

34 **Abstract**

35 **Purpose**

36 Elastic knee sleeves are often worn following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction
37 but mechanisms underlying observed changes in movement patterns are still unclear. The
38 aim of this study was to determine the immediate and 6-week effects of wearing a knee
39 sleeve on ground reaction forces (GRF) and knee joint power during a step-down hop
40 task.

41 **Methods**

42 Using a cross-over design, we estimated GRF and knee kinematics and kinetics during a
43 step-down hop for 30 participants (age 26.1 [SD 6.7] years, 14 women) following ACL
44 reconstruction (median 16 months post-surgery) with and without wearing a knee sleeve.
45 In a subsequent randomised clinical trial, participants in the ‘Sleeve Group’ (n=9) then
46 wore the sleeve for 6 weeks at least 1 hour daily, while a ‘Control Group’ (n=9) did not
47 wear the sleeve. Statistical parametric mapping (SPM) was used to compare (1) GRF
48 trajectories in the three planes as well as knee joint power between three conditions at
49 baseline (uninjured side, unsleeved injured and sleeved injured side); (2) within-
50 participant changes for GRF and knee joint power trajectories from baseline to follow-up
51 between groups. We also compared discrete peak GRFs and power, rate of (vertical)
52 force development, and mean knee joint power in the first 5% of stance phase.

53 **Results**

54 GRF did not differ for the (unsleeved) injured compared to the uninjured sides based on
55 SPM analysis. Discrete variables showed lower peak anterior (propulsive) GRF for the

56 injured side, and lower peak eccentric and concentric power, and mean power in the first
57 5% of stance. When wearing the sleeve on the injured side, mean power in the first 5%
58 of stance increased significantly [mean difference (95% CIs) 1.3 (0.6, 2.0) N/BW*ht]
59 from a concentric to an eccentric power when wearing the knee sleeve. After six weeks,
60 the direction of change for vertical GRF differed between the groups: while the Control
61 Group had slightly decreased forces, the Sleeve Group presented increased forces.

62 **Conclusions**

63 Increased knee power in the first 5% of landing when wearing the knee sleeve, combined
64 with greater knee flexion, may indicate a protective response for ACL ruptures, most
65 commonly occurring during that early phase of landing. The directional change of
66 increased vertical GRF for the Sleeve group, combined with shorter stance duration at
67 follow-up, may indicate enhanced performance when being prescribed such sleeve.

68

69 **Key words**

70 Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, hopping, kinematics, kinetics, knee sleeve

71

72

73 **Abbreviations**

74 ACL anterior cruciate ligament

75 Fx medio-lateral ground reaction force

76 Fy anterior-posterior ground reaction force

77 Fz vertical ground reaction force

78	GRF	ground reaction forces
79	IKDC-SKF	International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form
80	RCT	randomised controlled trial
81	RFD	rate of force development
82	SPM	Statistical parametric mapping

83 **Background**

84 Rupture of the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) is a debilitating knee injury with
85 potentially devastating short-term and long-term consequences. Rehabilitation following
86 ACL reconstruction includes individualised progressive exercise prescription to improve
87 range of motion, muscle strength, sensori-motor control and sports- and work-specific
88 skills, as well as physical fitness [1]. Strategies are also included to address potential
89 psychosocial factors, such as fear of re-injury, and to improve knee-related confidence
90 and self-efficacy for return to physical activity [2-4]. Such strategies may include
91 prescription of wearing a knee sleeve, or people with ACL reconstruction may intuitively
92 use them [2, 5]. We have shown that individuals with ACL reconstruction may have
93 immediate improved jump-related performance when wearing a knee sleeve [6]. Besides
94 focussing on the distance or height of jumping, considering movement patterns during
95 landing are also important [7, 8]. In our initial analysis of movement patterns during a
96 step-down hop, we found that participants with ACL reconstruction landed with greater
97 knee flexion when wearing a knee sleeve [9]. Wearing a sleeve for at least one hour over
98 a 6-week period resulted in no differences in knee flexion and moments compared to
99 participants who did not wear the sleeve, but those with the sleeve jumped faster,
100 evidenced with shorter stance duration [9]. Wearing a knee sleeve may influence
101 sensorimotor control [10-12], however, the mechanisms whereby a knee sleeve might
102 improve jump distance or enhance knee flexion during jump landing are unclear.
103
104 Jump-landing strategies have received substantial attention as a risk factor for ACL
105 rupture and as outcomes following such injury [13, 14]. Current understanding is that

106 increased impact, reflected by higher vertical ground reaction forces (GRF), increased
107 posterior GRF [15, 16], and higher rate of force development (RFD) may increase risk for
108 incurring an ACL injury [17]. In uninjured athletes, higher vertical GRF during jump
109 landing appear to be associated with decreased hip, knee and ankle flexion angles, thus a
110 ‘stiffer’ leg during landing [18]. Such stiffer landing patterns are associated with
111 increased risk of subsequent injuries in current uninjured participants [19]. Jump landing
112 training can increase knee flexion on landing [14] and reduce vertical and posterior GRF
113 and RFD [17]. Following ACL injury and ACL reconstruction, the response of GRF is
114 less clear. Vertical GRFs are likely to be lower for the injured than the contralateral
115 uninjured side post-reconstruction [20, 21], however such change may be time- and task-
116 dependent. For maximum single-leg hop, a systematic review found moderate evidence
117 for no difference between ACL-injured and contralateral sides for vertical GRF [7].
118 Pietrosimone et al. [22] showed that within the first 12 months following ACL
119 reconstruction, peak vertical GRF are likely to be lower compared to the contralateral
120 uninjured sides while walking but at mid-stance, the GRF may be higher. In contrast, in
121 the phase from 12 to 24 months post-ACL, the peak vertical GRF are likely to be higher
122 compared to the contralateral sides [22]. The GRF of the injured side relative to the
123 contralateral uninjured sides may thus change over the recovery period. The desired
124 direction for GRF change is thus uncertain post-ACL reconstruction.

125

126 During jump landing, power is absorbed by the lower extremity, and during take-off,
127 power is generated. Lower knee range of motion decreases the range over which force
128 can be generated, potentially leading to lower peak knee moments and knee power [7,

129 23]. Following ACL reconstruction, it is likely that knee power is reduced, both during
130 absorption and during take-off [7, 23].

131

132 Our project for exploring the effects of wearing a knee sleeve during the step-down hop
133 provides opportunity to explore the influence of wearing a knee sleeve on the ground
134 reaction forces and on knee power. The aim of this study was to determine the (1)
135 immediate effects and (2) 6-week effects of wearing a knee sleeve on GRF and on knee
136 power in participants who had undergone an ACL reconstruction in the previous five
137 years.

138

139 Our primary hypothesis is that peak vertical GRF and the rate of force development will
140 be lower in the injured side compared to the uninjured side during the unsleeved
141 conditions. The secondary hypothesis is that wearing the sleeve will increase the peak
142 vertical GRF and rate of force development during the absorption phase of the injured
143 side. Similarly, we hypothesise that, for the 6-week effects, the Sleeve Group will have
144 larger changes in the vertical GRF and for rate of force development than the Control
145 Group.

