40 with slowed knee flexion movement. We identified an abnormal knee movement involving

41 the dynamic knee valgus with low knee flexion, which we call “knee wobbling.”

42 How this study might affect research, practice or policy – summarise the implications of this

43 study

44 ACL injury has been difficult to predict; however, we found that knee wobbling, which is new

45 parameter of abnormal knee movement, including rapid knee valgus/varus, is a potential

46 predictor of ACL injury.

47

48

49 INTRODUCTION

50 Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injury is a severe sports injury¹. Annually,
51 250,000 cases of ACL injury are reported in the United States² alone. The medical cost for
52 one case is approximately \$17,000³. Nationwide, the cost of reconstructive surgery and
53 rehabilitation for treatment of ACL injuries represents an economic loss of approximately
54 \$4.2 billion annually. The incidence of ACL injury is especially higher among female
55 adolescents⁴. Female athletes frequently suffer ACL injuries in noncontact situations that are
56 typically caused by an external load upon the knee joint during a landing, slowing, or
57 pivoting^{5,6}. Despite efforts at prevention internationally, the incidence of ACL injury in female
58 athletes has not decreased⁷. There is still no consensus on why the incidence of ACL injury
59 among female athletes is so high, although gender differences, including anatomical,
60 hormonal, and neuromuscular factors are thought to affect the incidence of ACL injury⁸.
61 There is no incontrovertible evidence showing that anatomical or hormonal factors directly or
62 indirectly lead to incidence of ACL injury. Only neuromuscular factors are modifiable as
63 preventative methods, which led researchers to screen athletes with biomechanical testing.
64 Many neuromuscular risk factors associated with ACL injury have been proposed, including
65 an increase in the valgus knee angle¹⁰, tibial internal rotation¹¹, anterior tibial shear force,¹²

66 hip joint valgus¹³, and adduction¹⁴ or a decrease in the knee joint flexion angle¹² or trunk
67 bending angle¹⁵ during athletics. However, Bahr et al.⁹ claimed that no screening test can
68 predict ACL injury and that no intervention study supports the efficacy of screening. This
69 would be caused since ACL injury occurs with dynamic loads and factors. Establishing
70 dynamic parameters is required for more effective screening methods in order to identify
71 high-risk athletes.

72

73 Previous screening methods focused only on an increasing valgus angle in
74 snapshots. The knee valgus angle at IC during a drop vertical jump (DVJ) was reportedly
75 significantly higher in those with an ACL injury than those without¹⁰. However, many
76 uninjured subjects presented the same amount of knee valgus angle; therefore, there were
77 many false positive subjects in the study¹⁰. Krosshaug et al.¹⁸ showed that knee valgus angle
78 during DVJ did not predict ACL injury. These studies analyzed only a snapshot of knee
79 movement during landing, and dynamic knee motion during single leg activity has not been
80 investigated. ACL injury often occurs during deceleration with slight knee flexion (<25°),
81 valgus, and with internal or external rotation^{16,17}. From an analysis of knee kinematics at the
82 time of ACL injury in female athletes, using a model-based image matching technique, Koga

83 et al.¹⁶ showed that the knee valgus angle increased by 12°, while the knee flexion angle
84 increased by only 1° between the initial contact (IC) of the foot during the movement that
85 caused the ACL injury and 40 ms after IC. This study showed that both increasing knee
86 valgus angle and disappearing flexion movement occurred simultaneously at ACL injury.
87 Detecting the combined phenomenon would be necessary for considering risk factors of ACL
88 injury. Only one study examined dynamic knee movement as an index for fluency of knee
89 motion during single leg hops¹⁹. Roos et al.¹⁹ showed that knee fluency, meaning without
90 dynamic knee valgus or varus movement, was decreased in ACL-deficient knees more than
91 ACL-intact and ACL-reconstructed knees. Accordingly, combined slight knee flexion and
92 dynamic valgus would be considered a risk factor. However, no study has established the
93 assessment of the dynamic parameter and has identified the association between the new
94 parameter and ACL injury as a potential risk factor.