146

147 **Methods**

148 This is the third paper in a sequence of papers stemming from a single, multi-year study
149 exploring the influence of wearing a knee sleeve for people with ACLR. This paper
150 differs from the previous papers [6, 9] in that it considers GRF and knee power. We
151 recruited participants from August 2018 to September 2020 and the follow-up data

152 collection was completed in October 2020. While this paper reports an additional
153 analysis, there are no on-going or related trials for the intervention. The data had been
154 collected during two sessions (baseline and six-week follow-up) in the School of
155 Physiotherapy Human Movement laboratory of the University of Otago, and via REDCap
156 (Research Electronic Data Capture). The Health and Disability Ethics Committee (of
157 New Zealand) granted ethical approval for the study. We follow CONSORT reporting
158 guidelines [24]. We repeat the data collection methods here for completeness of this
159 report.

160

161 **Trial design and blinding**

162 The study had two linked parts and all participants were involved in both parts. Part 1
163 consisted of a cross-over laboratory-based study, to examine immediate effects of the
164 wearing of the knee sleeve on single-leg hop distance [6] and knee mechanics during a
165 single-leg step-down hop task [9]. Part 2 entailed a parallel two-armed, assessor-blinded
166 randomised controlled trial (RCT) to determine the effects of wearing the knee sleeve
167 over a 6-week period on self-reported knee function and physical performance measures.
168

169 **Participants**

170 **Recruitment**

171 We recruited participants via community advertising and the research participant
172 recruitment agency TrialFacts (<https://trialfacts.com/>). Volunteers completed a
173 questionnaire (also serving as screening for eligibility) via REDCap prior to attending the
174 first laboratory session. The questionnaire included demographics, injury and surgery

175 history, the International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form (IKDC-
176 SKF) [25] and the Tegner activity scale [26]. The Tegner scale categorises sports and
177 physical activity in terms of the level of knee-related loading where ‘0’ indicates ‘sick
178 leave or disability due to a knee injury’ and ‘10’ indicates ‘competitive soccer or rugby at
179 national or international elite level’.

180

181 **Inclusion criteria**

182 We recruited men and women, aged 18-40 years, who underwent ACL reconstruction
183 within 6 months to 5 years previously. We specifically sought individuals who had not
184 yet reached full functional level, defined for the purpose of this study by a score between
185 40 to 80/100 on the IKDC-SKF [25, 27, 28].

186

187 **Exclusion criteria**

188 Participants were excluded if they had undergone a revision ACL reconstruction of the
189 same knee (due to re-injury), or a previous ACL reconstruction of the opposite knee; self-
190 reported any other lower limb, pelvic or low back musculoskeletal injuries or disorders
191 that required medical care over the past 6 months; had known systemic, neurological or
192 cardiovascular disorders; or had a body mass index (BMI) greater than 30 kg/m².

193 Participants found to have an IKDC-SKF score less than 40 (due to potential safety risk
194 during the laboratory-based tasks) or greater than 80/100 (as use of a sleeve would
195 clinically be less likely to add benefit) were excluded.

196

197 **Procedures**

198 **Randomisation**

199 Participants were individually randomised twice (once for the cross-over trial, and once
200 for the RCT) with equal numbers in each group for both allocations. Block randomisation
201 (in groups of 8 participants) was undertaken sequentially by a research officer using an
202 electronic random number generator prior to participants being entered into the study.
203 Each group was stratified by sex. The research officer informed the researcher
204 responsible for the laboratory data collection of the order for the conditions for the cross-
205 over trial, and the group allocation (for the RCT) via email prior to the start of the
206 individual participant's first laboratory session.

207

208 Eligibility to be included was confirmed and participants provided written informed
209 consent at the start of the first session. Participants were asked to be dressed in a singlet, a
210 pair of shorts and their own sport shoes. Body mass and height were measured during the
211 baseline session.

212

213 **Part 1: Laboratory cross-over trial – immediate effects**

214 Participants undertook two hopping tasks; a maximum horizontal single leg hop and a
215 stub-maximum step-down hop. Participants practised the hopping tasks at sub-maximal
216 distance with the uninjured and injured sides until they were confident with performing
217 them as part of familiarisation and warm-up. They performed the maximum horizontal
218 hop prior to undertaking the step-down-hop.

219

220 **Part 2: Randomised clinical trial**

221 Participants were informed of their group allocation for the RCT on completion of the
222 first laboratory session. Following the 6-week period, all participants were asked to return
223 to the laboratory to repeat the above assessments, repeating the hopping tasks (without
224 wearing the knee sleeve).

225

226 **Intervention**

227 The intervention entailed use of the commercially available GenuTrain (Bauerfeind® AG,
228 Zeulenroda-Triebes, Germany), a CE-certified medical device. For Part 1 (cross-over
229 trial), all participants performed the step-down hop with and without the sleeve. For Part
230 2 (RCT), participants of the ‘Sleeve Group’ (intervention) were instructed to wear the
231 knee sleeve while performing their rehabilitative exercises, physical activity and sports,
232 with a minimum of 1 hour per day for the 6-week period; the control group were not
233 provided with a sleeve during this period.

234

235 **Outcomes**

236 Step-down hop: Three-dimensional motion analysis was performed for the step-down hop
237 with 11 infra-red Eagle-500RT cameras (Motion Analysis Corporation, Santa Rosa, CA,
238 USA), sampling at 120 Hz, and Cortex 4.4 software (Motion Analysis Corporation, Santa
239 Rosa, CA, USA). This was synchronized with a floor-mounted tri-axial force plate (OR6-
240 5 AMTI Inc., Newton, MA, USA), sampling at 2,400 Hz. Cortex 5.5 was used to track
241 and label the markers, and the biomechanical model, kinematic (joint angles) and kinetic

242 (moments) variables were calculated using Visual3D Professional v6 (C-Motion, Inc.,
243 Germantown, MD, USA). Here we report the procedures only for the force plate data.
244
245 The participants were asked to stand on a 30-cm box, placed 15 cm from the force plate,
246 and performed a step-down hop (adapted from E Kristianslund and T Krosshaug [29])
247 onto the force plate: the participants were asked to step off the box with either the injured
248 or the uninjured leg onto the force plate, then hop forward off the plate as fast as possible.
249 The distance of that hop was defined as 60-70% of the maximum horizontal jump length.
250 They performed the step-down hop with the uninjured side first, then the injured side
251 under the (1) the ‘sleeved’ condition (experimental, wearing the sleeve) and (2) the
252 ‘unsleeved’ condition (control, no sleeve), ordered by randomisation. A 5-minute walk
253 between the conditions provided a standardised run-in to the second condition to
254 minimise carryover effects.

255

256 **Data processing**

257 GRF data from the stance phase of the hop is of interest; the start and end of the stance
258 phase were defined by the vertical component of the GRF exceeding and returning below
259 20 N, respectively. Based on the SPM analysis the following discrete variables were
260 extracted: rate of force development, mean joint power during the first 5% of stance, peak
261 eccentric joint power and peak concentric joint power. The averages of five trials for each
262 limb (injured versus uninjured) and condition (sleeved and unsleeved) for each
263 participant along with descriptive variables were calculated.