95

96 Better screening methods also need to reproduce the injury mechanism with single-
97 leg tasks. Single-leg activities should be investigated, because many ACL injuries occur
98 during high-impact activity with one leg⁶. However, DVJs with both legs have been utilized in
99 the majority of previous studies. Although some previous studies that utilized single-leg

100 landings, these studies showed only maximum knee valgus or flexion angle^{20,21}. This is not
101 adequate to assess dynamic knee control during single-leg activities. In our preliminary study,
102 24 female athletes performed single-leg jump landings (SLJL). This was an appropriate task
103 for single-leg, high-impact activities. Repeated valgus/varus knee motion (knee wobbling)
104 was observed, and this may be used as an index of dynamic parameters. We speculate that
105 knee wobbling at low knee flexion during SLJL is an unstable dynamic knee movement that
106 may be associated with ACL injury. The objective of this pilot study was to determine
107 differences in knee valgus angle and dynamic knee joint motion during single-leg landings in
108 female basketball players, comparing ACL-injured and uninjured athletes by following them
109 for 3 years. The hypotheses of this study were that (1) there is no difference in the knee valgus
110 angle between ACL-injured and ACL-uninjured knees during single-leg landings, and (2)
111 knee wobbling movement is more frequent in ACL-injured knees than ACL-uninjured knees.
112 We utilized a case-control design to compare knee kinematics between the ACL-injured and
113 uninjured groups by recording kinematic data during SLJL in female basketball athletes at
114 baseline, and by gathering data about non-contact ACL injuries during up to three years of
115 follow-up.
116

117 **METHODS**

118 **Subjects**

119 This is a case-control study (Level of Evidence: 3). The study commenced after
120 obtaining approval of the ethics committee of Institutional Review Board of our institution
121 and informed, written consent of all subjects and their parents. Recruitment was conducted
122 from 2010 to 2013. Inclusion criteria were: (1) athletes participating in basketball team sports
123 (competition level); (2) 12-18 years old; (3) female; (4) healthy. Subjects who had any
124 neurological diseases, orthopedic diseases, or communication disorders at the time of data
125 measurement were excluded from the study. Forty-four subjects of two groups agreed to
126 participate in this study. After recruitment and measurement, information on the incidence of
127 non-contact ACL injuries was collected for two or three years. At follow-up, six ACL injuries
128 had occurred. All ACL injuries were diagnosed by an orthopedic surgeon based on magnetic
129 resonance imaging (MRI) findings. ACL injuries that occurred with no contact with another
130 person or object at the time of injury were defined as non-contact ACL injuries. Participants
131 were instructed to report all knee injuries to their coaches and the coaches were instructed to
132 relay the information to the investigators. One investigator continued to contact coaches.
133 Participants played only basketball during the follow-up period.

134

135 **Data Acquisition**

136 Subjects wore T-shirts and spats and each subject had six reflective markers
137 attached to her body for video analyses. The reflective markers were 10 mm in diameter and
138 were attached at the greater trochanter, the middle of the patella, and the lateral malleolus on
139 both legs. Subjects performed SLJL with both legs, landing with one leg after a maximum
140 vertical jump from a single-leg standing position on the floor. Two digital video cameras
141 (Casio Computer Co., Ltd., Japan) were used at 30 Hz. Cameras were located in the front and
142 ipsilateral side, 350 cm from the subject and 93 cm from the floor. The knee valgus and
143 flexion angle during SLJL were measured for lower limb kinematics in each frame. The
144 reliability of knee valgus angle for a two-dimensional video analysis at 30 was sufficient to
145 correlate with motion capture during this SLJL²².

146

147 **Data Processing**

148 We used an Ulead Video Studio 11 (Corel Japan Ltd., Japan) to convert video
149 images into static images at 30 frames/s, and computed the knee valgus and flexion angle in
150 each frame. We then used ImageJ 1.86 (National Institutes of Health, United States) to

151 measure each joint angle on static images. The knee valgus and flexion angle were obtained
152 by deducting the angle formed by a line connecting the greater trochanter, the middle of the
153 patella and the lateral malleolus from 180° . The analyzed phase during SLJL was between IC
154 to maximal knee flexion (MKF). IC was defined as the point when a part of the foot touched
155 the floor, while the MKF was defined as when the knee flexion angle reached its maximum
156 value. All measurements and data analysis were performed by different trained investigators.


157

158 Relative frontal motion (RFM) was used as an index of knee valgus/varus
159 movement relative to flexion movement during landing. More precisely, RFM was calculated
160 by the amount of valgus/varus movement in the frontal plane during 1/30 second divided by
161 the amount of flexion movement in the sagittal plane (Figure 1). In order to calculate knee
162 movement at low knee flexion, the knee flexion and valgus angle at IC was set as 0° . Then,
163 the predictive valgus angle at 6° , 12° , 18° , 24° and 30° for standardized knee flexion angle
164 was calculated based on two time points. Positive RFM indicated valgus movement, while
165 negative RFM denoted varus. Positive and negative RFM on successive jumps were
166 interpreted as knee wobbling (Figure 2a). The number of RFM's between IC and MKF was
167 counted. On the other hand, those with only positive or negative RFM's were excluded

168 (Figure 2b). The method we developed during a previous study for detecting knee

169 valgus/varus movement with RFM was further validated in the present study²³.

170



171


172 Figure 1. Determination of relative frontal motion (RFM)

173 This graph shows one kinematic dataset from a single-leg landing. RFM was calculated as the

174 amount of valgus/varus movement in the frontal plane (a) divided by the amount of flexion in

175 the sagittal plane (b) during 1/30 second.

176



177

178 Figure 2. Kinematic data showing repeated knee wobbling and no knee wobbling.

179 (a) Repeated positive and negative RFMs were present. This RFM crossed the zero line

180 between Frames 4 and 5 and between Frames 5 and 6. (b) An example of kinematic data with

181 no knee wobbling. Only positive RFM values are present. This RFM never crossed the zero

182 line.

183

184

185

186

187 **Statistical Analyses**

188 Subjects were divided into two groups: ACL-injured and uninjured groups. We
189 computed the mean and standard deviation (SD) of valgus knee angle and flexion angle at IC
190 and MKF and the data presented a normal distribution. T-tests with Bonferroni adjustment
191 were used as parametric tests to compare groups. Chi-square tests were used to assess
192 differences in knee wobbling between ACL-injured and uninjured knees. We used Predictive
193 Analytics Software (PASW) Statistics 18 (Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS),
194 Inc., United States) for statistical analysis, and set the significance level at $\alpha < 0.05$.

195

196 **RESULTS**

197 Six athletes suffered ACL injury after the three-year follow-up period. Table 1
198 shows the profiles of the six subjects with ACL injuries. There were no significant differences
199 between the six ACL-injured and 38 uninjured subjects in terms of age (ACL-injured: $15.5 \pm$
200 1.2 years; uninjured: 16.1 ± 0.3 years; $p = 0.28$), height (ACL-injured: 163.6 ± 4.8 cm;
201 uninjured: 159.5 ± 5.8 cm; $p = 0.11$), weight (ACL-injured: 51.7 ± 6.5 kg; uninjured: $52.7 \pm$
202 6.0 kg; $p = 0.71$) (Table 2).

203

ACL-injured subject	Age range at time of injury (years)	Injury scene
Case 1	16-18	Game
Case 2	16-18	Practice
Case 3	16-18	Game
Case 4	16-18	Game
Case 5	16-18	Recreation
Case 6	12-15	Game

204

Table 2. Physical characteristics of subjects with and without ACL injuries

	ACL-injured subjects	Uninjured subjects	<i>p</i> value
n (persons)	6	38	
Age (years) ^a	15.5 ± 1.2	16.1 ± 0.3	0.28
Height (cm) ^a	163.6 ± 4.8	159.9 ± 5.8	0.11
Weight (kg) ^a	51.7 ± 6.5	52.7 ± 6.0	0.71

^a: Mean value ± standard deviation

205

206 Inter-group comparisons of kinematics during SLJL were performed on the two
207 groups: 6 knees with ACL injuries belonging to 6 subjects and 76 uninjured knees belonging
208 to 38 subjects. Ten uninjured knees were difficult to analyze due to missing markers and were
209 excluded from this study. No differences were detected between the six ACL-injured and 66
210 uninjured knees in terms of knee valgus, flexion at IC, or MKF (Table 3). Accordingly, no
211 difference in knee joint motion was discernible between the ACL-injured and uninjured knees.
212

Table 3. Valgus knee angle and flexion angles at initial contact and maximal knee flexion

	Analysis point	ACL-injured knees (6 knees)	Uninjured knees (66 knees)	<i>p</i> value
Valgus (°)	IC	12.3 ± 2.4	14.8 ± 4.1	0.15
	MKF	29.3 ± 9.8	27.8 ± 10.0	0.73
Flexion (°)	IC	34.0 ± 5.3	37.0 ± 5.3	0.19
	MKF	86.0 ± 10.5	82.7 ± 8.5	0.38