264

265 The x , y , and z components of the ground reaction force data during stance were analysed
266 for immediate effects (Part 1) and 6-week effects (Part 2). Force data were time-
267 normalised to 1001 data points for each participant and condition (baseline) or session
268 (follow-up). The mean time of all first and second vertical GRF peaks (F_z peaks), relative
269 to the mean length of all trials, were used to time-align the respective F_z peaks for each
270 trial. Therefore, data were time-normalised in three phases to ensure comparison of
271 equivalent events in the movement. For trials with only one F_z peak, standard time-
272 normalisation to 1001 frames was performed.

273

274 Joint power was analysed as a follow-up to the GRF presented in this report and the
275 kinetic, kinematic and temporal variables in previous reports. We investigated joint
276 power in the sagittal plane as $JP(t) = M_x(t) \cdot \omega_x(t)$, where JP is joint power at each
277 time t , M_x is the knee flexion-extension moment (normalised by body weight and height)
278 and ω_x is knee flexion-extension angular velocity. By convention a knee (external)
279 flexion moment is positive, and a flexing knee has a positive angular velocity, thus
280 positive joint power indicates a net eccentric muscle contraction at the joint and negative
281 joint power indicates a concentric contraction.

282

283 **Statistical analysis**

284 For our primary analysis, we analysed GRF and knee joint power using Statistical
285 Parametric Mapping (SPM, <http://spm1d.org/>; Pataky, 2012) [30]. Mean trajectories of
286 five trials for each participant, limb and condition (Part 1) and each session (Part 2) were
287 computed using MATLAB R2022a (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA, USA). A

288 secondary analysis of discrete variables followed. The data set can be found on Zenedo

289 [31].

290

291 **Ground reaction forces**

292 We determined immediate effects by two-way comparisons across the three combinations

293 of sleeved injured leg, unsleeved injured leg, uninjured leg. The SPM time-continuous

294 Hotellings T^2 test was performed on the GRF components within each baseline condition

295 [32, 33]. SPM allows comparison of the entire GRF trajectory, rather than a pre-selected

296 discrete variable, which helps to control both Type 1 and Type 2 error rates [32].

297

298 Six-week effects were determined by calculating the mean, time-normalised GRF curves

299 for each component, as with the immediate effects, and subtracting the baseline from the

300 follow-up session, leaving ‘difference’ trajectories. We performed a time-continuous

301 Hotellings T^2 test on the three-dimensional force difference trajectories comparing Sleeve

302 and Control groups [32, 33]. For both immediate and 6-week analyses, significant effects

303 were analysed with *post-hoc* time-continuous *t*-tests to determine which conditions

304 differed.

305

306 A conservative Bonferroni threshold of 0.017 was adopted to correct for multiple

307 comparisons across the three GRF components.

308

309 **Knee joint power**

310 Sagittal plane joint power is a one-dimensional, time-continuous variable so immediate
311 effects were determined with multiple time-continuous paired *t*-tests. A Bonferroni
312 threshold of 0.017 was adopted to correct for multiple comparisons across the three
313 conditions. Six-week effects were determined by time-continuous independent *t*-tests on
314 the joint power difference trajectories. SPM calculations were performed using the `spm1d`
315 package version M.0.4.8 (`spm1dmatlab`: One-Dimensional Statistical Parametric
316 Mapping in MATLAB. <https://github.com/Otodd0000/spm1dmatlab>, T Pataky, 2019).

317

318 **Secondary analysis: Discrete variables**

319 Post hoc analyses were performed for the pre-defined GRF and knee joint power discrete
320 variables, and those that were deemed to be of interest from the SPM analysis. Time-
321 based variables included the Rate of Force Development (RFD). The RFD reflects the
322 speed at which F_z increases from initial contact to the first F_z peak. We defined the RFD
323 as the first F_z peak divided by the time duration from landing force to the first F_z peak
324 [34]. For trials with a single F_z peak a time duration of 100 ms was used.

325

326 To investigate the immediate effects of wearing a knee sleeve, we used one-way repeated
327 measures ANOVAs to compare three conditions at the baseline: (a) uninjured side,
328 unsleeved to (b) injured side, unsleeved, and (c) injured side, sleeved. Sex (male/women)
329 and time since ACL reconstruction (in months) were entered as co-variates. If
330 Mauchley's test for sphericity was significant ($p \leq 0.05$), the Greenhouse-Geisser

331 correction was used. Post-hoc pairwise analyses using paired *t*-tests and a Bonferroni

332 correction across the three pairwise tests assessed between-condition effects.

333

334 Individual change scores from baseline to follow-up were calculated for the dependent

335 variables of the GRF and knee joint power. Due to low sample size (n=9 per group) the

336 change scores were compared between the intervention and the control groups using

337 Mann-Whitney U tests for each outcome. The alpha level were set at $p \leq 0.05$. These

338 analyses and those of demographic data were performed with SPSS Version 28.0.1.0

339 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY).

340

341 **Results**

342 We assessed 34 participants at baseline, but data for four participants were excluded from

343 this analysis due to technical issues. Two participants of the Sleeve Group withdrew from

344 the study following baseline assessment due to knee re-injuries, unrelated to use of the

345 knee sleeve (Fig 1). Eight participants were lost to follow-up due to the COVID-19

346 lockdown in New Zealand, March/April 2020. Twenty-four participants completed the

347 follow-up laboratory session. Data from six participants were excluded due to technical

348 difficulties, resulting in data being analysed for nine participants in each group for Part 2

349 (RCT). Demographic data of the participants are provided in Table 1.

350

351 **Fig 1. CONSORT flowchart of participant recruitment, allocation and follow-up.**

352

353

354 **Table 1. Demographic data (n = 30)**

	All	Men	Women
Men/Women n (%)	30	16 (53)	14 (47)
Age (years)	26.1 (6.7)	25.5 (5.7)	27.3 (7.6)
Mass (kg)	75.9 (11.3)	78.5 (12.2)	76.1 (11.8)
Height (m)	1.72 (0.1)	1.76 (0.07)	1.67 (0.08)
Body mass index (kg.m ⁻²)	25.7 (3.1)	25.1 (2.7)	27.1 (3.3)
Reconstruction: Hamstring/patella tendon grafts n (%)	14 (47)/16 (53)	9 (56)/7 (44)	5 (36)/9 (64)
Meniscal repair: no/yes n (%)	22 (73)/8 (27)	13 (81)/3 (19)	9 (64)/5 (36)
Time since ACL injury (months)	21 (9 – 108)	21 (9 – 55)	25 (12 – 108)
Time since surgery (months)	16 (6 – 53)	17 (6 – 44)	16 (7 – 53)
Time from ACL injury to surgery (months)	6 (1 – 89)	6 (1 – 11)	8 (1 – 89)
Tegner activity scale: Preinjury (median, range)	8 (3 – 10)	9 (3 – 10)	7 (6 – 10)
Tegner activity scale: Baseline (median, range)	5 (2 – 9)	5 (2 – 9)	4 (2 – 9)
IKDC-SKF Baseline	66.8 (9.8)	67.2 (10.3)	67.8 (8.7)
IKDC-SKF Follow-up	73.7 (11.5)	71.3 (13.2)	76.5 (8.9)

Figures are numbers (Frequency), Mean (SD) or Medians (minimum – maximum)

IKDC-SKF: International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form

356 **Part 1: Immediate effects**

357 **Ground reaction forces**

358 The SPM analysis found no statistical differences between any GRF components for any
359 of the baseline conditions (Fig 2 to 4).