Mean value ± standard deviation

IC: initial contact

MKF: Maximal knee flexion

213

214 Wobbling of the knee was observed in many subjects in both ACL-injured and
215 uninjured knees during SLJL. Although there is no significant difference by chi-square test (p
216 = 0.55), the rate of occurrence of knee wobbling was larger in five of the six ACL-injured
217 knees than 41 of the 66 uninjured knees, in at least one jump. No significant difference in
218 relative frontal motion (RFM) was detected between ACL-injured and uninjured knees (Table
219 4). The RFM's for ACL-injured knees and uninjured knees at 12°, 18°, 24°, and 30° of knee
220 flexion were 0.09 ± 0.43 and 0 ± 0.25 ($p = 0.66$), 0.42 ± 0.52 and 0.10 ± 0.31 ($p = 0.02$), 0.23
221 ± 0.37 and 0.13 ± 0.31 ($p = 0.45$), 0.16 ± 0.46 and 0.13 ± 0.48 ($p = 0.88$), respectively.
222 Therefore, the RFM was significantly greater only at 18° in ACL-injured knees.

223

Table 4. RFM at each knee flexion angle

	Analysis point (knee flexion angle)	ACL-injured knees (6 knees)	Uninjured knees (66 knees)	p value
RFM ^a	12°	0.09 ± 0.43	0 ± 0.25	0.66
	18°	0.42 ± 0.52	0.10 ± 0.31	0.02
	24°	0.23 ± 0.37	0.13 ± 0.31	0.45
	30°	0.16 ± 0.46	0.13 ± 0.48	0.88

^a: Mean value \pm standard deviation

RFM: relative frontal motion

224

225 **DISCUSSION**

226 The objective of this study was to determine the difference in valgus knee angle and
227 knee joint motion between knees that had sustained ACL injuries and those that had not,
228 during SLJL in middle school and high school female basketball players during three years.

229 The knee valgus angle at IC and MKF did not differ significantly between ACL-injured knees
230 and uninjured knees, and abnormal knee joint motion was present in most ACL-injured knees
231 and uninjured knees, but especially in ACL-injured knees.

232

233 A combination of low knee flexion and valgus motion was observed in ACL-injured
234 knees²⁴. Therefore, screening tasks for ACL injury risks should induce such movement.

235 Valgus angle at landing has been the parameter most evaluated as a potential risk factor^{10,16,17}.

236 A previous study indicated that an increase in the knee valgus angle and valgus moment
237 during landing are considered risk factors for non-contact ACL injury¹⁰. However, many

238 uninjured subjects presented the same knee valgus angle as the injured subjects¹⁰. In the

239 current study, the knee valgus angle showed no difference between ACL-injured and

240 uninjured knees in either IC or MKF. Thus, we concluded that the knee valgus angle alone

241 during landing is insufficient to portend ACL injury. Another parameter examined was knee

242 flexion angle at IC during landing. The knee flexion angle at the time of ACL injury was
243 between 5 and 25° during single-leg landing or deceleration²⁵. The current study found that
244 the knee flexion angle at IC during SLJL was 34.0° for ACL-injured knees and 37.0° for
245 uninjured knees. In a previous study using a motion capture system, the knee flexion angle at
246 IC during a bilateral vertical drop was reportedly 31°²⁶. Therefore, knee flexion was greater
247 during single-leg landing than bilateral-leg landing. Despite the high flexion angle at landing
248 during SLJL, landing movement with one leg would be more appropriate as a screening task
249 to detect risk factors than that with both legs during a landing task considering that ACL
250 injury occurs during single-leg activities.

251

252 RFM may serve as an index of dynamic knee motion in the frontal and sagittal
253 planes. Previous studies screened knee kinematics using only snapshots at IC or MKF¹⁰. The
254 RFM used in this study was the amount of change in the frontal plane angle during 1/30 s
255 divided by the amount of change in the sagittal plane angle. The greater RFM at 18° in ACL-
256 injured knees suggests a sudden valgus or varus and slow flexion movement. Therefore, RFM
257 clearly demonstrated the quality of dynamic valgus/varus movement during landing when
258 compared with snapshots of knee angle at IC or MKF. Decreasing knee flexion movement

259 during landing should be taken into consideration to detect high-risk athletes. A cadaveric
260 study showed that the combined knee valgus external torque at slight knee flexion angle
261 induced excessive ACL strain. In the current study, five of the six ACL-injured knees showed
262 knee wobbling, which led us to consider this as a risk factor for ACL injury. The cause of this
263 abnormal knee movement is unknown, and the mechanism of knee wobbling and the
264 association between wobbling and ACL injury should be studied in the future. Since the
265 flexion angle exceed 30° during the SLJL, knee wobbling over a smaller flexion range should
266 be induced and evaluated in future studies.