360 **Fig 2. Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-**
361 **down hop for the injured (unsleeved) sides to the uninjured contralateral sides**
362 (n=30). A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted
363 significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical)
364 component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively.

365

366 **Fig 3. Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-**
367 **down hop for the sleeved and unsleeved conditions for the ACL injured sides (n=30).**
368 A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance
369 criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component
370 curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively.

371

372 **Fig 4. Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-**
373 **down hop for the ACL-injured sleeved sides to the uninjured unsleeved sides (n=30).**
374 A: SPM Hotellings T^2 test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance
375 criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component
376 curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively

377

378 For the discrete variables, significant effects were found for RFD, and peak anterior and
379 posterior GRFs (Table 2). Although RFD for the sleeved, injured side was higher ($34.3 \pm$
380 14.1 N/BW/s) than the unsleeved, injured side (31.9 ± 12.2 N/BW/s), this difference was
381 not statistically significant in *post-hoc* testing. Similarly, although the actual peak
382 $F_{yPosterior}$ was higher for the sleeved (0.140 ± 0.080 N/BW) than the unsleeved
383 conditions (0.127 ± 0.071 N/BW) for the injured sides, the difference was not statistically
384 significant in *post-hoc* testing. The (unsleeved) injured side had lower peak $F_{yAnterior}$
385 (0.237 ± 0.097 N/BW) compared to the uninjured side (0.270 ± 0.087 N/BW), and
386 wearing the sleeve showed no statistically significant effect for the injured side.
387

388 **Table 2. Immediate effects of wearing the sleeve: cross-over trial (n=30)**

	Unsleeved Condition		Sleeved Condition	Repeated measures ANOVA	Between side comparison (unsleeved)	Between condition comparison, injured side	Between side/condition comparison (unsleeved, uninjured side; sleeved, injured side)			
	Uninjured side	Injured Side	Injured side		Mean Difference (95%CI)	p-value	Mean Difference (95%CI)	p-value	Mean Difference (95%CI)	p-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)							
Rate of Force Development	34.1 (12.0)	31.8 (12.1)	34.3 (14.1)	0.133*	--		--		--	
Knee joint power										
Mean, first 5% of stance	0.4 (3.3)	-1.5 (2.9)	-0.2 (3.5)	<0.001	1.9 (0.7, 3.0)	<0.001	1.3 (0.5, 2.1)	<0.001	0.6 (-0.5, 1.6)	0.574

Peak eccentric	28.8 (11.9)	20.7 (10.3)	21.3 (11.5)	<0.001	8.1 (5.0, 11.3)	<0.001	0.5 (-2.1, 3.2)	1.000	7.6 (4.0, 11.1)	<0.001
Peak concentric	-14.2 (4.0)	-9.7 (3.8)	-10.4 (5.2)	<0.001	4.5 (3.0, 6.0)	<0.001	0.7 (-8.4, 2.2)	0.762	3.8 (2.1, 5.6)	<0.001

*Greenhouse-Geisser correction

389 **Knee joint power**

390 The absorption phase (first phase) of stance entails eccentric quadriceps contraction,
391 followed by a force generation (second) phase entailing concentric quadriceps
392 contraction. Based on the SPM analysis, with one exception, there were no significant
393 differences between the (unsleeved) injured and uninjured sides (Fig 5A and D), between
394 the sleeved and unsleeved conditions for the injured side (Fig 5B and E), or between the
395 sleeved injured and (unsleeved) uninjured sides (Fig 5C and F). The exception was at a
396 timepoint at around 5% of the stance phase where the SPM trajectory for the comparison
397 between the (unsleeved) injured and uninjured sides met the $p=0.017$ threshold (Fig 5A).
398 At that timepoint, the injured side had a greater magnitude and slightly longer lasting
399 negative power (concentric contraction) than the uninjured side. During this initial part of
400 the landing phase there was brief a knee (external) extension moment which shifted to a
401 flexion moment earlier for the uninjured sides. Knee angular velocity was positive for
402 both sides during this period, indicating the knee was flexing, with the uninjured side
403 showing a greater magnitude knee flexion velocity.

404

405 **Fig 5. Knee joint power time-continuous comparisons for the uninjured (unsleeved)**
406 **sides, and ACL injured sides for sleeved and unsleeved conditions.** Top panels: SPM
407 paired t-tests for comparisons between injured (sleeved versus unsleeved) and uninjured
408 sides. Joint power curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) for each respective test
409 are shown in the bottom panels.

410

411 The difference for the knee power in the first 5% of the stance phase when comparing
412 injured to uninjured side is also evident with the discrete variable analysis (Table 2).

413 When wearing the knee sleeve, the power increased significantly for the injured side
414 during that phase, resulting in no statistical difference when comparing the (sleeved)
415 injured side with the (unsleeved) uninjured side. Wearing the sleeve, however, did not
416 change the peak eccentric and concentric power, respectively (Table 2), corroborating the
417 results of the SPM analysis.

418

419 **Part 2: Six-week effects**

420 **Ground reaction forces and knee joint power**

421 There were no significant differences between the change in ground reaction force from
422 baseline to follow-up comparing the Sleeve group to the Control group (Fig 6). Similarly,
423 there were no significant differences in 6-week changes in joint power between groups
424 (Fig 7).

425

426 **Fig 6. SPM analysis of ground reaction force trajectory differences between baseline**
427 **and follow-up for the Sleeve group (n=9) and Control group (n=9).** A. Hotellings T^2
428 test trajectory. The dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion. B – D. The x,
429 y, and z component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) comparing groups.
430 Positive values indicate increases in values from baseline to follow-up.

431

432 **Fig 7. SPM comparing changes in knee joint power trajectories.** A. Independent t-test
433 trajectory (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands). Dashed red line indicates significance
434 criterion. B. Baseline to follow-up differences for the Sleeved and the Control Groups.

435

436 Discrete variable analyses of the baseline to follow-up changes suggest that there was no
437 significant difference for the Sleeve group, based on the 95% confidence intervals for
438 GRF and knee joint power variables (Table 3). There was, however, a difference in the
439 response between the two groups for the peak vertical GRF (Peak FzVertical): while
440 there was a slight *decrease* in Peak FzVertical for the Control Group, an *increase* was
441 evident for the Sleeve Group. However, based on the 95% confidence intervals for each
442 of the groups, the changes per group were not significant. The Control Group exhibited
443 an increase in the anterior GRF (Peak FyAnterior) from baseline to follow-up. In contrast,
444 no change was evident for the Sleeve group. For knee joint power in the first 5% of
445 stance an increase was evident only for the Control group.
446

447 **Table 3. Randomised Clinical Trial:** Parameters of injured sides at baseline and follow-up, and between-group differences of changes
 448 from baseline to follow-up.