267

268 This study had several limitations. First, we used video cameras for kinematic
269 analyses. Nagano et al.²⁷ performed a study to obtain correlations based on regression analysis
270 between two-dimensional and three-dimensional knee kinematics and there was a moderate
271 association between the two methods. Since two-dimensional evaluation is a simple, low-cost
272 technique, we believe that it is a more useful method than three-dimensional analysis when
273 conducting a large-scale study of risk factors. Also, RFM was calculated based on the amount
274 of change and it is not dependent on the method of capture. Second, conclusions of this study
275 cannot be generally applied to males or to athletes involved in other sports. However, this

276 study did follow up female young basketball athletes for a long time and this is a strong point.

277 Third, although the sample size was not large, the post-hoc power was medium to high, which

278 were 0.41 for t-tests and 0.50 for chi-square tests. In the future, there needs to be a larger

279 study with high accuracy, including athletes involved in other high-risk sports, for example,

280 soccer or football.

281

282 Conclusion

283 No differences in the knee valgus or flexion angles at IC or MKF during the SLJL

284 was detected between the ACL-injured and uninjured knees. Knee wobbling may be more

285 common in ACL-injured athletes and greater RFM at 18° during landing may be a potential

286 risk factor for ACL injury. Future studies should evaluate knee kinematics in a smaller knee

287 flexion range during movement using a different screening task.

288

289

290 **REFERENCES**

- 291 1. Silvers HJ, Mandelbaum BR. Prevention of anterior cruciate ligament
292 injury in the female athlete. *Br J Sports Med.* 2007;41 Suppl 1:i52-59.
- 293 2. Griffin LY, Albohm MJ, Arendt EA, et al. Understanding and preventing
294 noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injuries: a review of the Hunt Valley
295 II meeting, January 2005. *Am J Sports Med.* 2006;34(9):1512-1532.
- 296 3. Hewett TE, Stroupe AL, Nance TA, Noyes FR. Plyometric training in
297 female athletes. Decreased impact forces and increased hamstring torques.
298 *Am J Sports Med.* 1996;24(6):765-773.
- 299 4. Griffin LY, Agel J, Albohm MJ, et al. Noncontact anterior cruciate ligament
300 injuries: risk factors and prevention strategies. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.*
301 2000;8(3):141-150.
- 302 5. Besier TF, Lloyd DG, Cochrane JL, Ackland TR. External loading of the
303 knee joint during running and cutting maneuvers. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
304 2001;33(7):1168-1175.
- 305 6. Boden BP, Dean GS, Feagin JA, Jr., Garrett WE, Jr. Mechanisms of
306 anterior cruciate ligament injury. *Orthopedics.* 2000;23(6):573-578.

- 307 7. Agel J, Rockwood T, Klossner D. Collegiate ACL injury rates across 15
308 sports: national collegiate athletic association injury surveillance system
309 data update (2004-2005 through 2012-2013). *Clin J Sport Med.*
310 2016;26(6):518-523.
- 311 8. Hewett TE. Neuromuscular and hormonal factors associated with knee
312 injuries in female athletes. Strategies for intervention. *Sports Med.*
313 2000;29(5):313-327.
- 314 9. Bahr R. Why screening tests to predict injury do not work-and probably
315 never will...: a critical review. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50(13):776-780.
- 316 10. Hewett TE, Myer GD, Ford KR, et al. Biomechanical measures of
317 neuromuscular control and valgus loading of the knee predict anterior
318 cruciate ligament injury risk in female athletes: a prospective study. *Am J*
319 *Sports Med.* 2005;33(4):492-501.
- 320 11. Markolf KL, O'Neill G, Jackson SR, McAllister DR. Effects of applied
321 quadriceps and hamstrings muscle loads on forces in the anterior and
322 posterior cruciate ligaments. *Am J Sports Med.* 2004;32(5):1144-1149.
- 323 12. DeMorat G, Weinhold P, Blackburn T, Chudik S, Garrett W. Aggressive