	Control Group (n=9)		Sleeve Group (n=9)		Change score group		Between-group difference <i>p</i> -value*
	Mean (SD)		Mean (SD)		Mean difference (95% CI)		
	BL	FU	BL	FU	Control	Sleeve	
Ground reaction forces							
Rate of Force	31.63	35.87	35.82	32.76	-2.74 (-7.09, 1.61)	-2.11 (-7.90, 3.69)	0.935
Development	(11.82)	(11.96)	(16.24)	(10.89)			
Peak FzVertical	2.28 (0.68)	2.32 (0.81)	2.37 (0.56)	2.44 (0.59)	0.08 (-0.17, 0.33)	-0.25 (-0.79, 0.29)	0.142
Peak FxMedial	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.10 (0.05)	-0.08 (-0.04)	-0.08 (0.5)	0.008 (-0.004, 0.020)	-0.003 (-0.022, 0.029)	0.369
Peak FxLateral	0.07 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	0.08 (0.05)	0.08 (0.05)	-0.014 (-0.002, 0.031)	-0.003 (-0.015, 0.010)	0.086
Peak FyAnterior	0.23 (0.10)	0.30 (0.10)	0.27 (0.02)	0.28 (0.14)	-0.064 (-0.109, -0.019)	0.021 (-0.023, 0.065)	0.004

Peak FyPosterior	-0.12 (0.08)	-0.09 (0.05)	-0.14 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.935
Knee joint power							
Mean, first 5% of stance	-1.1 (3.5)	-1.2 (4.1)	0.22 (4.3)	-0.38 (3.4)	-0.6 (-1.7, 0.5)	0.2 (-2.3, 2.7)	0.514
Peak eccentric	22.6 (12.6)	24.7 (16.8)	24.6 (16.3)	26.3 (16.2)	-5.2 (-12.0, 1.5)	1.6 (-7.3, 10.5)	0.683
Peak concentric	-12.1 (5.9)	-11.8 (6.3)	-10.7 (5.8)	-12.0 (6.1)	1.3 (-2.2, 4.7)	-0.3 (-3.8, 3.2)	0.221

BL: Baseline; FU: Follow-up; * Mann-Whitney Test

449 **Discussion**

450 In our initial report of immediate effects of wearing a knee sleeve on knee kinematics and
451 kinetics showed increased knee flexion at initial contact and peak flexion during stance
452 during the step-down hop [9]. In the current analysis we found, firstly, increased knee
453 joint power during the first 5% of landing (stance) of the ACL-reconstructed knee during
454 that task when wearing the sleeve, compared to the unsleeved condition. Wearing the
455 knee sleeve appeared to limit an initial (external) extension moment and more quickly
456 transition to a flexion moment, similar to the uninjured sides. Secondly, at 6-week
457 follow-up, we found a significant difference in the *direction* of the change of the vertical
458 GRF: while the Sleeve Group showed increased vertical GRF at follow-up, those of the
459 Control group decreased. Per se, the differences within each group were not significant,
460 based on the 95% confidence intervals. No other significant differences in changes
461 between the Sleeve Group and the Control Group for kinematics and kinetics during the
462 task were found (when not wearing the sleeve).

463

464 Our SPM results do not support our hypotheses of lower vertical GRFs, and the discrete
465 variable analysis does not support lower RFD for the (unsleeved) injured versus the
466 uninjured sides for the group of 30 participants. The SPM results also do not support the
467 hypothesis that when wearing the sleeve, the peak vertical GRFs and RFD of the injured
468 side increase significantly. However, a potential effect on RFD when wearing the sleeve
469 may exist, although the post-hoc analyses did not reach significance.

470

471 **Ground reaction forces**

472 Our finding of lack of immediate differences for GRF in the three planes between the
473 injured and uninjured sides with the SPM analysis, as well as between the sleeved and
474 unsleeved conditions contrast with previous studies that found lower vertical GRF for the
475 ACL-reconstructed sides [20, 21]. The discrete variable analysis found significantly
476 lower peak $F_{yAnterior}$ (Table 2) for the injured versus contralateral side. Peak
477 $F_{yAnterior}$ occur during the early propulsion as the centre of mass is moved forwards
478 over the weight-bearing foot. Less trunk flexion observed participants with ACL
479 reconstruction may explain lower $F_{yAnterior}$ [35], but remains speculative as we did not
480 analyse trunk movements. The knee sleeve did not influence that variable for the injured
481 side. We used a sub-maximal hop for safety reasons as we had recruited participants who
482 had not achieved a high level of function post-reconstruction, as defined by an IKDC less
483 than 80/100. Dai, et al. [20] used a stop-jump task and a side-cutting task, whereas
484 Baumgart, et al. [21] used a bilateral and a single-leg countermovement jumping task.
485 Those tasks may have generated higher GRF than during our step-down task, thus those
486 tasks may be able to identify residual asymmetries to a greater extent. Pietrosimone et al.
487 [22] found that the time since ACL reconstruction influenced GRF during walking, with
488 vertical GRF during walking gait being lower in the injured side compared to the
489 uninjured side during the first year post-surgery, but higher than the uninjured side in the
490 longer term.

491

492 Lower vertical GRF following ACL reconstruction may indicate a more cautious, hesitant
493 landing pattern. Thus, the directional differences for the two groups for vertical GRF over

494 the 6-week period may be of interest. The Sleeve Group had reported higher physical
495 activity levels and duration during the 6-week period than the Control Group [6]. Thus,
496 the slight *increase* in vertical GRF from baseline to follow-up for the Sleeve Group
497 (compared to *decrease* for the Control Group), combined with the shorter stance duration
498 [9] may reflect increased confidence as well as performance for the Sleeve Group. Such
499 increased performance is most likely due to higher levels of physical activity during the
500 intervention period, potentially motivated by having a sleeve available.

501

502 **Knee joint power**

503 The stance phase of landing includes the eccentric (absorption) phase and a concentric
504 (propulsion) phase [8, 21]. During the eccentric absorption phase, the body decelerates
505 and the centre of mass lowers. During the concentric phase, the body is propelled
506 upwards and forwards. Both phases have a peak FzVertical (first and second peak during
507 the stance phase). The (unsleeved) injured side had significantly lower peak eccentric and
508 concentric power compared to the uninjured side. Particularly during the initial 5% of
509 stance, the unsleeved injured side had a mean concentric (negative) joint power,
510 suggesting a greater and slightly longer lasting (external) extension moment paired with a
511 lower magnitude (positive; flexing) angular velocity. In contrast, the uninjured sides had
512 a mean eccentric (positive) power during that early stance phase as the flexion moment
513 was initiated earlier. When wearing the sleeve, joint power increased during the first 5%
514 stance for the injured side, becoming ‘more positive’, leading to similar values for the
515 sleeved injured side and the unsleeved uninjured side. However, peak powers remained
516 lower for the sleeved injured side compared to the uninjured side.

517

518 Our initial report suggested enhanced knee flexion angle at initial contact (mean
519 difference 3°) when wearing the knee sleeve [9], alternatively a relatively more extended
520 injured knee at initial contact when unsleeved. Exploring the mean and individual time
521 series for the (external) knee flexion moments for the injured (sleeved and unsleeved) and
522 uninjured sides (unsleeved) reveals the slightly longer (external) extension moment for
523 the injured unsleeved sides compared to the uninjured sides in the first 5% of stance. The
524 SPM analysis suggested that the difference at that timepoint was statistically significant
525 [9].

526

527 **Improved sensori-motor control as a potential mechanism**

528 Combining that result with those of the current report with reference to the slight
529 concentric power in the early stance phase, it is possible that the unsleeved ACL-injured
530 knee lacks knee control during landing and decreased ability to absorb initial impact.
531 That lack of control might be evident in a short-lived extension moment and reduced
532 angular velocity at initial contact, resulting in prolonged concentric knee power. The
533 observed delayed flexion moment, more extended knee and reduced angular velocity at
534 initial contact may also be explained by previously reported subtle increased quadriceps
535 pre-activation prior to landing in a group ACL-reconstructed participants with similar
536 duration post-surgery as our group [36]. As outlined in our earlier report [9] and by other
537 researchers [10-12, 37, 38], wearing a knee sleeve may enhance sensori-motor control or
538 awareness of the knee position. We speculate that wearing the sleeve might also decrease
539 subtle fear of movement, potentially decreasing quadriceps pre-activation or guarding.

540 Improved awareness may spontaneously lead to increased landing absorption and control,
541 evident with slightly increased power during the first 5% of stance when sleeved. ACL
542 ruptures are likely to occur in the first 50 ms following landing [39]. Based on our
543 findings, we cautiously speculate that the sleeve might enhance sensori-motor
544 mechanisms during the early eccentric (absorption) phase of landing, potentially
545 decreasing risk for ACL injury or re-injury.

546

547 Based on our findings, changes in knee power may explain possible immediate responses
548 of enhanced landing knee flexion when wearing the knee sleeve, rather than adaptation or
549 responses related to ground reaction forces. To confirm such hypothesis, knee angular
550 velocity could also be explored. In contrast, over a longer period, wearing the sleeve
551 regularly may lead to enhanced overall performance, evident in potential small increases
552 for vertical GRF and shorter stance duration. Whether an increased vertical GRF explains
553 the improved stance duration for the Sleeve group at follow-up, and implications of
554 increased anterior GRF remain speculative considering the very low sample size.

555 Increased anterior GRF at follow-up for the Control group poses the question whether
556 they needed greater effort to hop at the same pre-defined, individualised distance as
557 during the baseline assessment. Furthermore, compensatory responses of the hip, ankle
558 and trunk and centre of mass positioning during landing need to be explored further.

559

560 As a summary for the research pipeline, several directional changes are supportive of the
561 sleeve's role in improving function for individuals with ACL reconstruction. Immediate
562 effects of wearing a knee sleeve included approximately 5% increased maximal single leg
563 hop distance [6]; increased knee flexion at initial contact and peak flexion (approximately

564 3□) [9] and, from the current analysis, increased knee power in the first 5% of stance.
565 While changes for RFD and peak anterior and posterior GRF when wearing the sleeve
566 did not reach significance, directional changes were evident towards the values of the
567 uninjured side. Particularly, the combination of increased knee flexion at initial contact
568 and increased knee power during the early landing (stance) phase may indicate enhanced
569 sensorimotor control during the phase in which the knee is most vulnerable for ACL
570 rupture and re-rupture. Wearing a knee sleeve at least one hour daily for 6 weeks may
571 lead to increased performance evident in faster stance phase during the step-down hop,
572 and there is evidence of a directional change towards increased vertical GRF. However,
573 there is no statistical evidence that the magnitude of GRF, peak knee power or moments
574 changed over that period. We found no effects for wearing the sleeve in terms of self-
575 reported outcomes (IKDC-SKF) and thigh muscle strength, indicating that wearing the
576 sleeve did not improve nor limit self-reported knee function and muscle strength to a
577 greater extent than not wearing the sleeve. From a clinical perspective, prescription of
578 knee sleeves for people with ACL reconstruction should be based on assessment of the
579 individual's impairments, context, and their response to the knee sleeve on re-assessment.
580

581 **Methodological considerations**

582 Our findings need to be interpreted with caution. Most variables that we explored had
583 relatively large standard deviations compared to their means, suggesting large between-
584 individual variability. We did not explore responses at the ankle, hip and trunk, which
585 would add to the complexity of the analysis. Anticipation of a task (such as a drop jump)
586 can lead to change in neuromechanical and functional differences in performance [19,

587 40], in turn, potentially enhancing confidence. Thus, psychological responses, such as
588 levels of confidence, also need to be considered.

589

590 A strength of our analysis is that we included SPM as well as discrete variable analysis.
591 SPM allows identification of differences across time series without *a priori* defined
592 variables. However, time-aligning the respective peaks for each trial may mask potential
593 differences between conditions and between participants. The discrete variable analysis
594 of specified time points thus complemented the SPM analysis. As an explanatory study of
595 findings, we performed multiple analyses, increasing the risk of Type 1 errors. On the
596 other hand, as the COVID pandemic interfered with the follow-up sessions, only a small
597 number of participants completed the RCT. The of Type II errors exists, thus those
598 results, in particular, remain speculative.

599

600 Various confounders influencing the outcomes need to be considered. Wearing the knee
601 sleeve may lead to improved knee-related confidence, or being prescribed a knee sleeve
602 might lead to greater motivation to exercise or undertake physical activity, thereby
603 potentially improving sensori-motor control and skill. The level of activity may influence
604 outcomes such that those with higher performance levels may respond to a lesser degree
605 to those with low performance (or greater impairment). We did not control for level of
606 activity in the analysis, such as by the Tegner Activity scale. That remains a direction for
607 future research with a larger sample. Lastly, time since surgery and sex influences
608 biomechanical outcomes. We included participants with a large range of duration since
609 surgery (6 months to 5 years), which may have confounded our results. We controlled for
610 those two confounders by entering them as co-variates in the repeated measures

611 ANOVAs of the discrete variable analyses. Thus, time since surgery and sex are unlikely
612 to influence our findings of no statistically significant differences observed between sides
613 for vertical GRF.

614

615 **Conclusion**

616 Knee power increased during the first 5% of stance during a step-down hop when
617 wearing the knee sleeve on the injured side compared to not wearing the sleeve while
618 peak powers did not change. Wearing a knee sleeve did not change GRFs during that task
619 for the ACL-reconstructed side, as evident in the SPM analysis. Wearing the knee sleeve
620 at least one hour daily for 6-weeks lead to a directional change of increased vertical GRF
621 for the Sleeve Group at follow-up. There were no significantly different changes (in
622 magnitude) of GRFs compared to not wearing the sleeve, except for peak anterior ground
623 reaction forces. Our previous report indicated increased knee flexion at initial contact.
624 Combining that finding with increased knee power in the first 5% of landing when
625 wearing the knee sleeve may indicate a protective response during the phase when the
626 knee is most vulnerable for ACL ruptures.