- 324 quadriceps loading can induce noncontact anterior cruciate ligament injury.
- 325 *Am J Sports Med.* 2004;32(2):477-483.
- 326 13. McLean SG, Huang X, Su A, Van Den Bogert AJ. Sagittal plane
327 biomechanics cannot injure the ACL during sidestep cutting. *Clin Biomech*
328 *(Bristol, Avon).* 2004;19(8):828-838.
- 329 14. Zeller BL, McCrory JL, Kibler WB, Uhl TL. Differences in kinematics and
330 electromyographic activity between men and women during the single-
331 legged squat. *Am J Sports Med.* 2003;31(3):449-456.
- 332 15. Hewett TE, Torg JS, Boden BP. Video analysis of trunk and knee motion
333 during non-contact anterior cruciate ligament injury in female athletes:
334 lateral trunk and knee abduction motion are combined components of the
335 injury mechanism. *Br J Sports Med.* 2009;43(6):417-422.
- 336 16. Koga H, Nakamae A, Shima Y, et al. Mechanisms for noncontact anterior
337 cruciate ligament injuries: knee joint kinematics in 10 injury situations
338 from female team handball and basketball. *Am J Sports Med.*
339 2010;38(11):2218-2225.
- 340 17. Krosshaug T, Nakamae A, Boden BP, et al. Mechanisms of anterior

- 341 cruciate ligament injury in basketball: video analysis of 39 cases. *Am J*
342 *Sports Med.* 2007;35(3):359-367.
- 343 18. Krosshaug T, Steffen K, Kristianslund E, et al. The vertical drop jump is a
344 poor screening test for ACL injuries in female elite soccer and handball
345 players: a prospective cohort study of 710 athletes. *Am J Sports Med.*
346 2016;44(4):874-883.
- 347 19. Roos PE, Button K, Sparkes V, van Deursen RW. Altered biomechanical
348 strategies and medio-lateral control of the knee represent incomplete
349 recovery of individuals with injury during single leg hop. *J Biomech.*
350 2014;47(3):675-680.
- 351 20. Taylor JB, Ford KR, Nguyen AD, Shultz SJ. Biomechanical Comparison of
352 Single- and Double-Leg Jump Landings in the Sagittal and Frontal Plane.
353 *Orthop J Sports Med.* 2016;4(6):2325967116655158.
- 354 21. Jones PA, Herrington LC, Munro AG, Graham-Smith P. Is there a
355 relationship between landing, cutting, and pivoting tasks in terms of the
356 characteristics of dynamic valgus? *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42(9):2095-2102.
- 357 22. McLean SG, Walker K, Ford KR, et al. Evaluation of a two dimensional

- 358 analysis method as a screening and evaluation tool for anterior cruciate
359 ligament injury. *Br J Sports Med.* 2005;39(6):355-362.
- 360 23. Aoki A, Kubota S, Morinaga K, et al. Detection of knee wobbling as a
361 screen to identify athletes who may be at high risk for ACL injury. *Int*
362 *Biomech.* 2021;8(1):30-41.
- 363 24. Mokhtarzadeh H, Ng A, Yeow CH, et al. Restrained tibial rotation may
364 prevent ACL injury during landing at different flexion angles. *Knee.*
365 2015;22(1):24-29.
- 366 25. Olsen OE, Myklebust G, Engebretsen L, Bahr R. Injury mechanisms for
367 anterior cruciate ligament injuries in team handball: a systematic video
368 analysis. *Am J Sports Med.* 2004;32(4):1002-1012.
- 369 26. Kristianslund E, Krosshaug T. Comparison of drop jumps and sport-
370 specific sidestep cutting: implications for anterior cruciate ligament injury
371 risk screening. *Am J Sports Med.* 2013;41(3):684-688.
- 372 27. Nagano Y, Sakagami M, Ida H, Akai M, Fukubayashi T. Statistical
373 modelling of knee valgus during a continuous jump test. *Sports Biomech.*
374 2008;7(3):342-350.

375

376

377 **Figure Legends**

378 Figure 1. Determination of relative frontal motion (RFM)

379 This graph shows one kinematic dataset from a single-leg landing. RFM was calculated as the

380 amount of valgus/varus movement in the frontal plane (a) divided by the amount of flexion in

381 the sagittal plane (b) during 1/30 second.

382

383 Figure 2. Kinematic data showing repeated knee wobbling and no knee wobbling.

384 (a) Repeated positive and negative RFMs were present. This RFM crossed the zero line

385 between Frames 4 and 5 and between Frames 5 and 6. (b) An example of kinematic data with

386 no knee wobbling. Only positive RFM values are present. This RFM never crossed the zero

387 line.