627

628 **Acknowledgements**

629 We thank David Jackson, Drs Anupa Patak, Sarah Ward and Mandeep Kaur for their
630 assistance for data collection and processing.

631 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

632 Ethics approval was granted by the Health & Disability Ethics Committee, New Zealand,
633 Reference 18/CEN/93, dated 5th June 2018, amended on 27th August 2019 and 4th
634 October 2019. All participants provided written informed consent to participate. All
635 methods were undertaken in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

636

637 **Authors' contributions**

638 Conceptualization: Gisela Sole, Niels Hammer

639 Data curation: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb

640 Formal analysis: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb, Todd Pataky

641 Funding acquisition: Gisela Sole, Niels Hammer

642 Investigation: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb

643 Methodology: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb, Todd Pataky

644 Project administration: Gisela Sole

645 Verification: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb

646 Visualisation: Peter Lamb

647 Writing – original draft: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb

648 Writing – review & editing: Gisela Sole, Peter Lamb, Todd Pataky, Niels Hammer

649

650 **Data availability**

651 All relevant data are available through Zenodo at DOI:

652 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6859069>

653

654 **Funding**

655 Funding and material (knee sleeves) were provided by Bauerfeind AG (Triebeser Straße,
656 07937 Zeulenroda-Triebes, Germany. The Funder was not involved in participant
657 recruitment, data collection, processing and analysis, and interpretation of results, and in
658 no way influenced experimental procedures or report preparation. The funding covered
659 the overheads for the Biomechanics laboratory, laboratory technician, administrative
660 support, research assistant, contribution towards participant transport costs, and staff-
661 related overheads.

662

663 **Conflict of interest**

664 The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

665

666

667 **References**

- 668 1. van Melick N, van Cingel REH, Brooijmans F, Neeter C, van Tienen T, Hulle
669 W, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MWG: Evidence-based clinical practice update:
670 practice guidelines for anterior cruciate ligament rehabilitation based on a
671 systematic review and multidisciplinary consensus. Br J Sports Med 2016,
672 50(24):1506.
- 673 2. Mahood C, Perry M, Gallagher P, Sole G: Chaos and confusion with confidence:
674 Managing fear of Re-Injury after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Phys
675 Ther Sport 2020, 45:145-154.

- 676 3. Martinez-Calderon J, Flores-Cortes M, Morales-Asencio JM, Fernandez-Sanchez
677 M, Luque-Suarez A: Which interventions enhance pain self-efficacy in people
678 with chronic musculoskeletal pain? A systematic review with meta-analysis of
679 randomized controlled trials, including over 12 000 participants. *J Orthop Sports
680 Phys Ther* 2020, 50(8):418-430.
- 681 4. Liew BXW, Feller JA, Webster KE: Understanding the psychological
682 mechanisms of return to sports readiness after anterior cruciate ligament
683 reconstruction. *PLoS One* 2022, 17(3):e0266029.
- 684 5. Ardern CL, Taylor NF, Feller JA, Webster KE: Fear of re-injury in people who
685 have returned to sport following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction surgery.
686 *J Sci Med Sport* 2012, 15(6):488-495.
- 687 6. Sole G, Lamb P, Pataký T, Klima S, Navarre P, Hammer N: Immediate and 6-
688 week effects of wearing a knee sleeve following anterior cruciate ligament
689 reconstruction: a cross-over laboratory and randomised clinical trial. *BMC
690 Musculoskelet Disord* 2021, 22:655.
- 691 7. Kotsifaki A, Korakakis V, Whiteley R, Van Rossom S, Jonkers I: Measuring only
692 hop distance during single leg hop testing is insufficient to detect deficits in knee
693 function after ACL reconstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J
694 Sports Med* 2020, 54(3):139.
- 695 8. Kotsifaki A, Van Rossom S, Whiteley R, Korakakis V, Bahr R, Sideris V, Smith
696 PG, Jonkers I: Symmetry in triple hop distance hides asymmetries in knee
697 function after ACL reconstruction in athletes at return to sports. *Am J Sports Med*
698 2021:036354652110631.

- 699 9. Sole G, Lamb P, Pataky T, Pathak A, Klima S, Navarre P, Hammer N: Immediate
700 and six-week effects of wearing a knee sleeve following anterior cruciate ligament
701 reconstruction on knee kinematics and kinetics: a cross-over laboratory and
702 randomised clinical trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2022, 23(1):560.
- 703 10. Collins A, Blackburn T, Olcott C, Jordan JM, Yu B, Weinhold P: A kinetic and
704 kinematic analysis of the effect of stochastic resonance electrical stimulation and
705 knee sleeve during gait in osteoarthritis of the knee. *J Appl Biomech* 2014,
706 30(1):104–112.
- 707 11. Schween R, Gehring D, Gollhofer A: Immediate effects of an elastic knee sleeve
708 on frontal plane gait biomechanics in knee osteoarthritis. *PLoS One* 2015,
709 10(1):e0115782.
- 710 12. Van Tiggelen D, Coorevits P, Witvrouw E: The use of a neoprene knee sleeve to
711 compensate the deficit in knee joint position sense caused by muscle fatigue. *Scan*
712 *J Med Sci Sports* 2008, 18:62-66.
- 713 13. Nagelli C, Di Stasi S, Tatarski R, Chen A, Wordeman S, Hoffman J, Hewett TE:
714 Neuromuscular training improves self-reported function and single-leg landing
715 hip biomechanics in athletes after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction.
716 *Orthop J Sports Med* 2020, 8(10):2325967120959347.
- 717 14. Neilson V, Ward S, Hume P, Lewis G, McDaid A: Effects of augmented feedback
718 on training jump landing tasks for ACL injury prevention: A systematic review
719 and meta-analysis. *Phys Ther Sport* 2019, 39:126-135.
- 720 15. Padua DA, Distefano LJ: Sagittal plane knee biomechanics and vertical ground
721 reaction forces are modified following ACL Injury prevention programs: A
722 systematic review. *Sports Health* 2009, 1(2):165-173.


- 723 16. Yu B, Lin C-F, Garrett WE: Lower extremity biomechanics during the landing of
724 a stop-jump task. *Clin Biomech* 2006, 21(3):297-305.
- 725 17. Irmischer BS, Harris C, Pfeiffer RP, DeBeliso MA, Adams KJ, Shea KG: Effects
726 of a knee ligament injury prevention exercise program on impact forces in
727 women. *J Strength Condit Res* 2004, 18(4):703-707.
- 728 18. Myers CA, Torry MR, Peterson DS, Shelburne KB, Giphart JE, Krong JP, Woo
729 SLY, Steadman JR: Measurements of tibiofemoral kinematics during soft and stiff
730 drop landings using biplane fluoroscopy. *Am J Sports Med* 2011, 39(8):1714-
731 1723.
- 732 19. Bates NA, Ford KR, Myer GD, Hewett TE: Impact differences in ground reaction
733 force and center of mass between the first and second landing phases of a drop
734 vertical jump and their implications for injury risk assessment. *J Biomech* 2013,
735 46(7):1237-1241.
- 736 20. Dai B, Butler RJ, Garrett WE, Queen RM: Using ground reaction force to predict
737 knee kinetic asymmetry following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction.
738 *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2014, 24:974-981.
- 739 21. Baumgart C, Hoppe MW, Freiwald J: Phase-specific ground reaction force
740 analyses of bilateral and unilateral jumps in patients with ACL reconstruction.
741 *Orthop J Sports Med* 2017, 5(6):232596711771091.
- 742 22. Pietrosimone B, Seeley MK, Johnston C, Pfeiffer SJ, Spang JT, Blackburn JT:
743 Walking ground reaction force post-acl reconstruction: Analysis of time and
744 symptoms. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2019, 51(2):246-254.

- 745 23. Orishimo KF, Kremenic IJ, Mullaney MJ, McHugh MP, Nicholas SJ: Adaptations
746 in single-leg hop biomechanics following anterior cruciate ligament
747 reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2010, 18(11):1587-1593.
- 748 24. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, the CG: CONSORT 2010 Statement: updated
749 guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *Trials* 2010, 11(1):32.
- 750 25. Irrgang JJ, Anderson AF, Boland AL, Harner CD, Kurosaka M, Neyret P,
751 Richmond JC, Shelborne KD: Development and validation of the international
752 knee documentation committee subjective knee form. *Am J Sports Med* 2001,
753 29(5):600-613.
- 754 26. Tegner Y, Lysholm J: Rating systems in the evaluation of knee ligament injuries.
755 *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1985, 198:43-49.
- 756 27. van Meer BL, Meuffels DE, Vissers MM, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA, Verhaar JAN,
757 Terwee CB, Reijman M: Knee Injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score or
758 International Knee Documentation Committee Subjective Knee Form: Which
759 questionnaire is most useful to monitor patients with an anterior cruciate ligament
760 rupture in the short term? *Arthrosc* 2013, 29(4):701-715.
- 761 28. Lefevre N, Klouche S, Mirouse G, Herman S, Gerometta A, Bohu Y: Return to
762 sport after primary and revision anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: A
763 prospective comparative study of 552 patients from the FAST Cohort. *Am J*
764 *Sports Med* 2017, 45:34-41.
- 765 29. Kristianslund E, Krosshaug T: Comparison of drop jumps and sport-specific
766 sidestep cutting: implications for anterior cruciate ligament injury risk screening.
767 *Am J Sports Med* 2013, 41(3):684-688.

- 768 30. Friston KJ, Holmes AP, Poline JB, Grasby PJ, Williams SC, Frackowiak RS,
769 Turner R: Analysis of fMRI time-series revisited. *Neuroimage* 1995, 2(1):45-53.
- 770 31. Sole G, Pataky T, Hammer N, Lamb P: Can a knee sleeve influence ground
771 reaction forces and knee joint power during a step-down hop in participants
772 following ACL reconstruction? Discrete and time-continuous datasets. Zenodo
773 2022, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6859069>
- 774 32. Pataky TC, Robinson MA, Vanrenterghem J: Vector field statistical analysis of
775 kinematic and force trajectories. *J Biomech* 2013, 46(14):2394-2401.
- 776 33. Pataky TC, Robinson MA, Vanrenterghem J, Savage R, Bates KT, Crompton RH:
777 Vector field statistics for objective center-of-pressure trajectory analysis during
778 gait, with evidence of scalar sensitivity to small coordinate system rotations. *Gait
779 Posture* 2014, 40(1):255-258.
- 780 34. Jensen RL, Ebben WP: Quantifying plyometric intensity via rate of force
781 development, knee joint and ground reaction forces. *J Strength Cond Res* 2007,
782 21(3):763-767.
- 783 35. Trigsted SM, Post EG, Bell DR: Landing mechanics during single hop for
784 distance in females following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction compared
785 to healthy controls. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2017, 25(5):1395-1402.
- 786 36. Trigsted SM, Cook DB, Pickett KA, Cadmus-Bertram L, Dunn WR, Bell DR:
787 Greater fear of reinjury is related to stiffened jump-landing biomechanics and
788 muscle activation in women after ACL reconstruction. *Knee Surg Sports
789 Traumatol Arthrosc* 2018, 26(12):3682-3689.
- 790 37. Birmingham TB, Bryant DM, Giffin JR, Litchfield RB, Kramer JF, Donner A,
791 Fowler PJ: A randomized controlled trial comparing the effectiveness of

- 792 functional knee brace and neoprene sleeve use after anterior cruciate ligament
793 reconstruction. Am J Sports Med 2008, 36(4):648-655.
- 794 38. Mohd Sharif NA, Goh S-L, Usman J, Wan Safwani WKZ: Biomechanical and
795 functional efficacy of knee sleeves: A literature review. Phys Ther Sport 2017,
796 28:44-52.
- 797 39. Carlson VR, Sheehan FT, Boden BP: Video analysis of anterior cruciate ligament
798 (ACL) injuries. JBJS Reviews 2016, 4(11):1.
- 799 40. Ambegaonkar JP, Shultz SJ, Perrin DH: A subsequent movement alters lower
800 extremity muscle activity and kinetics in drop jumps vs. drop landings. J Strength
801 Cond Res 2011, 25(10).
- 802
- 803

804




805

806 **Figure 1. CONSORT flowchart of participant recruitment, allocation and follow-up.**

807

808



809

810 **Figure 2: Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-**


811 **down hop for the injured (unsleeved) sides to the uninjured contralateral sides**

812 **(n=30). A: SPM Hotellings T² test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted**

813 **significance criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical)**

814 **component curves (mean and ±1 standard deviation bands), respectively.**

815



816


817 **Figure 3: Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-**
818 **down hop for the sleeved and unsleeved conditions for the ACL injured sides (n=30).**

819 A: SPM Hotellings T² test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance

820 criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component

821 curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands), respectively.

822



823

824 **Figure 4: Comparison of ground reaction forces during the stance phase of the step-**
825 **down hop for the ACL-injured sleeved sides to the uninjured unsleeved sides (n=30).**

826 A: SPM Hotellings T² test trajectory, dashed red line indicates adjusted significance

827 criterion; B to D: x (lateral/medial), y (anterior/posterior), and z (vertical) component

828 curves (mean and ±1 standard deviation bands), respectively

829




Figure 5: Knee joint power time-continuous comparisons for the uninjured

(unsleeved) sides, and ACL injured sides for sleeved and unsleeved conditions. Top panels: SPM paired t-tests for comparisons between injured (sleeved versus unsleeved) and uninjured sides. Joint power curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) for each respective test are shown in the bottom panels.




Fig 6. SPM analysis of ground reaction force trajectory differences between baseline and follow-up for the Sleeve group (n=9) and Control group (n=9). A. Hotelling's T^2 test trajectory. The dashed red line indicates adjusted significance criterion. B – D. The x, y, and z component curves (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands) comparing groups. Positive values indicate increases in values from baseline to follow-up.




Fig 7. SPM comparing changes in knee joint power trajectories. A. Independent t-test trajectory (mean and ± 1 standard deviation bands). Dashed red line indicates significance criterion. B. Baseline to follow-up differences for the Sleeved and the Control groups.